MINUTES

Mankato Planning Commission
August 26, 2026 - 6:00 p.m.
IGC - Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Zehnder called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner's Present: Chair Zehnder, Ms. Surdy, Mr. Laven, Mr. Wilke, Ms. Bigham, Mr. Filipovitch.

Staff Present: Mark Konz-Director of Community Development, Travis Johnson-Permit Technician, Molly Westman-Planning Coordinator, Bennett Hanson-Planner, Ean Pringnitz-Economic Development Specialist.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Wilke made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Filipovitch seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Wilke made a motion to approve the minutes from July 22nd, 2026. Ms. Bigham seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

1. July 2026 - Planning Commission Minutes

4. OLD BUSINESS

5. NEW BUSINESS

1. CY35-26

Request of ISG, on behalf of the property owner, Rolls Royce Solutions America, Inc., for a conditional use permit to allow the installation of one, 2,000-gallon HVO/diesel above-ground tank in P-I, Planned Industrial, zoning district. The subject property is described as Lots 1-3 and all of Lots 6-8, Block 1, and the east 200' of Lots 4 and 5, Lundin Industrial Park, and the southerly 62' of Lots 3 and 4, Block 2, Summit Industrial Park (304 Lundin).

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff respectfully submits the following findings of fact for the Conditional Use Permit:

1. The applicant aims to amend the existing conditional use permit to allow for modifications to the sizing of above-ground storage tanks. All applicable elements of the original conditional use permit shall remain as is.
2. The proposed amended above-ground tanks, when implemented with the recommendations and in conformance with the Mankato City Code, is in keeping with the comprehensive planning policies of the City. The underlying land use plan identifies this parcel as "Light Industrial".
3. To the extent known, the development conforms with all other applicable regulations of the district, and other applicable ordinances.
4. The applicant has identified the three following aboveground storage tanks that will be constructed or remain onsite: 1) a new 2,000-gallon diesel / HVO tank, 2) an existing 200-gallon diesel tank, relocated on site, and 3) an existing 1,000-lb LP tank to remain as is.

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff recommends approval of the amended conditional use permit to allow for modifications to the purposed exterior fluid/fuel storage tanks with the following conditions:

1. All applicable conditions of approval associated with the original Conditional Use Permit shall remain active and in-place.
2. Any proposed future modifications to the volume and quantity of the outdoor aboveground storage tanks shall be reviewed for compliance and approval as a new CUP or as an amendment to the existing Conditional Use Permit.
3. Applicants shall coordinate with all appropriate regulatory agencies, including the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to ensure compliance with all applicable state standards and permit requirements associated with installation and utilization of a 2000-gallon aboveground HVO/Diesel tank.

Randy Potter, ISG. Mr. Potter was present at the meeting representing Rolls-Royce and was available to answer any questions the Commission members may have.

Ms. Surdy questioned what new information had been discovered that resulted in the need for the 2,000-gallon split tank.

Mr. Potter explained that, as Rolls-Royce has gone through its future planning, the company has determined that it needs to produce more generators. This will require testing to be conducted more frequently, which is the reason for the requested increase in fuel storage capacity.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Filipovitch made a motion to approve CY35-26. Ms. Bigham seconded the motion and passed unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 14th, 2026.

2. CY36-26

Request of Bolton and Menk, on behalf of Kody Schendel of New Hope Board and Lodge and KD2 Properties, LLC, for a conditional use permit to construct and operate a 16-unit congregate micro-apartment addition; and for a variance to decrease the rear yard from 66' to 11.2' in the R-3, Limited Multiple Family Dwelling District. The variance is being requested in order to allow for an approximately 47' X 67' building addition. The property is described as Lots 6, 7, 8 and the westerly half of Lot 9, Block 16 of Mankato City, Blue Earth County (1429 3rd Avenue).

Mr. Konz reported that this item had been modified since the meeting packet was published. He further explained that they had received a letter from the applicant requesting an extension to September 23, 2026, for Planning Commission review and October 13, 2026, for City Council review. He explained that the extension would allow the applicant to make modifications to the plan to better align with Mankato City Code requirements and the previously approved CUP for the property.

Mr. Konz further explained that, from a city staff perspective, staff would support tabling the item and bringing it back for consideration in the future. However, he noted that if the item is tabled at the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission would need to provide direction to extend the 60-day rule beyond the current timeframe to satisfy the requirements of Section 15.99.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Filipovitch made a motion to table CY36-26 with the recommendation that the 60-day requirement be extended at the request of the applicant. Mr. Wilke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. CY37-26

Request of Southwest Minnesota Housing Partnership for an amendment for Phase 2 to the previously approved planned unit development, PUD, to allow for the usage of Scheid Hall and to allow for parking lot and related infrastructure improvements at the property. The subject property is described as Outlot B, School Sisters of Notre Dame Subdivision, according to the plat thereof on file at the County Recorder's Office, Blue Earth County, Minnesota, to be described as Lot 1, Block 1, Good Counsel Hill subdivision (170 Good Counsel Drive, BE County PID's R010905379005, R010908201007).

Ms. Mitchell reports that staff submits the following findings:

1. The planned unit development satisfies the intent of the City's ordinance, when approved with the recommended conditions, and does not jeopardize public health, safety or welfare.
2. The planned unit development conforms to an approved development plan for Phase 2, which includes utilization of the existing buildings, the existing parking areas, and additional parking.
3. All land shown on the approved development plan as open area will be held by the applicant.
4. Phase 2 is not proposed to impact common open spaces. Future phasing that proposed impacts will be required to submit updated plans for review and approval.
5. The public benefits provided in conjunction with the Planned Unit Development are:
    1. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics and open space. Phase 2 site plans do not impact any of the current open spaces. Future phases will be reviewed separately.
    2. A pattern of development which preserves natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features. Phase 2 does impact natural vegetation, topography, and geologic features. The new parking lots will be located on the northern and western sides of the property. The applicant will be required to restore as much of the natural vegetation and provide the needed screening and tree counts.
    3. Preservation and enhancement of historic and natural resources that significantly contribute to the character of the city. Phase 2 of the proposal preserves structures and a campus that may provide historical significance and no physical building improvements are planned with the project.
    4. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment or other special development features. Phase 2 does make changes to the current exterior features at the site and will be required to install landscaping according to Mankato City Code Chapter

10.

5. Provision of a variety of housing types in accordance with the city's housing goals. Phase 2 of the plan does provide a variety of housing types.
6. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation. Phase 2 provides an adaptive reuse of a currently vacant space.
7. Business and commercial development to enhance the local economy and strengthen the tax base. Phase 2 does include business and commercial development. Office uses are included to allow for a mixed approach to re-use that is similar to the historic use of the property. Event and assembly spaces are included in this phase of the development.
8. The efficient use of land results in more economic networks of utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, buildings, and other facilities. Phase 2 utilizes existing utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, and other facilities.

Ms. Mitchell reports that staff recommends approval of the amendment to PUD #2 with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall fulfill the terms of the development agreement for stormwater, drainage, utility, and traffic requirements.
2. The applicant shall continue to work with City Engineering/Construction Services to meet requirements set forth.
3. The applicant shall continue to meet the requirements set forth by PUD #1 approval.
4. The applicant shall not encroach into the bluff setback with any construction activity.
5. Applicant shall be aware that parking requirements shall be met at all times regardless of event occupancy.
6. As future phases are planned and submitted that include campus site improvements, building additions or uses associated with the Institutional Overlay District, a request for an update to the IO campus master plan shall be requested and obtained prior to implementation of any improvements.
7. Prior to occupancy of the structure, the applicant shall obtain a certificate of occupancy from the City of Mankato Building Official for each of the spaces.
8. All parking stalls shall be striped in accordance with the Mankato City Code prior to occupancy.
9. A rental license will be required for the residential units.

Mr. Laven questioned whether what he referred to as the “stormwater bunker” was intended to be designed to accommodate the current parking phase or whether it was intended to accommodate future phases as well.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the tank located beneath the parking lot being constructed as part of this project would serve that portion of the parking lot. She explained that her understanding was that future tanks would be used to accommodate any additional impervious surfaces associated with future phases.

Ms. Surdy referenced a feedback letter that mentioned reducing parking but noted that the staff report did not mention any reduction in parking. She questioned whether there was any confusion regarding this matter.

Mr. Konz indicated that city staff had a conversation with the individuals who submitted the letter, which provided a better understanding of what was being proposed. He explained that the change involves bringing the parking into compliance with Mankato City Code. He referenced a previous meeting item and the requirement for leased parking stalls off-site. He noted that the applicant would still have the opportunity to lease those stalls, but doing so is not a requirement of City Code and would instead serve as an additional option if needed. He concluded by stating that the individuals who originally submitted the letter were comfortable with the proposed changes.

Breanne Kennedy, representing Southwest Minnesota Housing Partnership. Ms. Kennedy was present at the Planning Commission meeting to answer any questions from Commission members and to provide a presentation and update on the overall project.

Ms. Kennedy stated that preparations, including building permit plans, are underway for Phase 1 of Good Counsel Hill. She also stated that GC Meadows is underway, with the hope that residents will begin moving in during the winter or spring of 2027. She further highlighted the requests included in this item and outlined the intended next steps for the project.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Surdy made a motion to approve CY37-26. The motion was seconded by Mr. Laven and passed unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 14th, 2026.

4. CY38-26

Request of Spirits at Rest for a conditional use permit to allow a licensed residential substance use disorder treatment facility in the B-3, Highway Commercial, zoning district. The subject property is described as Lot 1, Block 3, Wolfe Addition No. 2 (80 Power Drive; BE County PID R010903378003).

Mr. Hanson reports that staff respectfully submit the following findings of fact for the requested Conditional Use Permit:

1. Medical Clinics are considered a conditional use in the B-3 District.
2. The request is in keeping with the comprehensive planning policies of the City as the underlying land use plan identifies the subject property as "Commercial", and uses similar in character to this use are identified in the commercial zoning districts as permitted and conditional uses.
3. The proposal does not interfere with or diminish the use of property in the immediate vicinity.
4. The proposal does not cause undue traffic congestion. No changes are proposed to the public street system. The applicant has attested that no significant change with respect to trip generation, site operations and overall traffic impact to the area shall occur with the proposed reuse of the subject property.
5. There are no known historical or architectural resources on the site.
6. There are no known natural or environmental features on the site.
7. It will not cause a negative cumulative effect and effect on the City as a whole.
8. The proposal will not jeopardize the public's health, safety, or general welfare.
9. To the extent known, the development, when considered with the recommended conditions, conforms with all other applicable regulations of the district, and other applicable ordinances.
10. The applicant has confirmed their awareness that this proposal is a change to the Common Plan of Development previously approved by the City.

Mr. Hanson reports that staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions:

1. At the time of building permit, a photometric plan shall be submitted along with fixture cut sheets that conform with Mankato City Code Chapter 10.
2. At the time of building permit, an updated landscaping plan shall be submitted that depicts landscaping of the interior parking lot islands and screening requirements. Plan shall conform with Mankato City Code Chapter 10.
3. Any proposed mechanical equipment shall not be visible from the adjacent street frontage and be screened according to Mankato City Code Chapter 10.
4. Applicant shall coordinate with City of Mankato Public Safety to ensure sufficient fire coverage and

public safety access to all required portions of the subject property.

5. Approval of this modification does not eliminate the parcel from future coordination or alteration of the proposed storage basin with an adjacent parcel. The City shall not be responsible for this coordination and will enforce stormwater compliance for future development of the adjacent site.
6. The applicant shall be subject to SAC & WAC fees based on the City of Mankato assessment policy and fee schedule.
7. Any future expansion of services or structures on the Subject Property shall be subject to review and approval of the City of Mankato in accordance with all applicable Mankato City Code standards.
8. A fence permit shall be obtained prior to installation of any fencing on the subject property.
9. The applicant shall obtain a sign permit for any desired site signage prior to fabrication and installation.
10. No outside storage shall be permitted on the subject property unless fully enclosed/screened.
11. All refuse containers shall be fully enclosed in conformance with Mankato City Code Chapter 10.
12. Loading and unloading shall not interfere with the operation of adjacent uses.

Mr. Laven questioned the notification process, specifically whether notices sent by the City of Mankato to property owners located within 450 feet of the proposed project are sent at least 10 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Konz indicated that the City of Mankato is required to publish notices within 10 days of a meeting. He further added that typically they are sent out 2–3 weeks prior to the planning commission meeting.

Mr. Laven stated that residents within the 450-foot notification radius may have first learned about the project approximately 14 to 21 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting. He questioned the recommendation for the applicant to hold a neighborhood meeting and expressed concern regarding the short timeframe between the neighborhood meeting organized by the applicant and the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Konz added that the City of Mankato advises holding a neighborhood meeting; however, it is not required. He further explained that, generally, the city would recommend holding the meeting closer to the time when the notices are sent out.

Mr. Laven indicated that it was his understanding that neighborhood notifications are typically sent several weeks in advance. He suggested that if the City of Mankato could do more to encourage applicants to hold neighborhood meetings sooner, it would be beneficial to all parties involved.

Chair Zehnder questioned whether city staff had determined that the proposed use would be classified as a medical clinic and, therefore, would be an allowed use within the zoning district.

Mr. Konz indicated that the proposed use would be similar to what the Planning Commission approved earlier this summer for the Motel 6 conversion, which would provide services to residents staying at that facility. He explained that the Planning Commission recommended approval of that item based on a similar type of use, and the City Council subsequently approved the item.

Mr. Konz added that, from a code perspective, the City Council adopted updates to the B-3 zoning district last year to allow residential uses within the district. Therefore, between the medical clinic classification and the allowance of residential uses in the B-3 zoning district, city staff determined that the proposed use complies with the zoning requirements.

Joe Richter, Factor Property Management, and Jeremy Gerres, Founder/CEO of Spirits at Rest.
Mr. Richter indicated that he has been working with Mr. Gerres for the past year and a half and thanked city staff for their assistance as they explored various properties. He then introduced Mr. Gerres.

Mr. Gerres thanked the Planning Commission for hearing their proposal and indicated that he brought his Clinical Director and Director of Operations to answer any questions commission members may have.

Mr. Laven questioned why the Monday prior to the Planning Commission meeting was selected as the date for the neighborhood meeting rather than holding the meeting at an earlier date that would allow time for adjustments to be made if concerns were raised. He further questioned whether anything discussed at the neighborhood meeting on Monday would require the applicant to modify its proposal in any way.

Mr. Gerres stated that he was not aware of the concerns regarding the timing of the neighborhood meeting. He added that he did not fully understand the public hearing process and noted that he had been working with Max DeMars and Mr. Richter, relying on them to provide insight and guidance throughout the process. He also noted that they had rented the space for the meeting and Monday worked best for everyone to be present.

Mr. Richter stated that city staff had advised them to hold a community meeting and suggested a notification radius that would go beyond the minimum required for the city. He noted that this was what they did. He explained that they looked at their calendars and considered summer vacations and holidays when determining the most convenient time to make the meeting happen. He further noted that the community meeting was not something that was required but was necessary as part of the process. He stated that this portion of the process was related to the conditional use permit and that the next step would be to visit the City Council on September 14, 2026, where public comment could continue.

Mr. Laven questioned what feedback they had received at the public open house regarding the project and whether any modifications to the proposal would be made based on that feedback.

Mr. Richter indicated that the concerns they heard at the public open house would be similar to what they would hear at this Planning Commission meeting. He stated that the primary concern was the location and why it was chosen for the proposed facility. He explained that, throughout their process, they had looked at several different properties and, for several different reasons, determined that this location was the best option for establishing the facility in Mankato. He concluded by stating that they would not be making any changes to their application.

Mr. Wilke questioned how the individuals who would be served at the facility would find their way to the facility and asked if they could provide information regarding a typical treatment plan or timeline for these individuals.

Mr. Gerres asked that Carl White come forward to speak regarding the treatment aspect of the proposed facility. Mr. Gerres explained that many of their clients are already connected with Blue Earth County, whether they were previously incarcerated, had gotten into trouble, or had reached out to the county directly.

Mr. Gerres explained that the residential component of the proposed facility would be the beginning of the process to help individuals heal, enter recovery, and work toward returning to the community. He stated that this is one service that is currently missing from the area. He noted that most of their clients would come directly from Blue Earth County and would have already been working with county staff and completed assessments before being referred to their facility. Once referred, the individual would be reviewed by their staff to determine whether they could accept the client into the program.

Mr. Gerres added that he also conducts interventions and noted that he has been sober for 24 years. He explained that there is a detailed process that individuals must go through before they can enter the facility.

Mr. White stated that he is a Licensed Independent Clinical Social Worker (LICSW) and a Licensed Independent Clinical Director (LICD). He noted that he owns his own practice in Le Roy, Minnesota, as well as Spirits at Rest. He stated that he has worked in mental health and addiction counseling for several years with various agencies.

Mr. White stated that the screening process involves evaluating six dimensions, including medical needs,

mental health, physical health, readiness for change, housing, and other related issues. He noted that treatment clients come from a variety of backgrounds and may be referred from clinics or detox facilities. He explained that some individuals may be experiencing homelessness, while others may be high-functioning adults.

Mr. White explained that their focus is on understanding each individual and determining where they are within the stages of change. He noted that the stages of change are taught as part of addiction treatment and begin with determining whether the individual is aware that they have an addiction. He explained that they use motivational interviews to help determine whether the individual recognizes that a problem exists. The next stage is contemplation, which involves determining whether the individual is willing to address the issue and whether they know how to begin doing so. The next stage is action, during which they work with the individual to progress through the stages of change and reach the level where they can begin making changes.

Mr. White stated that they also utilize cognitive behavioral therapy, which focuses on the relationship between thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and is used to help change an individual's thought processes. He added that if an individual has cognitive distortions or other cognitive issues that prevent them from functioning at that level, they may instead utilize behavior activation. He explained that behavior activation focuses on identifying the behaviors that contributed to the individual's addiction or other issues and determining whether those behaviors can be modified. He noted that changing the individual's behavior can eventually lead to changes in their thought processes. He stated that they use these different approaches to determine where each individual needs to begin treatment.

Mr. White added that, as a mental health therapist, he works with the counselors and oversees the licensed staff. He explained that the staff will screen clients to determine whether an individual's needs are beyond the facility's level of care. He noted that they will evaluate whether the individual is there because of criminal issues, addiction issues, or a combination of both. He explained that criminal matters are addressed through jail or prison, while their facility focuses on addressing the individual's addiction. He noted that these issues can sometimes overlap and stated that they will not work with individuals who have a history of criminal behavior or individuals who are at a higher risk of reoffending.

Mr. White stated that he would personally review each case to ensure that the individual meets the facility's admission criteria. He explained that if an individual's health or treatment needs are beyond what the facility can address, the individual would not be accepted. He concluded by stating that treatment plans would be developed for each individual and that staff would provide education and treatment while working with the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) to ensure that the program meets applicable requirements.

Mr. White acknowledged that he could not guarantee that there would never be issues but stated that he would do everything possible to ensure the safety of individuals and the surrounding Mankato community.

Ms. Surdy questioned whether they utilize the LOCUS method.

Mr. White indicated that they do utilize the LOCUS method.

Mr. Wilke thanked the applicants for the extensive narrative included with the application. He wanted to confirm a section related to the safety standards, which referenced continuous professional staffing, controlled building access, alarmed exterior doors and windows, overnight client checks, medication protocols, and written emergency procedures. He asked for clarification regarding the statement that client movement off-site would be strictly managed and coordinated by staff as part of each structured treatment plan.

Mr. White stated that this was correct and explained that if clients had a medical appointment, staff would transport them to the appointment using company vehicles. He also explained that the exterior doors would be alarmed when opened. If a client were to leave through a door without staff being aware, the

client would be discharged from the program. He added that staff would speak with the individual regarding the incident and that the admission process would need to be completed again before the individual could be considered for admission.

Mr. Wilke further questioned whether, based on Mr. White's prior remarks, clients would be unable to leave the facility and walk around the neighborhood for purposes such as getting fresh air.

Mr. White stated that clients would not be permitted to leave the facility on their own and that allowing clients to leave the facility would not be consistent with how they operate their facility. He further explained that clients are in the program for a limited amount of time and noted that this is not a 13-month program, but rather a 30-, 60-, or 90-day program. He stated that, following completion of the program, clients would then step down to an outpatient treatment program.

Mr. Gerres added that the three wings within the facility would have doors that could only be freely opened if the fire alarms were activated. He explained that the main entry doors to the building would also be controlled, and anyone wishing to leave the building would need to speak with staff before doing so.

Ms. Surdy stated that providing additional information about the LOCUS and how it measures and determines an individual's appropriate level of care would help community members feel more comfortable with the proposed facility. She questioned whether the facility would primarily serve individuals at Level 3 and below.

Mr. White indicated that the facility would serve individuals below Level 3. He explained that, when considering individuals with sex offender charges, anyone classified as a Level 3 would not meet the criteria for admission to the facility. He stated that he understood the concerns surrounding this issue and added that the stigma associated with an individual committing an offense at or having previously been at the facility presents too great of a risk.

Ms. Surdy stated that she believes community members may not understand how the LOCUS levels are determined and that providing additional education on the process could be helpful.

Mr. White stated that he was not present at the meeting held on Monday and felt that he could have provided the type of information Ms. Surdy was referring to. He further stated that he believes security is the main issue and explained that they want to maintain a positive public image.

Mr. White further stated that the safety and security of his staff is his number one priority. He explained that having an individual who is a high-risk sex offender at the facility would not be appropriate for the other staff members and would present a safety and security concern.

Ms. Bigham asked whether smoking cigarettes would be allowed at the facility.

Mr. White stated that smoking would be allowed in the back of the facility. He explained that he has worked for other addiction agencies where cigarettes were not allowed and that they found many individuals would either sneak cigarettes into the facility or vape. He stated that, at this facility, smoking would be allowed in a designated area on the back portion of the fenced-in patio.

Mr. White explained that the fence was included in the design to help protect the privacy of the clients and maintain HIPAA requirements. He stated that a designated smoking area would be provided for clients within the fenced area. He noted that, based on his experience, treatment facilities must prioritize the addictions they are addressing. He explained that their primary focus would be on alcohol, methamphetamine, fentanyl, and cocaine rather than nicotine. He added that clients would be responsible for providing their own money to purchase cigarettes.

Mr. Gerres added that security cameras would be installed throughout the facility, except for areas where clients are housed. He also stated that a 24-hour security team would be present in addition to facility staff.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment.

John Woodrow Pfeffer, 704 Mulligan Street. Mr. Pfeffer stated that he was present at the meeting this evening because he lives in a neighborhood that was not made aware that the proposed facility was being considered until Monday. He noted that he was unable to obtain all the information at the neighborhood meeting because all the proposed facility staff were not available and felt as though there was a rush to judgment because of this.

Mr. Pfeffer indicated that there were many others in the neighborhood who were unable to attend the meeting on Monday and were also unaware that the proposed facility would be located in the area. He added that he believes this type of work needs to be done in the community and noted that he has been sober for 12 years. He stated that there are three full-time daycare facilities, two parks, and the Pickle Barn, which has a summer club for children who walk down to the park and may pass the proposed adult treatment facility.

Mr. Pfeffer indicated that he felt the Planning Commission should ask additional questions, including whether a traffic impact study had been completed. He noted that these questions were asked at the Monday meeting but were not answered. He further stated that the applicant was unaware of the fire station located on Augusta Drive and indicated that, if this information had not been considered or provided, he did not believe the Planning Commission was receiving the full picture. He also stated that he did not believe the neighborhood had been properly notified.

Mr. Pfeffer referenced previous statements made by Mr. White and Mr. Gerres and indicated that he felt their statements regarding safety were conflicting. He noted that, on one hand, they stated that they could not guarantee that nothing would ever happen, while on the other hand, they used statements such as "absolutely" when discussing what would or would not happen at the facility.

Mr. Pfeffer questioned why, if the proposed facility is considered a medical facility, clients would be transported off-site for medical services. He stated that he understood that they have a mental health license but believed that the license was being used to establish the facility. He questioned if they were truly a medical facility, why they would need to transport clients to another facility for medical services.

Mr. Pfeffer referenced his time in the Army and indicated that he helps disabled veterans and conducts a support group every Tuesday and Thursday at Hy-Vee. He stated that he loves his community, graduated from Mankato West, and wants to continue to serve his community. However, he stated that he feels the proposed facility is not serving anyone other than the bottom line.

Mr. Pfeffer further stated that they had asked the applicants why the Blue Earth County Justice Center was not considered as a potential location. He indicated that the response he received was that it would be too expensive because they would be piggybacking off someone else's electrical and septic systems and that it would cost millions of dollars to install new equipment. He stated that he felt the neighborhood was being left to suffer because of the lack of available funds and that his children's bus route would now pass by a treatment center.

Mr. Pfeffer indicated that there is a plethora of real estate throughout the community and stated that he felt the applicants were choosing the most convenient location in order to cut costs and achieve the largest margins. He referenced the familiarity of the neighborhood and stated that he felt the proposed facility would be detrimental to the neighborhood.

Mr. Pfeffer added that he understands there is a problem in the community but stated that he believes there should be a way to provide treatment without exposing children to individuals struggling with drug addiction. He concluded by thanking the Planning Commission for listening to his comments.

Joseph Prestia, 608 Fieldcrest Drive. Mr. Prestia stated that he was present at the Planning Commission

meeting along with his wife and other members of the neighborhood. He indicated that they received the letter approximately seven days ago and were originally made aware of the potential project through a Facebook post. He stated that they attended the meeting held by the applicant on the Monday prior to the Planning Commission meeting but noted that there were many unanswered questions. He added that he told Mr. Gerres that he agreed with the mission of the proposed facility but disagreed with its location. He noted that he has two young daughters and lives approximately a quarter mile from the proposed facility.

Mr. Prestia noted that one of the initial concerns he and his wife had was traffic congestion. He stated that, with 44 beds being proposed at the facility, he believed the project would result in significantly more traffic on Power Drive, Fieldcrest Drive, and Augusta Drive.

Mr. Prestia stated that another concern centered around the security measures that were discussed. He noted that they were told the staff responsible for security would be unarmed and would be unable to physically stop an individual from leaving the facility.

Mr. Prestia also expressed frustration with the notification letter they received, stating that some of the information provided was incorrect. He specifically referenced the email address provided for questions and stated that the email address was inaccurate and did not lead to anyone who could provide additional information.

Mr. Prestia stated that another concern was related to the qualifications of the staff who could be hired at the facility. He noted that they were told staff members could be hired who had only two years of sobriety experience and indicated that he did not agree with that requirement.

Mr. Prestia referenced his own experiences as a child and stated that he had been exposed to individuals struggling with drug and alcohol addiction. He indicated that, based on those experiences, he understands the impact that addiction can have on individuals and families.

Mr. Prestia stated that he did not believe the proposed facility would be conducive to the neighborhood. He indicated that he believes the facility could be beneficial to the Mankato community but stated that he does not believe it should be located as close to the Trail Creek neighborhood.

Hunter Wanderscheid, 724 Dogleg Street. Mr. Wanderscheid indicated that he wanted to piggyback off the comments made by the two previous speakers. He stated that one of his biggest concerns was related to the proposed site and why it was considered appropriate for the facility. He questioned what objective analysis had been performed to determine that a 44-bed, continuously staffed residential treatment facility would be compatible with the nearby residential neighborhoods. He indicated that there were other locations throughout Mankato that he felt would be more appropriate, specifically referencing the area near the Blue Earth County Justice Center.

Mr. Wanderscheid stated that, if the applicant's main concern was financial, his own concerns were more centered around the neighborhood, his family, and whether placing a residential treatment facility at this location was a good idea. He noted that the applicant's outreach to 166 businesses and households included an incorrect email address, which provided those individuals with no way to reach out with questions. He stated that this issue was never acknowledged at the Planning Commission meeting and indicated that he felt the situation was "shady" and that he did not agree with it.

Mr. Wanderscheid continued by referencing Mr. White's previous comments and his work in Rochester, Minnesota, specifically noting the Oakridge treatment facility. He stated that, from 2017 through 2023, there were more than 500 calls involving local law enforcement and 378 ambulance calls associated with that facility. He added that clients at that facility were able to leave the property on foot and referenced overdoses and other serious incidents. He also stated that the facility was shut down due to health hazards. Mr. Wanderscheid indicated that he did not want to see similar circumstances occur in his community. He further stated that, now that Rochester has fewer treatment facilities, he was concerned that individuals would be brought to Mankato.

Mr. Wanderscheid referenced the neighborhood meeting held on Monday and indicated that residents were told that if someone had court-ordered treatment for something such as DUI, the Mankato Police Department would simply drop the individual off at the proposed facility. He stated that he wanted to ensure that the information and concerns discussed at the Monday meeting were passed along to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Wanderscheid questioned who would be eligible for admission to the facility and expressed concern regarding the risks associated with the screening process. He stated that the neighborhood would want to know whether individuals with violent criminal histories, sexual offenses, weapons offenses, active warrants, probation or parole status, recent violent behavior, or other factors that could affect public safety would be eligible for admission. He indicated that he believes the public and the immediate surrounding area should be notified of these considerations.

Mr. Wanderscheid stated that the applicant had not adequately addressed what would happen when a resident leaves the treatment facility. He indicated that, at the Monday meeting, the applicant stated that residents would not be able to leave without their belongings. Mr. Wanderscheid expressed concern that if an angry individual struggling with drug addiction wanted to leave the facility, the individual may not care about retrieving their belongings and could simply walk out of the facility. He stated that, rather than going onto the road, the individual could enter the surrounding neighborhood to hide, and he emphasized that this was his neighborhood and that he would not want such an individual there.

Mr. Wanderscheid stated that the applicant indicated that, in such a situation, staff would call local law enforcement and that security would be present at the facility. However, he compared this to the St. Peter treatment hospital and stated that he believed security at the facility would not be able to do much in that type of situation.

Mr. Wanderscheid added that he would like to know what impact the proposed facility would have on the police, fire, ambulance, and crisis response systems. He stated that he did not believe the City of Mankato was fully aware of the potential demands the facility could place on these services or the additional stress it could create. He noted that the average response time for a 911 emergency medical services call is approximately eight minutes and stated that he did not want to see that response time increase.

Mr. Wanderscheid questioned what protections would be provided to the neighborhood in the event of disturbances. He referenced the proposed six-foot fence and stated that he did not believe the fence was tall enough, noting that it could potentially be jumped or run through.

Mr. Wanderscheid questioned what effect the proposed facility would have on property use and property values. He questioned whether property values would be diminished by having a facility of this type in the neighborhood and stated that he did not believe the proposed facility would be beneficial to surrounding property values.

Mr. Wanderscheid also questioned whether the zoning comparison being used for the proposed facility was appropriate. He questioned whether the facility was truly a medical facility and stated that he did not believe the proposed facility would be providing medical treatment. He concluded by stating that he believed the proposed facility would place additional stress on the Mankato community.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Chair Zehnder questioned whether the traffic memo included with the application correctly indicated that the project was not anticipated to generate a sufficient number of trips to warrant a more detailed traffic study.

Mr. Konz stated that this was correct. He added that a traffic study was performed and was reviewed by City of Mankato staff, and it was determined that the additional study was not required.

Ms. Surdy stated that the Planning Commission had considered a similar proposal a few months ago involving a treatment facility for substance use. She stated that the concerns expressed by the neighborhood regarding safety were understandable but added that everyone had also acknowledged the known need for a facility of this type. She noted that Mankato currently does not have a treatment facility for substance use and stated that there would likely not be a location where everyone would want such a facility to be located, making the situation somewhat of a "not in my backyard" scenario. She noted that there are other warehouse-type uses in the area and that the proposed facility would not be located directly within a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Surdy noted that she is a mental health provider herself and indicated that the level of care assessment performed before clients begin services is extensive. She stated that, if the applicant follows that process, they should not be accepting clients who require a higher level of care than the facility can provide. She added that the proposed facility would have 24-hour staffing and security.

Ms. Surdy acknowledged that the proposed location would not be ideal for everyone but stated that placing a treatment facility in an isolated location could limit access for individuals seeking treatment. She noted, however, that it would also not be appropriate to locate a facility of this type next to uses such as a school. She emphasized the number of considerations that go into a project such as this.

Ms. Surdy stated that the individuals who spoke during the meeting were being heard and acknowledged their concerns. However, she indicated that the situation presented a difficult choice in trying to determine an appropriate location for a facility that is needed in the community. She referenced the recent overdose incident in downtown Mankato as an example of the need for substance-use treatment services.

Ms. Surdy stated that she believes a treatment facility is needed in Mankato and that having a facility located within Mankato may ultimately be more beneficial to the community.

Chair Zehnder questioned whether the applicants could explain which individuals would not be eligible to receive services at the proposed facility based on their criminal history.

Mr. Gerres stated that he would have Mr. White address the question from Chair Zehnder but wanted to first address the medical aspect of the proposed facility. He indicated that the state requires the facility to be zoned for medical use and requires registered nurses to be on site in the event of health concerns related to drug withdrawal. He added that the facility is not a hospital, jail, or prison. He explained that they are not taking individuals directly from the street and admitting them into the facility but rather have an extensive process in place for accepting individuals into the program.

Mr. Gerres further stated that they are a licensed medical facility, which allows them to have registered nursing staff available to assist with medications and similar medical needs. He explained that when an individual's medical needs require a higher level of care, the individual would be transported to a hospital.

Mr. White stated that he did not work for Oakridge, as had been referenced previously during the public comment portion of the meeting. He noted that, in his opinion, the clinical director at that facility did not perform their job properly and stated that he takes his responsibilities seriously and has worked at other similar facilities.

Mr. White explained that, when determining which individuals they will accept into the facility, they consider the individual's necessity of need and whether they are appropriate for the level of care that will be provided. He added that if an individual has previously been incarcerated, they would look at the circumstances surrounding the incarceration, including whether the charges were related to drug or alcohol use, such as a fourth DUI, and whether substance use issues contributed to the individual's criminal behavior. He noted that an individual may have a weapons charge in addition to substance-related charges, but stated that they would not automatically eliminate an individual from consideration for that reason.

Mr. White stated that they are primarily concerned with individuals who exhibit what he described as antisocial behavior. He explained that they consider an individual's psychopathology, including whether the individual exhibits characteristics that he described as psychopathic or sociopathic. He stated that individuals with these characteristics are not the type of clients they would accept into the facility. He added that they would accept individuals who exhibit narcissistic behavior because they can use behavior modification techniques to work with those individuals.

Mr. White further stated that they also evaluate individuals using a biopsychosocial-spiritual approach, which he described as a holistic approach to treatment. He explained that they are focused on achieving positive outcomes and determining whether an individual will be effective in the proposed treatment setting. He stated that they want to determine whether they can help an individual achieve and maintain sobriety and emphasized that they want their clients to have positive outcomes.

Mr. White also referred to individuals with sexual offense charges and explained that there are multiple circumstances that can contribute to such charges. He stated that individuals who have committed offenses against younger individuals would not be accepted into their facility. However, he provided an example of an individual who was 19 years old and had a 15-year-old girlfriend, where the individual was subsequently charged with a sexual offense. He stated that an individual in that type of situation could potentially be accepted because, in his assessment, that would not constitute a predatory offender. He acknowledged that the individual would still have a sexual offense charge but stated that the individual would not be considered a predatory type of offender under the criteria they use when evaluating potential clients.

Chair Zehnder sought clarification on whether clients would be in the open areas or if they would be expected to use the designated smoking area enclosed by the privacy fence.

Mr. Gerres stated that anyone being admitted to the facility would enter through a specific door located off the cul-de-sac in the parking lot. He explained that, once an individual is brought into the facility, there would be a designated room where staff would meet with the individual and conduct an assessment to ensure that they meet all the criteria required for admission to the facility.

Mr. Gerres stated that, assuming the individual meets the admission criteria, they would then be permitted to enter the facility. He explained that if an individual arrives at the facility but is determined not to be eligible for admission, staff will meet with the individual and work to determine where they could be taken instead. He noted that they have worked with other similar facilities in the immediate area and stated that, if an individual could not be admitted to their facility, staff would provide transportation to another appropriate facility.

Mr. White added that if an individual is asked to leave the facility, staff would make an effort to transport the individual to an appropriate location, whether that be a homeless shelter, a family member's residence, or another appropriate location. He stated that if a client were to leave the facility without authorization and did not want staff to contact law enforcement, the individual would leave, and the facility could only do so much.

Mr. White also referenced his experience with Teen Challenge, which he noted is located within a residential area in Rochester. He stated that, to his knowledge, clients at that facility have never entered the homes in the surrounding neighborhood. He added that, if a client were to leave the facility, he believed the individual would be more likely to go to the nearest drug dealer, liquor store, or similar location.

Mr. White stated that, in his experience, he has never seen a situation where clients have entered or broken into someone's home. He acknowledged that he was sure it had happened at some point but stated that he was not aware of any specific examples from his experience.

Mr. Gerres added that they currently house 25 individuals in Montgomery, Minnesota, and stated that they have had instances where clients used substances, left the facility without permission, or obtained alcohol.

He explained that each time this occurred, they approached the client and informed them that they could no longer remain at the facility. He stated that he had never experienced an altercation because of asking a client to leave.

Mr. Gerres added that clients are usually willing to accept a ride rather than leave on their own. He noted that the transportation component is critical in helping clients feel safer and supported if they are asked to leave the facility.

Ms. Surdy indicated that there are ethical obligations for licensed providers to avoid client abandonment and stated that it is generally common practice to provide referrals or transportation services when an individual is leaving any type of treatment facility. She added that another meeting with the neighborhood may be beneficial so that this type of information could be discussed in greater detail. Ms. Surdy noted that when a client enters a facility such as this and requires a higher level of care, they are not simply discharged on the streets.

Mr. Gerres shared that when he went through treatment, he was homeless and had to rely on a bicycle for transportation. He stated that he was not provided with many of the options that they want to offer through this proposed facility. He indicated that his approach has always been to support individuals and stated that they would not abandon clients but would instead make every effort to help them as much as possible.

Mr. White stated that he would be happy to answer any questions that residents may have and acknowledged that all the concerns raised were valid. He added that he does not know why prisons are located where they are but expressed hope that the proposed facility would be successful and that they could continue addressing the concerns raised by the community.

Mr. Gerres stated that the other properties they considered, particularly the property near the Blue Earth County Justice Center, were not located within the City limits. He explained that, because those properties were outside the city, they would not have been able to establish a facility of this type at those locations.

Mr. Filipovitch stated that, as he considered the issue, the first question was whether this was something the community needed, to which he indicated that the answer was yes. The second question was whether everything possible had been done to minimize the risks associated with this type of activity. He indicated that the applicant had stated that they had considered everything they could think of to address potential risks and would continue to do whatever else they could to minimize risks.

Mr. Filipovitch stated that the third question was where the facility should be located. He indicated that he sympathized with the concerns regarding the neighborhood and the presence of children but questioned whose children the facility should be located next to. He added that the proposed location is zoned for business use and is not currently zoned residential.

Mr. Filipovitch further stated that efforts have been made to minimize the risks to residential areas and questioned again where a facility of this type should be located if not at this proposed site. He indicated that the proposed facility is in a business zoning district, meets the applicable City Code requirements, and meets the other requirements that have been identified. He concluded by stating that he could not find a reason to vote against the proposal.

Ms. Surdy asked whether an additional recommendation could be added to the proposal, recommending that the applicant hold another neighborhood meeting to address the concerns raised by residents.

Mr. Konz stated that the Planning Commission could make as many modifications to the recommendations provided by city staff as it deemed appropriate and that any additional recommendations would be forwarded to Mankato City Council. He added that, if the recommendation needed to be completed prior to the City Council meeting on September 14, 2026, it would require a relatively quick turnaround.

Mr. Gerres stated that they would be willing to hold another neighborhood meeting and would take as

many calls as possible regarding the proposed facility. He requested that residents approach the discussion respectfully and noted that the meeting held on Monday had been difficult due to the level of frustration expressed throughout the meeting.

Ms. Surdy made a motion to approve CY38-26 with the added recommendation that an additional community meeting be held with the neighborhood to address the concerns raised during the meeting, if possible, prior to the City Council meeting. She acknowledged that, if the meeting could not be held prior to the City Council meeting, it would be understandable and recommended that it take place within a 30- to 60-day timeframe before construction begins. Mr. Laven seconded the motion.

Mr. Konz requested clarification regarding the timeframe for the additional community meeting.

Mr. Laven questioned whether the Planning Commission was required to meet a specific deadline of September 14, 2026, or whether the item could be moved to a later City Council meeting in September while still meeting the city's procedural requirements.

Mr. Konz stated that the application was submitted on July 28, 2026, making the 60-day deadline September 28, 2026, which would be the date of the City Council meeting. He recommended extending the 60-day deadline in case additional information was requested, or the item was tabled because of something brought up during the City Council meeting. He stated that extending the 60-day deadline would provide additional time and help ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 15.99, the applicable state standard.

Ms. Surdy clarified that she would add the 60-day rule extension to her original motion to approve.

Chair Zehnder questioned whether the Planning Commission needed to vote separately on adding the recommendations or whether they could vote on the item, including the new recommendations.

Mr. Konz indicated that the Planning Commission should first make a motion regarding the amendment and then make a separate motion regarding approval of the item.

Chair Zehnder clarified that the proposed amendment included a recommendation for an additional neighborhood meeting to occur prior to the City Council hearing, as well as a recommendation to extend the 60-day timeline. The amendment was seconded by Mr. Laven. The amendment to the recommendations passed unanimously.

Mr. Laven stated that his colleagues on the City Council would likely have requested the extension on either September 16 or September 28. He indicated that they were attempting to expedite the process, so the parties could meet, discuss the concerns that had been raised, and work toward finding some collaboration and addressing the concerns in the best way possible. He added that the timing of the events could have been better planned and stated that, had that occurred, they may not have needed to take these additional steps.

Mr. Konz added that, from a city staff perspective, the City Council packet must be distributed at least one week prior to the City Council meeting, which would be September 21st, 2026, for a September 28 meeting. He stated that it would therefore be ideal for the additional neighborhood meeting to occur before September 21. Otherwise, the city would need to wait until October for the City Council meeting in order to provide residents and the applicants with additional time to address some of the concerns, unless it was determined that the City Council preferred to have the item on September 28th agenda.

Mr. Laven stated that the City Council was not committed to a specific date.

Ms. Surdy made a motion to approve CY38-26 with the amended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Laven and passed unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 28th, 2026.

5. CY39-26

Request of Bolton and Menk, on behalf of the property owner, for a preliminary and final plat review of Ironwood Estates No. 2. The subject properties are described as Lot 2, Lot 3 and Lot 4, Block 1, Ironwood Estates (Blue Earth County PID R010930301021 and R010930301024).

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff respectfully submits the following findings of fact for the requested Preliminary Plat and Final Plat of Ironwood Estates No. 2:

1. General Requirements
    1. The proposed Preliminary & Final Plat is a replat of Ironwood Estates.
    2. The site is designed in conformance with the location and width of streets, the general drainage situation, lot sizes and arrangement.
2. Streets
    1. The applicant purposes no new construction of any public or private streets.
    2. The property served is accessed from Applewood Ct.
3. Easements
    1. The plat provides a continuation of the standard easements required per the Mankato City Code and the continuation of all other underlying easements present.
    2. Existing easements as presented on Ironwood Estates shall not be modified or relocated with this proposal.
    3. An existing 35-foot-wide utility easement and an existing 30-foot-wide “permanent” easement are present on lot 2 block 2 and shall remain in place.
4. Block Standards
    1. The blocks within the subdivision were designed for the intended end use as Low Density Residential.
5. Lot Standards
    1. The lots within the subdivision are intended for Low Density Residential use.
    2. The lot boundaries of Lot 1 & Lot 2 previously had a minor lot split. This plat demonstrates adjusted property lines, allowing lot 1 to be approximately 5,998 square feet larger.
6. Public Sites and Open Spaces
    1. The proposed subdivision was previously platted and is therefore not subject to payment-in-lieu of parkland dedication requirements.
    2. The proposed subdivision does not create or contain any public sites or permanent open space.

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff recommends approval of the Preliminary and final Plat of Ironwood Estates No. 2 with the following conditions:

1. Conditions and recommendations from the previously approved final plat shall continue to apply.
2. Applicant shall provide a wetland delineation report, prior to affixing signatures to the final plat.

Nate Myhra, Project Manager Bolton & Menk. Mr. Myhra was present at the meeting to answer any questions the Planning Commission members may have.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Surdy made a motion to approve CY39-26. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bigham and passed

unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 14th, 2026.

6. CY40-26

Request of Jones Haugh & Smith, with permission of the property owner, Scott Brown, for a preliminary plat review of Metcon Addition, and for the rezone of the subject property from T, Transition, to B-3, Highway Business and M-1, Light Industrial zoning district. The subject property is described as That part of the Southwest Quarter of Section 11, Township 108 North Range 26 West, Blue Earth County, Minnesota, Blue Earth County, Minnesota (Blue Earth County PIDR430911300021).

Mr. Hanson reports that staff respectfully submits the following findings of fact for the requested Preliminary Plat of Metcon Addition:

1. General Requirements
    1. The site is designed in conformance with the location and width of streets, the general drainage situation, lot sizes and arrangement.
    2. Concept plans for the future site development show the dedication of a public stormwater pond located within Outlot B.
    3. The site provides storm drains and stormwater facilities that outlet into the city's stormwater facilities at the rates and volumes allowed by the MS4 permit.
    4. Three onsite wetlands are shown on the plat. The applicant intends to seek replacement of the existing wetlands.
    5. Drainage study information has been submitted to the City Engineer to verify compliance with the City drainage requirements.
2. Streets
    1. The street right-of-way widths conform to the standards outlined in Chapter 10 of Mankato City Code.
    2. The applicant proposes to construct a new public roadway identified as "Ponderosa Court".
    3. The applicant proposes to dedicate a portion of the subject property as Right-of-Way for the future extension of “Evergreen Drive”.
    4. The applicant proposes to modify the existing condition of the adjacent Adams Street Right-of-Way, by constructing a dedicated right turn lane for Ponderosa Court.
    5. The existing dedicated bike lanes along Adams Street will remain in place.
    6. Only one private access shall be permitted off of Adams St. The applicant intends to construct a singular shared access for lots 2 & 3. All other accesses will be restricted to Ponderosa Ct or the future Evergreen Dr.
3. Easements
    1. The preliminary plat provides the standard drainage & utility easements required in Chapter 10 of the Mankato City Code.
    2. Drainage and utility easements are provided to encompass the full extent of all proposed rear-lot swales to ensure adequate access for drainage conveyance, maintenance, and long-term operation.
4. Block Standards
    1. The blocks within the subdivision were designed for the intended end use as light industrial uses.
    2. At a future date, Outlot A is intended to be platted into four commercial lots.
    3. Outlot B will be dedicated as a public stormwater pond.
5. Lot Standards
    1. The lots are designed in conformance with the standards set forth in Chapter 10.
    2. The lots within the subdivision are intended for light industrial development.

3. The concept plan for the industrial areas demonstrates adequate areas to allow off-street parking, loading areas and such other facilities. Further review and consideration will be required for any site improvements proposed at the subject property.

6. Public Sites and Open Spaces
    1. The subdivision has not designated an area for parkland or public open space in the comprehensive development plan.
    2. The applicant will be required to make a payment-in-lieu of parkland dedication, as the subject parcel has not previously been platted. The amount of this fee will be determined in conformance with Mankato City Code standards and payment will be due prior to affixing signatures to the Final Plat.

Mr. Hanson reports that staff respectfully submits the following findings of fact for the rezoning of the subject property:

1. The subject property was recently annexed into the City of Mankato and therefore bares the assigned zoning designation of T, Transition District.
2. The rezoning from T, Transition, to B-3, Highway Business & M-1, Light Industrial, is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive land use plan, as adopted and amended from time to time by the City Council.
3. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the underlying land uses, as the subject property is designated as a mixture of Highway Commercial and Industrial Commercial land uses.
4. The proposed B-3 Highway Business District zoning classification is consistent with adjacent properties in the immediate vicinity and compatible with the overall character of existing development. Adjacent properties are zoned B-3, Highway Business District
5. The proposed M-1 Light Industrial zoning classification is consistent with adjacent properties in the immediate vicinity and compatible with the overall character of existing development. A portion of properties located to the north and west are zoned as M-1, Light Industrial.
6. The proposed rezoning will not interfere with or diminish the use of property in the immediate vicinity.
7. The applicant proposed to extend municipal water, sanitary, and stormwater facilities from the adjacent ROW into the proposed subdivision.
8. There are deferred assessments on file for the subject property (R43.09.11.300.021).

Mr. Hanson reports that staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat of Metcon Addition with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall dedicate, on the final plat, the right of way area for Ponderosa Court, according to the size standards as reviewed and approved by the City's engineer.
2. The applicant shall execute a subdivision agreement with the City, prior to affixing signatures to the final plat, that outlines the terms of the agreement for proposed and future public stormwater, infrastructure, and utility elements.
3. The applicant shall make a payment in lieu of parkland dedication accordance with Mankato City Code. Payment shall be provided prior to, or in conjunction with, affixing signatures on the final plat.
4. In tandem with submittal of the request to review the Final Plat, the applicant shall apply for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for Wetland Replacement. Wetland replacement shall occur at a ratio of 2:1.
5. Applicant shall agree to be a willing petitioner for a full roadway improvement of Evergreen Drive for a connection to Madison Avenue if the CSAH 12/Adams St or Ponderosa Court/Adams St intersection results in operational or safety issues.
6. The applicant shall coordinate with City of Mankato staff to determine addressing for the proposed subdivision.
7. A singular private access shall be permitted off of Adams Street. The subdivision shall be served primarily by access from Ponderosa Court and the future Evergreen Drive.
8. The stormwater pond proposed on Outlot B shall be improved privately and dedicated to the public. .

9. No parking will be permitted along the Ponderosa Court roadway and cul-de-sac. The applicant shall install no-parking signage in coordination with City Staff.
10. Any boulevard trees impacted by the proposed development shall be replaced per Mankato City Code Standards, at a ratio of 2:1.
11. Development of Outlot A shall only be permitted upon replatting of the Outlot into lots & blocks.
12. The existing field entrance and culverts along the north side of Madison Avenue (CSAH 17) shall remain in place for purposes of future pond access for maintenance and cleaning by the City of Mankato.
13. Applicants shall provide a Drainage and Utility Easement encompassing the full extent of all proposed rear-lot swales to ensure adequate access for drainage conveyance, maintenance, and long-term operation.
14. The applicant shall work with Blue Earth County to ensure any necessary approval or permit for the proposed site stormwater discharge has been received prior to work occurring.

Mr. Hanson reports that staff recommends approval of the rezoning of the subject property from T Transition to M-1, Light Industrial and B-3, Highway Business zoning districts.

Mr. Laven questioned why the City of Mankato would not recommend modifying the intersection now rather than waiting until a later date.

Mr. Konz stated that the city was not looking solely at traffic volume, but rather at the performance of the intersection. He explained that much of what has been discussed with other applications is that, when the level of service at an intersection begins to decline, the city would conduct an analysis to determine whether a secondary access or other improvements would be appropriate based on the uses in the area and how the commercial corridor develops. He added that if a high-volume user were to locate in the area, there could be a need for additional improvements or traffic-control measures. However, he stated that the city wants to ensure that any improvements are necessary and appropriate rather than requiring an improvement that may not ultimately be needed.

John Schulte, Jones Haugh & Smith. Mr. Schulte indicated that Jones Haugh & Smith were the engineers and surveyors for the project. He added that representatives from the MetCon ownership group were also present at the meeting to answer any questions from the Planning Commission members.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment. With no one wishing to speak, thepublic hearing was closed.

Mr. Wilke made a motion to approve CY40-26. The motion was seconded by Mr. Filipovitch and passed unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 14th, 2026.

7. CY41-26

Request of RJC Rental Properties LLC to rezone the subject parcels from M-1, Light Industrial, to R-3, Limited Multiple Dwelling District. The subject properties are described as Lots 3, 4, and 5, Block 25, Mankato City subdivision (1618, 1620 and 1622 3rd Avenue).

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff respectfully submits the following findings regarding the request of the rezoning of M-1, Light Industrial, to R-3, Limited Multiple Dwelling District.

1. Given the location of the parcels, the rezoning of the parcels aligns with neighboring city blocks.
2. Proposed use of an Intensive Outpatient Treatment Program facility requires issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.
3. The request does not negatively impact the health, safety and general welfare of the City of Mankato.

4. Utility accounts will change from taxable to non-taxable status with the proposed request.

Mr. Pringnitz reports that staff recommends approval of the request to rezone from the current zoning classification of M-1, Light Industrial, to R-3, Limited Multiple Dwelling District with the following conditions:

1. The proposed future uses of the Subject Properties shall comply with the standards of the R-3, Limited Multiple Dwelling District.
2. The applicant shall submit a request for a Conditional Use Permit prior to seeking to utilize the space for prospective use.
3. Applicant shall evaluate sewer and water service needs for each of the three lots. In the event additional/upgraded services are needed or if any of the properties are being considered to be demolished, the applicant would be encouraged to expedite any service installation/disconnection work in unison with the 3rd Avenue Reconstruction project.
4. The applicant will be required to pay SAC & WAC connection charges based on the City of Mankato assessment policy and fee schedule based on increased development density.

Jim Rotert. Mr. Rotert indicated that he would be purchasing the property and was present at the meeting with his wife, who would be opening the IOP (Intensive Outpatient Program). They explained that they had since applied for the CUP and were not aware whether a neighborhood meeting was required prior to the rezoning or only for the CUP. They apologized for not holding a meeting prior to the current Planning Commission meeting but indicated that they fully intend to hold a neighborhood meeting. They added that they would provide their personal contact information in relation to the meeting. Mr. and Mrs. Rotert stated that they were also present to answer any questions from the Planning Commission members.

Chair Zehnder opened the public hearing for comment.

Leslie Allen Jr. Mr. Allen stated that he has lived in the area since 1995 and questioned whether the proposed use was the same as what the House of Hope previously operated and, if so, why the property would need to be rezoned.

Chair Zehnder explained that the Planning Commission was currently considering only the rezoning request and was not considering the CUP for the proposed use. He added that the previously approved CUP had lapsed, meaning the process would need to start over.

Mr. Konz stated that this was correct. He explained that when a use expires or the property is no longer being used for that purpose, the property owner has one year to return and resume the same use. If that had occurred in this case, the applicant would not have needed to go through the rezoning or CUP process. However, because that did not occur, the applicant is required to go through the necessary steps to allow the proposed use. He explained that the proposed use would not be allowed under the current zoning classification, which is why the property must first be rezoned. He added that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the City of Mankato's land use plan, after which the applicant would return to the Planning Commission for consideration of the CUP.

Jesse Spencer. Mr. Spencer stated that he understood the purpose of the meeting was not to address the CUP but wanted to outline some of his concerns and obtain more information regarding when future meetings will take place. He indicated that there were additional residents in the neighborhood who were unable to attend the meeting. He noted that there are currently five facilities, like the proposed facility, operating in the neighborhood. He stated that these facilities have not created significant issues but wanted to discuss some of the negative externalities experienced by the neighborhood, such as lighting and traffic. He indicated that he would be present at future meetings to discuss these concerns in greater detail.

Mr. Spencer referenced the common “not in my backyard” concern but stated that the concerns being raised were legitimate concerns from residents who live in the neighborhood. He noted that he has peer-reviewed research that he would like to present but felt that it would be more appropriate to do so during consideration of the CUP. He questioned when the CUP would be considered and whether there

would be any additional neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Konz stated that, from the City of Mankato's perspective, the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., at which time the item would be back before the Planning Commission. He added that it was his understanding that the applicant would hold a neighborhood meeting outside the formal project review process and stated that he could speak with the applicant to obtain additional information regarding that meeting. He explained that, if the Planning Commission recommends approval at the September meeting, the item would then be forwarded to the Mankato City Council for consideration on October 13, 2026.

Mr. Spencer concluded by requesting that the City of Mankato take a close look at the cumulative impact of these facilities within the neighborhood, including the intensity of the facilities, the individuals being served, and the existing conditions within the neighborhood.

Ryan Gemlo. Mr. Gemlo stated that he is a resident located just south-west of the proposed facility and had lived there since 2014. He noted that he had experienced the neighborhood both while the House of Hope was fully operational, and after it ceased operations, adding that he preferred the latter. He stated that, during the time House of Hope was operating, his children were exposed to what he described as an excessive amount of drug activity. He also referenced the amount of traffic traveling in and out of the alley, noting that the buildings in the area are accessed from the alley to the south and the alley to the north. He explained that the alley on Pine Street has a significant incline and can be difficult to use at times, particularly during the winter, resulting in most of the traffic using the alley on Chestnut Street.

Mr. Gemlo stated that he did not know the full scope of the applicant's plans for the property but questioned which buildings would be demolished. He indicated that, if the access and parking were not adequate for the number of tenants the applicant intended to place in the building, he believed that information was relevant to the rezoning request. He stated that he was not in favor of the rezoning and would rather see the property deteriorate than have another treatment facility operate at the location because of what he believed the implications would be for his children and others in the neighborhood. He added that the impacts would not be limited to the immediate block, stating that he believed drug activity and other issues associated with these types of facilities could extend to the nearby park, which he described as a gathering or hangout area for clients of these types of facilities. He asked the Planning Commission to take these concerns into consideration.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Chair Zehnder questioned whether the house located on the north side would be eligible to obtain a rental license and whether the rental use would be outside the proposed rezoning classification.

Mr. Konz stated that if the house were strictly used as a rental property, it would be allowed as a permitted use and would be eligible to operate as a rental property.

Ms. Surdy questioned whether the Planning Commission could receive the definitions and distinctions between the M-1 and R-3 zoning districts for public information.

Mr. Konz explained that M-1 is the Light Industrial District, where you would typically see more industrial-type uses, including distribution and light manufacturing. He explained that R-3 is referred to as the Limited Multi-Family District and is considered a medium-density residential classification. He noted that the ordinance specifically limits the number of units to a maximum of eight units in one building on a lot, with the allowable density based on the size of the lot. He stated that the minimum would be one unit and the maximum would be eight units.

Mr. Konz added that rental properties could be in an M-1 zoning district; however, the city would often recommend rezoning the property to RT (Residential Transition). He explained that obtaining a loan for a residential property can be challenging when the residential property is zoned for industrial use, which is

one reason the RT zoning classification may be more appropriate.

Ms. Bigham made a motion to approve CY41-26. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilke and passed unanimously.

The anticipated date of City Council action will be September 14th, 2026.

6. MISCELLANEOUS

No miscellaneous items

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Wilke moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Filipovitch with all in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:21 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED.

_____

Chair, Mankato Planning Commission