CIty of Corcoran
Corcoran Planning
Commission Agenda February 1, 2024-7:00 pm

## 1. Call to Order / Roll Call

2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Agenda Approval
4. Open Forum
5. Minutes
a. January 4, 2024, Regular Meeting Minutes*
6. New Business
a. Public Hearing. Lister Garage CUP (City File No. 23-031)
i. Staff Report
ii. Open Public Hearing
iii. Close Public Hearing
iv. Commission Discussion \& Recommendation
b. Public Hearing. Hope Community Preliminary Plat, Preliminary PUD, Rezoning \& Comprehensive Plan Amendment (City File No. 23-028)
i. Staff Report
ii. Open Public Hearing
iii. Close Public Hearing
iv. Commission Discussion \& Recommendation
7. Reports/Information
a. Other Business
b. Planning Project Update*
c. City Council Report* - Council Liaison Vehrenkamp
8. Commissioner Liaison Calendar

City Council Meetings

| $2 / 8 / 2024$ | $2 / 22 / 2024$ | $3 / 14 / 2024$ | $3 / 28 / 2024$ | $4 / 11 / 2024$ | $4 / 25 / 2024$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lind | Lanterman | Van Den Einde | Brummond | Lind | Lanterman |

## 9. Adjournment

*Includes Materials - Materials relating to these agenda items can be found in the House Agenda Packet by Door.

## City of Corcoran

## Corcoran Planning Commission Minutes <br> January 4, 2024-7:00 pm

The Corcoran Planning Commission met on January 4, 2024, in Corcoran, Minnesota. Three Planning Commissioners were present in the Council Chambers. Members of the public were able to participate inperson as well as through electronic means using the audio and video conferencing platform Zoom.

Present: Commissioners Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
Also present: Planner Davis McKeown, Planning Technician Klingbeil, and Council Liaison Schultz.
Absent: Commissioners Lanterman and Lind.

## 1. Call to Order / Roll Call

2. Pledge of Allegiance

## 3. Agenda Approval

Motion made by Horn, seconded by Van Den Einde, to approve the agenda for the January 4, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting.

Voting Aye: Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
(Motion passed 3:0).
4. Open Forum (none)

## 5. Minutes

Motion made by Van Den Einde, seconded by Horn, to approve the December 5, 2023, Planning Commission Minutes.
Voting Aye: Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
(Motion passed 3:0).
6. New Business - Public Comment Opportunity
a. Public Hearing. Minks Preliminary Plat and Variance (City File No. 23-025)
i. Staff Report - Staff Report was presented by Planner Davis McKeown.
ii. Public Hearing

Motion made by Horn, seconded by Van Den Einde, to close the Public Hearing.
Voting aye: Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
(Motion passed 3:0)
iii. Commission Discussion \& Recommendation - Commission discussion included a series of questions directed at the applicant, Lyndon Minks, 6950 Jubert Lane. Lyndon Minks discussed the need for lot 1 to abut his other property at 6385 Old Settlers Road; a previous attempt to adjust the lot line; hoping this process would be more streamlined this time around; and the neighbor's trees planted near his driveway.

The commission discussion included clarification of the applicant's options to address the driveway encroachment from lot 2 onto lot 1; a question of the well location on the site; clarification of what's considered a flag lot; private shared access agreement being the least intensive option to address the driveway encroachment; clarification that the platting process triggers the need for wetland buffer signs; and letting the applicant decide which option he'd like to pursue to address the driveway encroachment.

Motion made by Brummond, seconded by Horn, to recommend approval of the resolution approving a preliminary plat and variance for "Minks Addition" at 6925 Old Settlers Road and 7005 Old Settlers Road.

Voting Aye: Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
(Motion passed 3:0).

## 7. Reports/Information

a. Other Business -
b. Planning Project Update* - The mayor requested staff to request the Commission's interest and availability to hold a joint work session to discuss the City's goals. Commissioner Brummond inquired on the status of the Hope Community Preliminary Plat and Preliminary PUD and Planner Davis McKeown confirmed that it was tentatively scheduled for the February meeting.
c. City Council Report* - City Council Report included a request for a summary of the Planning Commission's accomplishments for 2023; planning items included in the Council's goal for 2024; and the status of the new City Logo.

## 8. Commissioner Liaison Calendar

City Council Meetings

| $1 / 11 / 2024$ | $1 / 25 / 2024$ | $2 / 8 / 2024$ | $2 / 22 / 2024$ | $3 / 14 / 2024$ | $3 / 28 / 2024$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brummond | Horn | Lind | Lanterman | Van Den Einde | Brummond |

## 9. Adjournment

Motion made by Brummond, seconded by Van Den Einde, to adjourn the January 4, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Voting Aye: Brummond, Horn, and Van Den Einde.
(Motion passed 3:0).
The meeting adjourned at 7:28 pm.

## STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item 6a.

| Planning Commission Meeting: | Prepared By: <br> February 1, 2024 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dopight Klingbeil |  |
| Lister Garage CUP | Action Required: |
| (PID 19-119-23-21-0007) | Recommendation |
| (City File No. 23-031) |  |

## 1. Application Request

Carrie Johnson, the applicant, on behalf of Dan and Peggy Lister, requests approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) for a garage with a sidewall height of greater than 10' located in the side yard for his property at 26315 Julie Ann Drive.

## 2. Context

## Zoning and Land Use

The proposed property is guided for Rural/Ag Residential and zoned Rural


Figure 1 Site Location Residential (RR). The property has an existing single-family home with an attached garage. The property is outside of the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA).

## Surrounding Properties

All surrounding properties are guided for Rural/Ag Residential, within the RR district, and outside of the MUSA. The properties to the north, east, and south are residential uses, and the two properties to the west are used for agricultural/residential uses.

## Natural Characteristics of the Site

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan's Natural Resource Inventory Areas map indicates the presence of shrub wetland community on the western edge of this property. According to the Hennepin County Natural Resources Map, the western section of the property contains a small portion of a 100-year flood basin that is part of the larger wetland complex. The Engineering Report noted that the wetlands on this site were reviewed and were found to be unaffected by this project.


Figure 2 Hennepin County Natural Resources Map

## 3. Analysis

Planning staff coordinated review of the request for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, City Code requirements, and City policies. The City Engineer's comments are incorporated into this staff report. The detailed comments are included in the attached Engineering Memo, and the approval conditions require compliance with the Memo.

The City's discretion in approving or denying a CUP is limited to whether the proposed request meets the standards outlined in the City Code. If it meets these standards, the City must approve the CUP.

## I. Accessory Structure CUP

The applicant proposes to construct a detached garage of 1,600 square feet within a portion of the side and front yard on the 5.41-acre parcel.

Location and Setbacks

The structure is proposed to be placed north of the principal structure within the side and front yard which is allowed. The garage meets the 10' minimum separation from the residence. The structure is closest to the front property line to the northeast and is setback 122' where a 50' minimum setback is required. The proposed placement meets this requirement and exceeds the side and rear setbacks ( 25 ' and $15^{\prime}$ respectively).

## Size

Section 1030.020 of the Zoning Ordinance allows an accessory building footprint of 2,563 square feet for a lot of this size. There are no other detached structures on the property, and there is an existing attached garage of roughly 900 square feet. Since the attached garage is less than 1000 feet, it does not count toward the allowed 2,563 square foot footprint for the property. Altogether, the applicant proposes 1600 square feet of accessory structure space subject to the footprint limit. This complies


Figure 3 Site Plan with the standard. Should the applicant need to expand the accessory structure space in the future, they may be able to expand it by another 963 square feet. Additionally, one additional detached structure can be added if it does not exceed 200 square feet (as this is a specific exemption from the footprint limit).

## Building Height

The building is partially located both the front and side yard and is limited to a maximum sidewall height of 10'. The applicant requests a sidewall height of 15' to allow the storage of personal vehicles and potentially a boat in the future. This request can be granted through a CUP. The proposed building height is 23.75 ' and does not exceed the 35' height limit for the RR district.

## Architectural Standards

The plans show a typical detached garage with the use of pre-finished metal panels for the walls and roof. The front elevation illustrates a 12-foot garage door and a service door, with a cupola to provide architectural interest on the most visible façade. The other elevations incorporate windows with a door located on the south (noted as "right")
elevation, and an 8-foot garage door and windows on the west (noted as "back") elevation.

The building plans confirm the use of pre-finished steel panels for the walls and roof. Section 1030.020, Subd. 6 and Section 1060.050, Subd. 1(D) of the City Code allows metal siding and/or roofing on Accessory Structures via a Certificate of Compliance, provided they meet the standards adopted by the Minnesota State Building Code and have been treated with a


Figure 4 Front Elevation factory applied color coating system that protects against any fading or degradation. Staff did not have any concerns with the materials proposed by the applicant.

The Zoning Ordinance requires eaves (i.e., the underside or soffits on the side) and overhangs (i.e., the edge extending over the front and rear elevations) of at least 12" for all accessory buildings. The plans show eaves of 24 " which exceed the minimum requirement, and overhangs of 12 " which meet this requirement.

## Grading and Drainage

The submitted survey shows a slight slope at the proposed structure location. The site plan proposes new elevations that will flatten out the proposed site and slope away from the structure. As noted in the Engineering Memo, the grading plan will be reviewed at the time of building permit review.

## Conditional Use Permit Standards

The applicant requests a CUP to exceed the maximum sidewall height of 10' as allowed by Section 1030.020, Subd. 5(D). This provision in the City Code allows any building to exceed the allowable building height with a CUP. In order to grant a CUP, the following standards must be met:

1. The proposed use shall be in conformance with all City regulations.

The proposed use is in conformance with the City regulations. The proposed improvements meet setbacks, the accessory structure footprint, and architectural requirements. The taller building sidewall is requested to accommodate storage of the property owner's personal vehicles and garden equipment, and to do hobbies in. A condition of approval included in the draft resolution is that the structure cannot be used for commercial uses without a separate approval for a home occupation,
and the structure cannot be used as an accessory dwelling unit without approval of an administrative permit.
2. A certificate of survey shall be required that identifies all existing structures on site, including buildings, septic sites, and wells. In addition, the survey shall include the proposed structure, flood plain, wetlands, and any recorded easements.

The applicant submitted a certificate of survey and site plan that show the required features. The City's wetland specialist confirmed that a wetland delineation is not needed for the project as shown.
3. Applicable criteria as outlined in Section 1070.020 (Conditional Use Permits) of the Corcoran Zoning Ordinance.

Staff finds that the taller building height would comply with the standards as follows:
a. Compliance with and effect upon the Comprehensive Plan, including public facilities and capital improvement plans.

The proposed taller building has no impact on the Comprehensive Plan.
b. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use will promote and enhance the general public welfare and will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, or comfort.

The CUP for the taller building would not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, or comfort of the surrounding neighborhood. The building would be below the 35' maximum building height allowed for principal buildings in the RR district. The building would meet or exceed all setback requirements for the $R R$ district.
c. The conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.

Assuming the recommended conditions of approval are adopted, staff does not find reason to believe the CUP for the taller building would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of the surrounding properties for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The proposed building is below the maximum building height and meets or exceeds all required setbacks.
d. The establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

The surrounding properties are used for a mix of residential and agricultural uses. The proposed building does not preclude improvement or further development of the surrounding properties.
e. Adequate public facilities and services are available or can be reasonably provided to accommodate the proposed use.

Adequate public facilities are available to accommodate the proposed use. The taller building will not impact the demand for services.
f. The conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.

If the CUP is approved with the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, the use will comply with the district regulations for the RR.
g. The conditional use and site conform to performance standards as specified by this Chapter.

If the CUP is approved with the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, the use will comply with the performance standards for accessory structures.
4. The building materials standards required by this Section have been met.

As noted previously, the applicant proposes to use pre-finished metal wall- and roof panels. Section 1060.050 Subd. 1(D) of the Zoning Ordinance allows metal siding and/or roofing provided they meet the Minnesota State Building Code standards and are treated with a factory applied color coating system that protects against fading. The proposed materials feature G 60 galvanized coating as well as zinc phosphate. Staff had no concerns with the materials proposed by the applicant.
5. The proposed building will be compatible with surrounding land uses.

The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

## 4. Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the draft resolution approving the CUP for a detached garage exceeding a sidewall height of 10 ' in the side yard.

Attachments:

1. Draft Resolution 2024-xx Approving the CUP
2. Applicant Narrative
3. Site Plan
4. Building Plans
5. Engineering Memo dated 01/10/2024

Motion By:<br>Seconded By:

## A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A DETACHED STRUCTURE FOR DAN AND PEGGY LISTER AT 26315 JULIE ANN DRIVE (PID 19-119-23-21-0007) (CITY FILE 23-031)

WHEREAS, Carrie Johnson, the applicant on behalf of Dan and Peggy Lister, the landowner, requests approval of a conditional use permit to allow an accessory building with a sidewall height of 12 ' at property legally described as follows:

## See Attachment A

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the conditional use permit request at a duly called Public Hearing and recommends approval, and;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORCORAN, MINNESOTA, that it should and hereby does approve the request, subject to the following findings and conditions:

1. A conditional permit is approved, in accordance with the application received by the City on November 7, 2023, and additional information received on January 2, 2024, and January 18, 2024.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of the City Engineer's memo dated January 11, 2024.
3. A conditional use permit is approved to allow a $1,600 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. accessory building with sidewalls taller than 10 feet in the side yard, based on the finding that the conditional use permit standards in section 1070.020 have been satisfied.
4. The structure cannot be used for commercial purposes unless the applicant applies for City approval of a home occupation and such approval is granted.
5. The structure cannot be used as an Accessory Dwelling Unit unless the applicant applies for an Administrative Permit and such approval is granted.
6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following must be submitted for review and approval by the City:
a. The applicant/landowner must record the approving resolution at Hennepin County and provide proof of recording to the City.

VOTING AYE<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

VOTING NAY<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor
ATTEST:
City Seal
Michelle Friedrich - City Clerk

# RESOLUTION NO. 2024- 

## ATTACHEMENT A

Lot 2, Block 1, Julie Anns Wildwest Estates, Hennepin County, Minnesota

## Written Narrative

23615 Julie Ann Drive Conditional Use Permit
a) We are requesting to build an outbuilding approx. $32^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ for the clients to garden, do hobbies, and store cars in.
b) There is no impact on adjoining properties. The home is on over 5 acres.
c) One building; pole barn style, $32^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$.
d) The homeowners intend to use it for storage and hobbies.
e) Normal daytime hours; this will not be used for business
f) $N / A$
g) $N / A$
h) No impact on traffic, there will be an asphalt driveway connected to the existing driveway that will go up to the new building.
i) The new building will connect to the existing well. A new well pump will be installed. There will be a new septic installed for the building.
j) No environmental impacts: there is a pong on the property, but this is far from that.
k) There is a tree line on the north side of the property that will hide the building from adjacent neighbor.
l) $N / A$
m) $N / A$

| legend |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $:$ | Set Iron Monument Inscribed R.L.S 1523 |
| $\begin{gathered} 1000) \\ 10000) \end{gathered}$ |  | unplatted

LOT 8


| COLOR SCHEDULE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SHEET STEEL |  | TRIMS |  |
| LOCATION | COLOR | LOCATION | COLOR |
| ROOF | BURNISHED SLATE | RIDGE CAP | BURNISHED SLATE |
| EAVE WALLS | LIGHT STONE | GABLE TRIM | CLAY MIST |
| GABLE WAlLS | LIGHT STONE | EAVE TRIM | CLAY MIST |
| SOFFIT | CLAY MIST | CORNER TRIM | LIGHT STONE |
| WAINSCOT | NA | WAINSCOT CORNER | NA |
| UPPER SHEATHING | NA | WAINSCOT TRANSITION | NA |
|  |  | BASE TRIM | LIGHT STONE |
| SHEET STEEL (INTERIOR) |  |  |  |
| CEILING LINER | KESTREL WHITE | UINDOU AND DOOR TRIMS |  |
| WALL LINER | KESTREL WHITE | SERVICE DOOR TRIM | CLAY MIST |
| WAINSCOT LINER | KESTREL WHITE | OHD TRIM | CLAY MIST |
| PORCH CELING | NA | WINDOW TRIM | CLAY MIST |
|  |  | SLIDER TRACK COVER | NA |
| MISCELLANEOUS |  | SLIDER TRIM | NA |
| VERSETTA STONE | NA | SLIDER DOOR PANEL | NA |
| BOLLARD COVERS | NA |  |  |
| CUPOLA WALLS | LIGHT STONE 308 | MISCELLANEOUS |  |
| CUPOLA ROOF | BRONZE 213 | ROOF VENT TRIM | BURNISHED SLATE |
| שEATHER VANE | NA | POST / BEAM URAP | NA |

JOB NAME: J BROTHERS - LISTER PROJECT
ADDRESS: 23615 JULIE ANN DRIVE $\qquad$

## LORETTO <br> $\qquad$ MN 55357

 JOB \#:23145PHONE \#: 763-221-2337 $\qquad$ SALES REP.: MIKE R.

CUSTOMER SIGNATURE: $\qquad$

| DRAWING HISTORY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| REV. $\#$ | DATE | NOTES | SIGNATURE |
|  | - | CONTRACT RECEIVED |  |
|  | - | - |  |
| $\triangle$ | - | - |  |
| $\Delta$ | - | - |  |
| $\triangle$ | - | - |  |
| $\Delta$ | - | - |  |
| $\triangle$ | - | - |  |



I hereby certify that this plan, specification, of report was prepared by me or under my dire report was prepared that I am a duly Licensed
supervision and Professional Engine
State of Minnesota. Joitn HoLT
 ate: $10 / 1412023$ License \#49214

## GENERAL NOTES

 THE PLANS AND SPECS AS OUTLINED ARE BASED ON THE DESIGN/BULLD PROCESS OFSTRUCTURAL BUILDINGS. THE SUBCONTRACTORS HIRED BY STRUCTURL BULLDNGS AND
STRUCTURA BLI STRUCTURAL BULLDINGS SALES REPRESENTATIVE. IT IS THE BELIEF OF
2. WHERE LACK OF INFORMATION, OR ANY DISCREPANCY SHOULD APPEAR IN THE DRAWINGS OR SPECIFICATIONS, WRITTEN INTERPRETATION FROM STRUCTURA
MUST BE RECEIVED BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THAT PORTION OF WORK.
3. NO CHANGES, MODIFICATION OR DEVIATIONS SHALL BE MADE FROM THE PLANS AND
SPECS WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM STRUCTURAL BUILDINGS.
4. ANY CONTRADICTIONS IN THE PLANS, SPECS. OR APPLICABLE BULLDING CODES MUST BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF STRUCTURAL BUILDINGS PRIOR TO WORK BEING
PERFORMED. IN THE EVENT OF A CONTRADICTION, THE SUBCONTRACTOR MAY BE REQURED TO PERFORM THE MORE STRINGENT AT NO ADDITIONAL COST. THIS DECISION peLIES SOLELY ON STRUCTURAL BUILDINGS
5. ALL SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL TAKE NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC damage.
6. SUBCONTRACTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CUTTING/PATCHING OF NECESSARY

PENETRATIONS TO INCLUDE SHEETROCK, STEEL, POLY AND CONCRETE.
7. SUBCONTRACTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR SITE ORGANIZING AND DAILY CLEAN UP.
8. SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL PROVIDE STRUCTURAL BULDINGS WITH OPERATION MANUALS
9. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED IN THE PLANS. WINDOW AND DOOR LOCATIONS SHALL BE
10. UNLESS OTHERUISE STATED. THE FINAL GRADING. INCLUDING NECESSARY IMPORT OR
EXPORT IS THE RESPONSIBLITY OF THE CUSTOMER.

A. LATEST EDITION OF MIINESOTA STATE BULDDING CODES AND IBC

| DESIGN LOADS LOAD: ROOF SNOW LOAD: | ${ }_{30}^{50} \mathrm{PSF}$ LIVE LOAD MEZZANINE 50 |
| :---: | :---: |
| deal loadi | WOOD |
| WINDUARD: | 10.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unn } \\ & \text { Sil } \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 15 \end{aligned}$ | PH (ASD) 10 |
|  |  |




CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE
A. CONCRETE IF'C IS 28 DAY COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF CONCRETE

B. RENFORCING STELL (NEW, DEFORMED AND CLEAN)

ASTM AIBS FOR WELDED
ASTM
ALS
GRADE
GABR
post frame bullding
A. treated laminated (glued or nalled) wood poles are to be msr lumber un




CARPENTRY
A. INSTALATION OF ALL MATERALS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE




c. M

MACHINE STRESS RATED SAWN LUMBER IMSR). WITH GRADING PEREORMED BY ONE
OF THE FOLOUNG AGENCIES: WCLB. NLGA, UWPA, NELMA OS SPB, WITH MIIMUM
VALES AS SPECIFIED ONDRAUMCS.

glulam: Approved products meeting the requrements of ansi/aitc standard


H. PLYUOOD. FS M A.S. PRODUCT STANDARD FOR CONST. AND INDUST. PYYUOOD" OR

I. FRAMING ANCHARE: IB GAGE MINIUM: KNAT-SAG. SIMPSON OR APPROVED EQUAL, U.N.O.


M. NAG BOLSH. FF-B-5G NEET FF-N-IO5 OR CS-2L3 GALVANIZED AT EXTERIOR. ALL
N. ADDLCATED ON IBC TAALE 2304.91 ALIMGSR HARDUARE TO BE STRONG TIE ANCHORS SYSTEMS OR APPROVED

GENERAL CONSTRUCTION NOTES

1. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MEANS AND METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHAL REVIEW THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS FROM ALL DISCIPLINES 3. REPORTED TO THE ARCHETUEF OR NNGF THE IIMENSARUCTION DOCUMENTS SHALL BE
3. 15

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Minnesota. |  |
| Print Name: Johar Holt $\qquad$ |  |
| Signature: Chem tholt $\qquad$ | SHEET |
| Date: $10 / 14 / 2023$ License \# 49214 | $-0.5$ |











| To: | Kevin Mattson, PE | From: | Kent Torve, PE City Engineer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Public Works Director |  | Steve Hegland, PE |  |

## Exhibits:

This review is based on the following documents:

1. Site Plan for J. Brothers at 23615 Julie Ann Drive by W.Brown Land Surveying, Inc, dated 3/23/2023.

## Comments:

1. No impacts to public infrastructure are involved with the outbuilding construction.
2. Floodplain is shown at 1004 with proposed building at 1020.
3. Wetlands were reviewed and project has no impact.
4. Grading plan will be reviewed with building permit.

## End of Memo

| Planning Commission Meeting: | Prepared By: <br> February 1, 2024 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Topic: | Action Ravis McKeown |
| Hope Ministries | Recommendation |
| Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, |  |
| Preliminary PUD Plan, and Preliminary Plat |  |
| (PIDs 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0004, |  |
| 11-119-23-14-0005, 11-119-23-11-0012) |  |
| (City File No. 23-028) |  |

Review Deadline: April 2, 2024

## 1. Application Request

The applicants (Hope Community Church, Brian and Jacque Lother, and Corcoran Investments, LLC) request approval of a 40 -acre mixed-use development at the northwest corner of County Road 116 and County Road 30 and surrounding the existing Hope Community Church location.

## 2. Background

Hope Community Church is an existing institution located at 19951 Oswald Farm Rd. Hope
Community Church purchased the
 subject parcels over 20 years ago with a long-term vision to create a campus that would provide places for people of multiple age groups to live, work, dine, and worship. Significant components of this vision include senior housing options as well as medical office space.

The church was approved in 2001. As part of the original approvals, the landowner provided a concept plan for future build out of the entire church property, which included senior housing, office/retail on the property east of the church, and a cemetery west of the church. No approvals for future phases were granted as these were conceptual plans only.

In 2005, the City approved a request from the church to complete a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to allow a daycare on site with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). In 2006,
the church submitted a request for a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to allow development of land in the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) prior to availability of services, subject to several conditions. This request was approved.

In 2012, the City approved a CUP and a Site Plan Amendment to allow a 498-plot cemetery on 1.504 acres of land west of the existing church. As a part of this approval, the applicant was required to plant screening for the cemetery, and an escrow was taken as a financial security to guarantee the work. However, the applicant has not completed this requirement. It is staff's understanding that the adjacent property owner requests that this screening not be installed. Staff note that it has been 8 years, and no complaints have been received. Staff recommends the City Council accept the cemetery in its current condition as a part of this application, and staff will work to release the historic escrow account.

Most recently, the Lothers and Hope Community Church worked with the City to provide land for a water treatment plant and water tower in the Northeast District.

## 3. Prior Review

A concept plan for this proposal was reviewed by the Council on January 12, 2023. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) was completed for the development proposal, and the City issued a Notice of Decision confirming no need for an Environmental Impact Statement on July 27, 2023.

Applicants wishing to submit a request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) are now required to host a neighborhood meeting prior to submittal of their preliminary application. A meeting was held at Hope Community Church on Wednesday, October 11, 2023. A summary of the meeting is enclosed with this report.

The Parks and Trails Commission reviewed this application on December 14, 2023. The information was specifically regarding the Three Rivers' Diamond Lake Regional Trail and estimated park dedication fees for the project. Their recommendation is discussed subsequently in this report when the trail is discussed in more detail.

## 4. Context

## Zoning and Land Use

The proposed development spans four parcels. Two parcels do not have any existing structures. One parcel has an existing single-family home. The largest parcel contains Hope Community Church and the associated cemetery. The City recently approved a small subdivision on the Hope Community Church parcel to be used as the location for the City's first water tower. Construction on the water tower is underway, and this property is noted as "not included" in the preliminary plat exhibit.

The existing church site is zoned Public/Institutional (P-I) while the three surrounding parcels to the east are currently zoned General Mixed Use (GMU). The 2040 Comprehensive Plan guides the church site as Public/Semi-Public with the three
surrounding parcels are guided as Mixed Use. All four properties are within the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) and are within Phase 1 of the 2040 Staging Plan.

## Surrounding Properties

The guiding, zoning, and existing use of the surrounding properties are detailed in the table below. All surrounding properties are within the MUSA.

| Direction | Guided | Zoning District | Use | Staging Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | Existing Residential | Urban Reserve (UR) | Single-family Residential Neighborhood | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Phase } 4 \\ & 2035-2040 \end{aligned}$ |
| East (Across CR 116) | - Existing Residential <br> - Business Park | - UR <br> - Single Family Residential 1 (RSF-1) <br> - Business Park (BP) | - Single-family residential neighborhood <br> - City Water Treatment Plant <br> - Agriculture/Vacant | - Phase 4 <br> - Phase 1 <br> 2020- <br> 2025 |
| South <br> (Across CR 30) | Mixed Use | General Mixed Use | Agricultural Homestead | Phase 1 |
| West | Mixed Residential | UR | Agricultural Homestead | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Phase } 3 \\ & 2030-2035 \end{aligned}$ |

## Natural Characteristics of the Site

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan's Natural Resource Inventory Areas map does not reflect any natural communities on the four subject properties. Previous wetland delineations confirmed two large wetlands on the west portion of the site (to the northwest of the church). A wetland delineation was finalized for the entire project site in May of 2023. A total of 6 wetlands were delineated on the site.
5. Analysis

The development proposal includes the following application components: comprehensive plan amendment (CPA), rezoning, preliminary planned unit development (PUD) plan, and preliminary plat.
 The development plan includes 642 housing units and 80,200 square feet of commercial space. The proposed uses include the following:

- A 13-acre parcel will be carved out to contain the existing Hope Community Church site, existing cemetery, and a future cemetery expansion is noted on the site plan.
- Multi-Family "A"
- Market-rate apartment building
- 4-stories
- 148 units
- Retail "B"
- 10,100 square feet commercial building
- Potential users possible with this space include a small grocery store, coffee shop, restaurant, barbershop, bank, pharmacy, child care, etc.
- Medical "C"
- 2-story medical office building
- 31,300 square feet
- Medical "D"
- 2-story medical office building
- 28,800 square feet
- Retail "E"
- 10,000 square foot commercial building
- Same uses as discussed for Retail " B " are anticipated for this building.
- Shared parking lot to serve the retail and medical buildings.
- Multi-Family "F"
- Market-rate apartment building
- 4-stories
- 184 units
- Senior Housing
- Apartment building
- 122 units
- Full continuum of care including independent living, assisted living, memory care, and hospice.
- A breakdown of how many units are independent living versus assisted living, memory care, or hospice units is not available at this time as the end user is not finalized for this building. For the sake of reviewing the application, all of these units will be treated as independent living units.
- 28 memory-care units
- Active Senior
- Apartment building catered to 55+ Active Senior population.
- 110 units
- Independent living
- Villas "l"
- 20 detached (single-family) senior villas
- 6 twin-home senior villas
- One-level living
- Rowhomes "J"
- 52 townhome units
- 8 groups of townhomes ranging from 3-8 units
- Market-rate / non-age restricted.
- Three River's Diamond Lake Regional Trail and underpass to cross County Road 16.

A. Level of City Discretion in Decision-Making

The City has a relatively high level of discretion in approving or denying a comprehensive plan amendment. The comprehensive use plan is the City's long-range planning tool that indicates what type of development should occur on all land within the City. It is the City's plan for directing future development and growth. The City Council may guide property as it deems necessary to protect and promote the general health, safety, and welfare of the community.

The City has a relatively high level of discretion in approving or denying a rezoning application. The proposed zoning for a property must be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. If the proposed zoning is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the City must deny the rezoning application. The Zoning Ordinance and Map are the enforcement tools used to implement the goals and standards set in the Comprehensive Plan.

The City has a relatively high level of discretion in approving PUDs. A PUD must be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City may impost requirements in a PUD not otherwise required if the City deems it necessary to promote the general health, safety, and welfare of the community and surrounding areas.

The City's discretion in approving a preliminary plat is limited to whether the proposed plat meets the standards outlined in the City's subdivision and zoning ordinances. If it meets the standards, the City must approve the preliminary plat.
B. Consistency with Ordinance Standards

Staff reviewed the application for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and other City Code requirements, as well as City policies. Planning staff coordinated review of the development application with Public Works and Engineering as well as the Public Safety team. Memos from the City Engineer and Public Safety are enclosed in this report as well as incorporated into the following analysis as appropriate. The applicant is responsible for reviewing the entirety of both memos, and the approval conditions require compliance with the memos.

## Comprehensive Plan Amendment

As part of the development proposal, the applicant requests to amend the 2040 Future Land Use Map to update the land use guiding from Public/SemiPublic to Mixed Use on the northern portion of the existing Hope Community Church site to allow for senior housing apartments, villas, and twin-homes. The site for Hope Community Church will remain guided as Public/Sem-Public.

The Comprehensive Plan is a living document. When the City finds evidence to support a change to the plan, the City Council has the discretion to make a change. The City should consider the following issues when reviewing a CPA request:

- Evidence submitted by the applicant demonstrating the reason(s) that the plan should be changed, including, but not limited to, whether new information has become available since the
 Comprehensive Plan was adopted that supports re-examination of the plan, or that existing or proposed development offers new opportunities or constraints that were not previously considered by the plan.
- Whether or not the change is needed to allow reasonable development of the site.
- The relationship of the proposed amendment to the supply and demand for particular land uses within the City and the immediate vicinity of the site.
- A demonstration by the applicant that the proposed amendment has merit beyond the interests of the proponent.
- The possible impacts of the amendment on all specific elements of the Comprehensive Plan as may be applicable, including but not limited to:
- Transportation;
- Sanitary sewer, including existing and proposed sanitary sewer flows as compared to the adopted plan;
- Housing, including the extent to which the proposal contributes to the City's adopted housing goals;
- Surface water, including compliance with the City's goals for water quality as well as water quantity management;
- Water supply;
- Parks and open space; and
- Consideration of the impact of the proposed amendment upon current and future special assessments and utility area charges, future property tax assessments or other fiscal impacts upon the City.

This is a policy decision for the City Council. The City should evaluate all these issues when considering the decision. Staff recommends approval of the future land use change as it will allow reasonable development and will simply extend the boundary of the mixed-use land use designation in the area. The higher density in this consolidated area will help contribute to the City's overall density goal and would be factored in to the 2050 Comprehensive Plan update.

## Rezoning

The properties in this proposed development are currently zoned GMU and PI. The applicant requests rezoning the properties to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) district. Assuming the CPA is approved, the rezoning will be consistent with the underlying land use districts. The districts standards for PI will continue to apply to the site for Hope Community Church as well as the cemetery. The remaining acreage will be developed in accordance with the Mixed-Use land designation which anticipates half the district acreage to be developed at a residential density of 8-30 units per acre.

The Zoning Ordinance establishes a PUD zoning district with the purpose of granting flexibility from site design requirements in return for creative community designs of exceptional quality with a combination of public benefits. The PUD ordinance clarifies that PUDs for land guided as Public/Semi-Public is assumed to allow uses as detailed in the PI zoning district. Additionally, land guided as mixed use is assumed to allow uses as detailed in the zoning districts for GMU as well as Downtown Mixed Use (DMU). The presumptive performance standards for the Public/Semi-Public portion will continue to be based on the PI zoning district. The presumptive performance standards for the mixed-use portion of the PUD will be based on the requirements of the GMU districts unless deviation from these standards is specifically approved.

The applicant's narrative requests PUD flexibility for the following:

- Deviation in lot square footage standards for the Villa Units.
- Setback reduction for multifamily and commercial buildings along County Road 116 and County Road 30.
- Joint Parking / Parking reductions throughout the project area.
- Allowance of townhomes, twin-homes, and detached villas in the GMU.
- As directed Allow single-family homes, townhomes, and twin-homes.
- These housing types are not allowed in GMU but are allowed in the DMU. Allowing these uses as part of a mixed-use PUD is consistent with the PUD ordinance.
- Flexibility to shift required landscape material from some portions of the site to allow for improved buffering at the edges of the site.
- Relief from Ordinance 1040.135 which requires a grade separation on all housing units accessing the building on the first level.
- Flexibility from landscape island / parking bay spacing standards found within the Northeast District Standards for the commercial parking lot.
- Flexibility from the restriction on drive-through lanes abutting public ROW. The applicant proposes to screen the drive-through lanes instead.

The staff report identifies additional areas of flexibility that may be necessary for the application to move forward in a similar vision to what is currently proposed.

The concept plan for this development proposal was reviewed prior to the adoption of the City's PUD Public Benefit Policy on 5/23/2023. Therefore, the proposal will not be reviewed against the policy. However, a combination of public benefits is still expected. In exchange for this flexibility, the applicant proposes the following public benefits:

- An architectural transition between existing uses and the proposed development by locating taller buildings as far away from existing single-family homes as possible, lessening impact to existing residents.
- Construction of Hope Way, an east-west connection to future development to the west. This arguably provides relief from future east-west traffic that would have otherwise been routed through the existing Hunters Ridge road connection. This idea in particular was received well at the neighborhood meeting.
- Coordination with City staff/consultants to shift existing ROW to allow for more economical construction of the water utility lines.
- Improvement of existing drainage conditions for neighbors to the south of the project area through stormwater routing through the project area.
- Establishment of a significant tax base to serve Corcoran and its residents will into the future.
- Provide a trail easement in excess of 20 feet to support the Three Rivers Diamond Lake Regional Trail and a grade-separated crossing at County Road 116. The applicant proposes to dedicate this easement on the outset of the
project to allow for more wholistic trail planning. Alternatively, Three Rivers would need to acquire this easement at a later point which could delay the trail/underpass project and lead to land conflicts in order to expand the corridor.
- This project serves as a vital link for future development in the City of Corcoran.
- The flexibility in applying the required landscaping across the site will allow for more buffering near the edges of the site.
- The flexibility to bypass the parking island / parking bay requirement within the commercial parking lot will allow for more unified pedestrian walkways throughout the commercial parking lot.

The PUD flexibility and public benefits are discussed in more detail in the PUD development plan section of this report.

The City must review this request for compliance with the PUD standards as follows:

1. The planned development is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed PUD appears to comply with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The new parcel for Hope Community Church and associated cemetery will remain guided as Public/Semi-Public. This land use designation is for public facilities, including those owned by the City of Corcoran, as well as semi-public facilities like places of worship and golf courses.

The Mixed-Use land use designation is expected to develop with a mix of residential, retail, and office uses either within 1 building or 1 development. The proposed PUD uses are not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. Residential development within mixed use areas is anticipated at 8-30 units per acre. More specifically, the 2040 Comprehensive Plan states the following:

The City expects approximately $1 / 2$ of these [mixed use] areas to develop with residential uses at a variety of densities, but the City will plan for 8-30 units per acre on average.

The Comprehensive Plan notes that the City calculates net density (gross land area - wetlands and land below the 100-year ordinary high-water level) to ensure compliance with the Comprehensive Plan goals. That is the calculation that the City has used for other development reviews in Corcoran.

Prior to the proposed CPA, the mixed-use portions of the project comprised roughly 25.18 gross acres. Based on the provided site plan, all wetlands not on the church parcel will be impacted, and there is no known floodplain on the site. Therefore, the estimated net acreage is also 25.18. For a mixed-use site, the residential density target is calculated based on the assumption that half of the net acres will go towards residential uses at a density of 8 to 30 units. This means that roughly 100.7 to 377.7 residential units were anticipated in this area in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

The applicant provides that the net mixed use acreage with the requested CPA is 43.74 acres. This means it would be assumed an estimated 174.96 to 164.6 to 656.1 residential units within the project boundaries. The proposal includes 642 housing units. The pre-development density when applied to the residential portion of the proposed project area ( 33.58 net acres) comes back at 19.11 units per acre. The language in the Comprehensive Plan (specifically the use of the term "approximately") appears to allow for flexibility with how the assumptions are ultimately applied. The density based on the residential acreage of the project is within the density range anticipated for the land use designation. Further, the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals to provide a variety of housing options.

The 2040 Parks and Trails map contemplated the Three River's Diamond Lake Regional Trail in the vicinity of County Road 116 before meandering northeast near Hunters Ridge on the east side of County Road 116. The City's comprehensive plan was completed prior to Three River's providing a more finalized alignment. The proposed trail alignment and underpass shown through the southern portion of the proposed project appears to comply with the City's Parks and Trails plan as well as the Three River's master plan for the trail.
2. The planned development is not in conflict with the intent of the underlying zoning district and is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The proposed PUD provides a mix of residential and commercial uses with a combination of public and private pedestrian routes to interconnect the uses throughout the development. This is consistent with the purpose of the GMU district. The church site and cemetery are consistent with the intent of the PI district as a semi-public use. The applicant is requested approval of a PUD zoning for design flexibility to allow for modification to requirements for setbacks, site design requirements, lot size, lot width, and building height at a density consistent with the zoning district and Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed plan would start the development process for this property in advance of municipal water being operational. However, the applicant does not intend to move forward with building permits until Corcoran water is available for this site. Site work may start in 2024, and building permits are not anticipated until 2025.
3. The planned development is not in conflict with other applicable provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

The development is not in conflict with other applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance, except that PUD flexibility is requested as noted in the staff report. In exchange for this flexibility, the developer will provide the above-noted public benefits.
4. The planned development or unit thereof is of sufficient size, composition, and arrangement that its construction, marketing, and/or operation is feasible as a complete unit without dependence upon any other subsequent unit or phase.

The planned development is feasible without dependence upon any other subsequent phase. The project is anticipated to be completed in 4 phases that will be able to adapt to the needs of the market. Development is contingent upon completion of trunk infrastructure improvements and water service. The initial phases will include the construction of the primary project infrastructure, roadway improvements on County Road 116 and County Road 30, and other key public infrastructure improvements.
5. The planned development will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public facilities and utilities which serve or are proposed to serve the planned development.

The planned development will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public facilities and utilities which serve or are proposed to serve the planned development. The developer is providing a public trail consistent with the Three River's Diamond Lake Regional Trail master plan and the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. A private tot lot that will be accessible to residents of the planned development is proposed on the church property. The residents living in assisted living, memory care, and hospice units will place less demand on public facilities such as streets and parks. The development includes the construction of all public infrastructure needed to serve the site at the developer's expense.

Municipal water is anticipated to be available at the end of 2024 under best case scenario. The applicant is hoping to start site work by the end of this year; however, they believe it will be unlikely they will be ready for a building permit before 2025. The applicant states they do not intend to pull a building permit prior to the availability of Corcoran water for this site.
6. The planned development will not have an undue and adverse impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the neighboring property.

The planned development intentionally placed residential uses near the adjacent residential and agricultural uses to minimize the potential for an undue or adverse impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the neighboring property. Should the property to the west develop in the future, it will develop for mixed residential uses, which will be compatible with the proposed uses along the western border of the PUD.
7. The quality of the building and site design proposed by the PUD plan shall substantially enhance the aesthetics of the site, shall demonstrate higher standards, more efficient and effective use of streets, utilities, and public
facilities, it shall maintain and enhance any natural resources within the development, and create a public benefit that is greater than what would be achieved through the strict application of the primary zoning regulations.

> The PUD would provide quality building and site design; install and provide streets, utilities, and public facilities more efficiently; and create public benefit that is greater than may otherwise be achieved. The development will meet the City's density goals, the proposal hopes to address pre-existing stormwater drainage concerns in the vicinity of the project where possible, provide pedestrian routes, and dedicate a larger-than-typical trail easement for an underpass pedestrian crossing at County Road 116 .

## Preliminary PUD Development Plan

The PUD zoning district offers greater flexibility in site design requirements in exchange for creative community designs of exceptional quality. This may be accomplished through preservation, restoration, and/or enhancement of natural systems; aboveaverage open space amenities; creative design in the layout of buildings, open space, and circulation; compatibility with surrounding land uses and neighborhood character; and provide greater efficiency in the layout and provision of roads, utilities, and other infrastructure.

The applicant anticipates this project will be built over 4 phases. The applicant's narrative notes that the market will ultimately drive the phasing of the project, but they believe the multifamily and senior housing will lead the development due to current market conditions and availability of utilities. At this point, the applicant anticipates the first building permits will be pulled in early 2025 with grading and utility work commencing later this year (2024). They do not intend to apply for building permits until watermain and sanitary sewer are in place and operational.

## Uses

Per the PUD ordinance, mixed-use PUDs are presumed to include all permitted and accessory uses in addition to uses allowed by conditional, interim, or administrative permits within the GMU and Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) districts. Additionally, PUDs located on land guided as mixed-use are expected to include a combination of residential and commercial uses. The proposed housing types and commercial buildings are consistent with the uses outlined within these districts. While the GMU only contemplates multi-family housing, assisted living, and nursing homes, the DMU does contemplate detached houses and attached houses as permissible uses.

The two retail commercial buildings are shown to include drive-throughs. While drivethroughs are conditional uses within the GMU, they are not allowed to be located between a street frontage and the building. This is GMU standard as well as a general performance standard of drive-through conditional use permits (CUP). However, this standard appears to be difficult to satisfy with the location of the commercial buildings
and the fact these lots have double street frontages. The applicant requests flexibility from this standard and proposes to screen the drive-through lanes with vegetation.

Lot 2, Block 1 includes both the Active Senior building and the Senior Housing building. Per Section 1060.050, Subd. 3, no more than one principal building shall be located on a multiple family residential lot or non-residential lot, except by conditional use permit. Two principal buildings on Lot 2, Block 1 would be approved as part of the permitted uses in the PUD.

The parcel for the church and cemetery is consistent with uses contemplated within the underlying PI district.

## Lot Standards

Per the PUD ordinance, the district regulations of the most closely related underlying zoning district shall be considered presumptively appropriate but may be departed from as deemed appropriate to accomplish the purpose and intent of a PUD.

The church parcel was reviewed against the PI district standards. All the PI standards are satisfied, or exceeded, with the exception of a tunnel connection shown between the Senior Housing building and the church that will be within the 50 ' side setback. This tunnel will serve for easy transportation for senior residents, some of which may need more assistance than others, from their residence to the church. This can be handled as a PUD flexibility and limited to the tunnel connection. This tunnel connection will also require an encroachment agreement with the City since it is within the City's drainage and utility easement.


The commercial and multi-family housing uses will be reviewed against the GMU district standards for the commercial and multi-family housing uses. The applicant's narrative noted flexibility from the front setback from county roads as well as flexibility from the building height limit. The requested flexibilities from the GMU lot standards are shown in red in the table below.

| Commercial \& Multi- <br> Family | Proposed | GMU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 25,000 square feet | 25,000 square feet |
| Minimum Lot Width | 150 feet | 150 feet |
| Minimum Lot Depth | NA | NA |
| Minimum Principal <br> Structure Setbacks |  | 100 feet |
| - Front, Major Roadways | 40 feet with enhanced <br> landscaping | 25 feet |
| $-\quad$ Front, Other Streets | 25 feet | None |
| - Side | None | None <br> - Rear <br> Maximum Principal <br> Building Height <br> None <br> setbacks but may be <br> increased up to a <br> maximum of 50 feet with <br> increased setback at a rate <br> of 1-foot additional height <br> for every 5 feet in <br> additional setback |
| Maximum Impervious minimum <br> Surface Coverage | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |

Section 1060.070, Subd. 2(K) allows for the 100' setback from major roads (i.e. county roads and state highways) to be reduced to 60' with enhanced landscaping. However, the applicant's narrative requests a 50' setback be applied along County Road 116 and County Road 30, and they are requesting the additional 10' of right-of-way (ROW) required on County Road 116 be factored into this measurement. Based on the submitted site plan as compared to the preliminary plat, it appears this equates to a setback of 40' setback as measured from the front property line. The applicant provides the enhanced landscaping for the multi-family buildings and commercial buildings.

The medical buildings are expected to be two-story structures which should be able to comply with a 35 ' building height. However, the multi-family housing buildings are expected to be 4 -stories and as tall as $50^{\prime}$. A $50^{\prime}$ tall building would require an additional 75 ' setback above the minimum setback lines. The multi-family housing properties will end up having front setbacks applied on three sides. These parcels have limited depth to accommodate this additional setback requirement for the height of the building proposed. An increased setback from the county roads would likely mean the surface parking lots would need to wrap further around the buildings with a larger portion of the parking lots adjacent to the county road frontage rather than keeping the parking lots interior to the development as much as possible.

Since detached and attached homes (such as twin-homes and townhomes) are not contemplated within the GMU, the lot standards are not well-suited for such uses considering the density goals of the district. Even though detached and attached homes are contemplated in the DMU, unfortunately, the lot standards in that district also do not appear well-suited for such uses. The detached villas seem most consistent with the single-family home standards within the RMF-2 (Mixed Residential) district and are used to review the proposed PUD. Areas where a deviation would be required are noted in red.

| Detached Single-Family | RMF-2 | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 6,000 square feet | 5,285 square feet |
| Minimum Lot Width | 60 feet | 44 feet |
| Front, Major Roadways | 100 feet | N/A |
| Front, Other Streets | 25 feet | 25 feet |
| Side | 10 feet | 7.5 feet |
| Rear | 25 feet | 25 feet |
| Maximum Principal <br> Building Height | 35 feet | 35 feet |

The applicant's plat and site plan propose a common lot of 76,000 square feet to serve 6 twin-home lots, each 1,920 square feet in size. The zoning ordinance does not seem to contemplate twin-homes within a surrounding common lot, but rather one lot for the entire twin-home structure. Therefore, it appears it makes more sense to apply townhome standards in the review of the twin-homes.

| Attached Homes | RMF-2 | Proposed TwinHomes | Proposed Townhomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Area | 5,000 square feet per unit | 14,500 square feet per unit | 4,500 square feet per unit |
| Minimum Lot Width | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Front, Major Roadways | 100 feet | N/A | 40 feet measured from the front lot line of the common lot |
| Front, Other Streets | 25 feet | 25 feet measured from the front lot line of the common lot | 25 feet measured from the front lot line of the common lot |
| Side | - 10 feet <br> - 20 feet between attached structures separated by a common area | - 10 feet measured from the side lot line of the common lot <br> - 20 feet between attached structures separated by a common area | - 10 feet measured from the side lot line of the common lot <br> - 15 feet between attached structures separated by a common area |


| Rear | 25 feet | 25 feet measured <br> from the rear lot line <br> of the common lot | 25 feet measured <br> from the rear lot line <br> of the common lot |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Principal <br> Building Height | 35 feet | 35 feet | 35 feet |

The intent of the per unit square foot requirement is intended to be an average based on the twin-home and townhome areas (a sum of the unit footprints plus the common areas divided by the number of units). Staff provided an approximate calculation for the proposed minimum lot area for the twin-homes and another calculation for the townhomes; however, the applicant is required to provide a minimum lot area calculation using this formula to confirm compliance.

## Public Safety

Public Safety reviewed this item at two meetings at the end of 2023. Additionally, the applicant scheduled a meeting with the City of Roger's Fire Chief to work through fire access questions. The memo is enclosed with this report, and the applicant is responsible for reading the memo and complying with any requirements. There was a fair amount of support for a reduced setback along County Roads for ease of fire access on the rear side of the buildings. Additionally, Public Safety requested clustered landscaping, particularly with overstory trees, to provide access corridors.

## Parking

Parking standards in Section 1060.060, Subd. 4 of the Zoning Ordinance requires drive aisles and parking lots are subject to the following setbacks:

- Front, Major Roadways 100' or $25^{\prime}$ with enhanced landscaping
- Front, Other Roadways 25'
- Side and Rear 10'

However, the GMU allows for shared parking arrangements that are fully connected. The table below identifies where flexibility would be required to approve the plan as shown:

| Parking | Front, Major <br> Roadway | Front, Other <br> Roadways | Side/Rear |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multi-Family A | $100^{\prime}$ | $16^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |
| Commercial Area | $40^{\prime}$ with enhanced <br> landscaping | $25^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ <br> No interior setback <br> required for shared <br> commercial parking <br> lot |
| Multi-Family F | 75' with enhanced <br> landscaping | $10^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| Senior Housing | N/A | $15^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |

The plans reflect 90-degree parking throughout the development which must comply with the following standards:

- $\quad$ Stall width parallel to aisle -9'
- Stall length of line - 9'
- Stall depth - 18'6"
- Aisle width - 26'

The plan appears to comply with this standard. Additionally, the plan complies with a standard within the GMU that at least half of the residential parking spaces shall be provided in structured parking or in enclosed garages.

The City Code requires the following minimum number of stalls per each proposed use:

| Use | Number of Stalls Required |
| :---: | :---: |
| Single and Multi-Family Housing | 2 spaces per unit plus 1 space for each 5 units in an apartment or townhome complex |
| Senior Housing | 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit |
| Retail Uses | 8 parking spaces plus 1 space for each 200 sq. ft. of retail space and 1 space for each 35 sq . ft. of dining area |
| Office Buildings | 1 space for each 200 sq . ft. of floor area. Minimum of 8 spaces required. |

The applicant's narrative notes that the senior villas will have 2 garage spaces and 2 driveway spaces. This more than complies with the required number of stalls.

The townhomes are also proposed to have 2 garage spaces, 2 driveway spaces, as well as an additional 8 guest parking stalls. This more than satisfies the standard.

The applicant is requesting a reduction in the parking requirements for the muti-family housing buildings. Section 1060.060, Subd. 10 allows space reductions to be permitted through an Interim Use Permit if an applicant can demonstrate in documented form a demand which is less than what is required by code. The applicant completed a parking study as did the City Engineer. This was weighed with the parking requirements for multi-family housing in neighboring jurisdictions. This process supported a deviation from City Code to 2 spaces per unit for each multi-family building which can be approved as part of a PUD. However, Multi-Family A appears to comply with this standard, but did not include the required landscaping islands that will be discussed subsequently in this report. Also, Multi-Family F is currently short 7 spaces under this new formula. Staff believes the applicant must revise the plans to confirm parking at 2 spaces per unit.

The applicant is also requesting a deviation from the senior housing parking requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit to 1 space per unit. This was also supported by the study submitted by the applicant with results confirmed by Stantec. There are 232 units within the two senior buildings, and there are 249 stalls proposed. Additionally, the Hope parking lot is noted as a viable off-site option for overflow parking within the applicant's study. This is more than what was provided on the St. Therese project which also had a mix of independent living and assisted living units. The difference with this project is the number of independent units has not been confirmed. This will need to be confirmed for the final plat/PUD for this site in order to confirm there is enough parking for the site.

For the commercial parking, the applicant proposes a shared parking lot with some reduced parking. The GMU allows for reduced parking within commercial development for shared parking arrangements. This was also reviewed in the studies completed by the applicant and Stantec. A total of 415 spaces are provided and the studies confirmed this will support the demand as long as the medical buildings are limited to 2 stories. This would be a standard of the PUD.

The applicant will need to show snow storage accommodations for the parking lots. Further, the NE District plan requires all multi-family and non-residential developments to provide a Chloride Management Plan. The applicant should carefully consider the snow storage locations as a part of their overall management plan for the development. The Chloride Management Plan will be required with the final PUD submittal.

The NE District Plan requires bicycle racks as a part of the parking requirements. The parking plans will need to reflect bicycle racks which may be placed near the entrance of the businesses if a minimum 5 -foot-wide pedestrian access to the building entrance is maintained. Bicycle parking may occupy a maximum of two required parking stalls without requiring additional parking.

Landscaped islands as required per the NE District plan are shown on the plan. Except for they are not shown for the Multi-Family A site. These must be added. The applicant requests flexibility in the placement of the intermittent landscaping islands for the commercial parking lot. This will allow for more cohesive pedestrian pathways to be provided through coordinated placement of the islands.

## Retaining Wall

A retaining wall is shown behind the detached villas in Block 2. The applicant must confirm whether these will exceed 4 '. If so, they must be designed by a structural engineer and reviewed by Engineering.

Utilities, Streets, and Access
The City Engineer's memo provides detailed plat, utility, and transportation comments. This project will extend municipal sewer and water through the site.

The City ordinance requires developers to stub sanitary sewer, water, and streets to the property line, which means development of this infrastructure makes development possible for adjacent properties. During review, staff became aware of an outlot (Outlot B of Serenity Meadows) that was created without street frontage that is adjacent to the townhomes portion of the proposed development (north of Lot 4 Block 4 in the proposed plat).


While it was confirmed this outlot has no development rights, it theoretically can develop at an urban density once utilities are deemed available to this existing neighborhood (currently in Phase 4). There is an existing 20' driveway easement on the proposed townhomes site for access to the outlot. Since the properties included in this plat were all a part of the original plat for Serenity Meadows, staff believe access must be addressed with this application. This will ensure the outlot has access to streets and utilities should it develop in the future. The applicant will be required to dedicate a 50' ROW through the townhomes site to the outlot, and utilities must be stubbed. This will likely result in the loss of at least one townhome unit.

The development shows two main access locations. One is at the existing Hunters Ridge intersection at County Road 116, and the second intersection is at the south side of the development along the west property line. This location is consistent with the Northeast (NE) District Plan. The plat shows the entire 60' ROW for the southern access within the boundaries of this plat consistent with the Concept Plan discussion. The applicant shows two future development connections to the western property which is consistent with the NE District Plan and preferable.

The townhomes and twin-homes are served by private roads which are allowed when the Council finds that a public street connection is not required for the public street network. Maintenance requirements for private roads must be detailed in Homeowners Association (HOA) documents. In 2023, the City adopted the following standards for private drives in urban residential districts:

- A private drive shall not exceed 2,640 feet in length unless it forms a continuous connection or loops back to a public street. Any such private drive with a terminus 1,320 feet or more from the nearest intersection will be required to provide a cul-desac at the closed end according to City Engineering Standards.
- The subdivider shall provide access to lots via public streets. Private drives are subject to the access standards of 945.020, Subd. 12, D and 945.020, Subd. 12, F.
- Roadway standards must comply with Section 945.010, Subd 5 (Engineering Design Standards). Private drives shall conform to the City of Corcoran Standard Detail Plates for shared driveways, as may be amended. The City Engineer may require additional site information and may require additional design standards that enhance safety.
- Individual unit driveways that gain access from any such private drive shall be a minimum of 22' in length.
- A decorative sign stating "Private Drive" shall be located near each entrance to a private drive. Such a sign shall also provide the range of addresses served by the private drive.

The applicant's narrative notes that the driveways will be at least 20 ' in length which would require flexibility from the minimum driveway length discussed above. The Planning Commission may choose to discuss their thoughts on this deviation.

The Feasibility Study completed for this project as part of the EAW identified offsite improvements required to support this development. This included turn lanes at the development entrances and turn lane extension of County Road 30 at County Road 116. These projects are anticipated to be City-led development, and terms will be identified within the development agreement.

The applicant shows a right-in into the commercial portion of the development that was not included in the NE District Plan. This must be approved by Hennepin County. The memo from Hennepin County requested additional information which was submitted by the applicant on January 22. The City Engineer's Memo noted that Hennepin County must review and approve ROW. The Hennepin County memo stated a 60 -foot half ROW with an additional 5' easement for drainage, utility, and future multi-modal purposes will be required along County Road 30 and County Road 116. The County also requested a 25' x 25 ' right-of-way sight triangle in the northwest quadrant of County Road 30 and County Road 116, the northwest and southwest quadrant of County Road 116, Hunters Ridge, and Oswald Farm Road, and the northwest and northeast quadrants of County Road 30 and the new access. However, the northwest quadrant of

County Road 30 and the new access is not included in this plat and will have to be established once that property develops.

The NE District plan notes that the developer is responsible for construction of all streetscape improvements along adjacent streets. These improvements include all hardscape, landscape, and site amenities, such as trails, sidewalks, benches, bike racks, street trees, and plantings.

## Stormwater Management

Attached to this report is a stand-alone City Engineering memo discussing Stormwater. The applicant is responsible for reviewing this memo in its entirety and complying with the requirements.

## Wetlands

The grading plans must identify whether designated wetland buffers within the site are to utilize existing vegetation or if new vegetation will be established for the buffers. If existing vegetation is to be utilized, the vegetation shall be approved by the City Wetland Specialist. For buffers that must be established, a plan identifying the establishment and maintenance procedures shall be provided at the time of Final Plat/PUD. The preliminary plans must be updated to clearly identify and label the wetland buffer zones and wetland buffer signage.

## Design Standards

This site is subject to design standards outlined in the GMU District, the Northeast District Plan and Design Guidelines, and the PUD district. This is in addition to the underlying performance standards that generally apply. It should be noted that final building plans have not been submitted at this time as end users are not finalized for any of the uses as of the time of this report. Final site and building design will be approved as part of each phase's final PUD plan.

1. PUD Design Standards

The application must satisfy the following PUD requirements:
A. Appropriate Integration. PUDs shall be appropriately integrated into existing and proposed surrounding development. This does not mean the PUD reflects the specific standards of the surrounding area such as lot size, density, setbacks, or design. While integration may be achieved through such standards, it may also be achieved through continuation of existing land use types, architectural transitions, landscaping buffering, or other means.

The applicant intentionally placed commercial uses within the far southeast corner of the site with villas and townhomes located near the existing neighborhood to the north. Denser housing options (apartment buildings) are
located near the church, County Road 116, and County Road 30. While the multifamily building in the southwest corner of the site is near an existing agricultural farmstead, this location makes sense with the vision of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan which anticipates the farm will eventually develop as mixed residential which anticipates uses such as multi-family apartment buildings. The applicant intends to comply with the buffering requirements of the development as well as exceed the standard near the existing residential uses.
B. Variety and Enhanced Design. Since PUDs are expected to exceed standards, most residential PUDs should include a wide variety of styles. Style refers to the exterior image and footprint, not the floor plan. Where a wide variety of styles does not make sense, the PUD should include enhanced building design that exceeds underlying standards.
i. PUDs with detached homes must provide house elevations for approval. There should be no less than 5 styles of detached homes.
ii. PUDs with attached homes (not including apartment buildings) must include no less than 2 styles.
iii. For PUDs without a residential component, applicants must provide material boards with renderings for design evaluation.

The applicant provided some architectural examples, but the applicant's narrative notes they do not have specific building designs finalized at this time as they continue to work with potential end users. Their narrative asserts their intention to comply with the NE district standards and any other underlying standards. A condition of approval is for the applicant to comply with this PUD standard, and this will be confirmed with the submittal of Final PUD Plans for each phase.
C. Open space.

The open space standard for low density residential PUDs does not apply to this project.
D. Perimeter Buffer. PUDs shall provide a landscaping buffer to screen homes from arterial and major collector roads.

The landscaping plan shows a landscaping buffer along County Road 30 and County Road 116 to screen the apartment buildings and townhomes from these roadways.
E. Public Accessibility. When a PUD includes natural features such as creeks, streams, ponds, and lakes, the PUD shall provide public access to these features.

While this site does not have the specific natural features discussed in this standard, there is a fairly large wetland complex on the western side of the site. A private path is proposed to provide access to this area, and this will be accessible to the public and residents as noted on the applicant's Travel Route plan.
F. Discretionary Standards. In addition to the above standards, the City Council may impose such other standards for a PUD project as are reasonable and as Council deems are necessary to protect and promote the general health, safety, and welfare of the community and surrounding areas.

The Planning Commission can choose to recommend other standards for the project as they find may be necessary to make the PUD compatible with the existing neighborhood and have a long-term vision of the City for this area.
G. Prohibited Features and Modifications.
I. The City will not grant side setbacks that result in less than a 15 -foot minimum required separation between two detached buildings.

The minimum setbacks and proposed site plan will result in a building separation of at least 15 '.
II. PUDs with detached homes shall be designed to avoid interior perimeter roads that are parallel to arterial roadways.

This feature is not proposed in the application.
III. PUDs cannot request flexibility from meeting the minimum required screening and/or buffering standards otherwise required in the Zoning Ordinance unless the applicant can show there is a site constraint out of their control that justifies a deviation from these requirements, proposes an alternative screening methods that will meet the intent of the requirements, and/or proposes relocating screening methods to a more beneficial location within the development.

The applicant is not requesting flexibility from the required screening or buffering standards.

## 2. Site Design

It appears the plan will be able to satisfy the following site design requirements of the GMU. These will need to be confirmed with the final PUD plan submitted for each phase/site:
A. Structures shall be oriented and consolidated to complement existing adjacent development to create a coordinated and visually attractive mixeduse setting throughout the district.

This is the first mixed-use development in this area that will set the bar for future mixed-use development. The applicant was mindful in placing residential uses next to existing and future residential uses. Additionally, the villas and townhomes were placed closest to the existing residential neighborhood to the north to provide a transition from the more intense market-rate and senior multi-family housing to the larger lots along Hunters Ridge. The commercial buildings are consolidated in the far southeast corner of the site to minimize the impact on the existing neighborhood.
B. Site planning shall respect the relationship of the site to the existing and proposed buildings and streets and major roadways.

The site planning appears to respect the existing and future buildings, streets, and major roadways within the vicinity of the project.
C. Commercial parking lot design shall include provisions for cross easements and stubbed access drives to the property line for the use of adjacent properties so that residents and customers do not need to return to the public street system to access adjacent developments.

The commercial parking lot is proposed as a shared parking lot. Users will not need to re-enter the public street system once they enter into the commercial area to travel to another business within the development. Sidewalks and trails will allow for residents of the development to walk to the commercial portion of the development. The Planning Commission could decide to recommend that a more direct pedestrian pathway be provided between Multi-Family A and the commercial parking lot as this seems feasible, but sidewalks will be provided within the ROW, so it may be unnecessary.
D. Buildings shall have a clearly defined primary pedestrian entrance at street level.

This will need to be applied to commercial buildings, multi-family housing, senior housing building, and active senior housing building. Flexibility was not requested from this standard, and the applicant is expected to comply.
G. Maximum impervious coverage. The total lot coverage shall not exceed 80\% impervious.

The applicant confirmed with staff that none of the proposed lots currently exceed a maximum impervious surface limit of $80 \%$, and they intend to comply with this standard.

The applicant is specifically requesting flexibility from the following GMU site design standard:
F. Drive-through or drive-in lanes are not allowed within the front of any buildings. They must be located to the side or rear of a building.

The two retail buildings, each showing the potential for a drive-through business to be located within the structures, have two frontages. Due to the applicant's desire to consolidate he commercial uses within the southeast corner of the site, it does not seem that a business within this location would be able to comply with this standard. The applicant would like this standard to be removed, and they intend to screen the drive-through lanes if constructed.

The following standard appears to be at odds with a similar standard within the NE District Plan. The Planning Commission is asked to clarify which standard they believe should prevail for the PUD.

GMU Standard:
E. Wherever a surface parking area faces a street frontage, such frontage shall be screened with a decorative wall, railing, hedge, or a combination of these elements to a minimum height of $21 / 2$ feet and a maximum height of $31 / 2$ feet above the level of the parking lot at the build-to line.

## NE District Plan Standard:

A landscape buffer shall be provided between all parking areas and the public sidewalk. The buffer shall consist of shade trees, low shrubs, or perennial flowers and a decorative fence or masonry wall. Plantings and parking lot screen walls or fences shall be no less than three feet and no more than four feet in height to allow a view into and out of parking areas.

The above GMU standard applies to all parking areas facing a street frontage, while the NE District standard is specific to the area between parking areas and a public sidewalk. However, there are several locations within the proposed development where both standards could apply. Applying both standards at the same time seems to create an unnecessary complexity. Staff proposes choosing one standard or the other to apply in this PUD. Another option is to apply the NE district standard between parking areas and sidewalks, and the GMU standard only to parking areas that face a street frontage and do not have a sidewalk. The draft Resolution clarifies the NE District standard prevails.
3. Building Design Requirements

The GMU includes two pages of building design standards. Staff notes that these do not appear to be applicable for detached homes, twin-homes, or townhomes. Additionally, the NE District Plan provides that properties in the mixed-use area must comply with the building and articulation standards outlined in the NE District Plan. Staff proposes that the PUD be held to the GMU building design standards, attached to this report, with the following modifications:

- The GMU standards apply to the commercial buildings, multi-family buildings, senior housing, and active senior building.
- The detached villas shall comply with the NE District Plan (also attached).
- Knowing the proposed minimum lot width and the side setback of 7.5 feet for the detached villas, staff believes it is unlikely that the garages will be able to comply with the standard capping the garage at $55 \%$ of the viewable ground floor street-facing linear building frontage. The applicant's narrative confirms 2-car garages are anticipated for these villas. This means the garage will be at least 20 ' wide. This would be nearly $70 \%$ of the viewable ground floor. A one-car garage would satisfy this requirement. Staff believes there is a benefit of ensuring enough parking for residents and guests over requiring strict compliance with this rule, and this is reflected in the draft Resolution. The Planning Commission should discuss their thoughts on this flexibility.
- The attached villas and townhomes shall comply with the NE District Plan.
- The garage standards for attached homes have a minimum garage size as follows:
- The attached villas are single-level, and therefore have a minimum garage size of 540 square feet.
- It is unclear if the townhomes have basements. If they do, the minimum garage size is 440 square feet.
- In either scenario, garages must have a minimum width of 20'.
- It is unclear if the attached villas and townhomes will be able to comply with the minimum size requirements for the garage without the availability of a more finalized building design. The Planning Commission should discuss their thoughts on pre-emptively granting flexibility to this requirement, and to what degree, prior to building plans being finalized. The draft resolution requires the garages fit at least two cars and do not identify a minimum square footage.
- Garage sizes must be confirmed with the Final PUD to ensure compliance with this standard.
- The applicant specifically requests flexibility from the following requirement:
- C. Residential Uses on First Floors: Whenever residential uses are included on the first floor of a building the first-floor elevation shall be raised above the sidewalk elevations immediately adjacent to the front of the residential unit to ensure the residential unit is separated from the
public space. In addition, each first-floor unit must have an individual private entrance at the street level with private courtyard enclosure.
- The applicant's narrative notes that this requirement will be difficult to apply across the different housing types of development, including memory care units.
- The Planning Commission should discuss their thoughts on preemptively granting flexibility to this requirement, and to what degree, prior to building plans being finalized.
- The exterior material standards of the NE District Plan shall prevail.
- Elevations with material percentages will be required with the Final PUD to ensure compliance with the code standards.


## Screening

The screening requirements of the NE District Plan seem to be more stringent, so these standards will prevail with the exception that wood fencing or chain link with slats shall not be used for screening as provided in the GMU. Screening of roof top and ground mounted equipment will be further confirmed when the preliminary plat/PUD is submitted, and building/site design is more finalized.

## Landscaping

The applicant's narrative requests flexibility not in the amount of landscaping, but where the landscaping is located. This allows them to provide additional screening/buffering on the perimeters of the site.

The Multi-Family A lot must provide 148 overstory trees per the underlying landscaping requirement for residential units (one overstory tree per unit). Additional landscaping must be provided per the enhanced landscaping clause for a reduced setback from County Road 30 as well as to satisfy a Buffer Yard Class "D" from the property to the west. Only 95 overstory trees of the underlying trees are proposed on these trees, but the landscaping required for the other two sections of code are present as required. Screening is provided between the parking lot and sidewalk to meet the parking buffer requirement in the NE District plan, but it appears the plan needs to be revised to include either a decorative fence or masonry wall of at least three feet but no less than 4 feet in height.

The plans combined the commercial buildings in order to calculate the required landscaping. Typically, staff would apply the landscaping formula on a lot-by-lot basis. It should be discussed whether the commercial lots should be considered one "site" for purposes of calculating the landscaping standards. If so, this will result in a reduced landscaping requirement for the commercial properties. The draft resolution proposes that the landscaping plan be revised to calculate the commercial landscaping requirement on a site-by-site basis. Additionally, the underlying understory shrub requirements for the commercial properties were calculated, but these were omitted from the plan and do not appear to be made up elsewhere. This also needs to be
addressed with a revised landscaping plan. There appears to be screening between the sidewalk and the parking lot to satisfy the NE District parking screening standard. However, a decorative fence or masonry wall must be confirmed.

Multi-Family " $F$ " requires 184 overstory trees, but 148 are proposed on the lot. The enhanced screening requirements for a reduced setback are proposed on the lot. The Villas require 26 trees, one on each lot. However, the applicant proposes 64 overstory trees in this area to provide more screening for the existing residential. Similar to MultiFamily A, there appears to be screening between the sidewalk and the parking lot. However, the presence of a decorative fence or masonry wall needs to be confirmed. The buffer requirements are also included and appear to comply with a 6' fence. The townhomes require 52 overstory trees; 65 are proposed. The enhanced screening and buffer yard requirements are provided on the overall site for the townhomes as required. For the senior buildings site, 232 overstory trees are required. The plans propose 253.

If a drive-through is constructed for Retail B, screening must be provided per Section 1060.070, Subd. 2(J). That is not yet factored into the landscaping plan. This is also true for Retail E.

The proposed development is subject to the preferred tree list for the NE District Plan. There appear to be several trees that are from the list. However, there appear to be a number of shrubs and some tree species that are not the same breed as what is provided on the list. The applicant has not requested flexibility from the landscaping standards of the NE District. The species list must be revised to comply.

There is a screening requirement within the GMU that applies to adjoining residential use. However, the buffer yard ordinance appears to accomplish this requirement with more specific guidance on how to provide the screening. Staff proposes clarifying the buffer yard ordinance will prevail over the screening requirement within the GMU.

Finally, the City Engineer's memo notes that there appears to be several areas where proposed landscaping conflicts with such as pond access routes and the storm sewer and trunk utilities. The applicant must revise planting locations to minimize conflicts. Additionally, there are plantings shown in the Hennepin County ROW which will require the applicant to obtain approval from Hennepin County.

A buffer yard is not required around the church parcel as there is an exemption in the buffer yard ordinance that existing developed parcels, even if they are re-platted, as long as there is no change in use or building expansion. No change in use is proposed on the church site, and the building footprint will not be expanded.

## Lighting

The applicant must comply with Section 1060.040. A photometric plan is provided. More information must be provided on the proposed freestanding luminaires to confirm they do not exceed a height of 30' or extend above the roofline of the principal building; whichever is less. Additionally, any light or combinations of light may not exceed one
foot-candle as measured from the property line or the centerline of a public street. It appears there are multiple areas that exceed this standard. The applicant must revise the plan to bring into compliance with the lighting performance standards. No lighting is shown for the parking lot. Any lighting used to illuminate the off-street parking area shall be so arranged as to reflect glare away from adjoining property, adjacent residential uses, and public rights-of-way. The lighting must also comply with Section 1060.040 of the Zoning Ordinance. Street lighting locations shall be reviewed by Public Safety with final lighting locations determined at the time of Final Plat/PUD.

## Signs

The application includes an initial sign plan that anticipates the signage needs throughout the development. Signs must comply with Chapter 84 of the City Code unless flexibility is granted through a PUD. The GMU allows 1 freestanding sign with a height of up to 16 ' and sign copy area of 64'. The plan proposes 3 monument signs throughout the development that appear to be for the purposes of advertising the commercial users and entrances into the development. Additionally, a larger gateway monument sign is shown on the corner of County Road 30 and County Road 116. Offsite signs technically are not allowed, but flexibility could be granted for the 4 monument signs allowed for each commercial use to be placed throughout the development as desired by the applicant.

The GMU does not specifically allow monument signs for residential subdivisions. However, the sign code generally allows residential subdivisions to include up to two monument signs of 32 ' in sign copy area and 6' in height. Each residential component of the development is shown to have a monument sign that complies with these standards.

Walls signs for commercial buildings are supposed to be limited to the façade of the front entrance and $10 \%$ of the primary building façade The applicant and sign plan request for sign flexibility in splitting the $10 \%$ façade limit for walls signs between the front façade as well as the façade that faces the county road for each building.

## Resiliency Options

As a part of the Northeast District Design Guidelines, incoming developments must include 3 resiliency options from a list of 8 strategies provided in Appendix C. The submitted narrative indicates an intention to incorporate solar panels and electric vehicle charging stations throughout the development. These will need to be reflected in the plans as part of the Final PUD/plat submittal. Additionally, a third resiliency strategy must be confirmed and reflected on the plans.

## Plazas and Open Space

Multi-family residential developments are required to provide landscaped private open space for their residents per the NE District Plan. This open space shall be designed and landscaped for outdoor recreation. The plans reflect a small "tot lot" just west of the existing church. No further information is provided in the applicant's narrative on the tot
lot. The narrative does explain the intent to incorporate both indoor and exterior amenities. The exterior amenities may include a swimming pool, grill stations, firepits, pergolas, bocce courts, putting greets and a roof deck for gatherings. Compliance with this standard will need to be confirmed with the final plat/PUD.

## 2040 Parks and Trails Map

The 2040 Parks and Trails Plan map shows existing on-road trails (painted shoulders) on County Road 116 and County Road 30. Additionally, a proposed off-road trail is

shown in the vicinity of County Road 116 which was meant as a placeholder for the anticipated Diamond Lake Regional Trail (DLRT) planned by the Three Rivers Park District. It was expected this trail would connect through Bellwether to the east and move north to the City of Rogers border.

Since the adoption of the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan, Three Rivers completed their master planning process for the DLRT. Their proposed route anticipates the trail on the west side of County Road 116 with a grade-separated crossing in the vicinity of the proposed project site. This crossing will allow the trail to connect to the east side of County Road 116 towards Bellwether. The City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan suggests the crossing would occur near or at Hunters Ridge. However, as a part of the planning process for this project, Three Rivers completed a feasibility study for the crossing location. Based on factors such as the grades of the site and infrastructure corridors, it was determined the ideal location for an underpass is about half-way between County Road 30 and Hunters Ridge. This will allow for a
 future trail connection on the Oswald farm property at the northeast corner of County Road 116 and County Road 30 at the time of development.

No parks are shown in this area on the 2040 Parks and Trails map. The applicant proposes a tot lot located to the west of the church and "Senior Housing" building. This is proposed as a private park, and access to the Tot Lot will be provided by a private, internal path. The Tot Lot will be open to the public.

## Trails and Sidewalks

The applicant's plans show the DLRT in two segments and revised the plans to satisfy the recommendation from the Parks and Trails Commission. The trail will run parallel west to east along Oswald Farm Road. Due to the location of this portion of the trail within the road right-of-way (ROW), this segment of the trail will be considered an onroad trail. A 5' trail easement is shown for this portion of the trail behind the ROW to allow the larger 10' trail required for Three Rivers to extend outside of the ROW. The trail then moves east of Oswald Farm Road between the Retail "E" and Multi-Family Housing " $F$ " buildings. This portion of the easement is considered an off-road trail and will serve as the corridor anticipated for the underpass at County Road 116.

There is ongoing discussion as to whether the trail should be located along the north or south side of Oswald Farm Road. The Parks and Trails Commission recommended the trail be moved to the north side of Oswald Farm Rd with a pedestrian crossing to access the underpass. It was hoped this would create less conflict with vehicle traffic entering and exiting the commercial and residential sites. Three Rivers has confirmed they are
open to this idea. However, the City's Engineering memo states that a crossing on the bend of Oswald Farm Road mid-block should be avoided per the City of Corcoran Pedestrian Crosswalk Policy. The memo recommends keeping the trail on the south side of Oswald Farm Road as at least conflicts at the drive entrances would be at a "stopped traffic condition." If a crossing from Hope Church is proposed, the memo recommends considering shifting the crossing location southwest so that it is not located on the bend of the roadway. Additional details are provided in the memo.

For off-road trails, the City policy is to require an 8 ' wide trail in a 20 ' easement and give credit for the area of off-road trails shown on the Comprehensive Plan. The standard for the Three Rivers trail requires a 10' wide trail in a 20 ' easement. However, the feasibility study completed by Three Rivers for the underpass indicated a corridor of at least 40' is needed for the off-road segment of the trail to accommodate the underpass and anticipated retaining walls.

A 40' easement is shown on the preliminary plans. Staff recommends the City give park dedication credit for this segment of trail easement based on the City's standard protocol (20'). However, after further discussions with the applicant and Three Rivers, it is recognized that Three Rivers would need to acquire additional easement to support the design improvement for the underpass. The applicant proposes dedication of the full easement for the underpass now as a public benefit for the Planned Unit Development application to avoid the need for Three Rivers to expand the corridor at a later date. It was anticipated the easement would be at least 40' wide. Three Rivers provided comment on the preliminary application, and the width of the easement requested for the underpass is now 55'. The applicant will continue working with Three Rivers and the City to finalize the width of the easement and revise plans as necessary.

Typically, the developer is responsible for "making certain improvements to the developments for park, playground, trail and public open space purposes, including, but not limited to, finished grading and ground cover for all park, playground, trail, and public open spaces within their developments. No credit for the required dedication shall be given for this work. The City reserves the right to pave the trails or require the developer to pave these off-road trails. Should the City require the developer to pave the trails, the City shall reimburse the Developer for the costs for paving the trail."

In this case, the underpass will be constructed by Three Rivers at an unknown date in the future. The on-road portions of the trail will be constructed as a part of this project. Previous projects offered construction of trail segments by the developer without reimbursement as a public benefit. It may be helpful for the Planning Commission to weigh in whether they see that as a public benefit worth negotiating with the applicant.

In addition to the trail, the site shows sidewalks on both sides of Oswald Farm Road and Hope Way. Additionally, there are private internal paths shown for access to a tot lot shown to the west of the church. The applicant provided a travel route exhibit to show
these pedestrian connections. The sidewalks are indicated in green, the internal paths to the tot lot are shown in blue, and the DLRT is also shown in blue.


## Park Dedication

The applicant's plans show an easement of approximately 0.14 acres (roughly 326 ' long x 20' wide) to be dedicated for the off-road underpass of the DLRT. This is consistent with the City's standard protocol. While the plans are expected to be revised for the easement to become roughly 0.3 acres ( $326^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$ ), the City will base park dedication fees using the City's standard protocol (i.e., 20' width easement). The exact dimensions of the length of the easement must be confirmed by the applicant in the final plat/PUD plan.

## Park Dedication Calculation Estimate

The preliminary plat indicates a total site area of 54.15 acres. However, park dedication is based on the net land area. This is defined as the gross land area minus wetlands, areas below the 100-year ordinary high-water level, and ROW or easements for existing public streets. This also would exclude the church site since the church was already on a platted lot and subject to park dedication fees. The net land area was not provided. Staff estimates the net area at roughly 43.74 . This will need to be confirmed by the applicant.

Dedication requirements for a mixed-use development are pro-rated based on the acres of land devoted to each type of land use. Additionally, developments that include
memory care and assisted living units shall apply the commercial rate to the percentage of memory care and/or assisted living units that are in the project, multiplied by the project net acres. The estimated calculations based on the current site plan are provided below.
The current park dedication ordinance requires $23 \%$ of the land area (or the market value of that land) for a mixed-use development. In this case, the developer would be required to dedicate the following:

- $23 \%$ of $43.74=10.06$ acres

The applicant will receive park dedication credit based on the City's standard protocol for a trail easement of $20^{\prime}$ wide and a length of approximately $326^{\prime}$. This is roughly 0.14 acres. Credit is given for net acreage only. Assuming a net acreage of 0.14 acres, this would provide $1.5 \%$ of the required park dedication. Therefore, the remaining $98.5 \%$ of the required park dedication would be cash-in-lieu of land.

The 2024 fee schedule has the following fees:

- \$5,954 per single family unit
- \$4,040 per multi-family unit
- \$5,866 commercial and industrial per acre

Park dedication is based on the park dedication fees in place at the time of final plat, but for discussion purposes the anticipated formula is as follows:

- 10.006 acres of commercial $\times \$ 5,866=\$ 58,695.20$
- 570 multi-family units $\times \$ 4,040=\$ 2,302,800$
- 77 single-family units $x \$ 5,954=\$ 458,458.00$
- 28 memory care units $=4.3 \% \times \$ 5,866 \times 43.74$ acres $=\$ 11,032.89$
- TOTAL = \$2,830,986.09
- Less $1.5 \%=\$ 42,464.79$
- Remaining cash due $=\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 8 8 , 5 2 1 . 3 0}$

The final park dedication calculation will be based on final land area calculations and the fee schedule in place at the time of final plat approval.

## Preliminary Plat

The preliminary plat requests approval of 43 lots and 1 outlot. However, a condition of approval is for Outlot A to be absorbed by neighboring lots. The applicant requested flexibility from minimum lot size, width, and setback requirements. The approval conditions noted in this staff report may result in changes to the lot layout and may also affect the unit count. The application anticipates the project to be built over 4 phases.

## Conclusion

Staff reviewed the plan for consistency with the application standards outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Subdivision Ordinance. Staff noted in the staff report the outstanding issues that must be addressed, and conditions are included in the draft resolutions to address these issues. The Planning Commission may modify these conditions.

However, the City has discretion when reviewing this a comprehensive plan amendment and PUD. The Planning Commission may find that the standards for one or more components of the application have not been met and may recommend denial. Should denial be recommended, findings of fact should be cited to forward to City Council.

## 6. Recommendation

Move to recommend approval of the following:
a. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Comprehensive Plan Amendment
b. Ordinance 2024-xx Rezoning to PUD
c. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Findings of Fact for Rezoning
d. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Preliminary PUD Development Plan
e. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Preliminary Plat

## Attachments:

1. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Comprehensive Plan Amendment
2. Ordinance 2024-xx Rezoning to PUD
3. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Findings of Fact for Rezoning
4. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Preliminary PUD Development Plan
5. Resolution 2024-xx Approving Preliminary Plat
6. City Engineer's Memo - Civil Plan Review Dated 1/22/2024.
7. City Engineer's Memo - Stormwater Review Dated 1/22/2024.
8. Public Safety Memo - Dated 12/6/2023.
9. Hennepin County Memo dated 12/28/2023.
10. Three River Parks District Memo dated 1/5/2025.
11.Applicant's Narrative dated 1/25/2024.
11. Plan drawings received 1/12/2024.
12. Phasing Plan
14.Architectural Examples
13. Cross Section Plan received 1/25/2024.
14. Neighborhood Meeting Summary

Motion By:

Seconded By:

## A RESOLUTION APPROVING A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR "HOPE MINISTRIES" AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF COUNTY ROAD 116 AND COUNTY ROAD 30 (PID 11-119-23-14-0004)

(CITY FILE NO. 23-028)
WHEREAS, Hope Community Church, Brain and Jacque Lother, and Corcoran Investments LLC ("the applicant") request approval of a 2040 Future Land Use Map amendment to change the lande use designation of approximately 15.97 acres from Public / Semi-Public to Mixed Use on the property described as follows;

## See Attachment A.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the requested amendment at a duly called Public Hearing and recommends approval;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Corcoran City Council approves the request for a comprehensive plan amendment for the above referenced parcel, based on the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development offers new opportunities that were not previously considered in the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Reclassifying the site is needed to allow reasonable development of the site that responds to current market conditions.
3. The development of the site as part of the larger development would facilitate other planned infrastructure improvements, including stormwater improvements, sanitary sewer extension, municipal water extension and transportation improvements that will have regional benefits.
4. With the planned infrastructure improvements developed with this project, there is adequate public infrastructure planned to serve the site.

VOTING AYE<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

VOTING NAY<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor

## ATTEST:

Michelle Friedrich - City Clerk

## ATTACHMENT A

Lot 1, Block 2, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Motion By:
Seconded By:

## AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE X (ZONING ORDINANCE) OF THE CITY CODE TO CLASSIFY CERTAIN LAND LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF COUNTY ROAD 116 AND COUNTY ROAD 30 (PID 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0004, 11-119-23-140005, AND 11-119-23-11-0012) (CITY FILE NO. 23-028)

## THE CITY OF CORCORAN ORDAINS:

Section 1. Amendment of the City Code. Title X of the City Code of the City of Corcoran, Minnesota, is hereby amended by changing the classification of the City of Corcoran Zoning Map from Public Institution (PI) and General Mixed Use (GMU) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), legally described as follows:

See Attachment A
Section 2. This amendment shall take effect upon adoption of the resolution approving the final PUD plan for this project.

VOTING AYE<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

VOTING NAY<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor
ATTEST:

Michelle Friedrich - City Clerk

## ORDINANCE NO. 2024-

## ATTACHMENT A

## Parcel 1:

Lot 1, Block 1, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota. Parcel 2:

Lot 1, Block 2, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota. Parcel 3:

Outlot A, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 4:
Outlot C, Serenity Meadows, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota (Abstract Property).

Motion By:<br>Seconded By:

## APPROVING FINDINGS OF FACT FOR REZONING FOR THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF COUNTY ROAD 116 AND COUNTY ROAD 30 (PID 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0004, 11-119-23-14-0005, AND 11-119-23-11-0012) (CITY FILE NO. 23-028)

WHEREAS, Hope Community Church, Brain and Jacque Lother, and Corcoran Investments LLC, (the "applicant") requested approval to rezone 56.72 acres legally described as follows:

See Attachment A
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the request at a duly called Public Hearing, and;
WHEREAS, the City Council adopted an ordinance rezoning the affected parcels from Public Institution (PI) and General Mixed Use (GMU) to Planned Unit Development (PUD);

## NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF

CORCORAN, MINNESOTA, that it should and hereby does support the request for reclassification of the property, based on the following findings and conditions:

1. The planned development is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. Lot 1, Block 1 containing the existing church will remain guided for Public / Semi-Public development, and the rest of the proposed development is guided for mixed use development as proposed.
2. The planned development is not in conflict with the intent of the underlying zoning districts. Lot 1, Block 1 will continue to be subject to PI standards unless otherwise amended by the PUD standards. The remaining portions of the site are zoned GMU. The proposed development is not in conflict with the intent of either of these zoning districts. The plan develops the site in advance of municipal water being able to service the area; however, the applicant will not be issued a building permit until Corcoran municipal water is operational.
3. The planned development is not in conflict with other applicable provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance, except that PUD flexibility is requested as noted in the staff report. The PUD allows the applicant to request flexibility from the performance standards in the ordinance in exchange for a high-quality development than might otherwise be expected.
4. The planned development or unit thereof is of sufficient size, composition, and arrangement that its construction, marketing, and/or operation is feasible as a complete unit without dependence upon any other subsequent unit or phase. The project is anticipated to be completed in 4 phases that will be able to adapt to the needs of the market. Development is contingent upon completion of trunk infrastructure improvements and water service. The initial phases will include the construction of the primary project infrastructure, roadway improvements on County Road 116 and County Road 30, and other key infrastructure improvements.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-
5. The planned development will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets and other public facilities and utilities which serve or are proposed to serve the planned development. The developer is providing a public trail consistent with the Three River's Diamond Lake Regional Trail master plan and the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. A private tot lot that will be accessible to residents of the planned development is proposed on the church property. The residents living in assisted living, memory care, and hospice units will place lace less demand on public facilities such as streets and parks. The development includes the construction of all public infrastructure needed to serve the site at the developer's expense. Corcoran municipal water is anticipated to be available at the end of 2024. The applicant anticipates applying for building permits in 2025 and will not pull a building permit prior to the availability of Corcoran water for the site.
6. The planned development will not have an adverse impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the neighboring property. The planned development intentionally placed residential uses near the adjacent residential and agricultural uses to minimize the impact of the project. Should the property to the west develop in the future, it will develop for mixed residential uses, which will be compatible with the proposed uses along the western border of the PUD.
7. The quality of the building and site design proposed by the PUD plan shall substantially enhance the aesthetics of the site, shall demonstrate higher standards, more efficient and effective uses of streets, utilities and public facilities, it shall maintain and enhance any natural resources within the development, and create a public benefit that is greater than what would have been achieved through the strict application of the primary zoning regulations.

VOTING AYE<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

VOTING NAY<br>McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor

## ATTEST:

Michelle Friedrich - City Clerk

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

## ATTACHMENT A

## Parcel 1:

Lot 1, Block 1, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

## Parcel 2:

Lot 1, Block 2, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 3:
Outlot A, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 4:
Outlot C, Serenity Meadows, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota (Abstract Property).

Motion By:<br>Seconded By:

## APPROVING PRELIMINARY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR "HOPE MINISTRIES" LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF COUNTY ROAD 116 AND COUNTY ROAD 30 (PID 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0004, 11-119-23-14-0005, AND 11-119-23-11-0012) (CITY FILE NO. 23-028)

WHEREAS, Hope Community Church, Brain and Jacque Lother, and Corcoran Investments LLC, (the "applicant") has requested approval of "Hope Ministries" a mixed-use subdivision on the property legally described as:

See Attachment A
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the plan at a duly called Public Hearing, and;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
CORCORAN, MINNESOTA, that the Corcoran City Council hereby approves the request for preliminary PUD plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. A preliminary planned unit development (PUD) plan is approved for "Hope Ministries", in accordance with the plans and application received by the City on October 20, 2023, and revisions received November 27, 2023, January 12, 2024, and January 25, 2024, except as amended by this resolution.
2. The preliminary PUD plan is approved based on the finding that the proposed project is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the PUD standards in the ordinance.
3. Approval is contingent upon City Council approval of the requested rezoning and preliminary plat (Ordinance 2024- and Resolution 2024-).
4. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Public Safety memo dated December 6, 2023.
5. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the City Engineer's memo for civil review dated January 24, 2024.
6. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the City Engineer's memo for stormwater review dated January 24, 2024.
7. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the July 27, 2023, EAW Record of Decision.
8. The applicant is subject to review and approval by Hennepin County. The applicant is required to secure all permits and approvals from the County. The applicant will continue to work with City staff to comply with requirements from the Hennepin County memo dated December 28, 2023.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-
7. The applicant will continue to work with City staff and Three Rivers Park District to finalze the necessary trail easements and location as well as comply with requirements from the Three Rivers Park District's mem dated January 5, 2024.
8. PUD flexibility is granted for the following:
a. Development in advance of City services (water) being available to serve the project. A building permit will not be issued until Corcoran municipal water is operational.
b. Reduced building setback along County Road 116 and County Road 30 of 40 feet with enhanced landscaping.
c. The following lot standards apply to the commercial and multi-family buildings within Block 5 of the preliminary plat:

| Minimum Lot Area | 25,000 square feet |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Width | 150 feet |$|$| Minimum Lot Depth | N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Principal Structure Setbacks | 40 feet with enhanced landscaping per <br> Section 1060.070, Subd. 2(K) |
| $-\quad$ Front, Major Roadways | 25 feet |

d. The following standards apply to the detached "villas":

| Minimum Lot Area | 5,285 square feet |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Width | 44 feet |
| Minimum Lot Depth | N/A |
| Minimum Principal Structure Setbacks |  |
| - Front, Major Roadways | 100 feet |
| - Front, Other Streets | 25 feet |
| - Side | 7.5 feet |
| - Rear | 25 feet |
| Maximum Principal Building Height | 35 feet |

e. The following standards apply to the attached "villas" and "rowhomes":

|  | Attached Villas | Townhomes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 14,500 square feet per unit | 4,500 square feet per unit |
| Minimum Lot Width | N/A | N/A |

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

| Minimum Lot Depth | N/A | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Principal Structure Setbacks |  |  |
| - $\begin{aligned} & \text { Front, Major } \\ & \text { Roadways }\end{aligned}$ | N/A | 40 feet measured from the front lot line of the common lot |
| - Front, Other Streets | 25 feet measured form the front lot line of the common lot | 25 feet measured from the front lot line of the common lot |
| - Side | - 10 feet measured from the side lot line of the common lot <br> - 20 feet between attached structures separated by a common area | - 10 feet measured from the side lot line of the common lot <br> - 15 feet between attached structures separated by a common area |
| - Rear | 25 feet measured from the rear lot line of the common lot | 25 feet measured from the rear lot line of the common lot |
| Maximum Principal Building Height | 35 feet | 35 feet |

f. Reduced front parking setback along Oswald Farm Road of 10 ' for Lot 1 and Lot 6 of Block 5, and Lot 2 of Block 1.
g. No interior setback required for the shared parking lot.
h. Lot 1 of Block 1 is subject to the PI district standards. Except a tunnel connecting the Senior Housing building in Lot 1, Block 1 can encroach into the required 50' setback.
i. An encroachment easement with the City will be required.
i. Parking requirements as follows:
i. Villas must have 2 garage spaces and 2 driveway spaces.
ii. Rowhomes must have 2 garage spaces, 2 driveway spaces, and 8 guest parking stalls.
iii. Market-rate Multi-Family buildings must be parked as 2 spaces per unit.
iv. Senior Housing Buildings must be pared at 1 space per unit.
v. A formal shared parking agreements must be established with Hope Community Church for overflow parking with the senior housing uses.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

vi. A shared parking lot for the commercial uses is permitted should the square footage not exceed what is shown currently on the site plan. 415 spaces are required.
j. The commercial parking lot can deviate from the intermediate landscaped island requirements as long as at least 3 clear pedestrian pathways are provided within the parking lot.
k. The driveways for villas and rowhomes served by private roads must be a minimum length of 20 feet.
I. Drive-through lanes can be between the building and a frontage but must be screened per Section 1070.060.
m . Where there is a conflict between the GMU district and the Northeast District Design Guidelines, the Northeast District Design Guidelines prevail.
n . The building materials for the detached villas, attached villas, and rowhomes must comply with the Northeast District Design Guidelines.
o. The garages for the detached villas can have a garage that comprises up to $70 \%$ of the street-facing linear building frontage.
p. The garages for the rowhomes must have a minimum width of 20 and accommodate two cars.
q. Buildings with residential uses on first floors do not need to be raised above the sidewalk elevation.
r. The required landscaping must be calculated on a per lot basis but can be distributed throughout the entire site instead of a per lot basis with emphasis placed on screening the perimeter of the development.
s. Where there is a conflict within the GMU ordinance and buffer yard requirements, buffer yards shall prevail.
t. Up to 4 monument signs for the commercial buildings can be distributed throughout the site as long as setbacks are satisfied.
u. Each residential development is allowed to have a monument sign.
v. Wall signs can be placed on the rear and front of the commercial buildings, but the combined size of the signs cannot exceed $10 \%$ of the primary building signs.
9. All uses identified in the P-I zoning district (allowed, accessory, conditional, interim, or administrative permit) are permitted on Lot 1, Block 1.
10. Except for Lot 1, Block 1, all uses identified in the General Mixed Use and Downtown Mixed Use zoning districts shall be permitted in this PUD.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

11. Park dedication shall be satisfied by a combination of land and cash-in-lieu of land for the PUD. Park dedication will be based on the park dedication ordinance in place at the time the final plat is approved.
12. Prior to submittal of the PUD final plan and final plat:
a. A 50 ' right-of-way with utilities stubbed must be provided to Outot B of Serenity Meadows.
b. Parking plan must be revised to show compliance with the granted flexibilities and provide pedestrian connections with aligned landscape islands in the commercial parking lot as well as the required landscape islands in Lot 6, Block 5.
c. Outlot A must be absorbed by one ore more of the surrounding properties.
d. The landscaping plan must be revised to calculate the minimum required landscaping on a per lot basis which can be applied throughout the site with emphasis placed on the edges of the site.
e. All plant species in the landscaping plan need to be from the preferred tree list within the Northeast District Design Guidelines.
f. Final building and site plans must be provided as each phase moves forward.
i. A minimum of 5 different styles must be submitted for the detached villas.
ii. A minimum of 2 different styles must be submitted for attached villas and townhomes.
g. A third resiliency strategy must be identified.
h. Plans must be revised to show details for trash enclosures to ensure compliance with 1060.020 of the Zoning Ordinance. The trash enclosures must be clearly shown on the site plans.
i. Plans must show mechanical equipment screening in compliance with Section 1060.030 of the Zoning Ordinance.
j. Snow storage areas must be clearly shown on plans.
k. A chloride management plan shall be provided.
I. The lighting plan must be revised to confirm compliance with Section 1060.040.
13. A wetland buffer establishment plan must be submitted and the preliminary plat should be revised to identify and label the wetland buffer zones and monument signs.
a. All permanent wetland buffer monuments must be erected along the wetland buffer line as required by Section 1050.010, Subd. 7 of the Zoning Ordinance.
b. A The applicant shall work with City staff to finalize the location of wetland buffer monuments.
c. Wetland signs shall be purchased from the City.
d. The final locations must be inspected and approved by City staff.
e. Monument signs shall be installed prior to approval of the building permit.
14. Drainage and utility easements must be provided over all wetlands, wetland buffers and ponds.
15. Drainage and utility easements shall be provided along the perimeter of all lots.
16. All utility facilities shall be located underground.
17. A sign permit is required for any signage. All signage must comply with Chapter 84 of the City Code, except where PUD flexibility has been requested and granted for wall signage on Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block 1.
18. The development shall comply with the City's requirements regarding fire access, fire protection and fire flow calculations, the location of fire hydrant, fire department connections and fire lane signage.
19. Parking shall be reviewed with building permit and must comply with ordinance standards for the proposed use, except where PUD flexibility is requested.
20. The new public streets shall follow the City's street naming policy.
21. An encroachment agreement shall be required for all site improvements or items placed within the City rights-of-way or easements.
22. The applicant must enter into a stormwater maintenance agreement prior to release of final plat.

| VOTING AYE |
| :--- |
| $\square$ McKee, Tom |
| $\square$ Bottema, Jon |
| $\square$ Nichols, Jeremy |
| $\square$ Schultz, Alan |
| $\square$ Vehrenkamp, Dean |

VOTING NAY<br>$\square$ McKee, Tom<br>Bottema, Jon<br>Nichols, Jeremy<br>Schultz, Alan<br>Vehrenkamp, Dean

Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor

## ATTEST:

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

## ATTACHMENT A

## Parcel 1:

Lot 1, Block 1, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

## Parcel 2:

Lot 1, Block 2, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 3:
Outlot A, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 4:
Outlot C, Serenity Meadows, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota (Abstract Property).

## Motion By: <br> Seconded By:

## APPROVING PRELIMIINARY PLAT FOR "HOPE MINISTRIES" LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF COUNTY ROAD 116 AND COUNTY ROAD 30 (PID 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0004, 11-119-23-14-0005, AND 11-119-23-11-0012) (CITY FILE NO. 23-028)

WHEREAS, Hope Community Church, Brain and Jacque Lother, and Corcoran Investments LLC, (the "applicant") requested approval of "Hope Ministries" a mixed-use subdivision on the property legally described as follows:

See Attachment A
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the plan at a duly called Public Hearing, and;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
CORCORAN, MINNESOTA, that the Corcoran City Council hereby approves the request for preliminary plat, subject to the following conditions:

1. A preliminary plat is approved to create 43 lots, "Hope Ministries", in accordance with the plans and application received by the City on October 20, 2023, and revisions received November 27, 2023, January 12, 2024, and January 25, 2024, except as amended by this resolution.
2. Approval is contingent upon City Council approval of the preliminary PUD plan for "Hope Ministries". The applicant shall comply with all conditions of the preliminary PUD plan approval (Resolution 2023-).
3. The preliminary plat must be revised to show the following:
a. A 50-foot right-of-way to provide street and utility access to Outlot B of Serenity Meadows.
b. Outlot A must be absorbed by one or more of the surrounding lots.
4. Park dedication is due as required by the PUD approvals, prior to the release of the final plat for recording.
5. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the City Engineer's memo for Civil Review, dated January 24, 2024.
6. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the City Engineer's memo for stormwater, dated January 24, 2024.
7. The applicant shall continue to work with City staff to incorporate comments and comply with all requirements from Three River Park District's memo dated January 4, 2024.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

8. The applicant shall continue to work with City staff to incorporate comments and comply with all requirements from Hennepin County memo dated December 28, 2023.
9. Approval shall expire within one year of the date of approval unless the applicant has filed a complete application for approval of the final plat.

VOTING AYE
McKee, Tom
Bottema, Jon
Nichols, Jeremy
Schultz, Alan
Vehrenkamp, Dean

VOTING NAY
McKee, Tom
Bottema, Jon
Nichols, Jeremy
Schultz, Alan
Vehrenkamp, Dean

Whereupon, said Resolution is hereby declared adopted on this $\mathbf{2 2}^{\text {nd }}$ day of February 2024.

Tom McKee - Mayor
ATTEST:
City Seal
Michelle Friedrich - City Clerk

## RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

## ATTACHMENT A

## Parcel 1:

Lot 1, Block 1, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

## Parcel 2:

Lot 1, Block 2, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 3:
Outlot A, Hope Place, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.
Parcel 4:
Outlot C, Serenity Meadows, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota (Abstract Property).

| To: | Kevin Mattson, PE, <br> City of Corcoran Public Works Director | From: | Kent Torve, City Engineer <br> Steve Hegland, PE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project: | Hope Community Church Development | Date: | January 22, 2024 |

## Exhibits:

This Memorandum is based on a review of the following documents:

1. Hope Community Development Civil Plans by Sambatek dated 1/12/2024

## Comments:

## General:

1. Consistent with the review process, a comment response letter shall be provided in response to the following comments provided in this Memorandum in which the applicant provides a written response to each item.
2. In addition to engineering related comments per these plans, the proposed plans are subject to addition planning, zoning, land-use, and other applicable codes of the City of Corcoran.
3. Final approval by the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission must be attained before any site grading or activity may commence.
4. An encroachment agreement shall be required for all site improvements or items placed within the City ROW or easements.

## Plat/Easements:

1. Provide D\&U easement over Pond 4 N HWL and access route and Filtration 6 F access route.
2. Provide trail easements along CR116 and CR30 as well as along regional trail.
3. Verify with Hennepin County that ROW dedication along CR30 is appropriate. ROW is skewed to section corners but is not 60' at intersection of County Road 116.
4. Provide easements for all shared parking at time of site plan.
5. Provide and show easements for shared bituminous trail in Block 1.
6. Provide easements of sufficient width to account $1: 1$ slope for each side of trunk sanitary sewer along Hope Way. Sewer appears to reach a depth of $45.24^{\prime}$ in current utility plans and ROW plus easement width is only $80^{\prime}$.
7. Vacate all underlying easements which are no longer necessary with proposed development.
8. Easements over all water, sanitary, and storm sewer utilities not in the ROW shall be provided and reviewed at time of final plat.
9. ROW along CR116 appears consistent with previous request from Hennepin County if a 5' trail easement is also provided. Final ROW dedication shall be reviewed and approved by Hennepin County.
10. Provide D\&U easement over outlot $A$.
11. Provide sufficient easements for a $1: 1$ slope over trunk sanitary sewer along CR116. Sanitary sewer appears to have a depth over $40^{\prime}$ and buildings $7 \& 8$ appear to be in conflict.
12. Corcoran City Planner and Attorney shall confirm the proper designation of Block 3 Lot 1 and Block 1 Lot 3 as lots or outlots.
13. Final Three Rivers trail alignment shall be encompassed by appropriate easements for construction and maintenance.
14. A ROW stub should be provided to the upland area north of Lot 4 Block 4 to provide access should the area be developed in the future.
15. Easements shall be provided over all storm sewer pipes. Easements shall be shown on the site, utility, and storm sewer plans to ensure they are adequate.

## Erosion Control/SWPPP

1. Preparation of and compliance with a SWPPP shall be required for construction.
2. Final silt fence and inlet protection locations will be reviewed at Final Plat.
3. Erosion control blanket shall be used for restoration on areas with slope of $3: 1$ or greater.
4. Final review of erosion control BMPs, sequencing, and quantities to take place at Final Plat.

## Transportation

1. Maintenance requirements for private roads in Blocks 1 and 3 shall be detailed in HOA documents.
2. At time of Final Plat, a temporary access plan shall be included with the construction drawings showing how access will be maintained to the church and existing homes during the project.
3. All 28 ' roads shall be signed "No Parking" on one side of the roadway with No Parking" signs required within all cul-de-sacs. Oswald Farm Road will be no parking on both sides of the roadway. Final sign location to be shown on plans and reviewed at time of Final Plat.
4. The Feasibility Study identified offsite improvements including turn lanes at the development entrances and turn lane extension of County Road 30 at County Road 116. These projects are anticipated to be City led development and at the time of the development agreement the terms of these project should be identified.
5. All parking areas shall have concrete curbing and a paved surface.
6. The regional trail is shown to cross Oswald Farms Road at the mid block location. As outlined in the City of Corcoran Pedestrian Crosswalk Policy mid-block crossings should be avoided, especially as this crossing location is also within the bend of the roadway. We would recommend the trail be kept along the south side of Oswald Farms Road. There will still be conflicts with all of the drive entrances but this would be at a stopped traffic condition.
7. If the regional trail is constructed on the south side of the roadway, a crossing to access the trail from the church was previously proposed. Because this crossing is significantly greater than the 300' access spacing to adjacent intersections in the policy, we would recommend if needed, the crossing location be shifted southwest so it is not located at the curve of the roadway.
8. The roadways within the development are anticipated to have AADT's of less than 9,000 trips per day and a posted speed limit equal to or less than 30 mph . All pedestrian crossings not at standard intersections or roadways crossings for the regional trail (Oswald Farms Road or southwest access road), should incorporate the following elements in accordance with the Pedestrian Crosswalk Policy.

This level of improvement is considered appropriate given the conditions of the development and timing of the regional trail. Additional crossing improvements may be necessary in the future as additional segments of the regional trail are constructed and this area is further utilized.
a. Incorporate high visibility crosswalk markings
b. Provide advanced warning crosswalk signage
c. Post no parking restrictions in the locations of the crosswalks.
d. Provide adequate nighttime lighting
e. Incorporate curb extensions.
f. Provide for RRFB system due to significant multimodal facilities
9. Construction plans to display location of surmountable and high-back curb. Locations of surmountable and high-back curb to be reviewed at Final Plat.
10. Provide plan sheet with locations of stop, street, and no parking signage in final plat drawings.
11. Provide intersection details plan demonstrating ped ramp design per ADA and Corcoran standard detail requirements in final plat drawings.
12. All pavement markings to be reviewed at Final Plat.
13. The local roadway connection to County Road 30 shall be adjusted to have both right and left turn lanes onto County Road 30.
14. At time of each individual lot plan, the ADA parking stall count and all ADA access routes to facilities shall be shown on site plans.

## Site Plans

1. Street lighting locations shall be reviewed by Public Safety and final lighting locations shall be determined at the time of Final Plat.
2. Include all necessary City of Corcoran standard detail plates in construction plans.
3. There is significant amount of planting conflicts over the storm sewer and trunk utilities adjacent to County Road 30 and County Road 116. At time of Final Plat, revise planting locations to minimize conflicts.
4. Tree planting should be removed from pond access routes. Plantings around Filtration 12F2 and Pond 4 N appear to be in conflict.
5. Review Senior Housing building and Building 26 for conflicts with D\&U easements.
6. Plantings are shown in Hennepin County ROW. Applicant shall receive approval from Hennepin County for these plantings.

## Grading/Stormwater

1. The grading plans shall clearly identify whether designated wetland buffers within the site are to utilize existing vegetation or if new vegetation will be established for the buffers. If existing vegetation is to be utilized, the vegetation shall be approved by the City Wetland specialist. For buffers to be established, a plan identifying the establishment and maintenance procedures shall be provided at the time of Final Plat.
2. Wetland buffer zones and wetland buffer signage shall be clearly identified and labeled on plans.
3. Sumps in manholes with drops of greater than 18 " and the last accessible structure prior to stormwater basins to be 3 ' sumps.
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4. Rational calculations shall be provided to confirm all pipe sizes and inlet capacity at the time of final plat.
5. Label top and bottom elevations of retaining wall behind Block 2 single family homes. If greater than $4^{\prime}$, it shall be designed by a structural engineer.
6. Inlet and pipe capacity calculations for all roadways including Hope Way and existing storm sewer along Oswald Farm Road shall be submitted and reviewed with Final Plat application.
7. Confirm EOF (947.43) nearest the center structure of "Rowhomes J" (FFE 948.25) meets freeboard requirements of 2 foot separation.
8. Provide 10 ' safety bench for all wet ponds. Pond 4 N appears to be the only wet pond with a sufficient safety bench.
9. Call out trash guards for all FES on construction plans.
10. Filtration basin 12 F2 may require lining to inhibit seepage to Three Rivers trail underpass; to be reviewed at final plat.
11. Additional inlets required for storm sewer system to drain all low areas below Block 2 retaining wall.
12. Catch basin capacity of all commercial and multi-family sites shall be reviewed at time of site plan/building permit and rational calculations shall be provided. At time of Final Plat concept rational calculations will be necessary to ensure stubs from street have adequate capacity.
13. Plans shall be modified to accommodate trapped water adjacent to western property boundary south of Oswald Farm Road.
14. Verify discharge location for STMH 311.
15. Existing storm sewer underneath Senior Housing that conveys drainage to existing wetland must be removed.
16. EOF in front of Multifamily A parking garage must be relocated.

## Watermain/Sanitary Sewer

1. Plan and profiles for all utilities shall be provided at the time of Final Plat submittals.
2. Valve locations to be reviewed at time of Final Plat. Generally, valves shall be located at all intersection as one less valve than the number of legs. Valves should typically be located out from the end radius points unless specific circumstances don't allow. Butterfly valves required for watermain 12 " and greater.
a. Review valve midway on Hope Way.
3. Hydrant spacing to be reviewed by Public Safety at time of final plat.
a. Ensure hydrants are located at all high points.
4. All water stubs from the 20 -inch trunk water pipe shall have a valve and a 20 -foot extension of pipe so connection can be made without shutting down the City system.
5. The sanitary sewer of Hunters Ridge sanitary stub shall be lowered to accommodate connection to existing properties.
6. Looping of the 8 " watermain along the west property boundary may be necessary for required looping depending on timing of the project.
7. A dedicated lot for a future municipal well shall be coordinated with City.
8. Provide 20 -foot easement and install the raw water line along CR 116 for municipal water supply.
9. Provide 20 -foot easement along CR30 for future raw water supply from the west.
10. Separate domestic and fire lines shall be run into buildings with separate shut offs.
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11. The sewer stub to the southeast shall be lowered to match the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan identifies this sewer invert at a 920.2. Credits (if available) from the development's TLAC would be provided for overdepth installation.
12. "20-inch" DIPS HDPE DR-11 BY OTHERS" shown on Utility Plan Sheets to be labeled 20" C900 DR18 fusible pipe.
13. Utility stubs should be provided to outside the roadway for the

## End of Comments

| To: | Kevin Mattson, PE <br> City of Corcoran Public Works Director | From: | Kent Torve, PE, City Engineer <br> Steve Hegland, PE, |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project: | Stormwater Comments Hope <br> Community Church Development <br> Project | Date: | January 22,2024 |

## Exhibits:

This Memorandum is based on a review of the following documents:

1. Hope Community Development Civil Plans by Sambatek dated $1 / 12 / 2024$
2. Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan for Hope Community Church by Sambatek dated 1/12/2024

## Comments:

- Final approval by the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC) must be attained before any site grading or activity may begin.
- City needs to authorize submittal to ECWMC.


## Summary

Stormwater findings and City guidelines for developments and drainage were provided in the Feasibility Study. These should be implemented with revised stormwater management plan.

## Draintile

1. Include the surveyed elevations and diameter of the tile on the Existing Conditions plan sheet.
2. Submit verification of the material and condition of tile under CR 116 (video, etc.).
3. Verify capacity of rerouted tile through the site is equal or greater than existing conditions, include existing pipe material as compared to RCP (see comment No. 4).

## Stormsewer, EOF and Outlet Structures (OCS)

4. Pipes carrying public drainage (City, County, or offsite drainage) are required to be RCP.
5. The WMO may require an OCS with skimming on all basin outlets.
6. The site shows flat stormsewer (less than $0.5 \%$ ) that may require additional manholes for maintenance access. City will review and may require additional structures for access at time of final plat.
7. Catch basin spacing of storm sewer appears to not meet City Standards. It should be anticipated that additional structures will be necessary in the streets and parking areas.
8. Provide individual detail plates for each OCS with site specific elevations.
9. The EOF for the large area south of Oswald Farm Road and south of the future tunnel is elevation 950.31 . City requires low openings to be 2 feet above the EOF, therefore adjust the finished floor elevations for the four retail and medical buildings.

## Ponds/BMPs

10. Modify the stormsewer length between OCS 931 and FES 930 to include the length of the stilling basin. Additionally, the plans should show where the pipe is being upsized per the detail.
11. The existing pond adjacent to Hope Church is receiving stormwater from the development, therefore add an OCS to manage discharge (Pond 7P) to the existing wetland and include in the system's model. Any wetland impacts for the discharge and construction will need WCA approval.
12. Provide a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard from the HWL to the top of berm. For example Pond 5 N only has 6 inches.
13. Ponds $4 N, 5 N, 11 N$ and $12 N$ do not require the berm divider in the wet ponds.
14. Create stilling basin at the FES into each filtration basin to dissipate velocity. Utilize the City detail, however the upsize in pipe is not required. Alternatively, submit a design for City review.

## Modeling

## Data

15. The capacity of the offsite driveway culverts may not be sufficient for the Hope Development system design. Therefore, it is necessary to extend the model north along CR 116 and the culvert under Hillside Drive. Include in both the existing and proposed models.

The following culvert information shall be input into the model:
a. Culvert under Hunters Ridge at CR 116 intersection.
b. Culvert under the field access near the tree line.
c. Three driveway culverts north of Pond 5N.
d. Culvert under Hillside Dr at CR 116 intersection.
16. It appears a generic impervious percentage is used for proposed conditions however it is necessary to quantify the impervious areas within each subwatershed as shown on the plans. Provide both a subwatershed total and an exhibit and table of quantities of pervious, impervious, and total area for each Block and ROW as shown on Sheet 2.02 to be used as the benchmark for the WMO permitting and future development review.

## Model

17. Filtration basins shall be set to have a starting water elevation at the constructed outlet control elevation.
18. Wetlands shall have a starting water elevation at the elevation of the delineated edge. The existing wetland has a Flood Elevation of 937.88 in both models, not a Starting Elevation.
19. Water loss in modeling is not allowed, therefore remove the modeling approach of discarding exfiltration from the existing wetland in both models.
20. Before resubmittal, ensure all devices in the HydroCAD match the construction plan information.
21. Model filtration basins and ponds using a CN of 98.
22. Adjust routing of $11 \mathrm{E}-\mathrm{OS}$ in the proposed model to discharge directly to the wetland.

## Offsite Drainage

23. Incorporate the drainage from the west near CR30 into the street plan. Currently the proposed road plans would block drainage from the west.

# HENNEPIN COUNTY <br> MINNESOTA 

December 28, 2023
Ms. Natalie Davis
City of Corcoran
8200 County Road 116
Corcoran, MN 55340

Re: Hope Community (Received 12/01/23)
County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 30 \& County Road (CR) 116
Hennepin County Plat Review ID \#4047 (Reviewed 11/07/2023)
Ms. Davis:

Please consider the following county comments for the preliminary plat to combine multiple parcels in the northwest corner of County Road (CR) 30 and CR 116 into a multi-use development including multifamily and senior housing, commercial, retail and medical office.

Access: We concur with the full access locations with turn lanes on CR 30 and CR 116. The turn lane design for both locations must be reviewed and approved by the county. County staff requires additional information for the proposed right in access on CR 116, including forecasted daily user volumes and rationale for the access, to determine whether or not the county will support the access.

Right-of-way: County staff request 60 feet half right-of-way with an additional 5 -foot easement for drainage, utility and future multi-modal purposes on CR 30 and $C R 116$. Staff also request a $25 \times 25$ sight triangle in the northwest quadrant of CR 30/CR 116, the northwest and southwest quadrants of CR 116/Hunters Ridge/Oswald Farm Road, and the northwest and northeast quadrants of CR 30/new access to provide sufficient sight distance and accommodate space for utilities.

Multimodal: The sidewalk and curb ramp design must meet current ADA standards. In 2023, the US Access Board issued a final rule in the Federal Register for the Public Right-of-Way Access Guidelines (PROWAG). These guidelines are expected to be adopted by the Department of Transportation and Department of Justice in 2024. PROWAG, section R202.2 will require that altered facilities "be connected by a pedestrian access route complying with R302 to an existing pedestrian circulation path." Curb ramps and appropriate connections will need to comply with R302, R304 and R305, including requirement R203.6.2 that "crosswalks, curb ramps or blended transitions shall be provided on both ends of the crosswalk where the pedestrian access route crosses a curb." Depending on project timing, this may require that curb ramps are provided at all impacted intersections and a sidewalk or multiuse trail on CR 30 and CR 116 and should be taken into account in the design.

County staff were recently made aware of a planned trail underpass connecting with this development under CR 116. Coordination still needs to occur for the planned trail, underpass, box culvert, and retaining wall layout and design. Site modification may need to occur to accommodate the underpass. Ownership and maintenance responsibilities will also need to be determined prior to construction of the trail underpass and planned trail currently shown on the east side of CR 116 .

Storm Water/Drainage: Discharge rates must remain less than existing flow rates. The county storm water system will not take water from new drainage areas. Additional treatments may be needed if flow rates cannot match existing. Contact: Jordan Labat at 612-596-0703 or Jordan.Labat@hennepin.us

Permits: Please inform the developer that all construction within county right-of-way requires an approved county permit prior to beginning construction. This includes, but is not limited to, driveway and street access, drainage and utility construction, sidewalk/trail development, and landscaping. Contact: Michael Olmstead, Permits Coordinator at 612-596-0336 or michael.olmstead@hennepin.us

Please contact Ashley Morello: 612-596-0359, ashley.morello@hennepin.us with any questions.

Sincerely,
Conerne Sture
Carla Stueve, PE
County Highway Engineer


PARCEL ID: 1111923140005
OWNER NAME: Corcoran Invstts LIc Et AI
PARCEL ADDRESS: 52 Address Unassigned,Corcoran MN 00000
PARCEL AREA: 15.71 acres, $684,306 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$
A-T-B: Abstract

## SALE PRICE:

## SALE DATE:

## SALE CODE:

ASSESSED 2022, PAYABLE 2023
PROPERTY TYPE: Vacant Land-Residential
HOMESTEAD: Non-Homestead
MARKET VALUE: $\$ 260,000$
TAX TOTAL: \$3,894.02
ASSESSED 2023, PAYABLE 2024
PROPERTY TYPE: Vacant Land-Residential hOMESTEAD: Non-Homestead
MARKET VALUE: $\$ 260,000$

## Comments:

This data (i) is furnished 'AS IS' with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this data.
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# ThreeRivers <br> PARK DISTRICT 

January 5, 2024

Natalie Davis McKeown
City of Corcoran
8200 County Road 116
Corcoran, MN 55340

RE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Hope Community Church PUD

Natalie,

Three Rivers Park District has reviewed the preliminary PUD plans for the Hope Community Church Development Project, dated November 27, 2023, and has the following comments.

1. Plan should reflect the most current design and layout for the future regional trail and underpass from the CSAH 116 Grade Separated Crossing Feasibility Study by SRF Consulting Group. See attached plan dated December 22, 2023.
2. Plan should note the location and extent of the anticipated easement to be granted to Three Rivers Park District for the future regional trail underpass and trail, including all areas needed for construction of the underpass retaining walls, trail and trail clearzones per the Three Rivers Park District Trail Design Guidelines, updated August 11, 2023. A 55-foot-wide permanent easement area will be needed at the retaining walls for the underpass approach.
3. Filtration Pond 12F2, including all associated drainage structures and underground piping, should be designed and constructed such that it will not be impacted by the future construction of the retaining walls needed for the trail underpass approach.
4. Indicate the best connection point for electrical power for the future box culvert lighting.
5. The trail along Oswald Farm Road west of the underpass is intended to become the regional trail in the future. This trail should be meet Three Rivers' design standards: 10 ' wide, $3^{\prime}$ minimum trail clear zones on either side of the trail. A 6'wide (minimum) boulevard is recommended between the trail and the street to allow space for street signage and light poles outside of the 3'-wide trail clearzone. Landscape plantings, including the expected tree branch growth, should be outside of the trail corridor, 16 ' wide $\times 10$ high. See attached TRPD Trail Design Guidelines. If the trail corridor does not fit within the road right-ofway, determine the amount of area needed for a trail easement.
6. Utility manholes should be located outside of the regional trail surface.
7. Ensure there is room for all current ADA requirements for all regional trail crossings in the development, including required sight lines and pedestrian ramps.
8. Three Rivers Park District would like to acquire all necessary property rights for the trail corridor and underpass area as part of the PUD platting process. The Diamond Lake Regional Trail Cooperative Agreement between Three Rivers Park District and the City of Corcoran has sample easement/limited use permit language that could be used to convey the property rights to Three Rivers.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary PUD plans. Please contact me at 763-5596766 or Stephen.shurson@threeriversparks.org with any questions.

Sincerely,


Stephen Shurson
Landscape Architect
Three Rivers Park District

## Three Rivers Park District

Trail Design Guidelines
Updated August 11, 2023

* Italic text indicates TRPD modification to published standard or a new standard created by TRPD.

| Design Component | Design Standard/Best Practice | References |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trail Classification $=$ Regional Trail (2-way shared use trail) |  |  |
| Trail Geometry |  |  |
| Trail width (shared use path) | Typically, 10' from pavement edge to pavement edge. Trail width may be modified based on Level of Service (LOS) projections. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |
| Shoulder width | 5' preferred where ROW is not constrained, $2^{\prime}$ minimum on both sides of trail. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |
| Clear zone | 3' minimum on both sides of trail. Clear zone is measured from edge of bicycle travel lane. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |
| Cross slope | Typically $1.5 \%$ in one direction, with direction dependent on drainage and horizontal curvature. Minimum cross slope $=1.5 \%$, maximum cross slope $=2.0 \%$. 5' for each percent of transition | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Side slopes | 2' min @ (1:6 V:H) 1:3 (V:H) for cut and fill slopes. <br> $1: 2$ fill slopes may be considered in wetland areas. 1:2 cut slopes may be considered in heavily wooded areas on a site-specific basis. No slopes steeper than 1:2. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |
| Physical barrier, dense shrubbery, or railing | Install when < 5' of shoulder can be provided from the slope and Slopes 1V:3H w/ 6'+ drop Slopes $1 \mathrm{~V}: 3 \mathrm{H}$ adjacent to water body <br> Slopes 1V:2H w/4'+ drop <br> Slopes 1V:1H w/1' + drop | - AASHTO 2012 |
| Vertical clearance | 10 feet minimum. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |
| Horizontal Alignment |  |  |
| Design Speed | 20 mph for regional trails. Use a 30 mph design speed for grades longer than 500 feet and greater than 4 percent, from the uphill point where grade equals 4 percent to 500 feet beyond the downhill | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual <br> - MN Rule 8820.9995 |


| Design Component | Design Standard/Best Practice | References |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | point where the grade becomes less than 4 percent. |  |
| Horizontal curves | 100-foot minimum radius for 20 mph design speed, 156 -foot minimum radius for 25 mph design speed. Lean angle assumed to be $15^{\circ}$ based on typical trail user. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Minimum lateral clearance (M) | Minimum lateral clearance on inside of horizontal curves to be free of sight obstructions. " M " is computed based on design speed, stopping sight distance, and radius of curve. Areas required to be free of obstructions will be staked prior to construction and reviewed by the project team. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Vertical Alignment |  |  |
| Profile grade | 5\% maximum profile grade preferred on regional trail. Short segments of trail may be considered for exceeding 5\% within the MnDNR allowable lengths on a case-by-case basis. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Vertical curves | Minimum vertical curve length is computed based on design speed, stopping sight distance, and approaching profile grades. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Other Design Considerations |  |  |
| Trail/Road Intersections | Crossing treatments to be evaluated based on site-specific considerations, current regulatory standards, and best practices guidance. | - Guidance for TPRD Trail Crossings <br> - MMUTCD |
| Intersection sightlines | Intersections shall provide clear sight distance equal to the stopping sight distance computed for the trail design speed. Where it is not feasible to provide the minimum sight distance, designer should consider mitigating for trail safety, natural resources, or a combination to meet trail safety objectives. | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Striping | Trail centerline striping to be 4" yellow latex with glass beads. Broken line consists of 3' stripe, $9^{\prime}$ gap. Locations of solid centerline to be determined by the designer. <br> 4 " Solid where trail is along BOC | - AASHTO 2012 <br> - MnDNR Trail Guidelines <br> - MnDOT Bikeway Manual |
| Signage | Signage needs to be determined by designer based on site-specific | - MMUTCD <br> - Safe Crossings guidance |


| Design Component | Design Standard/Best Practice | References |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | considerations and current regulatory standards. |  |
| Benches/amenities/kiosks | TRPD Project Team to review existing amenities along trail and provide recommendations for improvements. |  |
| Pavement section | Typically, 3" of bituminous over 6" of Class 5 aggregate base. Class 5 extends 1' beyond trail edge. Trail shall be designed for a 30-year service life. Consider thicker pavement section where heavy vehicular traffic known to cross trail. | - TRPD standard plates TR-1 and TR-2. |
| Curb ramps | Design to meet ADA guidelines. Curb cut and truncated domes shall match trail width. | - MNDOT Standard Plans 5-297.250 for Pedestrian Curb Ramps |
| Traffic control plan | Trail detours and/or trail closures may be considered. Appropriate signage must be included at all local access points. Designer to provide signage/phasing plan for review by TRPD Project Team. |  |
| Turf establishment | Seed mix and application rate to be determined based on land type adjacent to trail. Any erosion control blanket used shall consist of all-natural netting and stitching. | - TRPD Specification 329212 \& 312510 <br> - MNDOT Seeding Manual |

## Reference Information

- "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities", American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), 2012
- "Trail Planning, Design, and Development Guidelines", Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR), 2007.
- "Mn/DOT Bikeway Facility Design Manual", Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), 2020
- "Best Practices for Traffic Control at Regional Trail Crossings", Various authors, 2011.
- Minnesota Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD), July 2012.
- MNDOT Seeding Manual - 2014 Edition
- Guidance for Three Rivers Park District Trail Crossings, Determining Effective Trail Crossing Practices in TRPD parks and Public Rights-of-Way. December 2013

Note to designer: Any deviations from these design standards need to be documented through the TRPD project manager for incorporation into the permanent project file.

Special design elements: When underpass or overpasses are required, contact TRPD project manager for additional criteria.


6" TOPSOIL, TYP.
SEE PLAN SHEETS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SEEDING AND RESTORATION NOTES.


1. BITUMINOUS SHALL BE PLACED IN ONE LIFT.
2. CLASS 5 AGGREGATE BASE SHALL CONFORM TO MnDOT SPEC 3138 AND INSTALLED 1' BEYOND PAVEMENT EDGE.
3. SUBGRADE SHALL BE TEST ROLLED PRIOR TO AGGREGATE BASE INSTALLATION AND CONFORM TO MnDOT SPEC 2111.
4. WHERE BOULEVARD IS 2' TO 3' (MIN.), BOULEVARD SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED FROM IMPERVIOUS MATERIAL (I.G., BITUMINOUS, CONCRETE, PAVERS, ETC). SPECIAL STRIPING LAYOUT MAY APPLY, (SEE PLAN SHEETS).

5. BITUMINOUS SHALL BE PLACED IN ONE LIFT.
6. CLASS 5 AGGREGATE BASE SHALL CONFORM TO MnDOT SPEC 3138 AND INSTALLED 1' BEYOND PAVEMENT EDGE.
7. SUBGRADE SHALL BE TEST ROLLED PRIOR TO AGGREGATE BASE INSTALLATION AND CONFORM TO MnDOT SPEC 2111.
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DATE: January 25, 2024 -UPDATED
TO: City of Corcoran
FROM: Josh McKinney, PLA, Measure Group
SUBJECT: Hope Community Development - Preliminary Plat \& PUD Narrative

## Applicants: Hope Community Church

Brian \& Jacque Lother
Corcoran Investments, LLC
Civil Engineer: Sambatek, Mark Anderson, PE

## Proposal:

The applicants respectfully submit the enclosed application for Preliminary Plat \& Preliminary Planned Unit Development for approximately 40 acres of development located in the Northwest corner of County Road 30 \& County Road 116.

When Hope Community Church purchased this land over 20 years ago, their vision was to create a campus which would someday provide housing for seniors, and create a community center which would provide opportunities for commercial and medical tenants consistent with the mission of the Church.

The proposed plan would provide places for people of multiple age groups to live, work, dine, and worship while being respectful of our neighbors and seeking to be a contributor toward the aspirational goals the City has set forth in multiple planning efforts.

Once fully constructed, this plan would provide a variety of housing types and densities, as well as commercial, retail, and medical office space.

Below is a detailed description of the development, how we propose to meet the needs of multiple user groups, and fit into the existing context while planning for the future.

## Attachments:

Applications
Preliminary PUD Plan Documents

## Parking Study

Neighborhood Meeting Summary
Phasing Plan
Architectural Exhibits

## Proposed Uses:

## Multifamily Housing

- Multifamily housing is proposed in two different locations within the site plan.
- There is significant demand for this type of housing in Corcoran caused by several factors such as home affordability and shifting preferences of multiple demographics choosing to rent vs. own.
- The proposed buildings would be 4 stories with flat roofs to lower the visual profile of the buildings. Numerous examples of this proposed use are found in nearby communities.
- The proposed buildings would incorporate indoor amenities such as community rooms, work from home spaces, coffee bars, golf simulators, game rooms, and party/ community rooms. Typical exterior amenities found in modern apartments may include a swimming pool, grill stations, firepits, pergolas, bocce courts, putting greens, and a roof deck for gatherings.
- This use is consistent with the Mixed Use guidance for the property found in the Corcoran 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- Operationally, Market Rate apartments typically run a credit and background check for all residents. These buildings will be access restricted with Key Fobs, and have closed circuit monitoring of their facilities.
- Parking has been provided at a rate that exceeds the market.


## Senior Living

- Senior Living is a core component to this development. Developing Senior Living Facilities consistent with the mission of Hope Church, but also is a use that is underbuilt both in Corcoran and the west Metro given what some demographers call the "Silver Tsunami" of aging Baby Boomers reaching retirement age and in need of care. This need has been both exposed and exacerbated by the Covid 19 pandemic.
- The proposed senior living facility will provide a full continuum of care, including independent living, assisted living, memory care, and hospice.
- Modern senior living facilities include many of the same amenities found within the multifamily buildings mentioned above. In addition, there are amenities which cater specifically to senior and non ambulatory populations such as playing card rooms, barber shops, club rooms, and dining facilities.
- A tunnel is proposed to connect the church with this structure to allow for access in inclement weather.
- Any necessary overflow parking can be accommodated by sharing the existing church parking lot. We anticipate this might be where employees of the facility would park as well.


## 55+ Active Senior Living

- Active Senior Living is intended to serve as a transition from home ownership to a facility which provides more healthcare to its residents.
- Often seniors would prefer to live with people of similar ages when they transition from owning a home to a rental community.
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- Amenities are similar to a non age restricted multifamily building, but are catered to active seniors with amenities such as Pickleball courts.
- We have included tandem parking stalls in the event that two parking spaces for a unit are desired.


## Senior Villas

- The Senior Villas Shown on the proposed plan would serve as another housing option for seniors as an ownership option which allows for less maintenance and a single level living.
- These villas will be owner occupied.
- These Villas would have a two stall garage and driveway parking.


## Row Townhomes

- Row Townhomes are an important part of what urban planners call the "Missing Middle housing". These homes will serve as a transition for younger residents to move up into larger single family homes, as well as seniors looking for a smaller home which is more easily maintained.
- Garages will be loaded from an interior street or private drive. These garages would be 2 stalls, with driveway space for 2 additional stalls. Two areas are available for additional guest parking, totaling 8 additional stalls. These driveways would be at least 20 feet in length to avoid cars impacting sidewalk circulation.


## Commercial/ Retail

- With the anticipated growth of Corcoran over the next several years comes the need for high quality, well located commercial and retail options. This plan provides those options with the required traffic counts and visibility for those uses to thrive.
- Potential users for this space would be a small format grocery store, coffee shops, restaurants along with community services such as barbers, banks, pharmacies, child care facilities, etc.
- While Maple Grove is a regional hub for retail and commercial space, the need for retail to serve the more localized area will become more important with the anticipated growth of the surrounding community.


## Medical Office

- A medical office use is consistent with the mission of the church and a focus on healing. This use is in high demand as healthcare decentralizes from large hospital campuses and instead locates specialists within medical office buildings with multiple users.
- Examples of this type of use are numerous throughout the northwest metro, including Twin Cities Orthopedic, Ridgeview, and Park Nicolett as major users.


## Water Tower Site

- Hope Community Church has sold land to the City of Corcoran to construct a water tower located within the existing church site. This site is approximately 1.2 acres.


## Cemetery Expansion

- Hope Community Church owns an existing cemetery. Additional capacity is desired to facilitate future use for members of the community.


## Existing Church Use

- Hope Community Church is approximately 30,000 Square feet of worship space, office space, classrooms, and flex space. The Church has been a part of the community for over 20 years.


## Architecture:

All buildings within the project boundary will adhere to the Northeast Area standards approved by the council within the last year, along with the zoning ordinance. It is important to note that this project is preliminary in nature and no specific building designs are available for review. We are committed to working with the City.

Examples of proposed architecture have been included as an exhibit with this application.

## Transportation:

This site is well positioned within the City of Corcoran and is served by two county roads ( 30 \& 116), both of which are planned for expansion in the future. Additionally, the site is proposed to be served with a left turn lane from County Road 116.

The second access, shown on the western property line in the southern portion of the site, shows an access which was included in the Northeast District Design Guidelines and discussed at that time with Hennepin County.

We are also seeking a right-in access from southbound 116 to better serve the commercial area. This request has been submitted to the County for review.

## Trails:

The Diamond Lake Regional Trail will bisect the property. A proposed alignment is indicated on the plan and coordination with the Three Rivers Park District is ongoing to determine specifically which side of Hunters Ridge the trail will be on. The Parks and Trails Commission preferred a mid-block crossing at the tunnel location, with the trail located on the north side of the road. Discussions with Three Rivers Parks are ongoing.

## Utilities:

This site is in a unique position of housing the first water tower proposed in the City of Corcoran. Additionally, the water treatment facility is located directly to the north east of the site area.

Hope Community Church has worked with the City of Corcoran as a partner to site the water tower, and will continue to do so as it relates to the routing of utility lines to serve both the project area as well as our neighbors.

Trunk water and trunk sanitary lines are shown routed through the site. Stormwater infrastructure will be provided to meet the City and Watershed Requirements

## Enhanced Landscaping/ Screening:

Our team has included "Enhanced Landscaping Areas" on areas of the plan where a setback reduction is requested from the county roads.

Multifamily lots "A" and " $F$ " landscape requirement trees were consolidated in conjunction with enhanced screening requirements to provide the maximum amount of building screening.

Additionally, areas where the rowhomes and villas abut existing property owners have been provided with additional overstory and understory buffering using mostly native plant varieties.

The areas with commercial uses require a different approach. Commercial users desire views into the site to allow for visibility of signage in retail locations. Our plan attempts to strike a balance of buffering and visibility into the site. We understand that additional screening will be required to buffer the drive thru uses from the public ROW.

## Signage

Like any successful mixed use development, visibility and signage is important. Our team has prepared a signage plan that we feel is consistent with other quality commercial developments in the metro. Additionally, some commercial/medical users may also wish to have signage on the building facade.

## Buffering \& Neighboring Uses:

Creating a sense of community is important to the applicants. Great care was given to maintaining and enhancing vegetative buffers to reduce impacts to neighboring properties.

In addition to utilizing plant material, the intensity of the proposed uses is greatly reduced near the property boundaries with residential uses. For example, a step down in intensity is shown with the 1 story senior villas near the northern property boundary, in conjunction with the significant treeline in that area.

The property to the west of the Hope Community Church site is guided as "Mixed Residential" which made the multifamily building located in that area feel appropriate, given that a similar use on the other side of that access point is possible in the future.

Where appropriate, we include 6 foot privacy fencing to further enhance buffers to our neighbors.

## Conformance with Previous Planning Efforts :

The majority of this site is currently guided as Mixed Use in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The area with Senior Villas, 55+ Active Senior, and Senior Living uses is currently platted with the Church and is guided as Public/Semi-Public. A Comprehensive Plan amendment will be required to accommodate those uses.

The project also referenced the Northeast District Plan and Design Guidelines while planning our transportation and trail locations. Those guidelines will continue to provide shape to the plan as this evolves with specific end users.

Additionally, our team anticipates a significant amount of space designed for gathering and amenities, and plan for solar and electrical vehicles while developing individual site plans.

## Phasing:

While the market will ultimately drive the phasing of the project, our team has prepared an exhibit for what we believe a realistic phasing plan might be. We believe that multifamily and senior housing will ultimately lead this development due to current market conditions, and utility availability.

From that point we expect the retail and commercial spaces would begin to develop, followed by/or along with subsequent housing phases. See exhibit for a visual representation of this plan.

We anticipate that the first building permits would likely be pulled in early 2025, however grading and utility work would commence this summer/fall. We do not anticipate permits to be pulled without watermain and sanitary sewer in place and operational.

## Nature of PUD Request :

Our team understands a Planned Unit Development is meant to exchange flexibility for community benefit. We have made significant efforts to meet or exceed City standards, however in some areas we are challenged dimensionally due to the nature of the site. In others, we are seeking to develop in ways that are not yet considered as a part of the City of Corcoran Ordinances. We request a PUD to remediate/allow for the following:

1. Deviation in lot square footage standards for the Villa Units. These units are specifically designed to cater to seniors seeking lower maintenance, single story living.
2. Setback reduction for Multifamily and commercial buildings along County Road 116 and County Road 30. We feel this flexibility is reasonable because we would be meeting the 60 ' setback requirement but for the $10^{\prime}$ foot of additional ROW being dedicated on both of those frontages. As directed by code, enhanced landscaping has been provided in the Areas of the Multifamily buildings, which are taller in height. We anticipate these buildings would be between 40 and $50^{\prime}$ in height.
3. Joint Parking / Parking reductions per a 3rd party review of parking throughout the project area. This is requested to reduce empty/unused stalls.
4. Allowance of Townhomes in a Mixed Use district. We would like to lower the density nearest the existing residents to the extent practicable within the existing comprehensive planning guidance of the parcel.

## measure

Hope Community Development
January 25, 2024
5. Allow flexibility in density across the site area. For example, we can shift some of the available density from the townhome site to the multifamily tracts, effectively stepping down the intensity in certain areas of the site, while increasing the intensity in others. The current densities are identified on the site plan sheet.
6. Flexibility to shift required landscape material from inner portions of the site to allow for improved buffering at the edges of the site. We would like to maintain open view to wetlands and aesthetically pleasing areas, as well as preserve view corridors to the commercial areas to maintain a viable commercial area at the hard corner of our site.
7. Relief from ordinance 1040.135 which requires a grade separation on all housing units accessing the building on the first level. The building developers may well include this into their projects, however there are several different housing types on this project and this requirement is a barrier to development.
8. Flexibility from the landscape island/ parking bay spacing standards found within the Northeast District Standards. This flexibility is requested to accommodate improved pedestrian access to specific buildings through the use of landscape islands.
9. Flexibility from the restriction on drive thru lanes abutting public ROW. We would like to screen these drive through lanes with vegetation.

## Proposed Community Benefit:

1. We have taken great care to locate taller buildings as far away from existing homes as possible, lessening impact to existing residents.
2. Constructing an east-west connection to future development, which should allow for the existing Hunters Ridge road connection to be eliminated or reduced in importance from the existing neighborhood to any future development. This idea was well received at the neighborhood meeting.
3. Coordination with City staff/consultants to shift existing ROW to allow for more economical construction of the water utility lines.
4. Improvement of existing drainage conditions for neighbors to the south of the project area through stormwater routing through the project area.
5. Establishment of a significant tax base to serve Corcoran and its residents well into the future.
6. Providing a trail easement in excess of 20 feet.

Preliminary PUD Plans
for
Hope Community Church Development Project
Corcoran, Minnesota
Presented by:
Hope Community Church
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## Hope Community Development - Meeting Materials and Recap

Josh McKinney [jmckinney@measuregrp.com](mailto:jmckinney@measuregrp.com)
Thu, Oct 12 at 15:23
To: jim johnson [jimajohnson@comcast.net](mailto:jimajohnson@comcast.net), nikalden@comcast.net [nikalden@comcast.net](mailto:nikalden@comcast.net), crzycathy4@gmail.com
[crzycathy4@gmail.com](mailto:crzycathy4@gmail.com), corey@comfortmatters.com [corey@comfortmatters.com](mailto:corey@comfortmatters.com), peter@bliptoys.com
[peter@bliptoys.com](mailto:peter@bliptoys.com), [catalindima@comcast.net](mailto:catalindima@comcast.net), Sarah Schmidt [sarahschmidt006@gmail.com](mailto:sarahschmidt006@gmail.com),Pam Kothrade
[pam.kothrade@gmail.com](mailto:pam.kothrade@gmail.com)
Cc: Brian Lother [blother@comcast.net](mailto:blother@comcast.net)
Good Afternoon-
I want to thank all of you for either attending the neighborhood meeting yesterday or sending me an email requesting more information. As discussed, attached you will find the slides that were presented yesterday. Our team is interested in any feedback you have for what we are currently working on.

## Here is what was discussed as priorities yesterday:

1. Determine if there are plans for the signalization of the intersection shown in the SW corner of the project at County Road 30 . If so, when? If not, what would be the threshold for the need for a signal?
2. Some attendees were not excited with commercial development within the project.
3. Residents would like to see the right of way connection on Hunters Ridge eliminated with the proposed Hope Way extending to future development to the west of this project.
4. Owner Occupied Townhomes are much preferred over any rental product in that location.
5. Ensure sidewalk and trail connections exist for current residents to link with the planned Three Rivers Park District Regional trail.
6. There was a desire to look into a tot lot playground/pickleball courts/recreational opportunities that would benefit the existing residents in addition to the proposed development.

Please let me know if you have any additional ideas for project improvement as you have an opportunity to review.
As I mentioned at the meeting, please do not hesitate to reach out directly to me with any questions you have on the project. I will do my best to answer questions promptly. My contact information is also listed below if you would prefer a phone call. Please feel free to forward onto your neighbors that have not reached out directly to me at this time.

Finally, I am very aware that this development represents a significant change to the existing conditions. We will make every effort possible to be a good neighbor throughout the process, provide updates, and where possible provide for and accommodate things that we hope minimize the project's impact to your property. I appreciate your input to date and look forward to working with you all as we move forward.

Sincerely,
Josh McKinney
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MEMO

Meeting Date: $\quad$ February 1, 2024
To: Planning Commission
From: Dwight Klingbeil, Planning Technician
Re: Planning Project Update

Projects/comments in blue italics are new.

The following is a status summary of active planning projects:

1. Commercial and Industrial Development Standards (Citywide) (City File 23-023) The purpose of this zoning ordinance amendment is to address and evaluate the allowed uses and use specific standards within commercial and industrial developments. The Council adopted a work plan at the November 20, 2023, regular meeting, and requested the Planning Commission to provide their initial feedback. The Planning Commission discussed this item at the December 5, 2023, meeting and expressed their desire Commercial and Industrial Development Standards address a number of items such as: specific architectural standards, infrastructure investment incentives, encouragement toward sustainable development practices, proper transitions of intensities and height, the permitted and conditional uses of each zoning type, verbiage, and lighting standards City Staff prepared a survey for current landowners and lessees to express their opinions on items to be addressed with this update. Staff mailed the online survey invitation to property owners and tenants whose property is either currently zoned, or guided for Commercial, Industrial, or Mixed-Use.
2. Minks Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, and Variance (PID 27-119-23-43-0005) (City File 23-025)
Lyndon Minks applied for a preliminary plat, a final plat, and a variance which would allow him to adjust the western lot line of his property at 6925 Old Settlers Road. The Public Hearing for this item was held at the January 4, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. After a brief discussion, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the request, 3:0. Council approved this item at the January 25, 2024, Council Meeting.
3. 3019 Addition Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Preliminary Plat (PID 07-119-23-14-0003) (City File 23-027)
Craig Scherber \& Associates LLC have applied for a Preliminary Plat, Rezoning, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment for a Residential and Commercial Development on the property at PID 07-119-23-14-0003. The application includes 15 commercial lots and 4 single-family residential lots. This item is incomplete for City Review and is not currently scheduled for an upcoming meeting.
4. Hope Community Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Preliminary PUD, Preliminary Plat (PIDs 11-119-23-14-0003, 11-119-23-14-0005, 11-119-23-14-0006, and 11-119-23-11-0012)(City File 23-028).
Hope Community Church submitted application materials for a Preliminary Plat, Preliminary PUD, Rezoning, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment to allow for a mixed-use development around Hope Community Church. The proposed development includes medical offices, retail space, market rate apartments, townhomes, senior villas, and assisted living units. This item is complete for city review and the public hearing has been scheduled for the February 1, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.
5. Khacholing Center Place of Worship CUP (PID 06-119-23-13-0002) (City File 23029)

Lobsang Yeshi \& Nga Thi Ngoc Nguyen, of the Khacholing Center, applied for a Conditional Use Permit to hold regular religious assembly services at 23360 Oakdale Drive. This item is incomplete for City review and is not currently scheduled for any upcoming meetings.
6. Pioneer Trail Industrial Park Final Plat \& Final PUD (PID 32-119-23-43-0005, 32-119-23-43-0006, 32-119-23-43-0013)(City File 23-030).
Contour Development LLC has applied for a Final Plat and a Final PUD at 6210 Pioneer Trail. The application consists of 0 lots and 3 outlots. This application is incomplete for City review and is not currently scheduled for any upcoming meetings.
7. Lister Garage CUP (PID 32-119-23-21-0007) (City File 23-031).

J Brothers Design, Build, and Remodel has applied for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of an accessory structure with sidewalls that exceed 10 feet in height in the front yard of 23615 Julie Ann Drive. This item is complete for City Review and the Public Hearing for this item is scheduled for the February 1, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting.
8. Tavera 6 Final Plat \& Final PUD (PID 35-119-23-11-0003) (City File 23-032).

Lennar submitted application materials for the Final Plat and Final PUD for Tavera $6^{\text {th }}$ Addition, and staff is reviewing the materials for completeness. If complete, this item is tentatively scheduled for Council review during the February 22, 2024, Regular Meeting.
9. Woodland Hills Preliminary Plat, Rezone, \& Variance (PID 36-119-23-33-0010, 36-119-23-330003, 36-119-23-33-0007) (City File 23-033).
Woodland Hills of Corcoran, Inc. \& Gonyea Company submitted application materials for a Preliminary Plat, Rezoning, and a Variance to develop 60 single family lots on the northeast corner of the Hackamore Road and County Road 116 intersection. The proposal is to create 60 detached single-family lots, 1 amenity lot, and 5 outlots on a 36.74-acre site. Council provided informal feedback to the applicant's concept plan (Northeast Hackamore 116 Concept Plan) during the July 27, 2023, Regular Meeting. This item is complete for City review and is tentatively scheduled for March $7^{\text {th }}$ Planning Commission with City Council review anticipated on March $28^{\text {th }}$.
10. Chastek Farm Preliminary Plat, Preliminary PUD, Rezoning (PID 25-119-23-12-0002) (City File 23-034).
Trek Real Estate \& Development, Inc. submitted an application for a Preliminary Plat, Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD), and Rezoning of the Chastek Farm located at 7600 Maple Hill Road. The request is to allow the development of 117 single family lots on the 38.16-acre site. 101 of these lots would have a width of 55 feet, and the remaining 16 would have a width of 65 feet. This item is still being reviewed for completeness and is not currently scheduled for any upcoming meetings.

## MEMO

| Meeting Date: | February 1,2024 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Planning Commission |
| From: | Michelle Fredrich |
| Re: | City Council Report |

The Planning Commission last met on January 4, 2024. The following is a recap of some of the items discussed at City Council meetings since that time. A full recap can be found by reviewing the approved City Council minutes on the website.

## January 3, 2024, Council Work Session Meeting

- Review Mission, Vision, Values, and Core Strategies
- Council and staff reviewed 2023 short term goals and strategies and reestablished measurables for 2024.


## January 11, 2024, Council Meeting

- 2022 Audit
- Approved the Draft 2022 Audit Report, Final Report to be presented by Abdo at the January 25, 2024, Council Meeting.
- City Park Ice Rink Direction
- Council directed staff to open the Ice Rinks dependent upon weather with limited operations. Rink was open for a week and had to close due to inclement weather.
- North Pioneer Society Request for Assistance - Burschville School
- Approved funding assistance for foundation and floor repair for an amount not to exceed \$15,000.
- 2023 Year in Review
- Council accepted Year in Review as presented and requested more information from each department for the 2024 Year in Review.


## January 25, 2024, Council Meeting

- Planning Commissioner Jon Horn Resignation.
- Approved resignation of Commissioner Jon Horn from the Planning Commission.
- Hennepin County CSAH 19 \& CR 117 HSIP Letter of Support.
- Approved a resolution supporting Hennepin County 2024 Highway Safety Improvements program application for the intersection of CSAH 19 \& CR 117.
- Authorize 2024 Road Materials
- Authorized staff to obtain quotes for various road materials.
- Holiday Toy and Food Drive - Budget and Date Selection
- Approved for 2024 and requested itemized cost analysis of the program.
- Parks and Trails Commission Reappointment
- Approved the reappointment of Commissioner Nybo and Commissioner Strehler to the Parks and Trails Commission.
- Charter Commission Reappointment
- Approved the reappointment of Commissioner Tilbury to the Charter Commission.
- Recruitment \& Retention Policy
- Reviewed \& Approved Recruitment and Retention Policy for immediate implementation, with the added language that employees must remain employed with the City six months after receiving a wellness reimbursement.
- Review Process for Planning/Development: Flow Chart
- Reviewed the Planning/Development Flow Chart and suggested a "napkin" application for early conceptual projects and suggested the addition of indication for steps in the process that are out of the City's control.
- 2022 Audit Reports
- Approved the 2022 Audit Report as presented.
- NE Water Supply Infrastructure Improvements - Environmental Assessment Notice
- Approved NE Water Supply Infrastructure Improvements as presented and directed staff to post the Environmental Assessment Notice.
- State Pay Equity Report
- Approved the pay equity report as presented and directed staff to post the required notice. If the State finds a discrepancy in the report, Council will renew and direct staff to post the required notices.

