

Approved Minutes
 City of Bloomington
Development Review Committee
February 03, 2015
 City Hall
 1800 W Old Shakopee Rd., Bloomington MN 55420

Staff Present

Laura McCarthy (Fire Prev) – Chair 952-563-8965 Dennis Fields (Planning) 952-563-8925
 Mark Reichel (Assessing) 952-563-4644 Eric Wharton (Utilities) 952-563-4579
 Duke Johnson (Bldg & Inspection) 952-563-8959 Bernadette Gillespie (Bldg and Insp) 952-563-4709
 Jen Desrude (Engineering) 952-563-4862 Dennis Fields (Planning) 952-563-8925
 Erik Solie (Environmental Health) 952-563-8978

Item 2-Formal	9601 James Avenue South
Site address	9601 James Avenue South
Application type	Subdivision; Variance
Staff contact	Dennis Fields x8925
Case #	5277ABCD-15
Proposal	<p>The applicant proposes a type III subdivision to create two new lot from the existing lot at 9601 James Avenue. The connection between the two structures would be removed. Variances from the side yard setback of 9.9 feet and 6.5 feet is proposed. This request would return the parcel to the original configuration when added to this site in 1988.</p> <p>The only changes to the building would be the removal of the connection between the two building.</p>
Plat Name	STROUT ADDITION
Decision maker	City Council
Reviews	DRC; City Council; Planning Commission

Guests Present:

Russ Crawford russ@standardholdingsre.com
 Reed Nelson reed@nelsonnumeric.com 952-224-2082

Discussion/Comments:

- Dennis Fields (Planning): Introduced project (see proposal above). They are applying for a Type III plat and two variances. The variances are both for setbacks for the existing building on the proposed lots: 9.9 feet instead of 10 feet for a rear yard setback on the southerly lot and 6.5 feet instead of 10 feet for side yard setback on the north lot. Planning staff will support the two

variances because the link between the two properties is being proposed to be removed and there are no changes to the building separation regardless of where the lot line is drawn.

- Mark Reichel (Assessing): Asked if smaller building is listed for sale. Russ Crawford (Applicant) responded that it is listed, but not under contract yet.
- Erik Solie (Environmental Health): No Comment
- Duke Johnson (Building and Inspections): The materials used to fill in the openings created by demolishing the link have to be similar materials and has to have a one hour rating, as long as there are no openings on the link side of both buildings. Applicant confirmed that link and a small exhaust fan would be closed. Johnson noted that a building permit and final inspection would be required. As far as he can tell, the one opening is not a required exit but it will be verified through plan review.
- Laura McCarthy (Fire Prevention):
 - Each building will require an independent sprinkler system. A new water service to the south building will be needed. The systems will need to be monitored.
 - The fire lane needs to be maintained and that it is not “dead ended” on the east side of Lot 1.
- Eric Wharton (Utilities): Showed the existing water lines and loop on a map
 - 12 inch off of James and then a 6 inch loop that goes around the entire site. There is also an existing 1 inch line further south in Lot 2. Two options for water service:
 - Tap into 12 inch in James; or
 - Tap into the existing 6 inch loop (can go in the same location as the 1-inch line, if that works for the building.
 - Depending on the needs of the building, either may be fine. McCarthy asked if either of these options will disrupt the loop service to both buildings and Wharton responded that it does not. Regardless, a common easement/maintenance agreement will be needed for the site.
 - Crawford asked what the size of the line into the Lot 2 building is and Wharton responded that City records indicate 12 inch into the Lot 1 building and 6 inch into the Lot 2 building. However, the records are what we have on file, as provided by the previous developer and they have not been field verified.
 - McCarthy explained that typically there is a minimum of 6 inch water line to the buildings for sprinkler but may be able to utilize a 4 inch water line.
 - Wharton indicated that it also needs to be determined how the sewer is connected into the Lot 2 building. Crawford noted that it was previously a stand alone building. Wharton stated they can go into the building and trace the sewer line.
 - McCarthy-recapped that it will need an independent sprinkler system, that it needs to be monitored and that the fire lane needs to be maintained and that it is not “dead ended” on the east side of lot one.
- Heidi Miller (Police) Not present, no comment.
- Jen Desrude (Engineering): Provided Public Works comments, noting that they are the same as informal those provided at Informal DRC:
 - Title Commitment
 - 10 foot sidewalk and bikeway easement document, prepared by City staff for owner signature
 - If mortgages on the property, will need consent to plat. Crawford noted there is a contract for deed and Desrude stated that consents will be needed from all parties with property interest.
- Dennis Fields (Planning):

- A final site and building plan application will not be needed as long as similar material is used to close the existing openings in the building. Fields asked what the finish would be, and noted that painted brick/block is not allowed. Crawford was not sure if the high bay raked finish stand up panel is painted, but noted that the small building is concrete block.
- This will go to Planning Commission on Feb 19th.
- Crawford asked if a demolition and a construction permit are all that will be needed. Johnson answered that as long as it is done all at once then only one bldg. permit that includes the demo would be needed.
- Crawford asked how to handle the materials in the case that a raked panel insert cannot be found. Johnson noted that a block or any material that is similar will work.