

Bloomington Common Council-Regular Session Minutes
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, March 25, 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
Tim Street	Parks and Recreation, Director
Emma Williams	Human Rights Commission, Chair
Michael Shermis	Community and Family Resources, Special Projects Coordinator
Claudia Lara	Commission on Hispanic and Latiné Affairs, Chair
David Hittle	Planning and Transportation, Director
Margie Rice	Corporation Counsel
Dana Kerr	Legal, Assistant City Attorney
Kerry Thomson	Mayor
Anna Killion-Hanson	Housing & Neighborhood Development (HAND), Director

1. Agenda Summation [6:31pm]

Asare summarized the agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes [6:32pm]

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to approve the minutes of September 24, 2025. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

3. Reports [6:33pm]

3.1. Councilmembers:

Stosberg reported on her draft budget priorities memo and asked for feedback for a final draft. Councilmembers briefly discussed items in the memo.

Piedmont-Smith spoke about the Monroe County Waste Reduction District grant programs.

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

Tim Street, Parks and Recreation, Director, presented the 2026 Parks & Recreation Master Plan. He outlined community engagement and outreach, key findings, and draft goals. Top areas of demand included trails, parks, the farmer’s market, pools, and pickleball. Councilmembers asked about ecological integrity and survey methods.

Emma Williams, Bloomington/Monroe County Human Rights Commission, Chair, presented the commission’s 2025 Annual Report. The commission’s mission was to enforce the Human Rights Ordinance and educate community members. In 2025, they investigated cases and complaints, and performed outreach. Councilmembers asked about LGBTQ+ discrimination complaints and the complaint filing process.

Claudia Lara, Hispanic and Latiné Affairs Commission, Chair, presented the commission’s 2025 Annual Report. The commission worked to provide resources, strengthen partnerships, and foster belonging through family engagement, outreach, and radio programming. Councilmembers thanked the commission for their work and asked how they could support them.

3.3. Council Committees:

Rosenbarger reported on upcoming Pedestrian Safety Committee projects.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to approve the Pedestrian Safety Committee funding recommendations for 2026. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Asare reported on the Hiring Committee’s efforts to rewrite the job description for the council administrator/attorney position. Councilmembers discussed wording changes to the job description.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to approve the job description. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

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, and/or temporary legal counsel as necessary to ensure uninterrupted functioning of the council office and to support recruitment efforts.

Stosberg and Asare discussed task prioritization for the temporary legal counsel. Rollo thanked Clerk Bolden and staff for help given to the council.

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

3.4. Public:

Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke about upcoming chamber opportunities. Matt Caldie commented on the Environmental Commission’s Eco-Heroes Art Contest. Chris Tiwari spoke about food growing. Bree Christman commented on hoarding disorder. Paul Rousseau spoke against capitalism.

4. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [7:52pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and Zulich seconded to appoint Carey Champion to seat C-1 on the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Meeting Date: March 25, 2026

Zulich noted that Drew Herron had missed the last three meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission, and was not responding to emails from the chair and staff liaison.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to remove Drew Herron from the Historic Preservation Commission. Piedmont-Smith asked about sending a final notice. Zulich withdrew the motion.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to send Drew Herron a final letter prior to his removal from the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

5. Legislation for First Reading [7:56pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

6. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [7:56pm]

6.1. 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 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

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

Councilmembers decided to allow public comment on each reasonable condition (RC) and combine consideration for Reasonable Conditions 4 and 5; 6 and 7; and 8-11.

Mayor Kerry Thomson presented on the Hopewell PUD and said there was no housing utopia and there must be prioritization and collaboration. They focused on two specific goals: attainability and walkability. The PUD was certified unanimously by the Plan Commission and had received a large amount of public input. Design changes were costly and the current PUD was a deliverable plan. Margie Rice, Corporation Counsel, presented the administration's legal view on RCs. She stated that Indiana law did not allow legislative bodies to amend a PUD that was adopted and certified by a plan commission. While RCs were allowed, they could not amend PUDs. The administration viewed most of the council's proposed RCs as amendments. The council could pass amendments to the PUD only if the petitioner agreed to them. The administration's legal analysis was that RCs 1, 2, 5, and 6 were consistent with the certified PUD, and RCs 3, 4, and 7-13 were impermissible amendments.

Stosberg asked if the council would not be able to pass RCs 3, 4, and 7-13 if the petitioner did not agree. She asked if the petitioner had been asked if they were unwilling to do so. Rice stated that the Redevelopment Commission (RDC), petitioner, intended to move forward with the proposal as approved by the Plan Commission. Flaherty asked for clarification on the RCs which were believed to be amendments, therefore disallowed by Indiana law. He stated her opinion was counter to several past ordinances for PUDs, which the council was able to pass with similar RCs. Margie cited Crown Point v. Misty Woods case law. She had not reviewed the previous PUDs and was unsure whether the property owners had agreed to the RCs. The Indiana General Assembly took away authority from the legislative body to do anything other than approve or reject the PUD at this point in the process. Flaherty stated he had read the Misty Woods case and that case differed from the current situation, and his reading of the case countered the administration's. The RCs were only impermissible because of the administration's interpretation. Discussion ensued between Flaherty and Rice over whether the case was applicable and council authority to adopt RCs. Councilmembers questioned Rice on her

Meeting Date: March 25, 2026

legal interpretation and whether she had consulted with the RDC in a public meeting. Rice stated that their options were to approve or reject as certified. Councilmembers discussed postponing the legislation to receive their own legal counsel.

Stosberg moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded Reasonable Condition #1. Stosberg presented RC #1. It removed allowed uses that would not be residential.

Reasonable Condition #1 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition 01 is sponsored by Councilmember Stosberg. It requires an updated Allowed Use Table to reflect the stated Project Goals and a rational phasing plan.

There were no council questions. There was no public comment.

The motion to adopt Reasonable Condition #1 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Stosberg moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded Reasonable Condition #2. Stosberg presented RC #2. It asked the petitioner to provide a general rational phasing plan.

Reasonable Condition #2 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition 02 is sponsored by Councilmember Stosberg. This condition requires the applicant to provide a phasing plan as part of the final plan approval process.

Thomson agreed to provide a phasing plan.

There were no council questions. There was no public comment.

The motion to adopt Reasonable Condition #2 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Daily out of the room).

Ruff stated that he had discussed RC #3 with Thomson and it was redundant. He did not introduce it.

Stosberg moved and Rollo seconded Reasonable Condition #6. Flaherty presented RC #6. It called for all buildings in the PUD to be all electric for significant energy needs, which was consistent with the Climate Action Plan and was the only viable path for building decarbonization consistent with the city's net zero greenhouse gas communitywide emissions goal.

Reasonable Condition #6 Synopsis: This reasonable condition requires that all buildings in the Planned Unit Development will be all-electric for major energy needs, which is called for in the Bloomington Climate Action Plan (Action EB4-A-2). Bloomington has a goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions community wide by 2050, and building electrification is one of the core strategies to decarbonize the buildings sector.

There were no council questions.

Sarah Wolford, Habitat for Humanity, Housing Solutions Director, commented that there could be issues with entirely electric on-demand water heaters.

The motion to adopt Reasonable Condition #6 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Zulich moved and Daily seconded Reasonable Condition #5. Zulich presented RC #5, which directed the HAND Department to develop a framework for long-term homeownership affordability using tools such as silent second mortgages and right of first refusal.

Reasonable Condition #5: This Reasonable Condition 05 is sponsored by Councilmember Zulich. It is

Meeting Date: March 25, 2026

paired with a resolution sponsored by Councilmember Zulich directing the Housing and neighborhood development department to Develop a Framework for Long-Term Housing Affordability.

Stosberg clarified that the units the RC referred to were the 15% designated as permanently affordable. She asked about deed restrictions and data proving effectiveness of the proposed methods. Anna Killion-Hansen, HAND Director, stated that affordability frameworks could not be developed without knowing what would be approved. Over 50% of the units were already affordable at or below 120% Area Median Income (AMI). Councilmembers discussed whether RC #4 and RC #5 conflicted with each other, and discussed permanent affordability and percentages of units. Thomson stated that deed restrictions prevented properties from being marketable on a traditional mortgage and affected sellability.

Ryan Langley, Ruoff Mortgage, Branch Manager and former County Councilmember, spoke against deed restrictions and gave examples of financing issues. Ryan Still, Summit Hill Community Development Corporation, discouraged blanket deed restrictions. Sarah Wolford stated that Habitat for Humanity no longer used deed restrictions, and they had successfully used silent second mortgages and first right of refusal. Paul Rousseau expressed doubt that the properties would be permanently affordable. Christopher Emge asked the council to listen to commenters with experience working with mortgages. Blake Music, Ruoff Mortgage, President, stated that the greatest affordability issues were in areas with strict local government policy. Aaron Comforty spoke in favor of more regulations for permanent affordability.

Stosberg stated she would not support RC #5 due to lack of supporting data and concerns about affordability. Flaherty agreed with Stosberg's comments on affordability and supported RC #4 over #5, expressing that the two were in conflict.

The motion to adopt RC #5 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 3 (Asare, Daily, Zulich), Nays: 6, Abstain: 0. FAILED

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to postpone consideration of Ordinance 2026-06 to the next council regular session meeting on April 1st, 2026.

Rollo stated that because the administration believed that passing the other reasonable conditions was tantamount to rejection of the petition, he wanted legal clarification to consider the RCs based on their merits and not on whether they would disqualify the entire petition. Zulich stated the city had been discussing Hopewell since 2017, there was still a housing crisis, and the council should not let perfect prevent good. Stosberg was in favor of postponing due to affordability concerns and believed the PUD was not ready. Flaherty supported the motion to postpone due to concerns over contradictory legal guidance, affordability and substandard transportation infrastructure. The council had a 90 day window to review the PUD and the council's desire for two more weeks was not the cause of a delay. Daily was not in favor of postponing due to concerns about increasing expenses. Rollo stated that the council had waited for this legislation for over two years and was baffled by arguments that the council's request for two more weeks was holding up the project. They could not expect private developers to follow the UDO if the city did not. Piedmont-Smith was opposed to voting on the legislation that night and said the stated timeline on Hopewell was exaggerated. While the council had been involved in the past year, there was no reason to believe there would be issues with the UDO, affordability requirements, and reasonable conditions. Rosenbarger expressed concerns about the legality of reasonable conditions and a written commitment to affordability. Asare stated the conversation had been theoretical and the reasonable conditions discussion demonstrated why the council needed their own lawyer.

The motion to postpone received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Asare, Daily, Zulich), Abstain: 0.

6.2. 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

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-05 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Asare), Abstain: 0 (Rosenbarger off screen). Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-05 be adopted.

Flaherty suggested postponing the resolution.

Rosenbarger moved and Zulich seconded to postpone Resolution 2026-05 to April 1st, 2026. There was council discussion on the motion to postpone. Rosenbarger withdrew the motion.

Flaherty presented the resolution. He gave context on the process and steps moving forward, and detailed proposed changes, including lot sizes, electrification, and parking mandates.

Rollo moved and Zulich seconded to postpone consideration of Resolution 2026-05 to April 1st, 2026. Council discussion on postponement ensued. The motion to postpone received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

6.3. Resolution 2026-06

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

Clerk’s note: There was no motion to introduce Resolution 2026-06.

7. Additional Public Comment [10:41pm]

Zulich moved and Daily seconded to suspend the rules to allow general public comment to include anything on the agenda, excluding anything that was already offered for public comment. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

There was no public comment.

8. Council Schedule [10:43pm]

Asare stated the council would be meeting on April 1st, 2026.

9. Adjournment [10:43pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

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

APPROVE:



Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

Meeting Date: March 25, 2026



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>