



CITY OF CORCORAN
City Council Work Session Minutes
February 9, 2023 – 5:30 pm

The Corcoran City Council met on February 9, 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 Bottema, Councilor Vehrenkamp, and Councilor Nichols were present. Parks and Trails Commission Chair Anderson, Planning Commission Chair Lanterman, Planning Commissioner Van Den Einde and Planning Commissioner Brummond were present. Planning Commissioner Horn and Parks and Trails Commission Wyffels attended virtually.

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

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

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

2. Commission and Council Joint Work Session -- PUD Standards

Planner McKeown presented the planned unit development ordinance draft of standards for review, noting further discussion is necessary for the 4/5 majority threshold for approval. Planner McKeown noted discussion of the supermajority approval threshold, to allow for flexibility in the case a Council member is absent from a meeting to maintain review deadline timelines. Planner McKeown post amendments to a PUD district would adhere to current requirement of a majority vote. Planner McKeown reviewed a sliding scale fee based sited examples for reference. Planner McKeown discussed possible amendments requiring developers to host neighborhood meetings and discussed possible options for the meeting timelines and potential difficulties at different stages in the process from sketch plan stage to preliminary plat approval stage. Planner McKeown reviewed the PUD benefit categories and possible point rating system that incorporates and reflects the City's goals and ideals for future developments. Council and staff discussed developer neighborhood meetings, maintaining a record of discussions such as a Minutes record, venues for neighborhood meetings and scheduling the neighborhood meetings at City Hall. Council and staff discussed the developer meeting notification timeline of 30 and 60 days prior to formal preliminary application submission. Council noted scheduling the meetings the first Thursday on the month to coincide with Planning Commission meetings. Council noted possibly recognizing more points within the point scale category for obtaining resident collaboration and feedback. Planner McKeown noted the application needs to be complete prior to any scheduled meetings. Council, Commissions, and staff discussed public hearings and notice boundaries, developer meetings, potential value of feedback from community, difficulties of imposing meetings with potential unintended consequences. Commission and Council discussed disclosure statements within the developer meetings regarding PUD developments. Council and Commissions discussed difference between a collaboration meeting versus an informational meeting from a neighborhood perspective. Council and staff noted timing of developer meeting could be after the sketch plan concept and prior to application. Council noted presenting sketch concept plan within the Development Updates page on the website as an additional resource for residents. Council and Commissions discussed developer meetings could include developer feedback, could include a clarifying disclosure statement referencing the developer meeting is for educational and informational purposes and to assist residents in understanding the zoning district, what kinds of buildings can be built within the zoning district, located near their neighborhood. Planner McKeown outlined the category points system, how points are calculated, total points thresholds, and the positive and negative aspects of implementing a point category system regarding PUDs. Commission and staff reviewed the creation of open space category, the maintenance of open space, historic house and monument definitions, HOA maintained open space, and apartment building open space. Planner McKeown noted including additional points if the developer chooses to make open space available to the larger community. Planner McKeown explained, generally speaking, unless the open space is part

of a park dedication agreement, and the open space is not owned by the city, then it would be HOA maintained and the developer would have to submit an open space management plan. Planner McKeown noted grass and open prairie space could theoretically count as open space with additional points given for tree preservation as part of the open space. Planner McKeown discussed the parameters of a structurally sound building, with flexibility within the category. Council and staff discussed open space and park dedication and noted open space would be in addition to park dedication. Council discussed including points within the category point system for larger lot sizes. Council and staff discussed developments zoned urban reserve, guided low density residential and underlying zoning for PUDs. Council, commissioners, and staff discussed larger lot sizes, and benefits to individual owners to utilize land versus open space for a neighborhood as a benefit. The Council discussed minimum lot size, minimum depths, and minimum widths in RSF-3. Commissioners commented on open space, HOA ownership of open space, with less land being owned by individuals and concern of future developments and open space being owned by companies. Commissioners commented on balancing a mix of ownership type within the PUD process. Council, Commissioners, and staff discussed open space and HOAs, cost of land, and benefits provided to residents within HOA maintained neighborhoods. Council and commissioners discussed the purpose of the point system, and that it does not guarantee or imply approval of PUD but allows for meeting a minimum requirement before it is presented to Council or to the Planning Commission. Council discussed development appearance if straight code applied versus PUD's, and utilizing the point system to truly assist in establishing public benefit and desirable amenities. Council noted additional discussion on the topic is needed at a future Council meeting.

3. Unscheduled Items

No unscheduled business was heard.

5. Adjournment

MOTION: made by McKee, seconded by Schultz to adjourn.

Voting Aye: McKee, Bottema, Nichols, and Schultz

(Motion carried 5:0)

Meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm.



Michelle Friedrich – City Clerk