



CITY OF CORCORAN  
**City Council Work Session Minutes**  
**January 26, 2023 – 5:30 pm**

The Corcoran City Council met on January 26, 2023, in Corcoran, Minnesota. The City Council work session meeting was held in person and the public was present in person and remotely through electronic means using the audio and video conferencing platform Zoom.

Mayor McKee, Councilor Schultz, Councilor Vehrenkamp, and Councilor Nichols were present. Councilor Bottema was excused.

City Administrator Beise, City Clerk Friedrich, Planner McKeown, and City Planner Lindahl were present.

**1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Mayor McKee called the work session to order at 5:30 pm.

**2. Buffer Yard Transition Ordinance**

City Planner Lindahl presented buffer yard ordinance discussion beginning in May of 2022, and again in October 2022. Council provided direction to staff on some existing ordinances from Medina, Ramsey, and Rochester to assist in creating a draft ordinance in Corcoran. City Planner Lindahl noted staff used the current draft ordinance and applied it against some actual projects in Corcoran and noted items that had not yet been addressed or thought about. City Planner Lindahl referenced the results from the exhibit in the Council packet is an example of the potential buffer and is generally not resulting in dramatic changes to the site plan, noting the positive outcomes, and negative outcomes that may need some additional discussion or changes. City Planner Lindahl noted Council discussion included wanting to use the zoning in the matrix to establish the different buffers against different zoning districts. City Planner Lindahl noted currently, urban reserve is treated as a residential district for the purpose of this buffer ordinance, however, noted acknowledgment that some of the urban reserve is going to ultimately develop as commercial, but until that time, functions as residential. City Planner Lindahl reviewed the example concept plan, and noted on the west side, the property butts up against urban reserve property, and in this case the urban reserve property will eventually be residential, but the concept remains the same. Council and staff clarified the question and opened the discussion if underlying land use should be a factor in the level of buffering. Council noted landscaping requirements are different for commercial versus residential and discussed creating a restrictive ordinance. Council noted the issues seem to be with current zoning uses versus future zoning uses and the change being discussed would benefit surrounding property owners today versus in the future. Council and staff discussed a parcel that is a cemetery today, and will be in the future, and discussed if there should there be an exemption from the buffering ordinance for things such a cemetery. Council and staff discussed if structures placed within the cemetery such as a mausoleum, how the buffering ordinance should apply in such a situation. Council and staff reviewed buffering in proposed parks, private open space, outlots, unbuildable lots, and open spaces, and reviewed currently each would still require that same buffer along the plat line between the park and existing neighborhoods. Council and staff discussed buffering in existing developments that subdivide and new developments and if buffering requirements should be the same. Council and staff discussed buffering on arterial streets and major roadways. Council and staff discussed ponds as buffers and if buffers between ponds would be necessary. Council and staff noted differences in stormwater ponds under watershed rules, and filtration basins are bioswales and don't require buffers and note wetlands complicate things and are different than a filtration. Council discussed allowing for flexibility regarding buffering, natural vegetation buffers, and credit for allowing existing natural buffers to remain intact. City Planner Lindahl summarized the three changes, correcting the error in the table, allowing the ponds to encroach, and giving the Council the ability to give credit for existing forested areas. City Planner Lindahl noted Council review again of the draft ordinance with changes in either March or April.

**3. Draft PUD Ordinance**

Planner McKeown reviewed open space and how it is defined and how it is calculated. Planner McKeown noted in depth discussion with City Planner Lindahl regarding open space applications to an existing development. Planner McKeown noted consideration of having areas that are under a typical new easement, with respect to lot lines, floodplain or wetlands, or stormwater ponds and should count towards the open space requirement. Planner McKeown noted with that standard, a new easement encompasses the 10 feet around the perimeter of each site. Planner McKeown mentioned clarifying 15 percent should potentially be based on the estimated net post development land calculations versus the gross acreage. Planner McKeown noted an example would be the total land less floodplain wetlands and land under the 100 year, ordinary high water level. Planner McKeown reviewed the example provides a 15 percent calculation based on the gross acreage when reviewing revenue and would require a dedication of roughly an additional 40 acres of land that did not have any wetland in it to be kept as open space and would have likely impacted roughly 80 homes. Planner McKeown noted generally, the concern is this could unintentionally result in smaller lots throughout the rest of the development, as some of the 75 foot lots would have likely need to be reduced to 65 or less. Planner McKeown pointed out discussion on if allowing smaller lots is acceptable, than the open space at 15 percent is workable. Planner McKeown noted this example is why staff is recommending a host development, calculation of the pre-development, and a discussion of the neighborhood meeting. Planner McKeown noted determining when meetings occur and referenced before the sketch plat or before preliminary plat as possibilities and noted the pros and cons of each. Council discussed DMU easements, larger areas of open space and 15 percent was intended give a smaller number, but a more consistent application with the inclusion of the 10 feet around each lot as open space. Council and staff discussed PUD open space percentages, points standards, and meeting the 75 percent points standards prior to approval, minimum parcel size of less than 30 acres, and meeting underlying standards requirements, and petition for credit of proposed PUD benefits. Council and staff reviewed discussion of strict PUD standards, flexibility in PUDs, and referenced 15 percent open space preservation, and building rights. Council discussed subdivisions, reimbursement for trails, and discussed community meeting requirements and logistics of the meetings. Council reviewed HOAs and open space and residents with open space in their own yard. Council and staff discussed lot sizes and sliding scales regarding lot sizes and noted reviewing Dayton's open space parameters. Council reviewed point system and what encompasses the point system and subjectivity versus objectivity, and noted the point system provides some objectivity. Council discussed including the 4/5 Council vote.

#### **4. Unscheduled Items**

No unscheduled business was heard.

#### **5. Adjournment**

**MOTION:** made by Schultz, seconded by Nichols to adjourn.

Voting Aye: McKee, Bottema, Nichols, Schultz, and Vehrenkamp

(Motion carried 4:0)

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.



Michelle Friedrich  
Michelle Friedrich – City Clerk