

## Ken Roberts

---

**From:** Michael Bent  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2019 8:42 AM  
**To:** Ken Roberts  
**Cc:** Greg Malmquist  
**Subject:** Continental Concept review comments

Ken,

I have had an opportunity to review the concept plan submitted for the Continental Apartments project.

These comments are limited in scope due to the limited information provided in the plans submitted by the applicant. Please do not interpret these comments as inclusive of all requirements necessary as these plans are inadequate for performing any substantive review.

Comments as follows:

1. This site appears to be very tight and emergency vehicle access is important to all areas of the site. No dimensions are provided on the plans but it is obvious to me that there will be limited emergency vehicle access to many locations around the rear of many of these buildings. These buildings will require fire sprinkler protection to NFPA 13 standards as opposed to NFPA 13R systems due to the limited access to all points of the buildings proposed.
2. Emergency vehicle access will be necessary at all drive lanes including turn radius requirements throughout.
3. The proposed concept plan proposes only one entrance/exit from the site. The site will require a second entrance/exit be provided for emergency purposes. Applicant can propose an emergency access only gated type access that meets the requirements of the fire code for emergency apparatus access and access ability as approved by the fire chief.
4. The proposed gated main entry shall have emergency personnel and vehicle access as approved by the fire chief.
5. There are no utility plans provided, in the absence of utility plans, all water lines and hydrant locations shall meet the city requirements. Fire protection water flow requirements for each structures fire protection needs and hydrant water flow requirements shall be met as required.
6. All areas where fire hydrants are to be placed in the vicinity of parking stalls, clear access shall remain as required by the fire code and fire chief, this will likely result in a reduction in the number of parking stalls than is proposed. This could also include the proposed and required number of accessible handicap stalls.
7. Parking appears to extremely tight and a very clear plan moving forward regarding tenant and guest parking requirements needs to be addressed before any approvals are completed.
8. Proposed central garbage and recycling areas appear to be limited and inadequate for a facility of this size.
9. All required accessible areas and routes shall comply with the provisions outlined in the Minnesota Accessibility code.
10. I am presuming the city Engineer is addressing the access issue along Hudson Boulevard including the need for turn lanes and safe access in and out of the main entry.

As outlined, these comments are based on the concept renderings provided and should not be considered all inclusive. Detailed and scaled plans including utility plans with fire hydrant and water main sizing and locations, accessibility overview and revised proof of parking in concert with the required emergency apparatus access requirements and hydrant locations will be necessary before any actual review and approval for this project and site can be completed.

Please let me know if you have any questions on my comments.