

5.04 Review Landscape and Storm Water Management Plan Associated with a Site Plan Application for Sunwood Village: Case of Common Bond

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report.

Chairperson Stodola asked if they would be sharing the ramp.

City Planner Anderson replied that the access points will be shared.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that there is on-site parking.

Board Member Lewis inquired if it was all surface parking.

Community Development Director Gladhill responded affirmatively.

Chairperson Stodola asked if there is enough parking.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that the type of floor plan and income levels were considered. This project would likely be more one car households so it would meet the minimum of one stall per unit.

City Planner Anderson stated that there is visitor parking a half a block away that is not overnight parking for guests.

Board Member Lewis commented that this plan was well thought out and robust and that he was impressed. He doesn't have a problem with it and felt that it was more innovative and detailed than the previous proposal.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that this project did receive \$580,000 in funding from the Metropolitan Council.

Board Member Lewis stated that this is the kind of project and plan that should be looked at for the Eco Star Award.

City Council Liaison LeTourneau spoke to the Staff regarding the contrast between the two cases and how the Board is appreciative of complete picture. He asked how likely is it that the Board can ask developers to provide more complete plans in the future.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that this is something the Staff strives to achieve. He spoke about project deadlines and said that historically the City has tried to give some contingent recommendations and revisit them. If the Board feels that the information in the last case was not enough, then Staff should know and then they can go back to the developer. He stated that if it is the Board's wish to have the kind of detail found in this project, Staff will make sure they provide it without delaying projects. Staff can work with code to provide the desired level of detail.

Board Member Valentine would like to support the Staff. He talked about the huge contrast between the cases. He felt that the Parkview East case was close to the line of not be developed enough. He would like to support the Staff to be able to go back to developers to get more fully developed plans.

City Council Liaison LeTourneau stated that he doesn't think it is the Board intention to push developers away by setting too high a standard.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that the Parkview East case warrants pursuing additional details and that the City can commit to a smooth process if they are provided with detail.

Chairperson Stodola asked about the timeframe of the projects.

Community Development Director Gladhill replied that the City tries to provide approval 45 days from the date the application is received. Some cases do take longer depending on complexity.

Motion by Board Member Bernard and seconded by Board Member Lewis to move forward with the project.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Stodola, Board Member Bernard, Lewis, Hiatt, and Valentine. Voting No: None. Absent: Board Member Bentz.