CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

PLAN COMMISSION

February 10, 2025, 5:30 P.M. Council Chambers, Room #115 Hybrid Zoom Link:

https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82362340978?pwd=ZnExeVNaSUN GVGdZQTJHNjBBb3M0UT09

Meeting ID: 823 6234 0978 Passcode: 622209

Virtual Link:

https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/82362340978?pwd=ZnExeVNaSUNGVGdZQTJHNjBBb3 M0UT09

Meeting ID: 823 6234 0978 Passcode: 622209

Petition Map: https://bton.in/G6BiA

ROLL CALL

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED: January 13, 2025

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

PETITIONS TABLED:

SP-24-22 Cutters Kirkwood 123 LLC

 115 E Kirkwood Ave
 Parcel: 53-05-33-310-062.000-005
 Request: Major site plan approval to construct a 4-story building with 3 floors of residential units over a ground floor parking garage and retail space in the MD-CS zoning district. The upper floors will consist of 15 dwelling units for a total of 38 beds.
 Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

 ZO-34-23
 City of Bloomington Planning and Transportation

 Text Amendment
 Text Amendment

 Request: Text amendment related to Sign Standards and request for waiver of second

 hearing.

 Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

PETITIONS CONTINUED:

 ZO-03-25
 City of Bloomington Planning & Transportation

 Text Amendment
 Text Amendment

 Request: Text amendment related to Single-Room Occupancy and request for waiver of second hearing.
 Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

**Next Meeting March 10, 2025

Last Updated: 2/7/2025

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call <u>812-349-3429</u> or e-mail <u>human.rights@bloomington.in.gov</u>.

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact the **Melissa Hirtzel** at **hirtzelm@bloomington.in.gov** and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with.

PETITIONS:

USE2024-12-0070 / SP-47-24	Bledsoe Riggert Cooper James (William Riggert) 301 N College Ave Parcel: 53-05-33-310-170.000-005 Request: Major site plan approval for Convention Center in the Mixed-Use Downtown Downtown Core zoning district. <u>Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan</u>
ZO-01-25/RZONE2025-01-005	City of Bloomington Planning & Transportation Text Amendment Request: Text Amendments to Unified Development Ordinance: Affordable Housing Incentives.

Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

**Next Meeting March 10, 2025

Last Updated: 2/7/2025

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call <u>812-349-3429</u> or e-mail <u>human.rights@bloomington.in.gov</u>.

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact the **Melissa Hirtzel** at **hirtzelm@bloomington.in.gov** and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with.

3

BLOOMINGTON PLAN COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CASE #: SP-47-24 DATE: February 10, 2025

Location: 301 & 327 S College Ave and 300, 302, & 314 S Walnut St

PETITIONER:	Monroe County Capital Improvement Board c/o Jim Witlatch 211 S College Avenue Bloomington, IN		
CONSULTANTS:	William S. Riggert, BRCJ 1351 W Tapp Road Bloomington, IN		

REQUEST: The petitioner is requesting major site plan approval for a convention center in the downtown core overlay in the mixed-use downtown (MD-DC) zoning district.

BACKGROUND:				
Area:	~ 1.7 acres			
Zoning:	Mixed-Use Downtown Downtown Core Overlay (MD-DC)			
Comp Plan Designation:	Downtown			
Existing Land Use:	Office / Surface Parking Lot			
Proposed Land Use:	nd Use: Conference or Convention Center			
Surrounding Uses:	North – Office			
	West – Conference or Convention Center			
	East – Transportation Terminal			
	South – Office			

UPDATE SINCE JANUARY HEARING: The petitioner received variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals related to architectural requirements; driveway width and separation requirements; and street tree requirements with conditions at the January 23, 2025 hearing. The petitioner has continued to work with Planning & Transportation and Engineering Departments staff to address outstanding architectural issues, as well as on the design of the right-of-way along 3rd Street. The report below has been updated.

REPORT: The petition site is located at 301 & 327 S College Ave and 300, 302, & 314 S Walnut St and is zoned Mixed-Use Downtown in the Downtown Core Overlay (MD-DC). The property has frontage on W. 3rd Street to the north, S. College Avenue to the west, and S. Walnut Street to the east and is roughly 1.7 acres. The site currently contains a number of surface parking lots and an office building that is utilized as election central during voting seasons. There are a number of vacated alleys on the petition site. There are no known sensitive or regulated environmental features within the petition site.

The petitioner is requesting major site plan approval to allow the construction of one 55,000 square foot building to be used as a 'conference or convention center.' The building is proposed to contain a roughly 30,000 square foot two story 'great hall' as the majority of the structure. The first floor is proposed to surround the great hall with an open meeting area on the north and west sides on the building, while the second floor is proposed to be comprised of three additional auxiliary meeting rooms on the west side of the building. The back of the house kitchen and support staff areas are located on the south side of the building. The new building will be attached to the existing convention center by a skywalk over S. College Avenue.

MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW 20.06.050(a)(2)(C)(ii): Major site plan approval is required for developments that contain more than 20,000 square feet of new non-residential gross floor area. This proposal contains 55,000 square feet of new non-residential gross floor area.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS & INCENTIVES 20.04: The following UDO standards are required to be reviewed for all activities that require New Development approval.

Downtown Character Overlay Design:

Required Building Entrance: One entrance is required along each façade facing a public street. The proposed design incorporates corner entrances, one to serve both 3rd Street and S. College Avenue and one to serve 3rd Street and S. Walnut Street. The entrances must contain a landscaped plaza with at least 3 amenities, for example benches, bike racks, planters, or public art. The primary pedestrian entrances are required to be recessed 4 feet and have required design elements including address and lighting. The petition meets these requirements.

Roof Design: The site utilizes a flat roof with parapet, which is permitted. There is a flared roof design on the northern end of the building. The petition meets this requirement.

Windows and Doors: The MD-DC district requires facades along the ground floor to utilize a minimum of 60% window and door space. The petitioner meets this percentage. Windows on floors 2 and above must be between 20% and 70% coverage and must have a ratio for height at 1.5 times the width. The windows must have sills and lintels. The petition site is designed with curtain walls that extend to cover both the first and second floors. The petitioner received a variance to allow the current design.

Belt Courses: The MD-DC requires belt coursing, as well as vertical banding, on all four sides of the building. The petition meets this requirement with material differentiation both vertically and horizontally.

Articulation: The MD-DC allows for modules of 20-65 feet wide. The building is designed without modules as described in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The petitioner received a variance from this requirement.

Material: In the MD-DC, all exterior finish materials shall have a non-reflective, low reflectance, or matte finish. The exterior of the building is predominantly windows, which is not included in the analysis of primary or secondary exterior materials. Exterior materials are largely brick and stone. The petition meets this requirement.

MD-DC Dimensional Standards:

Building Setbacks: The front build-to range is 0 to 5 feet, with 70% of the façade required in this range. In the MD-DC character area, the first 2 stories shall comply with the build-to range. There are not side are rear yard setbacks required. The petition meets setback requirements on W. 3rd Street and S. College Avenue. The petitioner received a variance from the 70% standard for the S. Walnut Street frontage.

Front Parking Setback (minimum): There is no surface or interior parking proposed. The petition meets this requirement.

Side/Rear Parking Setback (minimum): There is no surface or interior parking proposed. The petition meets this requirement.

Impervious Surface Coverage: 100%. The petition meets this requirement.

Primary Structure Height: The maximum height allowed in the MD-DC is 4 stories or 50 feet. The minimum height allowed in the MD-DC is 35 feet. The proposed building is 2 stories and just under 50 feet tall. The petition meets the stories and height requirements.

First Floor Height: The minimum ceiling height of the ground floor is required to be at least 12 feet because the proposed use is non-residential. The petition meets this requirement.

Environment: There are no known sensitive or regulated environmental features within the site.

Access and Connectivity:

Driveways and access: Vehicular access is proposed from S. College Avenue on the southwest corner of the site to a loading area adjacent to the kitchen area in the south end of the building. The loading area will need to accommodate large trucks, and has been designed to do so. A variance was received for width and location of the driveway.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation: Required pedestrian facilities shall be as indicated in the Transportation Plan unless it is determined by the Planning and Transportation Director that such facility should be altered to match adjacent facilities. Minimum width requirements for pedestrian facilities and tree plots shall be as indicated in the Transportation Plan. The external sidewalk on each of the three frontages shall be located at least one foot inside the right-of-way or be included in a pedestrian easement if located on the petition site. Sidewalks shall have a minimum separation of five feet from the curb. All three roadways are classified as Primary Arterials. The Street Typology for W. 3rd Street at this location is General Urban. The Street Typology for S. College Avenue and S. Walnut Street are Main Street. Minimum street typology design requirements are found in Table 5 of the Transportation Plan. The General Urban typology calls for a 10 foot pedestrian zone (sidewalk) with an 8 foot greenspace (location for trees, meters, bike racks). The Main Street typology requires a minimum of a 7 foot pedestrian zone and a 5 foot greenspace. The proposal meets the pedestrian and greenspace requirements for S. College Avenue and S. Walnut Avenue. The petitioner received a variance from the requirement to meet the Transportation Plan guidance for greenspace along W. 3rd Street, but will continue to work with staff of both the Planning & Transportation and the Engineering Department to include the maximum number of street trees possible. This approval does not approve a right-of-way design for 3rd Street, and the petitioner will continue to work with staff to arrive at the best solution. The Engineering Department is working with the petitioner on the height of the skywalk.

Public Transportation: No new transportation stops are proposed. However the petitioner is working with Bloomington Transit (BT) on possible facilities. The BT Transit Center is on the east side of S. Walnut Street, across from the petition site.

Vehicular Parking and Loading: There are no minimum parking requirements for this use, and because the project is in the MD-DC district, but south of 4th Street, even if there were, they would not apply. No parking is required or proposed. There will be a loading berth on the southwest corner of the building, and it shall be screened from view from S. College Avenue by a 6 foot wall constructed of similar building materials as the building.

Bicycle Parking: A minimum of 11 bicycle parking spaces are required for this development. All 11 spaces are required to be Class II covered bicycle parking. Existing public bicycle parking spaces can count for up to 6 spaces. All spaces counting toward the 11 required spaces must be within 50 feet of a primary building entrance. A condition of approval has been added.

Outdoor Lighting: Any proposed pedestrian lighting plan shall be consistent with the City of Bloomington Downtown Vision and Infill Strategy Plan and approved by the Board of Public

Works. Such lighting can utilize traditional or contemporary design, and must not exceed 15 feet in height. A lighting and photometric plan will be submitted at the Site Development Permit stage. No deviations from the lighting code are expected. A condition of approval has been added.

Solar Ready Building Design: The petitioner has demonstrated compliance with this requirement, by demonstrating the inclusion of infrastructure for solar to be easily added to the building, and that will be verified again at the Certificate of Zoning Compliance stage.

Landscape, Buffering, and Fences: The site is allowed to be, and will be covered by improvements, with no substantial landscaping to occur on-site. The petitioner is planning an exterior roof garden on the roof of the first floor at the northwest corner of the building that will be accessible to building users.

Street Trees: The petition site has 3 public frontages that require street tree installation. One large canopy tree is required for every 30 feet of frontage. If a large canopy tree does not fit because of separation requirements from existing and proposed utilities, medium or small trees can be used at a rate of 2 per 30 feet of frontage. The S. College Avenue frontage requires 12 large canopy street trees. The W. 3rd Street frontage requires 10 large canopy street trees. The S. Walnut Street frontage requires 9 large canopy street trees. The petitioner desires a bus pull-off along 3rd Street which may affect the interface between the required pedestrian facilities and required greenspace for street trees. Each street tree may be planted in a minimum 5 foot by 5 foot tree pit with a grate. The variance received related to 3rd Street included a condition of approval that any tree totals that cannot be met because of utilities can be dealt with through the 'Alternatives Authorized' section of the UDO. **Screening:** All roof-mounted equipment shall be screened by a parapet wall or similar feature that is integral to the architectural design of the building. All ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall also be screened. A condition of approval has been added.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: The Plan Commission shall review the major site plan petition and approve, approve with conditions, or deny the petition in accordance with Section 20.06.040(g) (Review and Decision), based on the general approval criteria in Section 20.06.040(d)(6)(B) (General Compliance Criteria).

20.06.040(d)(6)(B) General Compliance Criteria

- i. Compliance with this UDO
- ii. Compliance with Other Applicable Regulations
- iii. Compliance with Utility, Service, and Improvement Standards
- iv. Compliance with Prior Approvals

PROPOSED FINDING: The proposed petition complies with the Unified Development Ordinance standards, excluding those items which received variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals. The petitioner is working with City of Bloomington Utilities on compliance with its regulations, and will continue to do so through the permitting stage. The proposal is compliant with the Board of Zoning Appeals approval. The proposal is reflective of the need for civic uses downtown and development encouraged in the downtown in the Comprehensive Plan.

CONCLUSION: The proposed site plan meets many of the design requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance, and received variance approval for those that are not met. Approval of the site plan will allow the convention center expansion that has been envisioned for some time to

take the next step toward completion.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the proposed finding and approve SP-47-24 with the following conditions:

- 1. The petitioner shall include compliant bicycle parking on the plans for the Site Development Permit filing.
- 2. The petitioner must include a lighting and photometric plan with the Site Development Permit filing.
- 3. The petitioner must show compliance with screening requirements in their building permit application.
- 4. The petitioner shall continue to work with the Planning & Transportation and Engineering Departments on the best design for the right-of-way along 3rd Street. This approval does not approve a right-of-way design for 3rd Street.

9



Jacqueline Scanlan <scanlanj@bloomington.in.gov>

MCC Expansion | Skywalk Clearance above College Avenue

William Riggert <wriggert@brcjcivil.com>

To: Joey Geibel <JGeibel@schmidt-arch.com>

Cc: "Eddie A. Layton" < ELayton@schmidt-arch.com>, Kenton Pardue <kpardue@brcjcivil.com>, Jacqueline Scanlan <scanlanj@bloomington.in.gov>

Thank you Joey - greatly appreciated!

Bill

On Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 10:41 AM Joey Geibel <JGeibel@schmidt-arch.com> wrote:

Bill,



Here is a snip of that elevation. Will this work or would you prefer it to be on a presentation plan? Just let me know!

Thanks Joey Geibel Architectural Graduate



From: William Riggert www.selfacture.com Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 10:25 AM

To: Eddie A. Layton <ELayton@schmidt-arch.com>

Cc: Joey Geibel <JGeibel@schmidt-arch.com>; Kenton Pardue <kpardue@brcjcivil.com>; Jacqueline Scanlan <scanlanj@bloomington.in.gov>

Subject: MCC Expansin | Skywalk Clearance above College Avenue

External sender <wriggert@brcjcivil.com>

Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Eddie,

Please share an elevation of the MCC Expansion skywalk that shows the clearance above College Avenue exceeding 17'-6" so we can submit it to Jackie Scanlan for the upcoming Plan Cc

Thank you,

Bill

William S. Riggert, PE | Principal wriggert@brcjcivil.com Bledsoe Riggert Cooper James A LAND SUNVEYING - COUL ENGINEERING - GIS Office: 812-336-8277 | Fax: 812-336-0817 1351 West Tapp Road, Bloomington, Indiana 47403 brcjcivil.com

Virus-free.www.avast.com



City of Bloomington Planning and Transportation Department

January 24, 2025

NOTICE OF APPROVAL

Petitioner:Monroe County Capital Improvement BoardLocation:301 & 327 S College Ave and 300, 302, & 314 S Walnut St

The Board of Zoning Appeals heard case V-39-24 on January 23, 2025 via a hybrid meeting in Council Chambers of Showers Center City Hall - Bloomington, Indiana and virtually via (Zoom). The petition for multiple variances related to the architectural requirements; driveway width and separation requirements; and street tree requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance in the Mixed-Use Downtown Downtown Core Overlay zoning district (MD-DC) was approved 5:0 with proposed findings along with the following conditions:

- 1. This variance approval is for the building and site design as submitted with the variance, except that any amendment to the site design or building shall not increase the degree of nonconformity allowed through this variance.
- 2. The petitioner will install code-compliant signage to alert pedestrians of the potential for truck traffic both north and south of the proposed driveway.
- 3. If street tree totals cannot be met, the 'Alternatives Authorized' section found in 20.04.080(c)(4) may be used.

Unless otherwise specified by the Board at the time of approval, any order or variance granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals shall expire:

- 1. In cases where new construction or modifications to an existing structure are required, three years after the date that the variance was granted, unless a building permit has been obtained and construction of the structure or structures has commenced; or
- 2. In cases where new construction or modifications to an existing structure are not required, three years after the date that the variance was granted, unless a Certificate of Occupancy has been obtained and the use commenced; or
- 3. At the date of termination as established by the Board of Zoning Appeals or Hearing Officer as a condition or commitment if different from (iii)(1) or (iii)(2) above.

Planning and Transportation Staff

City Hall



Planning and Transportation Department





Planning and Transportation Depathtment



Created: 11/22/2024 Map By:

For use as map information only, information is NOT warranted.











		- >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	
-	The second secon	-	
~	INCLUIT INCLUIT INCLUIT INCLUIT TODE INCLUIT TODE <th colspa="</td"><td>2</td></th>	<td>2</td>	2
~	Othered and the constrained and the constra	e	
ν		4	
۰۵ ۱	<image/>	5	
	<text><text><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></text></text>	9	



















Case # RZONE2025-01-0005 Memo

То:	Bloomington Plan Commission
From:	Jackie Scanlan, AICP Development Services Manager
Date:	February 7, 2025
Re:	Text Amendments to Unified Development Ordinance: Affordable Housing Incentives

UPDATE SINCE LAST HEARING: The petition was discussed at the January 16, 2025 Special Hearing of the Plan Commission. The Common Council directed particular amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to be studied and proposed. The Plan Commission had a number of questions about the appropriate scope necessary in order to amend the UDO in a way that would create a potential for increased affordable and workforce housing. The Common Council has specific requests that may be able to be addressed, while requiring a larger endeavor to widen the scope of review in the near future. The Plan Commission asked that a representative from the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department be present to answer questions about the proposed changes, as well as questions related to Historic Preservation and its effects on affordable housing. The Planning and Transportation Department envisions a presentation from HAND staff at the February 10, 2025 hearing with need for additional discussion, likely at a Special Hearing. The January 2025 report is below, with a modified recommendation.

Through Resolution 2024-23, the Bloomington Common Council directed the Plan Commission to draft amendments to Title 20 of the Bloomington Municipal Code, the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) section 20.04.110 Incentives, related to Affordable Housing Incentives.

The Resolution directed the Plan Commission to prepare a proposal that does the following:

1. To amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(2)) Eligibility to include an Area Median Income (AMI) requirement within Tier 1 and Tier 2 Affordable Housing Projects, as follows:

Tier 1 Affordable Housing Projects to include at least some units to be priced below 90% of AMI, using whole percentages for each tier.

Tier 2 Affordable Housing Projects to include at least some units priced below 70% of AMI, using whole percentages for each tier.

2. To amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(5)) (Affordable Housing Incentives) to assess the incentive structure and consider creating additional incentives for affordable housing, including but not limited to expected owner-occupied unit development.

3. To amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(7)) (Payment-in-Lieu) to require housing developments that use the "Payment-in-Lieu" option to accept housing vouchers.

The Planning and Transportation Department prepared draft amendments that address numbers 1 and 3 for review by the Plan Commission in response to the Resolution. Analysis and redline proposals of those amendments are below. Number 2 requires more coordination and discussion with the Plan Commission to determine what type of incentives to include, as well as what outcomes are desired for those incentives.

1. Tier 1 is proposed to be split, with 8 percent of total units required to be income-limited below 120 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) and 8 percent to be limited to below 90 percent of AMI. Tier 2 is proposed to continue to be split, with the percentages changes from 7.5 to 8 and the earning caps to be adjusted to 90 percent of AMI and 70 percent of AMI.

(2). Eligibility

Projects that satisfy one of the following criteria shall be eligible for the incentives established in subsection 0 below:

(A) Tier 1

- i. At least 60 percent of the total gross floor area of the building (including additional area awarded with an incentive) is dedicated to residential dwellings; and
- ii. A minimum of 845 percent of the total dwelling units (including those on floors awarded with an incentive) are income-restricted permanently, unless otherwise adjusted or forfeited by the City, to households earning less than 120 percent of the HUD AMI for Monroe County, Indiana; and or
- ii-jii. A minimum of 8 percent of the total dwelling units (including those on floors awarded with an incentive) are income-restricted permanently, unless otherwise adjusted or forfeited by the City, to households earning below 90 percent of the HUD AMI for Monroe County, Indiana; or

(B) Tier 2

- i. At least 60 percent of the total gross floor area of the building (including additional area awarded with an incentive) is dedicated to residential dwellings; and
- A minimum of <u>87-5</u> percent of the total dwelling units (including those on floors awarded with an incentive) are income-restricted permanently, unless otherwise adjusted or forfeited by the City, to households earning below <u>90120</u> percent of the HUD AMI for Monroe County, Indiana; and
- iii. A minimum of <u>87.5</u> percent of the total dwelling units (including those on floors awarded with an incentive) are income-restricted permanently, unless otherwise adjusted or forfeited by the City, to households earning below <u>7090</u> percent of the HUD AMI for Monroe County, Indiana.

2

2. To be discussed at the January 16, 2025 hearing.

(5) Affordable Housing Incentives

(A)Reduced Bulk Requirements

The following dimensional standards shall apply to single-family and duplex residential lots in the R1, R2, R3, and R4 zoning districts that meet either of the two criteria in subsection (2) above:

- i. The minimum lot area for subdivision may be reduced up to 50 percent.
- ii. The minimum lot width for subdivision may be reduced up to 40 percent.
- iii. The side building setbacks may be reduced to five feet regardless of the number of stories.
- iv. The rear building setback may be reduced to 15 feet.
- v. Where these standards conflict with the neighborhood transition standards established in Section Error! Reference source not found. (Error! Reference source not found.), the neighborhood transition standards shall govern.

(B) Primary Structure Height

i. Eligibility

In addition to the eligibility criteria in 0, affordable housing projects seeking increased maximum primary structure height shall comply with the following criteria:

- 1. The building shall contain six or more dwelling units; and
- 2. Unit size and bedroom mix for deed-restricted units shall be comparable to those for market-rate units.

ii. Tier 1 Projects

Projects that meet the Tier 1 affordability standards may increase the primary structure height by one floor of building height, not to exceed 12 feet, beyond the maximum primary structure height established for the zoning district where the project is located, as identified in Section Error! Reference source not found. (Error! Reference source not found.).

iii. Tier 2 Projects

Projects that meet the Tier 2 affordability standards may increase the primary structure height by two floors of building height, not to exceed 24 feet, beyond the maximum primary structure height established for the zoning district where the project is located, as identified in Section Error! Reference source not found. (Error! Reference source not found.).

iv. Sustainable Development Bonus

 Tier 1 Projects: Projects that are eligible for increased primary structure height for affordable housing and sustainable development shall be eligible for one additional floor of building height, not to exceed 12 feet. 2. Tier 2 Projects: Projects that are eligible for increased primary structure height for affordable housing and sustainable development shall be eligible for one additional floor of building height, not to exceed 12 feet. The additional floor of building height granted under this subsection (iv)(2) shall be limited to 50 percent of the building footprint area of primary structure, and that additional floor shall be set back at least 10 feet further than the lower floors of the building.

3. Utilizing 20.04.110, Incentives, is optional, so utilizing the Payment-in-lieu found in (c)(7) is also an optional process. However, the Department has some concerns as to the legality of including vouchers, per Indiana code 36-1-3-8.5, which reads as follows:

36-1-3-8.5 Prohibition against the adoption or enforcement of an ordinance requiring participation in Section 8 or similar program housing

Sec. 8.5. A unit may not adopt or enforce an ordinance that requires or would have the effect of requiring a landlord to participate in:

- (1) a Section 8 program of the federal Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f); or
- (2) a similar program concerning housing.

The Legal Department is researching this issue in relation to a Planned Unit Development proposal. Language is included below, in the event that the request is determined to be legal.

(7) Payment-in-Lieu

- (A) A payment-in-lieu of providing housing that meets the Tier 1 or Tier 2 affordability criteria may be authorized by: an agreement with the City and all payments will be deposited into the Housing Development Fund. <u>In order to utilize this option, housing</u> vouchers must be accepted at the development.
- (B) The provisions of this Section 20.01.010(a)(7) shall become effective no later than the effective date of the UDO, by which time administrative procedures for calculating, collecting, accounting for, and spending payments-in-lieu in compliance with all applicable law shall be adopted and publicly available in the Administrative Manual within the Planning and Transportation Department. The procedures used for calculating, collecting, accounting for, and spending shall be reviewed frequently and updated as local housing market conditions change. The calculations may use or be based upon one or more of the following methods:
 - i. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) annual rents based on Area Median Income;
 - ii. Area Median Income (per person, income bracket, etc.);
 - iii. Rental rates per unit or per bedroom;
 - iv. Utility rates allowances per unit;
 - v. Tiered rental rates based on percentages above and/or below AMI; and

4

vi. Payment contribution rates.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.69", Hanging: 0.38", Tab stops: 1.06", List tab + Not at 2.5"

RECOMMENDATION: The Department recommends forwarding the petition to the April 7, 2024 Plan Commission hearing with at least one additional Special Hearing to discuss the topic further to be scheduled in the interim.

RESOLUTION 2024-23

TO INITIATE A PROPOSAL TO AMEND TITLE 20 (UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE) OF THE BLOOMINGTON MUNICIPAL CODE Re: Preparation of a Proposal to Amend Chapter 20.04.110 (Incentives).

- WHEREAS, the Common Council, by its <u>Resolution 18-01</u>, approved a new Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington, which took effect on March 21, 2018; and
- WHEREAS, thereafter the Plan Commission initiated and prepared a proposal to repeal and replace Title 20 of the Bloomington Municipal Code, entitled "Unified Development Ordinance" ("UDO") in order to implement the vision for community development put forward in the Comprehensive Plan; and
- WHEREAS, on December 18, 2019, the Common Council passed <u>Ordinance 19-24</u>, to repeal and replace the UDO; and
- WHEREAS, on January 14, 2020, the Mayor signed and approved Ordinance 19-24; and
- WHEREAS, the UDO has since been revised by action of the Plan Commission and the Common Council seven times; and
- WHEREAS, the current affordability tiers set out in the UDO Chapter 20.04.110 (c)(2) have resulted in housing units priced at the maximum amount allowable based on the Area Median Income (AMI) for the City of Bloomington¹; and
- WHEREAS, this has resulted in the use of affordability incentives by housing developments that do not actually create affordable units²; and
- WHEREAS, pursuant to IC 36-7-4-602, the Common Council may initiate a proposal to amend or partially repeal the text of the UDO and require the Plan Commission to prepare it;
- WHEREAS, the Common Council wishes to initiate a proposal to amend the UDO to modify the Affordable Housing Incentives in order to create truly affordable units; and
- WHEREAS, in preparing and considering this proposal, the Plan Commission and Common Council shall pay reasonable regard to:
 - 1) the Comprehensive Plan;
 - 2) Current conditions and character of current structures and uses in each district;
 - 3) the most desirable use for which land in each district is adapted;
 - 4) the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and
 - 5) responsible development and growth.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, MONROE COUNTY, INDIANA, THAT:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to IC 36-7-4-602(b), the Common Council directs the Plan Commission to prepare a proposal consistent with this resolution to amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(2)) (Eligibility) to include an Area Median Income (AMI) requirement within Tier 1 and Tier 2 Affordable Housing Projects, as follows:

Tier 1 Affordable Housing Projects to include at least some units to be priced below 90% of AMI, using whole percentages for each tier.

¹ See City of Bloomington 2024 Workforce Rental Housing Limit Calculations, <u>https://bloomington.in.gov/housing/workforce</u>.

² "A major theme during public engagement was on the lack of rental units priced below \$900." Regional Opportunity Initiatives, *Indiana Uplands Regional Housing Study Addendum 2.H Monroe County*, (2023 Update), 131, <u>https://regionalopportunityinc.org/src-content/uploads/2024/01/Indiana-Uplands-Housing-Study-Addendum-2.H-Monroe-County.pdf</u>.

Tier 2 Affordable Housing Projects to include at least some units priced below 70% of AMI, using whole percentages for each tier.

SECTION 2. The Common Council further directs the Plan Commission to prepare a proposal to amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(5)) (Affordable Housing Incentives) to assess the incentive structure and consider creating additional incentives for affordable housing, including but not limited to expected owner-occupied unit development.

SECTION 3. The Common Council further directs the Plan Commission to prepare a proposal to amend the text of the UDO (BMC 20.04.110(c)(7)) (Payment-in-Lieu) to require housing developments that use the "Payment-in-Lieu" option to accept housing vouchers.

SECTION 4. Upon passage of this resolution, the Plan Commission shall review and recommend UDO amendments to the Common Council in response to this resolution.

SECTION 5. If any section, sentence or provision of this legislation, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be declared invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any of the other sections, sentences, provisions, or applications of this legislation which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this legislation are declared to be severable.

PASSED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this <u>20</u> day of <u>November</u>, 2024.

& Rudmart. Such

ISABEL PIEDMONT-SMITH, President Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

MBAde

NICOLE BOLDEN, Clerk City of Bloomington

PRESENTED by me to the Mayor of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this <u>26</u> day of <u>November</u>, 2024.

NICOLE BOLDEN, Clerk City of Bloomington

SIGNED by me upon this	<u> </u>	November.	, 2024.	
			DerOm	~
			KERRY THOMSON, Ma	ayor
			City of Bloomington	-

SYNOPSIS

This resolution, sponsored by Councilmember Stosberg, initiates a proposal to amend Title 20 (the Unified Development Ordinance or "UDO") of the Bloomington Municipal Code. The resolution directs that a UDO text amendment proposal be prepared by the Plan Commission to make changes to the affordable housing incentive structure.

Distributed to: Clerk, Council Attorney, Legal, Mayor, and Planning + Transportation.

Thu, Jan 16, 2025 at 5:36 PM



Jacqueline Scanlan <scanlanj@bloomington.in.gov>

UDO amendment comment

Harstad, Dave <Dave.Harstad@colliers.com> To: Jacqueline Scanlan <scanlanj@bloomington.in.gov> Cc: "chris@cockerham.us" <chris@cockerham.us>, Chris Smith <cdsmith3030@gmail.com>

Greetings,

If not too late, please include this statement in the public record for tonight's meeting. Chris or Chris: if you could read this I'd greatly appreciate it. I have a commitment that I don't think will be done in time for public comment, Thank you!

Dear Commissioners:

I write regarding the proposed changes to the UDO. Please reject the proposed changes and instead eliminate all affordable housing incentives provisions.

I oppose all payments of money (beyond reasonable permitting fees) or other costly conditions in exchange for government permits to use one's own land.

These multi-million dollar payments into an opaque fund are a horrible practice that needs to be abolished.

The point of zoning is to reasonably regulate things like the height, density, use, life safety and to some extent, the aesthetics of the built environmental. But the power to regulate the use of private property should not be abused. The use of the police power and land use controls should be reasonable and fair.

If, for example, a five-story building is good for the public welfare when it's partially occupied by people with incomes at 70% of AMI (or whatever), why arbitrarily cap the height at three stories? I know: the city does it so it can collect large payments from property owners and extract other concessions at the vulnerable moment when they are applying for building permits to improve their own property.

This well -intentioned but still awful practice actually undermines the point of zoning described above. Even the most ethical staff, elected officials, and citizen board members are influenced (whether they admit it or not) by the millions of dollars at stake. We all earnestly believe we're completely ethical. But it's unreasonable to believe that the millions being collected don't color thinking when it comes time to vote or write staff reports. Big project with big payments get approved because the city is addicted to the money. The public loses.

If affordable housing is worth supporting, do it with general fund dollars paid by all taxpayers! We need to stop perverting the zoning process, not matter how well intentioned the objective.

37

Dave Harstad

Senior Vice President | Indiana

dave.harstad@colliers.com

Direct: +1 812 822 1122 | Mobile: +1 812 361 1230

401 E. 4th Street | Bloomington, IN 47408 | USA

See my bio and listings: Dave Harstad | Experts | Colliers

