



December 29, 2016

SAS Architects and Planners, LLC  
ATTN: James Moyer  
630 Dundee Road, Suite 110  
Northbrook, IL 60062

RE: 8100 Highwood Drive – Friendship Village Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, Preliminary Development Plan, Final Development Plan, Rezoning and Comprehensive Plan Amendment application

Dear Mr. Moyer:

On December 21, 2016, you submitted applications for a Preliminary and Final Plat, Preliminary and Final Development Plan, Rezoning, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment for proposed development located at Friendship Village of Bloomington (8100 and 8210 Highwood Drive, Bloomington, MN). I have reviewed the applications in accordance with State Statutes to determine whether they contain all information required by law or by a previously adopted rule, ordinance, or policy. As submitted, except for the Comprehensive Plan amendment application, the applications do not contain all such information. This letter serves as notice regarding the following missing information:

- 1) As determined by the Issuing Authority, the application must include a parking study of the existing and proposed development (Sections 21.301.06(e)(5) and 21.501.02(f)(5)). Study focus will include whether or not there is enough parking supply proposed to effectively serve total site parking demand. The study would be completed by an independent consultant under City management. Please contact Jen Desrude at 952-563-4862 or [jdesrude@bloomingtonmn.gov](mailto:jdesrude@bloomingtonmn.gov) to further discuss the process. Previous parking flexibility was granted on the site based on the assumption that additional land was available to construct additional parking if needed. The proposed development removed a large portion of the available land that could be utilized to construct additional parking. Based on the proposed intensification of the site, the assumed level of parking flexibility needed, and the conditions under which past parking flexibility were granted, the City deems it necessary to require a parking study of the project site to confidently evaluate any requests for overall parking flexibility.
- 2) To complete the parking study and to properly calculate the parking requirement for the site, for the purpose of informing the updated Preliminary Development Plan, please identify the parking requirement by use and/or building in tabular form for the whole site including any office uses, meeting facilities or social rooms used for resident events or gatherings. The amount or supply of parking (both existing and proposed) is well documented. However, the updated Preliminary Development Plan must document the

parking requirement for all the existing and proposed uses per Section 21.301.06(d) of the City Code. Providing this information is particularly important for this specific site, as flexibility for parking was previously approved through multiple applications.

- 3) The required parking quantity calculations do not appear to include party/meeting room space. Per Section 21.301.06(d)(1) of the City Code, party rooms within senior citizen housing require 1 parking stall per 100 square feet of party room space. Please include these facilities (existing facilities included) in your parking calculation.
- 4) Beyond the number of residents, the City Code (Section 301.501.02(f)(3)(F)) requires the anticipated employment be provided. The number should include total employment for the entire site, which was not included in the submittal documents.
- 5) Per Section 21.501.01(f)(5)(Z) of the City Code, utility plans must show existing and proposed water lines and facilities on and adjacent to the site with pipe type and sizes, fire hydrant locations and Fire Department connections for the entire site. The utility plans are incomplete for the existing site.
- 6) The Preliminary and Final Development Application must include building elevation drawings for all building elevations (north, south, east, west, etc.) for both of the buildings proposed (Section 21.501.02(f)(4)(O)(i)). Only one elevation for each building was provided.
- 7) Per Section 21.501.02(f)(3)(B) of the City Code, the written documentation must include any flexibility requests by identifying all proposed Code deviations across the Planned Development, the level of deviation and the reasons why the deviations are in the public interest. You have identified the parking setback reduction on the west although did not provide any reasons why it would be in the public interest. A similar deviation is needed to the north and south as well. Parking quantity should also be identified as a deviation, again with reasons for why it is in the public interest. If there are no additional deviations requested (height, setback, landscaping, lighting, etc.), please affirm that in the narrative. At first glance, it appears the independent living building does not meet the height requirement on the west. Please see 21.301.10(f) (Step Back from Residential Standards) for more information. In addition, the building height is from the lowest natural grade. I would assume that is on the south side of the four story building, which is not shown on the plan.
- 8) No Final Plat document, with accompanying easements, was received. Please submit a final plat document per Section 22.06(f)(3) of the City Code.
- 9) There is a condominium plat for a portion of the site. Will this plat remove the existing condominium plat? This is not clear. For Preliminary Plats, the Code (Section 22.05(f)(1)(D)(v)) requires a correct legal description according to the official Hennepin County records, title under which proposed plat is to be recorded with names and addresses of owners, notation stating acreage, scale, north arrow, datum, benchmarks, certification of Registered Land Surveyor licensed in Minnesota, and date of survey.
- 10) The Rezoning application should make reference in the written documents to extending the Planned Development (PD) Overlay District over the entirety of the site (Section 19.13).

Because the applications (except for the Comprehensive Plan amendment application) do not include all information required by law or by a previously adopted rule, ordinance, or policy, we cannot formally accept them or begin to process them at this time. Pursuant to Minnesota Statute

15.99, I have attached the incomplete applications and am returning them to you. We will return the application fee for incomplete applications to you under a separate cover. In accordance with State Statutes, the time limit for agency action will not begin until all required information is submitted.

Regarding the Comprehensive Plan amendment application, please let me know in writing as soon as possible whether you prefer to have that application continue on its own or whether you prefer to withdraw that application and resubmit with the related applications so that they all track together. There are advantages to keeping all related applications together including fewer public meetings, consolidated notices and fewer packets to prepare and track.

Should you have any questions regarding this action, please contact me at [nmjohnson@BloomingtonMN.gov](mailto:nmjohnson@BloomingtonMN.gov) or at (952) 563-8925.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nick Johnson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nick Johnson, Planner

cc: Brian Devlin, Litespace DG, LLC  
Pat Gleason, Greystone Communities  
Jon Lindstrom, SAS Architects and Planners, LLC  
Daniel Martin, SAS Architects and Planners, LLC  
Ryan Blum, Westwood