

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 6:30pm, Council President Isabel Piedmont-Smith presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL  
REGULAR SESSION  
November 20, 2024

Councilmembers present: Isak Nti Asare, Courtney Daily, Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Andy Ruff, Hopi Stosberg, Sydney Zulich  
Councilmembers present via Zoom: none  
Councilmembers absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Isabel Piedmont-Smith gave a land and labor acknowledgment and summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:32pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to approve the minutes of June 18, 2024, July 31, 2024, August 14, 2024, September 11, 2024, and October 9, 2024. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:37pm]

June 18, 2024 (Regular Session)  
July 31, 2024 (Regular Session)  
August 14, 2024 (Regular Session)  
September 11, 2024 (Consensus Building Activity)  
October 9, 2024 (Special Session)

Daily discussed her previous and upcoming constituent meetings.

REPORTS

Asare spoke about activities taking place for Innovation Week.

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:36pm]

Stosberg responded to Mayor Kerry Thomson's comments made at the November 06, 2024 Regular Session meeting regarding an appointment to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The appointment process had received more attention than warranted and information was left out from Thomson's comments and media reports. Stosberg referenced city code regarding membership requirements for the HPC. Thomson's comments at the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting stated that the candidate's demographics were the reason for appointment. While diversity of perspectives was important, demographics was not a qualification to serve according to the Bloomington Municipal Code (BMC). People should not be qualified or disqualified because of their demographics. Doing so gave a bad name to the importance of diverse voices and resulted in unqualified people holding positions of power. Stosberg urged the mayor to return an appointment that met the membership requirements for the HPC. She emphasized the separation of powers and checks and balances between the legislative and executive branches of municipal government. Council and the mayoral administration should constantly be questioning each other.

Piedmont-Smith discussed her previous constituent meeting.

Erin McNeil and Jason Michálek gave the Community Advisory on Public Safety (CAPS) Commission's 2024 Annual Report. McNeil gave a summary of the goals and highlights of the CAPS Commission in 2024. She gave examples of their advocacy and stated CAPS' goals to expand their access to existing city public safety programs and overlapping boards and commissions.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:43pm]

Michálek recommended the council not add mayoral appointments. CAPS has also been seeking to recruit members with diverse experiences through their community outreach events. Flaherty asked about any barriers that CAPS may face with only council-appointed members.

McNeil said that mayoral appointments would hinder CAPS' mission because it would not incentivize volunteers to apply.

Michálek said that council and mayoral appointments would add a divide between commissioners and reduce solidarity.

Stosberg asked for clarification on what existing public safety programs CAPS wanted to join, and if the request was to have two sitting CAPS members on the Board of Public Safety (BPS).

Michálek said that was potentially their request. CAPS participated in community conversations and could be involved with groups that worked on public safety.

Stosberg stated that Bloomington's BPS already had the maximum number of members allowed under Indiana state code.

Piedmont-Smith suggested looking into whether the city could add advisory members to the BPS.

Rollo asked if the request was for CAPS commissioners on the BPS to be statutory members necessitating the mayor to restructure the Board, or if it was that commissioners be appointed to BPS.

McNeil said that it was the latter.

Rosenbarger asked if CAPS still recommended a feasibility study for a Department of Community Safety and Resilience as suggested in their 2023 Alternative Public Safety Report. She asked if they were interested in starting a program similar to Law Enforcement Action Partnership (LEAP) as was discussed earlier in the year.

Michálek said CAPS still recommended the feasibility study. They were unaware of any follow-up from the administration on LEAP.

Piedmont-Smith said Mayor Thomson was trying to schedule a meeting with CAPS representatives.

Piedmont-Smith extended the period for the mayor and city offices reports by 10 minutes with no objections from the council.

Motion to extend time for reports from mayor and city offices

Flaherty asked if CAPS had been involved in a forthcoming public safety action plan with the administration.

Michálek said they had not been.

There were no reports from council committees.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [7:03pm]

Darel Ruble expressed displeasure with roadwork repair.

- PUBLIC [7:04pm]

Deputy Attorney Ash Kulak read a written comment submitted via Zoom by Wes M., who commented that the Board of Public Safety would change to a the merit board in the next year.

Peg Hausman, Sierra Club, spoke about environmental concerns pertaining to Duke Energy.

Joe Davis of the Taxpayer Objection Petitioners spoke against the Convention Center expansion.

Robyn Skuya-Boss referenced and expounded on Peg Hausman's concerns on the environment and Duke Energy.

Eric Spoonmore, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, urged council to require public commenters to give their name.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Council questions:

Piedmont-Smith moved and Stosberg seconded to notify CAPS Commissioner Jenna Buckner that she would be considered for removal from the CAPS Commission at the council's December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting.

Daily asked if Buckner would be given a chance to appeal.  
Piedmont-Smith said yes.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

There was no legislation for first readings.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-24 to be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-24 be adopted.

Jessica McClellan, City Controller, presented the legislation. She noted that the par amount of the General Obligation (GO) bonds was \$4,300,000. The main goal was to preserve financial stability while funding important projects. Bonding was the best and most sustainable tool for the city to fund capital expenses since the levy was not keeping up with the city's actual growth. After discussions with the council, the administration had created a project list to be funded by the bonds.

Thomas Cameron, Quarrels & Brady law firm, explained his role as bond counsel. The bonds had to comply with state and federal laws and were backed by property taxes collected in the future.

Matt Frische, Reedy Financial Group, spoke to next steps with the project. The GO bonds allowed the city to fund capital projects without needing to raise taxes. If the bonds were approved, they would proceed to the sale and closing of the bonds.

Landon Baehm, Robert W. Baird & Company, stated their role in executing the best pricing of the bonds to result in lower taxpayer payments. They were working to finalize the bonds process by the end of 2024.

Rollo asked if the GO bonds would change Bloomington's debt per capita.

McClellan said they would not.

Asare asked about the sustainability of the bonds and of potential consequences if Bloomington's economy stopped growing or went into a recession.

McClellan reiterated that the GO bonds were a sustainable tool. GO bonds always generated a small amount of taxes to pay the debt service.

## APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:21pm]

Council discussion:

Vote on notification of pending removal [7:21pm]

## LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READINGS [7:22pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READINGS AND RESOLUTIONS [7:22pm]

Ordinance 2024-24 - To Authorize the Issuance of the City of Bloomington, Indiana General Obligation Bonds, Series 2024, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Projects of the City and Expenses Incurred in Connection with the Issuance of the Bonds [7:22pm]

Council questions:

Frische explained that bonds were planned conservatively and without anticipating growth. The bond was for a two-year financing period and the tax rate would not need to be raised.

Ordinance 2024-24 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Flaherty asked whether it was legally permissible to deviate from the approved project list.

Cameron said the project list could not be changed. The bonds would be sold to a purchaser and all changes would need the consent of the bondholder.

Stosberg asked if there could be issues finding a buyer for the bonds due to recent, negative changes to the bond rates.

Baehm did not believe that would be a risk. About \$35,000 of transaction costs had been eliminated, which had a bigger impact than any possible interest rate changes.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the bond maturity rates. Prior discussion had framed the bond maturity rates as two years; but, the ordinance stated the maturity rate was up to three years.

Cameron explained the bond scheduling process. The bond was drafted as three years because the final payment would be just over two years from the date of closing.

Flaherty asked why many items on the project list were vague. He asked for information about planned projects, and if the council or commissions would be involved in the decision-making process.

McClellan said the timeline for the creation of the list was very quick. Keeping the projects vague would give the Engineering Department more time to make planning decisions. The administration would like to hear feedback and discuss priorities with council.

Andrew Cibor, Engineer, stated that the structure of the list provided flexibility for projects in various stages of development. He was open to collaboration with council.

Rollo asked Council Attorney Lisa Lehner if the questions she had asked Cameron earlier that month had been answered satisfactorily.

Lehner said they were.

Rollo asked if approval for each of the projects would come before council in the form of an appropriation ordinance. He asked for clarification on the community-led, traffic-calming projects and asked if the ordinance could be amended to define those projects.

McClellan explained that the bond ordinance included the appropriation ordinance. The administration was eager to hear council's thoughts on the Transportation Plan. Project definitions should not be too restrictive.

Cameron explained that it was difficult for a bond to be tax-exempt without appropriating all of the funds.

Cibor explained that the bond funds would alleviate council's funding burden from the Sidewalk Committee. The bonds would help fund smaller, resident-led, traffic-calming projects.

Margie Rice, Corporation Counsel, stated that the role of the council was to approve funds, while the role of the executive branch was to decide how to spend the funds. They could amend the project list but needed to know what the potential amendments could be.

Rollo stated that he understood from Cibor's comments that the projects on the list would be sidewalks and smaller projects led by neighborhoods and not large scale, staff-led projects.

Stosberg clarified that the Sidewalk Committee had devoted funds in the past to the neighborhood-led, traffic-calming projects. If

the legislation passed, those initiatives could be funded by the bond, leaving more money for sidewalks via Sidewalk Committee.

Rollo stated that he did not like the ambiguity in the projects. Cibor expounded on his comments regarding projects funding.

Ordinance 2024-24 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Stosberg asked if the GO bonds could fund projects in the planning stage in addition to the installation.

Cameron said yes.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the cost of issuing the bonds.

Cameron explained the cost was included in Engineering Department projects.

Greg Alexander commented that the council should modify policy rather than withhold funds for projects.

Public comment:

Deputy Attorney Ash Kulak read a written comment submitted via Zoom by Kevin [unknown] who disagreed with the assessment on Bloomington's rate of growth.

Joe Davis expressed his disagreement with the GO bonds ordinance.

Steve Volan spoke positively about Bloomington's rate of growth and compared the bond ordinance to one passed in 2018. He said council should either accept or track the decisions made by the administration on how the bond funds were to be spent.

Stosberg asked if the project list contained any large-scale items that would not have a robust public comment process.

Council comments:

Cibor said some projects would have less public input, but larger projects would have more public engagement opportunities. All projects would be listed on the city's Engineering page, and the public was encouraged to reach out for more information.

Rollo asked if projects in the Transportation Plan and Safe Streets for All would go before the proposed Advisory Transportation Commission (ATC) and not to the council.

Cibor said that currently, projects went before the Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Commission. If the ATC was approved, the projects would go through that commission.

Flaherty stated his intent to vote in favor of the ordinance and credited Controller McClellan for the collaborative process. He was concerned about the lack of specificity in the project list. There had been prior issues with city administrations departing from what had been communicated in other approved bond ordinances.

Rollo reiterated his concern of the lack of specificity and council's approval of the projects. He would not be supporting the ordinance.

Ruff voiced his agreement with Rollo. He liked many aspects of the ordinance but was concerned about accountability due to the lack of specificity. He would not be supporting the ordinance.

Stosberg stated she was comfortable with the level of specificity in the project list as long as the public engagement efforts for the projects continued. She encouraged other councilmembers to participate in those public processes. Staff had been receptive to concerns and council should be open to new information.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the bond should not be held back due to disagreement over whether the council should have final say over transportation projects. Capital projects should be funded through bonds and not through the city's annual budget.

Ordinance 2024-24 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Rollo disagreed with Piedmont-Smith's comments and stated that specificity was needed for accountability.

Piedmont-Smith noted that this section of the meeting served as the legally required public hearing for the ordinance.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2024-24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Rollo, Ruff), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 2024-24 [8:38pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-20 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote (Flaherty out of the room). Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 2024-20 - To Amend the City of Bloomington's Transportation Plan in Order to Incorporate the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Safety Action Plan [8:39pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Resolution 2024-20.

Amendment 01 to Resolution 2024-20

Stosberg moved and Asare seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Resolution 2024-20. Stosberg presented the amendment. The update to the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plan draft was approved by the Plan Commission. Amendment 01 asked staff to present the final document of the plan. If the amendment passed, the plan would need to return to the Plan Commission.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment is proposed by Cm. Stosberg at the request of Planning and Transportation staff. It includes a revised version of the SS4A Safety Action Plan that corrects typos, updates graphics, and improves clarity; incorporates three completed appendices; and makes several substantive changes to address errors, provides additional information and context, and reorganizes action items. Additionally, it includes detailed descriptions of potential future funding, staffing, and other requirements necessary for completion.

Ryan Robling, Planning Services Manager, Planning and Transportation stated that council would need to approve the SS4A Action Plan before the end of 2024 for the plan to be eligible for grants in 2025.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the amendment was simply substituting the final draft and appendices of the SS4A Action Plan from what was sent out in the council packet.

Council questions:

Robling confirmed it was.

Stosberg also said yes and referenced a memorandum detailing the changes in the packet materials.

Rollo asked if council would postpone the vote in order to give the public time to review the proposed changes.

Stosberg stated she preferred to approve the amendment so council could hear from planning staff. Council could then postpone approving the plan as amended.

Joe Davis expressed his displeasure with the amendment's timing.

Public comment:

Asare asked Stosberg to read the proposed changes in Amendment 01.

Council comment:

Stosberg read aloud the brief summary of all of the proposed changes to the SS4A plan. The plan updates had received a nearly-unanimous positive recommendation from the Plan Commission.

Amendment 01 to Resolution 2024-20 (*cont'd*)

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Resolution 2024-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Resolution 2024-20 [8:51pm]

Robling presented Resolution 2024-20 as amended. The legislation amended the Transportation Plan to incorporate the SS4A Action Plan. The plan aimed to achieve the goal of zero traffic deaths and serious injuries on Bloomington streets by 2039. Redundancy was crucial to ensure safety as it provided layers of protection. Staff analyzed crash and traffic data, demographics data, and engaged in public outreach to identify priority areas with a focus on equity. There were a variety of action items needed to achieve these goals requiring additional staffing and funding. The action plan included multiple performance measures to provide accountability and track progress.

Rollo asked if collisions between pedestrians and bicyclists were tracked. He asked if pedestrians were asked in the survey if they felt safe sharing the sidewalk with bicyclists.

Council questions:

Robling explained those collisions were more difficult to track. Only collisions reported to the police were known. The specific question about pedestrian safety regarding bikes was not asked, but there was a space to answer that if anyone was specifically concerned.

Stosberg asked if drivers responded affirmatively to survey questions stating that people drove too fast on city streets.

Robling explained that drivers likely did answer yes to those questions. However, the questions did not ask what mode of transportation respondents used.

Asare asked about plans to collaborate with Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) to reduce traffic incidents along roads controlled by the state. He asked about contingency plans in case they were unable to collaborate.

Robling answered that they had attempted to collaborate with INDOT and would continue to do so. They would likely need lobbyists to continue adding pressure. Staff had limited viability for contingency plans since INDOT controlled their own roads.

Piedmont-Smith asked if Pat Martin, Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Manager, would speak to collaborating with INDOT in his position.

Martin said specificity was the best tactic to encourage collaboration with INDOT. The Planning department's crash dashboard would help these efforts.

Flaherty asked if the city could purchase INDOT-controlled roads if needed, and if so, if it could only be an intersection or its signals.

Martin said it was possible but was unsure about the intersection or signals.

Ruff questioned whether zero traffic deaths and serious fatalities was a viable goal without being able to control human behavior. He asked how first responders quickly responded to crashes with roadway designs that slow down traffic.

Robling affirmed that he believed zero deaths and serious injuries was achievable. While they could not control behavior they could

control designs that encouraged safer driving. Fewer crashes meant fewer incidents that needed first responders. Many traffic calming methods increased first responder response times.

Cibor agreed with Robling and explained his experience implementing traffic calming measures in conjunction with a fire department in another city. The fire department was able to increase their response times.

Piedmont-Smith expressed concerns with the plan, citing typos and clarity issues. She asked if there could be another amendment if the council postponed the vote.

Robling stated they would find and fix the errors. He said they could bring another amendment to the council.

Flaherty moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2024-20 as amended be postponed until the December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Regular Session.

Rollo asked why it was urgent to pass SS4A in 2024.

Robling explained that the priority was due to grant eligibility.

Stosberg encouraged councilmembers to communicate any concerns they had about the plan to Robling to shorten the discussion when council reconsidered the legislation.

Asare asked if the council could suspend the rules to allow public comment on the legislation.

There was a brief discussion on the process council could take.

Flaherty withdrew the motion without objection.

There was no public comment.

Flaherty moved and Asare seconded that Resolution 2024-20 as amended be postponed until the December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Regular Session. The motion to postpone Resolution 2024-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Flaherty moved and Zulich seconded to amend the agenda to hear Resolution 2024-24 before the other items on the agenda. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-24 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-24 be adopted.

Lehner and Stosberg presented the legislation. Lehner explained that the resolution clarified the Open Door Law for the public, and councilmembers would more easily understand the electronic meetings policy. It would add additional safeguards for meetings and work sessions.

Stosberg stated that the definition of work sessions should be clarified in Bloomington Municipal Code. The resolution would aid in the understanding of work sessions to remove confusion and assumptions.

Resolution 2024-20 as amended  
(cont'd)

Council questions:

Motion to postpone Resolution 2024-20 as amended

Council discussion:

Withdrawal of the motion

Public comment:

Motion to postpone Resolution 2024-20 as amended [9:30pm]

Motion to amend the agenda  
[9:33pm]

Resolution 2024-24 - A Resolution  
Revising the Bloomington  
Common Council Electronic  
Meetings Policy [9:38pm]



There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith noted that the resolution specified a presiding officer and meeting chair for council committees. Interview committees did not have chairs, so a chairs would need to be appointed in January.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Resolution 2024-24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 2024-24 [9:38pm]

Asare moved and Zulich seconded to combine Resolution 2024-23 and Resolution 2024-25 into a single item.

Motion to combine Resolution 2024-23 and Resolution 2024-25

Piedmont-Smith said it would be difficult due to the differences in the resolutions.

Council discussion:

Asare asked if they could combine discussion on the two resolutions but vote on them separately. The mechanism of both resolutions was the same. They had already discussed the need for the resolutions in multiple forums.

Stosberg stated that the legislation should be considered separately as they are different topics. She would vote no.

Piedmont-Smith stated her agreement with Stosberg. There was brief council discussion on the consideration of both resolutions.

Asare withdrew the motion.

Withdrawal of the motion

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-23 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

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) [9:40pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-23 be adopted.

Stosberg introduced the legislation. She explained the procedure for legislation that changed the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). If the council passed the resolution, it would be sent to the Plan Commission, who would vote on an ordinance to send back to council. The primary purpose of the resolution was to change the affordability incentive eligibility requirements for workforce housing. Workforce housing was not very low-income housing; it was for workers with an income between 80-120% of Bloomington's Area Median Income (AMI) but could not afford the high cost of rent. The resolution would address issues of imbalance in the current workforce housing requirements.

David Hittle, Director of Planning and Transportation, stated the resolution gave the department direction without constraining staff.

Anna Killion-Hanson, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) said while there were good intentions for the current workforce housing in the UDO, the qualifications had a high salary threshold to qualify. Many apartments only advertised rent prices at the highest rate allowed. The legislation would allow city staff to specify the percentage of units that need to be advertised at a certain rate.

Daily asked if Planning staff would set a specific number of units that had to be rented at the lower rental cost range set by workforce housing.

Resolution 2024-23 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Stosberg said the legislation would address affordability for workers making the middle range of AMI.

Daily asked if the number of lower-rent units would be specified or if it the number would remain vague.

Stosberg said the Planning Department would later analyze and decide those numbers.

Flaherty stated there needed to be a balance between requiring affordability and providing economic incentive for developers to build in Bloomington. He asked if requiring lower-rent apartments would result in fewer total workforce housing units. He asked if the city would monitor and calibrate the numbers over time.

Stosberg stated that the legislation asked staff to assess the incentive structure for developers.

Killion-Hanson stated that developers could make a payment in lieu rather than provide workforce housing apartments. The payment in lieu would go to HAND's housing development fund.

Stosberg said the legislation asked that developers accept housing vouchers if they take the payment in lieu route.

Rosenbarger asked if the payment in lieu could be priced very high since it was cheaper over the long run for developers to make that one-time payment rather than provide affordable housing rates. She stated that affordable housing should be integrated into all developments rather than relying on the city's housing development fund to build affordable housing.

Killion-Hanson explained that they could change the payment in lieu rate at the beginning of each year. They could not make the decision on rates until then.

Deputy Attorney Ash Kulak read a written comment submitted via Zoom by Steve Volan, who stated his approval of the legislation.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith expressed her appreciation for Stosberg's work on the legislation.

Council comments:

Stosberg thanked city staff for their time spent helping her with the resolution.

Rosenbarger expressed her appreciation for Stosberg's writing markups on the packet materials.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2024-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 2024-23 [10:00pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-25 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 2024-25 - To Initiate a Proposal to Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code Re: Single-Room Occupancy Residential Buildings as a Permitted Use [10:00pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Resolution 2024-25.

Piedmont-Smith passed the gavel to Ruff.

Piedmont-Smith introduced the legislation. She explained the history and use of Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) buildings. The council decided at the September 11, 2024 discussion session that SROs could help with some homelessness and housing problems.

She explained the process and responsibilities of the council and the Plan Commission for the UDO revision process. Resolution 2024-25 (cont'd)

Hittle explained that the resolution provided a starting point for the Planning Department without constraining them. There is a wide range of forms of SROs and they will need to tailor the rentals to the Bloomington community.

Ruff asked for further explanation on the differences between the legislation and current occupancy rules in the UDO. Council questions:

Hittle explained the differences. They would like to see larger buildings with a shared kitchen and bathroom which was not currently allowed.

Ruff asked Piedmont-Smith to elaborate on what she proposed to be specific standards.

Piedmont-Smith answered that she envisioned size limits based on the residential zoning district.

Rollo asked what would prevent the SROs from becoming student housing.

Piedmont-Smith explained that students could live there. They needed affordable housing too.

Hittle stated that he would like to reach out to other college towns to ask about their experience with SROs and students.

Piedmont-Smith suggested that students may be dissuaded to rent an SRO due to the lack of gathering spaces.

Rosenbarger asked if Hittle was planning on fitting smaller SROs into walkable neighborhoods.

Hittle answered that ideally there would be SROs in all different types of neighborhoods. They planned to look into doing that.

Rosenbarger stated that there seemed to be concerns about students living in SROs. However, she noted that students could also live in single-family homes.

Eric Ost asked if an owner could change a single-family home into an SRO. Public comment:

Joe Davis expressed his opposition to the legislation.

Steve Volan supported the resolution.

Tim Dwyer expressed support for the resolution.

Killion-Hanson commented that she has been contacted by many students who were living in their cars due to unaffordable housing. Students should not be excluded, and she recommended an affordability covenant setting qualifications for the SROs.

Stosberg asked Hittle if he had thought of conditions for owners who may want to convert their existing housing into an SRO. Council comments:

Hittle stated that he had not, but they would take those concerns into account as they crafted the ordinance modifying the UDO.

Zulich expressed disappointment with comments that stereotyped students. All students deserved affordable housing. The city should provide competition to Indiana University in the housing market.

Flaherty expressed his agreement with Zulich's comments. The conversation on housing affordability should be centered on all

Bloomington residents. SROs would be an important tool to help affordability. The legislation directed the implementation of existing city policy, and the final votes and details would be finalized later.

Resolution 2024-25 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Rollo stated that some of the most affordable homes in Bloomington were targeted for rentals. Bloomington was rich in rentals and poor in owner occupancy. They should maintain affordable homes so residents could build equity. He did support this resolution.

Stosberg commented that there should be a differentiation in thinking of student housing versus as a place where students live. She explained the definition of student housing laid out in the UDO. The city could not discriminate who could live in certain housing, but could define the SRO elements.

Rosenbarger referenced a complex in Bloomington that had enough parking spots for every resident, but the lot was never full since many renters did not have a car. Owner-occupied households in Bloomington had more cars than rental units did.

Piedmont-Smith thanked staff and councilmembers who helped with the legislation. She spoke positively of living in an SRO in Boston in graduate school. Bloomington should have SROs as well.

Ruff stated that the resolution was not the final step in the process. He would be supporting the legislation. He stated that some owners would not be invested in maintaining their property. And some concerns about SROs and students were valid.

Piedmont-Smith said rentals would be included in HAND's inspection program. There would be safeguards on the concerns.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2024-25 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 2024-25 [10:41pm]

Ruff passed the gavel back to Piedmont-Smith.

There was no public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [10:42pm]

Piedmont-Smith reviewed the upcoming council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:43pm]

Piedmont-Smith adjourned the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT [10:43pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 02 day of April, 2025.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:



Hopi Stosberg, PRESIDENT  
Bloomington Common Council



Nicole Bolden, CLERK  
City of Bloomington