

Bloomington Common Council-Regular Session Minutes
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, April 01, 2026 at 6:30pm

Call to Order [6:30pm]

Council President Isak Nti Asare called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call: (*indicates participation via Zoom) [6:30pm]

Council Members:

Isak Nti Asare	At-Large, Council President
Courtney Daily	District 5, Council Parliamentarian
Matt Flaherty	At-Large
Isabel Piedmont-Smith	District 1
Dave Rollo	District 4
Kate Rosenbarger	District 2
Andy Ruff	At-Large
Hopi Stosberg	District 3
Sydney Zulich	District 6, Council Vice President

City staff, officials, and guests present:

Nicole Bolden	City Clerk
Michael Wagenaar	Council, O’Neill Leadership Program Fellow
Kelly Murphy	Information Technology Services, Technology Support Manager
James Sanders	Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Birthday Celebration Commission, Chair
Kerry Thomson	Mayor
Clark Kirkman	Clark Quinn Law Firm, Attorney
Kelly Shaw	Clark Quinn Law Firm, Attorney
Allison Thurmond Quinlan	Principal Architect + Landscape Architect, Flintlock LAB
Nathan Ferreira	Summit Hill Community Development Corporation, and Bloomington Housing Authority, Executive Director

2. Agenda Summation [6:30pm]

Council President Asare summarized the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes [6:32pm]

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to approve the minutes of December 17, 2025. The motion was approved by voice vote.

4. Reports [6:33pm]

4.1. Councilmembers:

Stosberg spoke about the final draft of the letter to Mayor Kerry Thomson on the council's budget priorities.

Rollo moved and Zulich seconded to submit the letter of budget priorities from the council to Mayor Thomson. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Stosberg referenced her open letter to the community around Hopewell. She noted how to schedule a one-on-one meeting with her.

4.2. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions:

James Sanders presented the 2025 Annual Report for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration commission. He discussed the charge and focus, commissioners and staff, events in 2025, and strategic goals and initiatives. Asare appreciated that the celebration had expanded beyond day-of events. Daily concurred and asked how council could help. Sanders said attending the events was ideal. Stosberg spoke about filling vacancies and encouraged people to apply. Sanders discussed what commissioners needed to do on the commission.

4.3. Council Committees:

Piedmont-Smith presented the standard procedure for discussion of legislation at first reading, which had been discussed at the Committee on Council Processes (CCP), and highlighted key points. Asare noted council could still read legislation and not have discussion and presentation. Piedmont-Smith summarized the proposal to require that all legislation have councilmember sponsorship. She briefly stated reasons in support. There was discussion on the details of the proposal.

For the Committee on Council Processes, Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded that the Committee on Council Processes proceed with legislation to require councilmember sponsorship of all items of legislation. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Asare discussed the Council Administrator/Attorney job description and feedback from Human Resources. There was discussion on the red-lined changes to the description, and pay grade. Sharr Pechac, Human Resources (HR), Director, clarified that HR's revisions were to the language regarding the appropriation and salary of the position.

For the Hiring Committee, Daily moved and Zulich seconded to approve the job description for the Council Administrator/Attorney as amended. There was discussion on a clearer motion. Daily withdrew the motion.

Stosberg moved and Rollo seconded to empower the Hiring Committee to make changes to the job description as presented in the redline and as are reflected in the HR recommendations in the memo. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Asare said that additional action should be considered regarding the powers of the Hiring Committee.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to authorize the Hiring Committee to identify and contract, in coordination with appropriate city processes, with external vendors, professional service providers, or temporary legal counsel as necessary, to ensure uninterrupted functioning of the Council Office and to support recruitment efforts. The results shall not exceed \$50,000 and will have a maximum hourly rate of \$400. There was discussion on funds, hourly pay rate, and budget funds. The motion was approved by voice vote.

4.4. Public:

Claudia Brink spoke about affordable and modular housing. Joe Davis commented that the city had removed leaves and firewood from his yard without his permission, and demanded their return and a public apology. Kevin Keough discussed audits and timely financial reporting. Paul Rosseau talked about a ten year old girl who was struck by a vehicle on Morningside Drive by a distracted driver. She had severe injuries. Emily Niasse spoke about her home in the Trail View neighborhood, the Hopewell neighborhood, and affordable housing.

5. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [7:33pm]

Zulich said there were needed removals; one because the person could no longer fulfill the time commitment for the commission, and the other for lack of attendance. Clerk Nicole Bolden said a letter was sent by Deputy Clerk Jennifer Crossley to Drew Herron to inquire on absences and there had been no response by the requested date.

Zulich moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to remove Drew Herron and Carey Champion from the Historic Preservation Commission. Zulich withdrew the motion after a brief discussion on options for Carey Champion's appointment.

Zulich moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to remove Drew Herron from the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote.

6. Legislation for First Reading [7:35pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

7. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [7:36pm]

7.1. Ordinance 2026-06

To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps by Rezoning a 6.3 Acre Property from Residential Urban Lot (R4) and Residential Multifamily (RM) within the Transform Redevelopment Overlay (TRO) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to Approve a District Ordinance and Preliminary Plan

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-06 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-06 be adopted.

Mayor Kerry Thomson spoke about the Hopewell PUD and its timeline, and the effort to engage with council early in the process to receive input. She encouraged the council to remain engaged via the Plan Commission. She noted it was expensive to change plans. Thomson suggested having meetings in April to finalize the details of Hopewell's initial phase, in order to pass the legislation in May.

Asare asked if Thomson was requesting council to not vote that evening. Thomson said it was best to vote only if council was not going to make material changes to the proposal. Significant changes proposed by council via Reasonable Conditions (RCs) would require that the plan be altered and go back to the Redevelopment Commission (RDC). Stosberg asked the council's attorney to weigh in on the validity of Reasonable Conditions to the PUD. Clark Kirkman, and Kelly Shaw, Clark Quinn Law Firm attorneys, were present via Zoom. Kirkman referenced state code on council's authority to adopt RCs, specifically the 1500 series which governed PUDs, and Section 1512 gave power to the legislative body to add RCs when adopting PUDs. He referenced the Misty Woods case law, RCs, and written commitments. The Misty Woods case did not involve a PUD.

Flaherty asked what would determine that a RC was reasonable. Kirkman gave examples of what a court might analyze, including the overall goal of the project and if the project was furthered by the RC. Flaherty asked if city plans and code were considered and Kirkman said yes. Rollo asked if the Misty Woods case was irrelevant and Kirkman said it pertained to zoning law and not a PUD. Asare asked about the procedural options. Kirkman noted it was complicated because the petitioner was the person signing the ordinance. Allison Thurmond Quinlan, Flintlock LAB, said the proposal was a

fully-vetted, code-compliant plan that had gone through the Plan Commission. She addressed each of the RCs and their impacts on the project.

Zulich moved and Daily second to suspend the rules to allow Allison Thurmond Quinlan to present the slideshow. There was a brief discussion on the motion. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Flaherty, Rosenbarger, Ruff, Stosberg), Abstain: 0. FAILED. *Clerk's note: A motion to suspend the rules must receive a two-third majority vote to pass.*

Flaherty asked for clarification on the administration's legal position on the RCs being proposed by council. Dana Kerr, Assistant City Attorney, agreed that RCs may be imposed on a PUD, but the administration believed that anything that changed the proposed PUD were amendments and not permissible. Kerr gave examples and explained that an amendment would need to be voted on by the RDC. Kirkman countered that RCs were not zoning amendments, and were specific to PUDs. It was a unique proposal because the PUD was on city-owned land via the RDC. There was robust discussion on what RCs council could require, per state code, as well as covenants and restrictions.

Stosberg moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to introduce RC 4. The motion was approved by voice vote. Stosberg and Rosenbarger presented RC 4.

Reasonable Condition 4 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition introduces Permanent Affordability (PA) to the Hopewell PUD, where none currently exists. When Hopewell was purchased, the intent was to create permanently affordable housing - something the City of Bloomington lacks. The goal is to create a new neighborhood with affordable options, and to keep those options affordable forever, hence Permanent Affordability. Permanent affordability is a stepping stone between renting and owning market-rate homes, and having options for purchase in Hopewell is necessary. This RC hopes to allow affordable unit and property options that are similar to market-rate options: from condos, to townhouses, to small homes, to full-sized homes. Further, this Reasonable Condition brings this PUD in line with the current UDO standards for permanent affordability in a PUD, which states: at least 15% of total dwelling units within the PUD will be permanently income-limited to households earning at or below 90% AMI (amended from 120% AMI). Passed as Ordinance 2026-02 on January 14, 2026.

There was discussion on the opportunity for affordability available via a PUD given that the city owned the property. Deed restrictions, mortgages, lending, and ground leases were also discussed. Multiple types of mechanisms for affordability were being considered. Thurmond Quinlan said there was not a mechanism leading nationally. She gave examples of challenges with deed restrictions. Nathan Ferreira, Summit Hill Community Development Corporation, and Bloomington Housing Authority, Executive Director, spoke about the land trust, ground lease model, and difficulty with mortgage lending. There was discussion on what was working with the land trust as well as the challenges. Thurmond Quinlan added that Habitat for Humanity had been using a first right of refusal and a silent second mortgage, which worked at the time, and she listed examples from other cities. Council discussed allowing flexibility with the mechanisms for affordability. Kerr said that RC 4 was legally classified as an amendment since it had a significant impact on the PUD ordinance.

Steve Bishop said that permanent affordability was difficult due to escrow and taxes, and council needed to focus on the attainability of housing. Nathan Ferreira commented on low income buyers, challenges, and the importance of flexibility on affordability mechanisms. He spoke in favor of Hopewell with many examples. Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, encouraged council to listen to the experts and in support of Hopewell. Ben Berenko, Indiana University freshman, urged council to move forward with Hopewell. Joe Davis believed RC 4 did not do enough and he spoke about building housing. [Unknown] strongly supported RC 4 but said that equity should not be the primary focus of Hopewell, it should be stable housing. John Zody, CDFI Friendly Bloomington, Executive Director, discussed access to credit, the Hopewell proposal, and potential risks to homeowners and more. It was important to have many options for affordability.

John Fernandez commented on The Mill, the Trades District, affordable workforce housing, and the need for flexibility. He did not see the need to bring the PUD to council each time a change was made.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to close discussion on RC 4.

Flaherty questioned the purpose of discussing RCs if the administration believed they were illegal, which departed from four decades of city practice. It was bad policy precedent to use a PUD to violate the Transportation Plan and city code to make infrastructure worse than what the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) required. Thomson reiterated that the administration, RDC, and council could work together to establish something that worked well. Stosberg gave reasons in support of continuing the discussion on RCs. Daily concurred, adding that it would be useful to hear from the council's legal representation and the architect firm. There was additional discussion on options council could take. Piedmont-Smith said it was important to not forget that the Legal Department was stating that council could not do something that it in fact had legal authority to do. Rollo stated that surrendering the ability to improve PUDs via RCs was unprecedented and bad. Additional discussion focused on options for the proposal.

Clerk's note: Council opted to discuss RCs that pertained to input from Fire Chief Roger Kerr and no motion was made.

Flaherty stated that for building a subdivision, or PUD, one was required to follow the UDO and the Transportation Plan. The PUD should have followed the requirements from the beginning with the goal of having many modest homes. He gave examples supporting the RCs that followed design standards around green infrastructure and pedestrian accessibility and safety. He gave details and then discussed RC 11. Flaherty provided a brief history of fire safety issues, fire safety requirements and exceptions in code, sidewalk widths, and sprinkler systems. He had done legal research and submitted questions to Chief Roger Kerr and hoped to have a discussion on solutions and creative options for fire safety. Kerr spoke about fire code and concerns with RC 11. His focus was on maintaining access to dwellings for fire safety. There was discussion on the concerns and it was noted that the proposed design could be reworked including the sidewalks, utilities, greenspace, and more. The layout of the Hopewell PUD would impact the exceptions to fire code that could be applied.

Reasonable Condition 11 Synopsis: This reasonable condition would set a maximum width of 15 feet for Lanes (alleys) as opposed to 20 feet, while allowing additional width only where physically required to support the turning radius of a fire truck or sanitation vehicle. This change will help reduce speeds on Lanes; make Lanes function less like a street and more like an alley (as they are intended); and help ensure the planned central green space and sidewalks truly function as "fronts". If the proposed reasonable conditions 7 through 10 are adopted, related to improving the pedestrian realm by requiring sidewalk widths and tree plots that are consistent with the Transportation Plan, narrower lanes will also help ensure that total developable space for housing is a similar or greater area than in the original plan. Note: This reasonable condition has been updated since its inclusion in the March 25, 2026 council packet. The maximum width was increased from 12 feet to 15 feet, and additional allowances to accommodate vehicle turning radii were added.

Flaherty noted his discussion with Adam Wason, Public Works (PW), Director, regarding alley maintenance and sanitation. Wason did not expect there would be trash pick up in the alley, but PW would be responsible for alley maintenance. Kerr stated it was important to not set a bad precedent that would encourage other projects to do the same. Daily asked about the cost of the mountable curbs. Thurmond Quinlan said that fire code was the least flexible and she gave examples in the Hopewell PUD. She described problems with narrowing the twenty-foot alley and then spoke about the high cost of sprinkler systems. Stosberg noted that not every home in the PUD would need a sprinkler system, so the cost would be less than what was estimated. Flaherty expressed concern

that the PUD was not brought to council as a code-compliant proposal despite being presented as such. He gave examples of potential redesigns.

Asare asked for clarification on the impact on reducing the width of the alley. Thurmond Quinlan said the twenty-foot width was required for utilities but housing types could be changed. Asare asked what the impact on the number of houses would be if the alley was narrowed. Thurmond Quinlan said the number would be reduced. Stosberg spoke about setbacks, monolithic sidewalks, and options for Wylie Street. She questioned the goal of making many affordable homes but then compromising on other things like having a monolithic sidewalk. There was discussion on sidewalk widths. Flaherty expressed concern with the PUD because the city's plans and staff recommendations were not followed by FlintlockLAB. One example was smaller sidewalks which were not in alignment with city plans; the proposal had used the consultant's recommendations, and not staff's, which was a core problem. Thurmond Quinlan referenced the Transportation Plan which stated that existing streets should not be required to conform to the cross-sections, so Wiley Street was not going to match the new street section primarily for tree preservation. She provided additional information.

David Hittle, Planning and Transportation, Director, said Thurmond Quinlan was widely acclaimed and was hired as the designer of the PUD and it was important to trust the consultant. He had never seen the legislative body micromanage that work. He said using the PUD process was the best route for Hopewell. Flaherty asked Hittle for an example of when the city allowed a sidewalk in a new subdivision to be less than six feet wide. Hittle could not recall. Stosberg stated that since half of Wiley was being redeveloped then the street should conform to the Transportation Plan. Flaherty said that to his knowledge, no developer had been allowed to be noncompliant with the Transportation Plan when creating a subdivision or a rezone. Hittle was not aware of one. Stosberg discussed a homeowner in a historic district who had to build a six-foot sidewalk as part of remodel when there were four-foot sidewalks on either side of his dwelling. Asare asked if the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) would approve a variance for a sidewalk to be less than six feet. Hittle said no because you could not vary from the Transportation Plan.

Joe Davis spoke about affordable housing, and autonomy of homeowners. John Zody, CDFI Friendly Bloomington, commented on the need for safe, affordable housing. Jeff Richardson urged council to work with the mayor on the PUD. John Fernandez said the BZA regularly approved variances.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to postpone Ordinance 2026-06 to the May 06, 2026 regular session council meeting. Zulich withdrew the motion without objection.

Stosberg spoke about the importance of challenging each others' ideas. It was also important to note that consultants may have expertise, but were not from the city and therefore may miss important details, like bicycles on sidewalks. She stated that the BZA spent a lot of time on variances. It was the council's job to do the same with the PUD. Flaherty clarified his position and said it was difficult to make decisions when the information provided was not entirely accurate. He discussed possible compromises and dealbreakers. Daily discussed the importance of decorum and not being disrespectful to speakers. She appreciated the work done on the PUD and more discussions.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to postpone Ordinance 2026-06 to the May 6th regular session council meeting. There was discussion on postponing to the next regular session per Robert's Rules of Order. Zulich withdrew the motion.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to postpone Ordinance 2026-06 to the next regular session meeting on April 22, 2026. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Flaherty moved and Zulich seconded to conclude the portion of the meeting on second readings and move to the next portion of the agenda. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Meeting date: April 01, 2026

Clerk’s Note: Resolution 2026-05 and Resolution 2026-06 were not introduced.

7.2. Resolution 2026-05

A Resolution to Initiate a Proposal to Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code in order to Improve Sustainability and Housing Affordability

7.3. Resolution 2026-06

A Resolution Directing the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department to Develop a Framework for Long-Term Housing Affordability

8. Additional Public Comment [11:24pm]

9. Council Schedule [11:24pm]

There was discussion on using the upcoming Deliberation Session to deliberate on Hopewell PUD. Asare reviewed the council’s upcoming schedule.

10. Adjournment [11:27pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this day: 16 of September, 2026.



Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

ATTEST:



Signature of City Clerk Nicole Bolden

Clerk’s Note: The above minutes summarize the motions passed and issues discussed rather than providing a verbatim account of every word spoken. Bloomington Common Council meetings can be accessed on the following websites:

- [Community Access Television Services](#)¹ (CATS)
- [City of Bloomington YouTube](#)²

[Background materials and packets](#)³ are available on the Common Council website.

¹ <https://catvstv.net>
² <https://youtube.com/@citybloomington>
³ <https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings>