



Approved: February 4, 2026

---

---

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2025  
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

---

---

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Chair Collins called to order the regular Planning Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present were: Chair Joshua Collins, Commissioners Jessica Birken, Brad Bjorklund, Patrick Burlingame, Stephen Erler, Nancy Jacobson and Ben Lindau.

Absent: None.

Also present were: Community Development Director Jacob Reilly, Senior Planner Elena Fransen and Council Liaison Kurt Weber.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA – DECEMBER 3, 2025**

**Commissioner Bjorklund moved, seconded by Commissioner Burlingame, to approve the December 3, 2025, agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*November 5, 2025 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting*

**Commissioner Lindau moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobson, to approve the November 5, 2025, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).**

**PLANNING CASES**

**A. Planning Case 25-014 – 4100 Hamline Avenue Noise Wall**

**Senior Planner Fransen** explained Boston Scientific Corporation (BSC) applied for site plan review to construct a noise barrier wall along a portion of the northwest corner of the Arden Hills corporate campus. The stated purpose of the wall is to further reduce the level of noise generated from Building 14 that reaches neighboring residential properties. While study documents submitted by BSC demonstrate the operation meets local noise compliance requirements, the noise barrier wall is intended to further mitigate sound from daily operational noise including

loading dock-related noise. The proposed noise barrier wall is approximately 576 lineal feet with a varied height of 8 feet to 21 feet to accommodate existing grade changes. The proposed north leg of the wall runs 200 feet from east to west, and the southwest leg runs 376 feet from north to south. The proposed materials are precast concrete and pretreated wood. The proposed wall location is offset 17 feet from the nearest property line which is shared with City-owned property where a trail is located. To construct the wall, the Applicant proposes to remove significant trees in the area and make landscaping improvements on both sides of the proposed wall.

**Senior Planner Fransen** stated the Boston Scientific campus at 4100 Hamline Avenue North operates under a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was originally approved in 2002 for the Guidant Corporation. The last update to the PUD and Campus Master Plan took place in 2021 when the city approved a 17,450 square foot addition to the south side of Building 14, a facility located in the northwest corner of the Arden Hills campus near Innovation Way (Planning Case 21-001). The purpose of this facility is the development and production of lithium batteries for use in medical devices. A PUD Amendment was required for the proposed addition to Building 14. The PUD Amendment request included flexibility from the Zoning Code for the proposed height of 40 feet for a penthouse addition to enclose roof-mounted mechanical equipment. As part of the land use application process, the Applicant held a neighborhood meeting with residents and presented the concept at a City Council Work Session.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reported at a June 23, 2025, City Council work session, the Applicant presented a concept of the proposed noise barrier wall to garner feedback. Discussion topics included the height of the wall in relation to Building 14 and the neighboring residential properties; the sources of noise at Building 14, and changes to the landscaping. The City Council directed the Applicant to hold a neighborhood meeting and present the concept to and answer questions from the adjacent neighborhood. On July 29, 2025, having followed the City's policy for noticing neighboring properties, the Applicant held a neighborhood meeting and presented the noise barrier wall concept. Comments were made about the different sources generating noise at Building 14, including rooftop mechanical equipment and delivery and vendor vehicles accessing the loading dock area in the northeast corner of the building. Attendees asked questions about the proposed wall height and location and if these would be sufficient for noise mitigation, the visual impact of the wall, and the impact of a barrier wall to neighboring property values. The Applicant states updates were made to the length of the northern leg of the wall, extending it an additional 50 feet to the east in response to comments. A follow-up letter was mailed to neighbors describing next steps to construct the proposed wall and other actions taken to address nuisance noise generated by Building 14 operations.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reviewed the Site Data, the Plan Evaluation and provided the Findings of Fact for review:

1. The Applicant submitted a land use application for a site plan review to construct a noise barrier wall on the Subject Property located at 4100 Hamline Avenue North.
2. The Subject Property is guided as I/O, Light Industrial and Office on the Land Use Plan.
3. The Subject Property is a conforming use in the I-1 Limited Industrial Zoning District and operates under an approved PUD.
4. The Applicant complies with conditions of approval for previous PUD and Site Plan Review requests.
5. The proposed wall would be constructed from treated wood and concrete panel materials.
6. The proposed wall ranges in height from 8 feet to 21 feet as measured from existing grade.

7. The Applicant states that the proposed wall will further reduce the level of noise reaching adjacent neighborhood properties.
8. The proposal is not expected to adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood or the community as a whole.
9. The proposed tree replacement plan exceeds ordinance requirements.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission for Planning Case 25-014 for a Site Plan Review to allow a noise barrier wall at 4100 Hamline Avenue North:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions:
  1. The project shall be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as amended by the conditions of approval. Any significant changes to the plans, as determined by the City Planner, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
  2. All conditions of the original Planned Unit Development and Master Plan Amendment shall remain in full force and effect.
  3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape financial security equal to 125% of the cost of the landscaping to be installed on the site shall be submitted. The Applicant must submit a detailed cost estimate for the landscaping so staff can determine the final amount. Landscape financial security shall be held for two full growing seasons. For any landscaping that is not in accordance with the approved landscaping plan at the end of two growing seasons, the Developer shall replace the material to the satisfaction of the City before the guarantee is released. Where this is not done, the City, at its sole discretion, may use the proceeds of the performance guarantee to accomplish performance.
  4. The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any other permits necessary from other agencies, including, but not limited to, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Ramsey County, Rice Creek Watershed District, and any other relevant parties prior to the start of any site activities.
  5. The Applicant must provide a copy of the Water Management Plan and Report and verification of Rice Creek Watershed District staff approval to the city prior to the approval of grading and erosion control permit.
  6. The Applicant must obtain a Grading and Erosion Control permit from the City's Engineering Division prior to the commencement of any land disturbance activities.
  7. The Applicant must obtain a Right of Way permit from the City's Engineering Division prior to any work impacting City property or to use the trail for access to the work area.
  8. Heavy duty silt fence and adequate erosion control around the entire construction site is required and must be maintained by the Applicant during construction to ensure that sediment and stormwater do not leave the project site.
  9. The Applicant is responsible for protecting the proposed on-site storm sewer infrastructure and components and any existing storm sewer from exposure to any and all stormwater runoff, sediments, and debris during all construction activities. Temporary stormwater facilities must be installed to protect the quality aspect of the proposed and existing stormwater facilities prior to and during construction activities. Maintenance of any and all temporary stormwater facilities shall be the responsibility of the Applicant.
  10. The Applicant must continue to submit annual noise studies to the city.
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial

---

---

4. Table

**Chair Collins** opened the floor to Commissioner questions for staff.

**Commissioner Jacobson** reported she has heard a lot about this section of trail and she had the pleasure to walk it on Monday. She explained this trail section connects Cummings Park to Floral Park. She indicated the people surrounding this area are lucky to have this amenity in the area. She asked if there were concerns regarding how the wooded area would be impacted by the proposed construction.

**Senior Planner Fransen** stated staff had forwarded to the Commission the written comments the City received prior to this meeting. She noted there were also members of the public in attendance.

**Commissioner Jacobson** commented it was her understanding the proposed sound wall was an expensive, good neighbor gesture from Boston Scientific to assist with mitigating noise. She inquired if neighbors have complained about noise in the past.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reported there have been noise complaints from the neighbors.

**Commissioner Jacobson** questioned if the concerning noises were coming from the loading dock area.

**Senior Planner Fransen** indicated Boston Scientific does have an active loading dock with Building 14.

**Commissioner Jacobson** stated she lived near a college that has an active loading dock and she has asked the college to address this concern and this seems to have worked.

**Commissioner Lindau** asked if Boston Scientific currently met noise requirements within the 2021 PUD Amendment.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reported the applicant provided a recent noise study, which was a requirement of the 2021 PUD amendment for the addition to Building 14, Boston Scientific must submit yearly noise studies. She indicated the study findings showed Boston Scientific was in compliance with the required noise levels.

**Commissioner Lindau** stated the noise wall was not required, but rather was an act of goodwill.

**Senior Planner Fransen** commented the applicant has stated they are aware they are meeting the City's requirements but the noise wall would further mitigate the noise levels.

**Commissioner Birken** questioned if noise studies were taken from adjacent properties versus at the loading dock.

**Senior Planner Fransen** deferred this question to the applicant, but noted several noise studies have been completed by the applicant and the applicant was meeting the City's noise standard requirements.

**Community Development Director Reilly** commented on the City’s rules for noise noting the rules are applied at the property line. He indicated that MPCA rules are incorporated by reference, however the city is responsible for enforcing the rules.

**Chair Collins** stated there has been continuous concerns regarding noise at this Boston Scientific building since 2021.

**Community Development Director Reilly** explained he does not have a record of complaints made to the City but has record of complaints that were made when projects come before the Planning Commission and City Council.

**Chair Collins** inquired if the City had completed its own study to ensure Boston Scientific was compliant.

**Senior Planner Fransen** indicated the City has not completed a noise study but has instituted conditions on Boston Scientific to complete noise studies annually.

**Chair Collins** referred to Attachment F, stating a neighborhood comment notes that in 2024, Boston Scientific was out of compliance at certain hours.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reported the City does keep record of this. She understood that in 2023 Boston Scientific was out of compliance and steps were taken to address this concern.

**Chair Collins** asked if the applicant had verified that the proposed sound wall would create a noise reduction at the property line.

**Senior Planner Fransen** deferred this question to the applicant. She recalled from the neighborhood meeting that different wall heights were tested in order to see how sounds could be mitigated from Building 14.

**Chair Collins** questioned what the City’s noise standards were in City Code.

**Community Development Director Reilly** explained after reviewing City Code, the City does not have a noise standard established but rather references MPCA guidelines.

**Chair Collins** stated this meant Boston Scientific was to be no louder than 60 decibels during the day and 58 decibels at night.

**Commissioner Birken** requested Boston Scientific speak to the results from the recent sound study.

**Savannah Doerr**, Facilities Maintenance Manager at Boston Scientific, explained the July 2025 sound study had the receiver placed on the trail. She reported there were some levels above 50, but the MPCA rules require for one hour to be below 50, which was shown in the table.

**Commissioner Birken** inquired who owned the trail property.

**Senior Planner Fransen** reported this was City-owned property.

**Commissioner Burlingame** stated it appears the noise was coming from the garbage haulers, hissing from filling tanks, and the HVAC systems on the roof.

**Ms. Doerr** commented there was dock noise and noise coming from the northwest corner of the building where mechanical equipment was being exhausted out. She noted the third noise source was coming from the argon tanks and the last noise source was coming from the rooftop units.

**Commissioner Erler** inquired if the proposed noise wall would assist with addressing the rooftop noise, given that the sound wall would only be 21 feet tall and Building 14 was taller.

**Ms. Doerr** reported most of the building was at a lower elevation and the proposed sound wall would screen the equipment that was on the lower elevation portion of the roof.

**Commissioner Erler** anticipated that Boston Scientific had modeling that showed the sound would be reduced by the proposed sound wall.

**Ms. Doerr** explained Boston Scientific has completed multiple sound analyses with all of the equipment on the roof and the loading dock area and she sees a range of noise mitigation reduced.

**Tony Baxter**, ESI Engineering, explained he was the sound engineer working with Boston Scientific. He commented further on how the proposed noise wall would reduce noise for the surrounding neighborhood.

**Ms. Doerr** reported the proposed noise wall would create significant sound reductions.

**Commissioner Lindau** questioned if the sound wall is necessary if the other improvements listed on Attachment G were completed to the rooftop units.

**Ms. Doerr** commented Boston Scientific was currently meeting all of the City's requirements and the proposed HVAC unit replacements would assist in reducing noise. She indicated Boston Scientific was proposing to complete the sound wall in good faith in order to create a buffer between Boston Scientific and the adjacent neighbors.

**Commissioner Lindau** inquired if tree plantings would be a solution versus the proposed wall.

**Mr. Baxter** reported a few trees would not be effective. He explained a deep forest would be needed in order to impact the noise levels. He commented further on how the proposed sound wall would create noise reductions from the loading dock area.

**Commissioner Lindau** questioned if the noise wall had to be so close to the trail.

**Ms. Doerr** stated the studies have shown this would be the best location for noise mitigation as well as the proposed height for visuals.

**Mr. Baxter** stated the sound wall would be more effective at this location and would take advantage of the hill.

**Commissioner Bjorklund** asked if the louvered mechanical area had been screened.

**Ms. Doerr** reported this area has to allow air through and explained the best option was to place a wall in front of the louvered mechanical area. She commented further on the silencers that would be installed on the three big boxes on the roof.

**Commissioner Bjorklund** indicated he had concerns with the fact the proposed sound wall would not provide meaningful noise mitigation for the rooftop units. He explained he stood in the backyards of three of the adjacent homes and was able to see the rooftop units.

**Mr. Baxter** discussed how sound moves in a spherical pattern and how it dissipates over distance. He explained he understood the sound wall would not be tall enough to cover the rooftop units but there would be meaningful noise reductions in the backyards of these houses.

**Commissioner Jacobson** stated it appears the loading dock and the rooftop units were the main areas of concern. She explained it appears the berm and sound wall would mitigate a portion of this sound.

**Ms. Doerr** reported this was the case.

**Commissioner Jacobson** encouraged Boston Scientific to address the sharper sounds that were coming from their property.

**Ms. Doerr** noted Boston Scientific has received complaints from the neighbors regarding beeping from snow plows working overnight and noted the proposed wall would address this concern.

**Commissioner Bjorklund** expressed concern with the fact the sound wall would not alleviate sharp and sudden sounds.

**Mr. Baxter** reiterated that the sound wall would assist with addressing this concern. He commented further on how the silencers on the rooftop units would assist with addressing the noise that was hitting the second floors of the adjacent homes.

**Commissioner Jacobson** asked if there were any measures the neighbors could take to assist with mitigating the noise.

**Mr. Baxter** reported this would depend on the topography of the lot, but noted he did not believe there was a great deal a resident could do to mitigate all of the noise.

**Commissioner Birken** stated with the greenery in the illustration, she did not believe the noise wall looked so bad. She questioned how many of the existing trees would be retained.

**Ms. Doerr** discussed how Boston Scientific had pursued a full concrete, landscaped wall versus a cheaper wooden wall in order to properly address the concerns of the neighbors and to provide a nicer finished product.

**Chuck Evans**, Landscape Architect with Damon Farber, reported the plans show a mix of new and existing planted materials. He indicated he was hoping to save the mature evergreen trees on the neighborhood side of the wall. He stated the landscaping would then be augmented with new trees as well.

**Commissioner Jacobson** explained she read through the proposed planting list and appreciated the wide variety of trees that would be used.

**Chair Collins** commented it appears the sound wall would not be effective when it comes to the rooftop units for the adjacent homes.

**Ms. Doerr** reported the sound wall would be effective for the ground level of the homes, but not the second level. She indicated this was the reason Boston Scientific would be adding silencers to the rooftop units.

**Chair Collins** asked if the sound wall would address the noise coming from the louvered mechanical area and the argon tanks.

**Ms. Doerr** explained the sound wall would address the noise coming from these areas. She indicated the noise from the loading dock area would also be addressed.

**Chair Collins** appreciated the fact that the noise from three of the four problem areas would be addressed by the sound wall. He inquired what the decibel level reduction would be after the noise wall was in place.

**Ms. Doerr** stated there was a range pending which location on the wall someone was at.

**Mr. Baxter** reported the noise near the loading dock would be reduced by 7 to 20 decibels. He indicated the rooftop units would be reduced by 4 to 11 decibels.

**Chair Collins** inquired if Boston Scientific would be making any other changes to the campus that would be increasing noises.

**Ms. Doerr** commented there are two future items, one being a chiller that would be placed on the roof in 2026. She noted this piece of equipment would be screened on the roof. She explained other HVAC units would be removed which would help with sound mitigation.

**Chair Collins** opened the meeting for public comment.

**Bryan Mills**, 1280 Wynridge, explained he has lived in his home since 2009. He stated he moved eight houses up the street seven years ago in order to remain in this neighborhood. He encouraged the Commission to read his letter and to walk the beautiful path in his neighborhood in order to truly understand what he was living 24/7/365. He appreciated that some improvements have been made, but noted there was still a problem that engaged residents cannot solve. He stated he needed help from the City in order to hold Boston Scientific accountable for the impacts they are having on the residents each and every day. He indicated his quality of life has been greatly impacted by Boston Scientific and he wanted the City to hold Boston Scientific accountable. He recommended the trash bins be placed in a structure. He asked that a noise study be done on the rooftop units with and without the silencers to show the improvements. He urged the City not to push the sound wall through until these other improvements have been considered. He explained he was not a sound expert, but noted he had read through the entire packet of MPCA information prior to this meeting. He reported after speaking with Laura Dickerson at the MPCA, she would respectfully disagree that Boston Scientific was not meeting proper noise levels and the data was there to prove this. He recommended experts be brought in

to address this further. He stated the residents in this neighborhood will show up and were willing to engage with the City because they want to see the situation improved.

**Curtis Swenson**, 1228 Wynridge Drive, reported his home does not backup to the trail, but he could see the trail from his home. He explained he worked at the University of Minnesota and he was a building mechanic in one of the dorms. He discussed how the University has worked to alleviate noise and no longer allow for deliveries from large trucks. He was of the opinion more work needs to be done to negate the noise coming from Boston Scientific. He appreciated the fact equipment would be replaced and that mechanical walls would be built close to the HVAC units. He stated he did not want to advocate for the wall being higher, but questioned how effective the sound wall would be for the homeowners trying to sleep on the second story of their home. He commented further on how disruptive the snowplows were in the middle of the night after a large snow event. He recommended the beeping noises be eliminated. He asked that not all of the cottonwoods be removed on the neighborhood side of the trail and recommended the water runoff plan be further reviewed to ensure the stormwater pond would not overflow.

**Maria Pieters**, 1250 Wynridge Drive, explained she was a 20-year resident of Arden Hills. She thanked the Commission for allowing her to express her deep concerns regarding the proposed sound wall. She indicated she sent a detailed letter to the Commission regarding her concerns. She asked the Commission to hear the neighbors, the residents of Arden Hills who are being impacted by the noise and would be even more impacted by the construction of a sound wall. She reported she was not an expert in construction or sound mitigation but even so she believed there were more effective ways to address the noise coming from Boston Scientific. She indicated after the building was expanded in 2021 Boston Scientific, the company agreed to improve communication and have a liaison work with the neighborhood. She stated this never happened. Instead, Boston Scientific responds with unilaterally initiated projects. She recommended small changes be taken to improve the noise level situation, such as following the schedule for the loading dock area. She did not believe the sound wall was an act of goodwill. She encouraged Boston Scientific to really think about the people that live in this neighborhood and are being impacted by the noise. She stated the proposed construction would not be a solution but would only create more problems as mature trees would be removed. She indicated she did not want to look out her window and see a tall ugly wall, but rather would like to enjoy the trees that were currently in place. She expressed concerns with how her property value would be impacted if the noise wall were installed. She reiterated that she believed it would be more effective for Boston Scientific to take small measures in order to address the noise concerns than to install a noise wall.

**Pedro Urriola**, 1250 Wynridge Drive, commented he was concerned with how his property value would be impacted by the proposed noise wall. He discussed a study he found where property values decreased by 6 to 11% that were close to a sound wall. He asked that the City take this into consideration when making a decision on the sound wall.

**Andrew Centanni**, 1253 Wynridge Drive, explained he looks between his neighbor's homes to the path. He stated he and his boys use the trail a lot and commented on the visual pollution the sound wall would create for the neighbors. He understood Boston Scientific was trying to do the right thing. He urged the City to hear the voices of the neighbors that were being impacted in this small pocket neighborhood. He recommended Boston Scientific pursue noise solutions for the areas of concern instead of pursuing a noise wall. He reported he was an architect and he believed there were successful measures that could be taken that do not include a sound wall.

**Bob Christensen**, 1234 Wynridge Drive, thanked the Commission for allowing the neighbors to speak. He stated Boston Scientific has been saying things like “goodwill gesture” and “good faith”. He reported he was being woken from a dead sleep by slamming garbage bins. He supported Boston Scientific looking into the timing of deliveries versus a sound wall. He indicated he did not want to see the sound wall in his backyard.

**Chair Collins** closed the meeting for public comment.

**Chair Collins** referred to Attachment F and explained he was of the opinion the methods for gathering data may not have been met because the data was collected at the trail and not at the property line. He indicated the City does not have a clear understanding of if there was a point in time when sound was higher or if the noise levels were sustained. He wanted to better understand if the applicant was complying with current noise standards or not before this application was considered.

**Commissioner Lindau** stated he believed Boston Scientific has done an outstanding job trying to address the noise concerns and he understood the wall would be a significant investment. He was of the opinion Boston Scientific needed to better understand the problem and be specific with how the four sources of noise would be mitigated. He agreed the measurements should be taken from the proper location. He stated if the rooftop units had the silencers installed, then perhaps a wall would only be needed around the loading dock. He indicated this may be a more common-sense approach to the situation and would protect the natural beauty of the trail.

**Commissioner Bjorklund** agreed more had to be done from Boston Scientific before this project could move forward. He supported action on this item being tabled because there has been significant public comment addressing the concerns of the effectiveness of the wall and there has been significant Planning Commission input addressing the concerns of the wall and the deficiencies of the recent sound study. He stated there may not be a need for a wall if the proposed measures were taken on the roof top units and Boston Scientific followed the proper schedule for deliveries. He recommended Boston Scientific be given more time to consider what mitigation measures should be pursued in order to eliminate or reduce the scale of the proposed sound wall.

**Commissioner Jacobson** commented Boston Scientific put together a great set of plans. She stated she was hearing from the residents and Boston Scientific that there was a noise problem that had to be solved. She supported the Commission having before and after noise levels before making a decision. She encouraged Boston Scientific to consider looking into changing the road design on the site in order to reduce the amount of backup beeping for the neighbors.

**Commissioner Erler** stated this was a tough case. He noted he attended the neighborhood meeting in July and explained it was obvious there was a noise problem. He appreciated the efforts Boston Scientific had come forward with but noted this solution was being rejected by the residents who were being most affected by the noise. He encouraged Boston Scientific to take into consideration what other solutions may be more effective without being so intrusive. He stated he could support a shortened wall on the northwest corner of the building or to table action on this item to allow the applicant to further address the questions that have been raised.

**Commissioner Burlingame** explained he was not convinced the proposed wall would mitigate noise on the upper floors of the adjacent homes. He did acknowledge that some of the sound measurements were taken before some recent improvements were made, which was making it

difficult to understand the before and after impacts. He understood the wall would improve the noise situation for residents but does not address the questions about the neighborhood's look and feel. He discussed how property values may be impacted by the noise wall, but anticipated the noise would be the real property value killer. He stated he would like to better understand what viable alternatives exist, what other mitigation options could be considered or if this was the only option available. He indicated he could support tabling action on this item.

**Commissioner Birken** reported when she interviewed for this position she recalled the discussion that was held surrounding the difficulty of planning. She indicated there are pros and cons that have to be balanced. She was empathetic to the neighbors and their inability to sleep through the night due to the chronic noise. She understood how the wall seems like the best solution for the Applicant but the wall would also create the biggest impact. She explained her main concern was with where the sound measurements were taken. She feared the City did not have the proper data on what impact the changes would have on the residents. She anticipated Damon Farber would make the wall look beautiful for the neighborhood, but she wanted to better understand what kind of difference the wall would make when it came to decibel levels. She indicated she could support tabling action on this Planning Case.

**Chair Collins** stated he could support tabling action on this item as well. He indicated the Commission would need to provide staff with clear direction on why the item was being tabled. He stated he has heard from the Commission there was a desire to understand what the noise levels were at the residents' homes from Boston Scientific and also have a clear understanding of what the MPCA noise restrictions were. He explained he would like to know more about how property values would be impacted. He recommended the Commission be provided with more information on the commonsense solutions Boston Scientific could pursue such as the mechanical unit dampeners and having Boston Scientific address the delivery hours with their vendors.

**Commissioner Lindau** recommended the four main sources of noise be measured with the improvements that have been done and suggested on point solutions be pursued by Boston Scientific. He supported a more significant wall installed around the loading dock area that was higher to stop the noise from this area.

**Chair Collins** recommended thorough and detailed public impact statements be provided to the Commission as well.

**Commissioner Jacobson** recommended Boston Scientific work to provide the City with information on if and how the sound could be mitigated on site as opposed to how the noise is mitigated by a wall. In addition, she wanted to see noise ranges from all times of day.

**Chair Collins moved and Commissioner Bjorklund seconded a motion to table action on Planning Case 25-014 based on the following rationale:**

- 1. The Commission needs clear guidance and understanding on the MPCA noise guidelines are and how these measurements are to be taken and for what duration.**
- 2. The Commission needs measurements from the four noise generating items at Boston Scientific (rooftop/HVAC units, loading dock area, louvered area, argon tanks). The Commission wants to understand if Boston Scientific is compliant in all four areas.**

3. **The Commission wants commonsense solutions investigated for the effectiveness of the rooftop unit dampeners, a smaller sound wall around point source sound generation items on Building 14 and an understanding if Boston Scientific was following the proper loading dock hours.**
4. **The Commission received feedback from the neighbors as to the negative impacts of the sound wall both visually and property devaluation.**

**The motion carried unanimously (7-0).**

Chair Collins asked how staff would proceed with this item.

Community Development Director Reilly reported staff would relisten to this meeting in order to verify the actions and directions from the Commission. He explained staff would speak with the applicant about the State Statute timeline requirements and see how Boston Scientific would like to proceed. He indicated staff would come back to the Commission in January with further information on this item.

### **UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS**

None.

### **REPORTS**

#### **A. Report from the City Council**

Community Development Director Reilly provided the Commission with an update from the City Council.

#### **B. Planning Commission Comments and Requests**

Community Development Director Reilly reported there would be a special Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday, December 10.

### **ADJOURN**

**Chair Collins moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindau, to adjourn the December 3, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting at 8:51 p.m. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).**