

Johnson, Nick M

From: Beth Diem <beth@archnetusa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 2:32 PM
To: John Pierce
Cc: Johnson, Nick M; Markegard, Glen; Pease, Londell
Subject: Re: HOM Building Areas

Nick,

I believe the original numbers were actual usable square footage and did not include the cutouts in the floor, the atrium like spaces at the open stairs, stairs were only counted once, etc.

For the building code submittal, we used the entire footprint for all floors, without subtracting the open/non-floor spaces, etc. This was for building code purposes, not planning.

Would you require a calculation of actual usable square footage?

Please call or email with any questions.

Thank you,

Beth
ARCHNET
651-430-1404 cell

Planning Note: Staff compared the building permit plan set to the plans associated with the Council approval (Case #PL2018-206). The building footprints and corresponding setbacks match. Staff verified that the building size has not increased. NMJ 030719

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 5, 2019, at 2:20 PM, John Pierce <jpierce@homfurniture.com> wrote:

Nick et. al.,

I'll fill in what I know but leave ARChnet to fill in the blanks. Basically, the way that the building was laid out keeping the panel lengths and elevations in mind didn't make it easy to design engineer the site for efficiency. What we had done was work within the guidelines set forth by the setbacks and parking requirements to come up with the 212,800 SF building. From what I know, nothing changed from a setback requirement and it was mostly changed to assist with the panel width and structures overall fit on the site.

Beth can fill in on the calculation portion but I believe we met all the necessary calcs from an exiting and load standpoint.

Thanks,

John Pierce
Real Estate Director
HOM Furniture, Gabberts, Dock86
Direct: (763) 767-3767
Mobile: (763) 300-5646
JPierce@homfurniture.com

On Tue, Mar 5, 2019 at 9:43 AM Johnson, Nick M <nmjohanson@bloomingtonmn.gov> wrote:

John and Beth,

I have discovered a discrepancy between the floor areas of the building approve at Council and the plans submitted for the building permit. I have the following floor area numbers:

- Plans Aprproved at Council – 209,550 square feet (Basement – 51,853 SF, 1st Floor – 79,693 SF, and 2nd Floor - 78,004 SF)
- Plans submitted to building permit – 212,800 square feet (Basement – 51,600 SF, 1st Floor – 80,600 SF, and 2nd Floor – 80,600 SF)

It looks like the 1st and 2nd floors increased slightly, while the basement decreased slightly. Can you describe the source of this discrepancy? Are there any impact to building setback that were established and approved as part of the planning case file? We are concerned that you are now exceeding the upper floor area threshold established in the approval. Floor area can have an impact on required parking, as well as the setback issue I mentioned. Was there a different calculation methodology of floor area previously? If there is some discrepancy between the calculation methodology, there might not be an issue, but if the building has increased in size from what was approved at Council, we will need to asses how to remedy the discrepancy.


Thanks,

Nick M. Johnson | Planner

Planning Division | City of Bloomington

1800 West Old Shakopee Road | Bloomington, MN 55431

Direct: (952) 563-8925 | nmjohnson@bloomingtonmn.gov



Please consider your environmental responsibilities before printing this email. Reduce, Reuse, Recycle.