

Approved Minutes

City of Bloomington
Development Review Committee
November 3, 2015

McLeod Conference Room
 Bloomington Civic Plaza – 1800 West Old Shakopee Road

Staff Present

Laura McCarthy (Fire Prev) – Chair 952-563-8965	Amy Schmidt (Legal) 952-563-4889
Randy Quale (Park and Rec) 952-563-8876	Heidi Miller (Police) 952-563-4975
Duke Johnson (Bldg & Inspection) 952-563-8959	Londell Pease (Planning) 952-563-8926
Jen Desrude (Engineering) 952-563-4862	Amanda Johnson (B & I) 952-563-8961
Todd Angus (Assessing) 952-563-4539	Glen Markegard (Planning) 952-563-8923

Item 1- Informal	Nesbit Industrial Park 6100 W 110 th Street Preliminary and/or Final Development Plan; Rezoning; Subdivision
Project Name/Site Address	6100 W 110th
Application type	Preliminary and/or Final Development Plan; Rezoning; Subdivision
Staff contact	Pease, Londell, 8926
Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivide the existing lot with two buildings to two Lots • Rezone to IP-Planned Development to allow lot frontage requirement deviation • Preliminary and Final Development Plan for the existing conditions
Plat name	NESBITT INDUSTRIAL PARK 2ND ADDITION
Decision maker	City Council
Reviews	DRC; City Council; Planning Commission
Contact 1 name	Michael J. Mergens
Contact 1 address	Highlight Center 807 Broadway Street Northeast, Suite 140
Contact 1 e-mail	mike@entrepartnerlaw.com
Contact 1 phone	612.814.0499 (office) 612.207.5660 (mobile)

Guests Present:

Traci Tomas	mike@entrepartnerlaw.com
Michael Mergens	ttomas@leasespace.com

Discussion/Comments:

- Londell Pease (Planning):
 - The applicant proposes to Rezone to IP-Planned Development, Preliminary, and Final Development Plan for the existing conditions to allow lot frontage requirement deviation and subdivide the existing lot with two buildings to two Lots
 - Applicant said it is designed to get flexibility and update to modern use from when constructed to make different lots.
- Randy Quale (Parks & Rec): No comment.
- Todd Angus (Assessing): There will be no park dedication due to credit for existing buildings. Is there a pending sale on one or both of proposed new lots? Applicant says no there is not. Will the plat be filed yet this year? Applicants say yes, that is the goal if it is possible.
- Duke Johnson (Building & Inspections): How far away are the lot lines? Applicant states it depends on the surveyor's determination the . D. Johnson says there must be a 5 feet setback from the wall with a 1 hour rating. If no property lines, zero openings on that side, and no rating required. Pease said the applicant will have to decide. Applicant said it is within 10-15 feet. D. Johnson says if it is within 0-10 feet, no issues.
- Laura McCarthy (Fire Prevention): Provide a joint access agreement to insure emergency vehicle access to and around both buildings is maintained. Applicant said the area marked in green on the submittal is the location they need to finalize for the joint access agreement.
- Heidi Miller (Police): No comment.
- Jen Desrude (Engineering & Traffic):
 - Preliminary plat requirements are listed in City Code Chapter 22
 - Will need a title commitment and consent to plat from any mortgages
 - 10-foot sidewalk/bikeway, drainage and utility easement (5-foot on common lot line)
 - Vacate all existing easements and rededicate on the new plat (existing D&U, floodage easement) – different application for these.
 - Private access/driveway/parking/utility easements are needed and would need to be reviewed.
 - Private storm water maintenance and easement agreements are needed
 - PD and then Type 2 plats is order per Pease
- Amy Schmidt (Legal): No comment.
- Londell Pease (Planning):

The property was developed in a time when corporate offices and distribution centers were commonly located on the same site. Staff agrees with the applicant that the best alternative for long term viability of the site may be to divide the site allowing separate owners for the office and the warehouse. To accomplish this, the alternatives are a variance or a Planned Development, as the minimum lot width in the IP district cannot be provided. Applying for a Planned Development would establish a Final Development Plan which would allow a review and approval of other potential deviations, thereby providing a fully complying property, subject to Final Development Plan approval. Although the findings for a variance would be difficult to make, the fact that access, utilities and stormwater are shared between the two buildings makes a planned development a potential option in this situation.

 - An application for the rezoning with the Preliminary and Final Development Plan is as follows:
 - Development application signed by the property owner be provided
 - An existing conditions survey which includes all man-made improvements, including landscaping, be provided. Three full sized paper copies and one full sized PDF required.

The existing conditions could be used for preparing the required preliminary and final development plan.

- The Preliminary and Final Plat documents. See Section 22.05(f) and 22.06(f). Three full sized paper copies and one full sized PDF required.
- A narrative describing the proposal and any deviations. If the survey is provided prior to the application, staff can assist in identifying the deviations required for the existing development.
- Fees total \$5,470
 - Type II Preliminary Plat - \$880
 - Type II Final Plat - \$440
 - Rezoning - \$1,660
 - Preliminary Development Plan - \$830
 - Final Development Plan - \$1,600
- Applicant asked about timing. Pease said ideally next Wednesday. It would then get to the first council meeting in January. Miller asked if Veteran's Day affects Planning. Pease said yes, it would then be next Tuesday at the end of the day. Pease will work with them on final documents and deadlines.
- McCarthy asked if this item needs to come back to formal? It was decided no Formal DRC is needed.