



Development Review Committee

Approved Minutes

Development Application, #PL2017-72

Mtg Date: 05/23/2017

McLeod Conference Room

Bloomington Civic Plaza

1800 West Old Shakopee Road

Staff Present:

Laura McCarthy (Fire Prev, Chair) 952-563-8965
Lance Stangohr (Fire Prev) 952-563-8969
Randy Quale (Park & Rec) 952-563-8876
Duke Johnson (Bldg. & Insp) 952-563-8959
Shelly Hanson (Eng) 952-563-4866
Bruce Bunker (Eng.) 952-563-4546
Steve Segar (Eng/Water Res.) 952-563-4533

Jen Blumers (Assessing) 952-563-4749
Jessica Jutz (Env. Health) 952-563-4525
Nick Johnson (Planning) 952-563-8925
Glen Markegard (Planning) 952-563-8923
Mike Hiller (Planning) 952-563-4507
Sara Flagstad (Eng.) 952-563-4627
Eric Wharton (Utilities) 952-563-4579
Amy Schmidt (Legal) 952-563-4889

Project Information:

Project	Friendship Village Health Center and Residential Expansion
Site Address	8100 Highwood Drive and 8210 Highwood Drive
Plat Name	FRIENDSHIP VILLAGE; HIGHWOOD PROPERTIES ADDITION
Project Description	Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Preliminary and Final Plat, Preliminary and Final Development Plan, and Conditional Use Permit for an expansion of the Friendship Village senior living community to construct a new health center and 96-unit independent residential living building
Application Types	Comprehensive Plan Amendment Rezoning Preliminary Plat – Type III Final Plat – Type III Preliminary Development Plan Final Development Plan Conditional use permit
Staff Contact	Nick Johnson; nmjohnson@bloomingtonmn.gov 952-563-8925
Applicant Contact	Brian Devlin, Lifespace Communities Inc, brian.devlin@lifespacecommunities.com 515-309-7803 Jon Lindstrom, SAS Architects, jlindstrom@sasarch.com 847-564-8333 Ext 243
PC (tentative)	06/29/2017
CC (tentative)	07/24/2017

Guests Present:

Name	Email
Paul Carlsted, Kraus Anderson	Paul.carlsted@krausanderson.com
Jacob Steen, Larkin Hoffman	jsteen@larkinhoffman.com
James Moyer, SAS Architects & Planners	moyer@sasarch.com
Ryan Bluhm, Westwood	ryan.bluhm@westwoods.com
Patrick Gleason, Greystone	pgleason@greystonecommunities.com
Jon Lindstrom, SAS Architects & Planners	jlindstrom@sasarch.com

Introduction:

- Nick Johnson (Planning): Nick Johnson introduced the project as a comprehensive plan amendment to reguide a portion of the property from Office to High Density Residential, rezoning the subject properties from R-1 and R-1 (PD) to RM-50(PD), preliminary and final plat, preliminary and final development plan, and conditional use permit for an expansion of the Friendship Village senior living community to construct a new health center and 96-unit independent residential living building. The project consists of the removal of two existing buildings and the construction of a new health center which includes a memory care, assisted living, and skilled nursing components. (42 assisted living beds, 66 skilled nursing beds, 32 memory care beds) Overall there is a 22 unit increase on the portion of the site. The new health center building is proposed to be 192,115 square feet which includes an underground parking garage and a total of three stories in height.
- The independent living building is proposed to be 200,719 square feet with 94 units and a height of four stories. The result would fill in approximately 36 percent of the existing wetland pond on the site. The building will be linked via a skyway connection to the existing dining and other services and would also have underground parking.
- Parking improvements on the site will increase overall by 162 spaces, with 66 net new surface parking stalls. Existing parallel stalls will be removed. A total 94 underground stalls will be provided. A parking study has been completed by Alliant Engineering.
- Jake Steen added that in September of 2016 preliminary talks began with the City regarding this expansion. During the informal DRC meeting in December they learned the proposed level of development could only be allowed if the site were rezoned to at least RM-50 due to the scale of the project being proposed. They also learned they needed to complete a parking study for the project. Since that time, steps have been taken to educate staff and City Council of the project details through meetings and by inviting Council members out to the site. Engagement of current residents and the surrounding community/neighbors also has taken place by using informational meetings. He stated they look forward to hearing feedback from staff regarding this application.

Discussion/Comments:

- Randy Quale (Park and Recreation):
 - No Comment.
- Jen Blumers (Assessing):
 - Park dedication fees will need to be calculated and collected due to the platting of the property. An estimate amount cannot yet be calculated until addition information is provided. The calculated amount will be delivered through Nick Johnson.
 - Asked for clarification on what is happening to the existing skilled nursing building after residents are relocated to the new building. A representative stated the existing skilled nursing building will be changed to provide some more dining venues since we are increasing the residential living by 94 apartments. Looking for more amenities since there will be more residents. Details haven't been settled yet, but that is conceptually what we are planning on doing.
 - Asked for more information on square footage of what is being built versus what is being demolished.
 - Clarified the independent living building will be classified as apartments.
- Jessica Jutz (Environmental Health):
 - Requested plans of the kitchen area of the new proposed building and clarified there is not going to be a pool in the health center building.
 - The memory care unit must meet the Lodging Code so we will need the spacing information.

- Clarified the health care center building will have its own kitchen and will provide food and dining for all residents within the health center and dining venue.
- Clarified the new independent living building will not have a kitchen and its residents will be served in the main dining room.
- Clarified a portion of the existing skilled nursing facility will be converted into another dining venue.
- Duke Johnson (Building and Inspection):
 - Please set up a preliminary plan review code meeting which will include the architect and contractor with B/I when ready.
- Laura McCarthy (Fire Prevention):
 - Access and water supply are the two main points of interest for Fire.
 - Emergency vehicle access around the 4 story building is critical. .
 - Grass Crete is not a good option in MN due to winter conditions. .
 - Proposed new access point on Highwood Drive would help with access if it's permanent. Details would need to be worked out including clear view triangle issues. McCarthy stated if the access where to remain, Fire would like to see it have no barriers (gates, bollards, etc.). This issue should be included in a side meeting discussion.
 - Note for architect: Travel distance for exits is 250 feet and standpipe hose valves is 200 feet.
 - Asked for clarification on what the plan is when removing the existing skilled nursing building and what will be done with the residents during that time. An applicant representative explained only a portion of the existing skilled nursing building will be demolished. The new health center building will be constructed first (phase I) and, once completed, residents from the existing building will be transferred to the new building. Once the residents are in the new building, the demo of the rest of the existing building will occur and the construction of phase II will begin.
 - Kitchen fire suppression system is required to be connected to the building sprinkler system, Fire will work with you with the details.
 - If receiving federal funding for the skilled nursing facility, there will be a separate State Fire Marshal Inspector involved during final inspections.
 - Engineering will provide auto turn dimensions for Ladder 4. A minimum of a 20 feet wide plowable surface must be provided around the facility
 -
- Heidi Miller (Police):
 - Miller was not present but relayed the following comment to be included. Wayfinding during construction must be addressed. An applicant representative stated they will be developing a site logistics plan to help with wayfinding during construction. McCarthy asked the representative to route the plan to Nick Johnson who will share it with other City staff.
 - Residential Care facilities building security systems must be approved by the Bloomington Police Department.
- Eric Wharton/Tim Kampa (Utilities):
 - Access completely around the Phase 2 building.
 - Fire hydrant need to be strategically placed to cover south and east of phase 2 building and all the gaps. Watersupply should be looped to include coverage around the phase 2 building.
 - Discourage storm drainage and sanitary sewer (sleeving) under both buildings phase 2 buildings.
 - Storm sewer placement may conflict with building expansion and may be encroaching into existing building footprint.
 - Water supply looping needs to be checked for overall hydraulic capacity.
 - Hydrant locations cover a 150 foot radius. Flow tests should be conducted to determine if adequate pressure is available to cover the additional demands at the site.
 - Would like to see a combined domestic and fire service entering the buildings.
 - Metering and risers within the building be located within 10 feet of the exterior of the building (mechanical room sited directly adjacent to exterior wall of building).

- Portico is shown directly over sanitary sewer, needs to be corrected.
- Provide valves for system isolation and for building isolation without shutting down supply to hydrants (longest interval cannot exceed 400 feet).
- Valving separation issues.
- Minimum 25 year storm event must be taken into consideration for any parking spaces.
- Add in exterior grease interceptor on civil plan.
- SAC determination is required.
- Shelly Hanson (Engineering)
 - Please see comment summary for details, highlighted following:
 - Move all retaining walls so they are completely on private property (including tiebacks) and are not within drainage and utility easements or right of way areas. If not entirely on your property, please provide signed agreements to the City.
 - Site lines of drivers/pedestrians must be maintained near the entrances to the campus. Any signage/landscaping must not interfere with site lines to ensure public safety.
 - Six feet wide sidewalks are recommended to allow for wheelchairs to pass one another.
 - A signage and pavement markings must be MMUTCD compliant see Traffic Review comment summary #5 for details).
- Bruce Bunker (Engineering)
 - Vacate the underlying existing easements.
 - Any retaining walls will need an encroachment agreement if placed in public easements or right of way.
 - To use other owner's properties for construction staging, agreements must be in place with the appropriate property owners. Shelly Hanson added since the staging area will likely be in place for an extended period of time and will be highly visible, Council will likely want to have in place a staging plan to ensure nearby residents and park users concerns will be addressed.
 - If there is no public water going to the pond or infiltration basin there is no drainage and utility easement needed over them.
 - Property needs to be platted before foundation and building permits can be issued.
- Steve Segar (Engineering – Water Resources)
 - Provide Wetland Mitigation Plan, sequencing, alternatives, etc., Restoration of temporary impacts.
 - Concern that City has not seen detailed plans/options considered that show the impacts to the wetland are being minimized. Hanson added plans need to be submitted to show your plan to drain the portion of the pond you intend to fill.
 - Two feet above 100 year HWL = 849.21 for lowest floor elevation.
 - Make sure the underground storage/stormwater systems have pretreatment and sediment maintenance.
 - Hanson stated the redline plans have a number of comments on them to add details to the plan sheets.
 - Applicant representative stated the sheet piling that is planning on being used to drain the portion of the pond may or may not be removed once the project is completed. The face would likely be clad if it remains.
- Amy Schmidt (Legal)
 - No comment.
- Nick Johnson (Planning):
 - Please see comment summary sheet for details and note the following:
 - Rezoning the site from R-1 and R-1(PD) to RM-50(PD) does not match the stated intent of the RM-50 zoning district. RM-50 is meant for sites that are well served by public transit and are near areas of employment. The adjacency of single-family residential uses also calls into question rezoning to RM-50. Staff acknowledges the unique amenities and services offered within the Friendship Village senior living community. Staff believes RM- 24 would be a better fit for this location.

- Additional information must be provided about whether the existing skilled nursing wing proposed to be vacated will be demolished. Previous conversations with the project team about the future of the existing skilled nursing wing have not been clear. Future use of the wing has implications related to the future parking requirements and FAR calculations.
- See Planning Review comment #3 regarding FAR. Applicant representative stated calculations and different scenarios have been run and the project cannot meet the FAR requirements for the RM-24 zoning district and for this reason, they are requesting RM-50.
- Staff acknowledges the proposed building mass and height of the independent residential building has been moderately reduced at the southeast corner, stepping down to a two-story building. However, it must be noted recent comparable multi-family residential projects adjacent to single-family residential dwellings in Bloomington have resulted in greater reductions in building mass and height. Given precedents established by recent multi-family residential projects in proximity to single-family residential, staff is concerned about the building height proposed adjacent to the east property line.
- The applicants are proposing to fill approximately 36 percent of a medium value wetland. A Wetland Replacement Plan must be approved by the City Council prior to review and approval of Final Development Plans. Staff is concerned about the timing of the public review of the Final Development Plans prior to the approval of the Wetland Replacement Plan. The feasibility of the project as proposed is dependent on the outcome of the Wetland Replacement Plan.
- According to the Wetland Conservation Act, the filling and modification of wetlands is only to be considered when no other alternatives exist on-site. In addition, Nine Mile Creek Watershed rules require that minimum buffers be provided for the wetland. The required wetland buffers will not be met with the submitted plans. Based on the size and nature of the wetland impacts proposed, staff is concerned about potential future environmental and stormwater management impacts in this area. There are many factors pertaining to the wetland that are presently unknown, (including a possible variance for wetland buffer from the watershed district) making the feasibility of the project as proposed unclear at this time.
- The RM-50 building material requirements limit cement fiber to a secondary material status (max 15%) on each building elevation. As proposed, there are multiple building elevations that exceed the maximum amount of secondary materials permitted. (Note that RM-24 standards allow its use as a primary material)
- The extent of tree removal adjacent to single-family residential uses reduces the existing screen and buffer. These removals are concerning to staff. Staff would like to see tree removals adjacent to single-family minimized.
- Details in the plans provided are not adequate to complete the necessary review. Staff is scheduling the Planning Commission public hearing for June 29, 2017. The scheduling change is necessary to allow time for the applicant to submit the Wetland Replacement Plan and to resubmit plans addressing review comments. Staff requests the revised plans addressing the review comments be submitted to staff by June 8, 2017 to allow staff enough time to review the plans and prepare a report for Planning Commission.
- Glen Markegard (Planning)
 - Clarified the applicant is not intending on construction staging materials inside the campus. Applicant representative stated they intend to limit the staging to and will request the approval to use the right-of-way area owned by the City and acknowledged there is not room within the campus for construction staging.
 - Noted an odor control system will be necessary to mitigate food preparation odors. This is a standard condition of approval when applying for a conditional use permit.
 - Markegard summarized the more significant staff concerns: impact to wetland, lack of buffer around wetland, lack of a fire lane on the south side of the four-story building, not meeting the intent of the RM-50 zoning district, the relationship of the four-story building to single-family

residential not being consistent with recent Bloomington multi-family approvals, and the removal of trees along the east side of the site.

- Markegard stated there are options on the site to mitigate many of the staff concerns. Staff is happy to continue working with the applicants to address these concerns. Markegard stated the applicant discussed a plan early last week at the wetland meeting that addressed many of the concerns staff has raised today. Markegard stated the City would like to keep an open dialog with the applicants to continue working on these issues
- appropriate MMUTCD references for signs proposed for site traffic. All private signage must be installed outside of the city right-of-way.
- Applicant Representative
 - Asked staff to comment with regard to the requested RM-50 zoning district on whether the Friendship Village community is different or unique as the community is self-contained with its own shuttle service, fitness center, dining areas and activities areas. Markegard stated these amenities are a definite benefit to residents, but the RM-50 zoning district stated intent for proximity to mass transit is to improve access to those wanting to visit the site such as employees and visitors. Steen stated they believe their campus is unique because of the amenities they offer when compared to other multi-family residential sties, but will continue to work with staff to address the issues.
 - Wetland Replacement Plan is challenging from our perspective. We cannot submit a Wetland Replacement Plan until we know what the City is going to approve from a site plan building scenario. Asked if the City would be open to a phased plan. Markegard stated the City is open to phasing the approvals for the project. Markegard added most of the concerns are with the second phase of the proposed project although there were minor issues discussed that related to the first phase especially with regard to the utilities. Applicant representative stated the first phase of this project financially requires the second phase to be completed making phased approvals problematic. Markegard stated the City Code does not allow the approval of Final Development Plan before the Wetland Replacement Plan is approved by City Council.

McCarthy stated these issues will have to be dealt with in side meetings as they are not meant to be worked out in this forum. The meeting was adjourned.



Comment Summary

Application #: PL201700072

Address: 8210 and 8100 Highwood Drive, Bloomington, MN 55438

Request: **Comprehensive Plan Amendment to reguide the subject property from Office to High Density Residential, Rezoning the subject properties form R-1(PD) to RM-50(PD), Preliminary and Final Plat, Preliminary and Final Development Plan, and Conditional Use Permit for an expansion of the Friendship Village senior living community to construct a new health center and 96-unit independent residential living building.**

Meeting: Post Application DRC - May 23, 2017

Planning Commission - June 29, 2017 (Change – see planning comment #33)

City Council - July 24, 2017 (projected)

Planning Review Contact: Nick Johnson at nmjohnson@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-8925

- 1) Rezoning the site from R-1(PD) to RM-50(PD) does not match the stated intent of the RM-50 zoning district. RM-50 is meant for sites that are well served by public transit and are near areas of employment. The adjacency of single-family residential uses also calls into question rezoning to RM-50. Staff acknowledges the unique amenities and services offered within the Friendship Village senior living community. Staff believes RM-24 would be a better fit for this location.
- 2) Additional information must be provided about whether the existing skilled nursing wing proposed to be vacated will be demolished. Previous conversations with the project team about the future of the existing skilled nursing wing have not been clear. The future use of the existing skilled nursing wing have implications related to future parking requirements and floor area ratio (FAR) calculations.
- 3) The floor area ratio (FAR) proposed is 0.64. Per the institutional use standards (Sec. 21.302.06), the FAR proposed necessitates the rezoning of the property to RM-50. Staff is wondering if the project team has considered removing the existing skilled nursing wing that is proposed to be vacated in order to lower the FAR to 0.6 or below. With PD flexibility, 0.6 is the maximum that would be allowed under the RM-24 zoning district. Has the project team completed FAR calculations for alternative scenarios that would remove portions of the Friendship Village facility that are to be vacated?
- 4) Staff acknowledges that the proposed building mass and height of the independent residential living building has been moderately reduced at the southeast corner, stepping down to a two-story building. However, it must be noted that recent multi-family residential projects adjacent to single-family residential dwellings have resulted in greater reductions in building mass and height. Given precedents established by recent multi-family residential projects in proximity to single-family residential, staff is concerned about the building height proposed adjacent to the east property line.

- 5) The applicants are proposing to fill approximately 36% of a medium value wetland. A Wetland Replacement Plan must be approved by the City Council prior to review and approval of Final Development Plans. Staff is concerned about the timing of the public review of the Final Development Plans prior to the approval of the Wetland Replacement Plan. The feasibility of the project as proposed is dependent on the outcome of the Wetland Replacement Plan.
- 6) According to the Wetland Conservation Act, the filling and modification of wetlands is only to be considered when no other alternatives exist on-site. In addition, Nine Mile Creek Watershed District rules require that minimum buffers be provided for the wetland. The required wetland buffers are presently not provided with the submitted plans. Based on the size and nature of the wetland impacts proposed, staff is concerned about potential future environmental and stormwater management impacts in this area. There are many factors pertaining to the wetland that are presently unknown, making the feasibility of the project as proposed unclear at this time.
- 7) In the RM-50 zoning district, cement fiber siding is only permitted as a secondary building material. Per Section 19.63.08 of the City Code, secondary building materials are limited to 15% of total area for each individual building elevation. As proposed, there are multiple building elevations that exceed the maximum amount of secondary materials permitted. Staff recommends that the applicant submit calculations of the building materials on each elevation should substantial amount of secondary materials be proposed. The exterior materials of both the health center and residential living building must comply with Section 19.63.08(c)(1) of the City Code.
- 8) Submit a copy of Nine Mile Creek Watershed District permit and comments prior to issuance of City of Bloomington permits (www.ninemilecreek.org)
- 9) Institutional structures require a 50-foot setback from single-family residential uses (Sec. 21.302.06(b)(5)).
- 10) A Code-compliant amount of trees and shrubs is proposed.
- 11) The extent of tree removal adjacent to single family residential uses reduces the existing screen and buffer. These removals are concerning to staff. Staff would like to see tree removals adjacent to Single Family minimized.
- 12) Perimeter screening that complies with Section 19.52(d)(2) of the City Code must be demonstrated or provided.
- 13) Retaining walls over 4 feet in height require principle structure setback and must be designed by a civil engineer.
- 14) Along TH 169, Code requires a 20-foot landscape yard. Due to the presence of the sound wall, staff is supportive of a deviation to reduce the parking setback to 5 feet.
- 15) The requested parking deviation is 9.9% of the total quantity required by City Code. Alliant Engineering completed a parking study dated May 16, 2017 for the proposed development. The parking study concludes that the parking supply is sufficient if the underground parking is sufficiently utilized.
- 16) All signage must be consistent with Article X, Sign Regulations, of the City Code.

- 17) Drive aisles adjacent to 90 degree parking must be 24 feet wide.
- 18) Standard 90 degree parking stalls must be 9 feet x 18 feet.
- 19) A building security system must be approved by the Bloomington Police Department per Section 21.302.23(d)(3)(E) of the City Code.
- 20) Kitchen equipment must be approved by the Environmental Health division. Fire suppression must be provided per the Fire Code.
- 21) Trash and recycling facilities must comply with Section 19.51 of the City Code and the MN State Building Code.
- 22) Lighting plan is not Code compliant. Light levels for the parking areas must be maintained at 1.0 FC except for the perimeter 25 feet (along the property line) which must be maintained at 0.5 FC. See Section 21.301.07.
- 23) Please see Section 21.301.07 for lighting requirements at all entrances. Primary entrance lighting of 5.0 FC within 5 feet of the door. The site is deficient in some areas.
- 24) Existing parking lots are required to meet the minimum light levels no later than December 31, 2020. It may be beneficial to make the improvements now or plans for the new lighting accordingly. Section 21.301.07
- 25) Show all light levels for all fixtures. Many light levels are not shown on the plan. The BB3 light has light levels which appear to exceed the allowed 0.5 FC at the property line. The BB3 does not appear to have a back shield option.
- 26) Code requires minimum lighting for the indoor parking garages. This site is required 3.0 FC anywhere on the parking surface except for the perimeter 25 feet of the garage is 1.5 FC maintained). The entrance must also have 25 FC within 35 feet from the access door. See Section 21.301.07
- 27) The LED lights proposed require LM-80, LM-79 and IN-SITU reports be provided for review.
- 28) All residential zones and lighting within 300 feet of a residential Zone is limited to no more than 30,000 initial lumens per light source and may not be mounted higher than 28 feet. (Sec 31.301.07(c)(12))
- 29) Energy use calculations showing compliance with the Minnesota Energy Code, without exemptions, is required. All parking lots regulated by this Section are considered public parking lots in the Minnesota State Energy Code. (Sec. 21.301.07)
<https://energycode.pnl.gov/COMcheckWeb/>
- 30) City Code requires the installation or replacement of parking lot and access lighting with an efficacy less than 70 lumens per watt for the luminaire. The plan appears to provide lighting with efficiency of less than 70 LPW.
- 31) All lights required for security (as require by the Bloomington Police Department) must be on an alternate circuit or motion dimmer. All other exterior lighting must be illuminated no earlier than one hour before the start of business and must be extinguished no later than one hour after the end of business. (NOTE: IECC requires occupancy dimming, when possible.) (Sec 31.301.07(c)(12))

- 32) A management plan must be provided detailing program operation, staffing, security details, and access control per Section 21.302.23(d)(3)(C) of the City Code.
- 33) Details in the plans provided are not adequate to complete the necessary review. Staff is scheduling the Planning Commission public hearing for June 29th, 2017. The scheduling change is necessary to allow time for the applicant to submit the Wetland Replacement Plan and to resubmit plans addressing review comments. Staff requests that the revised plans addressing the review comments by June 8th, 2017 to allow staff enough time to review the plans and prepare a report for Planning Commission.
- 34) New commercial kitchen facilities require odor control devices, which must be approved by the Environmental Health Division.

Fire Department Review Contact: Laura McCarthy at lmccarthy@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-8965

- 1) Grass-Crete doesn't meet the requirements for emergency access lanes to be maintainable and provide a surface that allows all-weather driving capabilities.
- 2) Minimum 13'6" clearance below link.
- 3) Emergency access road meeting the requirements of the MN State Fire Code required around the entire structure.

Public Works Review Contact: Jen Desrude at jdesrude@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4862

- 1) SHOW GATED AND FENCED.
DRAINAGE AND EROSION PLAN NEEDED.
RESTORATION PLAN (SEE SHEET C301).
- 2) SHOW X-SECTION (SEE SHEET C302).
- 3) HOW WILL THE POND/WETLAND BE PROTECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION?

WILL IT NEED TO BE DRAINED?

FLOOD CONTROL
(SEE SHEET C305)
- 4) ADDITIONAL DETAIL AND CONSTRUCTION METHODS DETAIL WILL BE NEEDED FOR THIS GRADING AREA (SEE SHEET C500).
- 5) PROVIDE X-SECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRUCTION METHOD.
DISCUSS DEWATERING (SEE SHEET C505).
- 6) REROUTE SO THIS IS NOT UNDER THE BUILDING (SEE SHEET C600).
- 7) Retaining walls within public easements will require an easement encroachment agreement.

Utility Review Contact: Jen Desrude at jdesrude@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4862

- 1) See document for several important comments related to the development. The list below may not include all the mark-up comments.
- 2) Private common utility easement/agreement must be provided.
- 3) Encroachment agreement application must be submitted for encroachment in public right-of-way or easements.
- 4) A Minnesota licensed civil engineer must design and sign all civil plans.
- 5) Utility as-builts must be provided prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.
- 6) Use updated city standard details for driveways, utilities, erosion control, etc. found on the website at www.bloomingtonmn.gov/information-sheets-and-handouts-engineering-division
- 7) Show and label all property lines and easements on all plan sheets.
- 8) Utility permits are required for connections to the public storm, sanitary, and water system. Contact Utilities (952-563-8777) for permit information.
- 9) All unused water services must be properly abandoned at the main. All unused sanitary sewer services must be properly abandoned at the property line.
- 10) Contact Met Council (651-602-1378) for Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) determination.
- 11) A minimum 10-foot horizontal separation and 18-inch vertical separation is required between watermain and sewers.
- 12) Provide peak hour and average day water demand and wastewater flow estimates.
- 13) Provide valves for system isolation (longest interval cannot exceed 400 feet) and for building isolation without shutting down supply to hydrants.
- 14) Install hydrants to provide fire protection for entire building. Each hydrant covers 150-foot radius.
- 15) Provide a minimum of 8-feet and a maximum of 10-feet of cover over all water lines, valves, services, etc.
- 16) Use Class 52 DIP water main for pipe 12-inches in diameter and smaller. A minimum 8 mil polywrap is required on all DIP.
- 17) Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) water permit/review may be required. Provide a copy of MDH approval letter or written confirmation from MDH that no permit/approval is required.
- 18) Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) sanitary sewer permit/review may be required. Provide a copy of MPCA approval letter or written confirmation from MPCA that no permit/approval is required.
- 19) An inspection manhole is required on all commercial sewer services.
- 20) Use standard short cone manholes without steps.
- 21) Any new or substantial remodel of a food service facility must provide an exterior grease interceptor and grease interceptor maintenance agreement.

- 22) Install interior chimney seals on all sanitary sewer manholes.
- 23) Taps of live water mains are done by City forces and paid for and coordinated with the Contractor.
- 24) Utility and mechanical contractors must coordinate the installation of all water and sewer service pipes into the building to accommodate city inspection and testing.
- 25) Sanitary sewer mainline, clean-outs, manholes, and services must be designed with adequate depth of cover or install high-density polystyrene insulation to prevent freezing.
- 26) Use schedule 40, SDR 26, or better for PVC sewer services.
- 27) Combination fire and domestic services must terminate with a thread on flange or an MJ to flange adapter.
- 28) All components of the water system, up to the water meter or fire service equipment must utilize protective internal coatings meeting current ANSI/AWWA standards for cement mortar lining or special coatings. The use of unlined or uncoated pipe is not allowed.

Construction/Infrastructure Review Contact: Jen Desrude at jdesrude@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4862

- 1) Restore boulevard areas to preconstruction conditions. Use Bloomington Standard Non-Residential Driveway for proposed driveway.
- 2) Provide TPAR for removed sidewalk during construction.
- 3) Pedestrian Access Ramps near building access.
- 4) Retaining wall details not provided.
- 5) Staging area needs to allow access to manholes.
- 6) Sheet 303 of 40 shows crosswalk marking. Is there marking planned for here? Can't tell if the perpendicular lines are crosswalk or decorative given the one at the south leg of the intersection.
- 7) Move end of wall so not in drainage and utility easement
- 8) Move wall so tiebacks stay on this property and out of easement.
- 9) Move wall so not in easement and tie backs remain on private property and not in MnDOT ROW.
- 10) Move wall so not in easement and tiebacks remain on private property and not in MnDOT ROW.
- 11) Will the color be different enough to use as a crosswalk? Looks very similar to intersection color and may be creating a risk for pedestrians crossing.
- 12) Will need inlet protection given where the construction staging area is proposed.

- 13) Will also need MnDOT permission/agreement to install tiebacks from retaining wall onto public ROW.
- 14) Add notes about regrading/restoring site to existing conditions
- 15) This is a lot of water to drain over the face of the wall. Has consideration been made to swale behind the wall or has the design compensated for the drainage and steep slope?
- 16) Verify that the storm pipe and building foundation don't conflict.
- 17) Verify batter & geo reinforcement stays on private property and out of easements.
- 18) Show 3:1 slope behind wall. Are there provisions needed to handle that type of slope?
- 19) Emergency access road meeting the requirements of the MN State Fire Code required around the entire structure.

Traffic Review Contact: Jen Desrude at jdesrude@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4862

- 1) Demonstrate that this monument sign is outside of the sight line for drivers.
- 2) Verify that the bollard lights meet lighting standards and ADA standards for sidewalk setback
- 3) Monument sign not shown on plan. Is it being removed or already removed. If it is staying in place, demonstrate that sight lines are not blocked at both driveways (both vertical and horizontal).
- 4) Is this driveway for emergency access only? Show signage and dimensions. Check sight lines for the driveway.
- 5) A signage and pavement markings must be MMUTCD compliant. If this is intended to be a marked crosswalk, the markings must be MMUTCD compliant (zebra or longitudinal, retro reflective markings)
- 6) All of the proposed sidewalks on the site appear to be 5' wide. While this meets the FHWA recommended minimum width for Accessible Sidewalks, it should be noted that 6' is needed for wheelchairs to pass on a sidewalk.
- 7) Add Commercial driveway opening detail.
- 8) The details do not clearly identify the difference between notes 2) Accessible dropped ped ramp and 3) Pedestrian curb ramp.
- 9) Include the bike rack details in this section, including all spacing dimensions for installation.
- 10) Show all signs and pavement markings on the plans. Provide appropriate MMUTCD references for signs proposed for site traffic. All private signage must be installed outside of the city right-of-way.

Water Resources Review Contact: Steve Segar at ssegar@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4533

- 1) See document for several important comments related to the development. The list below may not include all the mark-up comments.
- 2) Provide Wetland Mitigation Plan, sequencing, alternatives, etc. Restoration of temporary impacts.
- 3) Label Friendship Village S. Pond on these sheets.
- 4) Avoid compacting soils within infiltration basin.
- 5) Two feet above 100yr HWL = 849.21, for lowest floor elevation.
- 6) Provide floating silt curtain.
- 7) Will underground systems have pretreatment and sediment maintenance?
- 8) A maintenance agreement must be signed by the property owner and recorded at Hennepin County.
- 9) A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction site permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be provided.
- 10) An erosion control bond is required.
- 11) Submit a copy of Nine Mile Creek Watershed District permit and comments prior to issuance of City of Bloomington permits (www.ninemilecreek.org)
- 12) Provide Inlet protection for active storm sewer inlets.

Stormwater Report still under review. Wetland mitigation plan has not been received.

PW Admin Review Contact: Bruce Bunker at bbunker@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-4546

- 1) See plans for comments on needed revisions.
- 2) Right-of-way dedication is required on the final plat.
- 3) If there is no public water going to pond or infiltration basin there is no drainage and utility easement needed over them.
- 4) Need agreement from State and City for staging area in ROW.
- 5) Encroachment agreement application must be submitted for encroachment in public right-of-way or easements. Or move walls out of d/u easements.
- 6) Show and label all property lines and easements on all plan sheets. The dedicated ROW for Hwy 169 in southwest corner of property is not shown on all plan sheets. Landscape plan shows tree planted in ROW area.
- 7) Move landscaping, pond, retaining wall, or other structure out of right-of-way or easement. Retaining walls on west line and on east line are in d/u easements. Will construction and tie backs require easements on MnDOT ROW on the west and private property to the east?
- 8) A title opinion or title commitment that accurately reflects the state of the title of the property being platted, dated within 6 months of requesting City signatures, must be provided.

- 9) Property must be platted per Chapter 22 of the City Code and the approved plat recorded at Hennepin County prior to the issuance of a foundation or building permit.
- 10) Public drainage/utility and easements must be provided on the plat.
- 11) Existing easements may be vacated. Contact Bruce Bunker at 952-563-4546 or bbunker@BloomingtonMN.gov for information regarding the Public Rights-of-Way Vacation Application. It is the responsibility of the developer to determine if private utilities exist in the easement prior to submitting the application. Developer/owner to provide legal description and Engineering staff will prepare vacation document.
- 12) \$15 fee for certified copy of plat. Engineering staff will obtain a certified copy of the plat from Hennepin County.
- 13) Consent to plat form is needed from any mortgage companies with property interest.

Assessing Review Contact: Kent Smith at ksmith@BloomingtonMN.gov, (952) 563-8707

- 1) There will be Park Dedication due to platting of property. We are still trying to determine how much based on demo and re-build. What is happening to existing skilled nursing after it is relocated to new building? Can we get square footages of skilled nursing to be built and that will be demolished? Kent Smith will give the number to Nick Johnson once calculated.