CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

August 25, 2022 @ 5:30 p.m.
City Hall, 401 N. Morton Street
Common Council Chamber, Room #115

https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/85216163371?pwd=REpnS09zVW9pajhNN3k3bUtqY2U2UT09

Meeting ID: 852 1616 3371
Passcode: 507539
CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (Hybrid Meeting)

City Hall, 401 N. Morton Street
Common Council Chambers, Room #115

August 25, 2022 at 5:30 p.m.

Virtual Meeting:
https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/85216163371?pwd=REpnS09zVW9pajhNN3k3bUtqY2U2UT09

Meeting ID: 852 1616 3371
Passcode: 507539

Petition Map: https://arcg.is/0mmO19

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 26, 2022

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: September 22, 2022

AA-17-22  Joe Kemp Construction, LLC & Blackwell Construction, Inc.
Summit Woods (Sudbury Farm Parcel O) W. Ezekiel Dr.
Request: Administrative Appeal of the Notice of Violation (NOV) issued
March 25, 2022.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

V-28-22  Warren Witt
3151 W. 3rd St.
Request: Variances from entrance and drive standards to allow a driveway in the
front parking setback, from maximum parking standards, and from pedestrian
sidewalk connection standards.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

AA-31-22  Lamar Advertising Co.
1800 N. Kinser Pike
Request: Administrative Appeal of Notice of Violation (NOV) for a sign.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

V-32-22  Richard Judd
508 W. 3rd St.
Request: Variance from rear setback standards to allow for construction of stair
access to and from a driveway in the Residential Small Lot (R3) zoning district.
Case Manager: Karina Pazos

**Next Meeting: September 22, 2022

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

AA-24-22  John Mackey  
221 E. Allen St.  
Request: Administrative Appeal of Notice of Violation (NOV) for failure to obtain a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC).  
Case Manager: Liz Carter

CU-25-22  Doug McCoy (Grant Properties)  
110 S. Roosevelt St.  
Request: Conditional Use approval for a ‘dwelling, duplex’ in the Residential Small Lot (R3) zoning district.  
Case Manager: Karina Pazos

V-26-22  Bailey 8, LLC (Cedarview Management)  
200 E. Kirkwood Ave.  
Request: Variance from height standards to allow for the construction of two additional stories for a total of 4-stories and 57’ in height. Also requested is a variance from development standards to allow for the existing drive-thru on E. Kirkwood to remain in the Mixed-Use Downtown, University Village Downtown Character Overlay (MD-UV) zoning district.  
Case Manager: Karina Pazos

V-27-22  Cutters Kirkwood 123, LLC  
115 E. Kirkwood Ave.  
Request: Variances from Downtown Character Overlay standards to allow less non-residential area and less large display windows; and a variance from the requirement to align with the front setback of an adjacent historic structure in the Mixed-Use Downtown zoning district with the Courthouse Square Character Overlay (MD-CS).  
Case Manager: Karina Pazos

V-34-22  Adam Jackson (Caritas-Indiana, LLC)  
1420 W. Kirkwood Ave.  
Request: Variance from buffer yard standards to allow construction of a 16-unit multifamily building in the Residential High Density Multifamily (RH) zoning district.  
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

**Next Meeting: September 22, 2022**

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call 812-349-3429 or e-mail human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.
PETITIONER: John and Chris Mackey
PO Box 5446, Bloomington, IN

REQUEST: The petitioner is requesting an administrative appeal of the issuance of a Notice of Violation Fine Letter for Failure to Obtain a CZC.

REPORT: This appeal request is the result of the issuance of a Notice of Violation with Fines for construction being done on the structure at 221 East Allen Street without a permit. A Stop Work Order was posted by the Monroe County Building Department on April 8, 2022 at 3:15pm for work being done on the roof at the location without a permit. The scope of the work, adding a new section of roof and wall, required a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC) from the Bloomington Planning and Transportation Department, as well as a building permit from the Monroe County Building Department. A contractor for the petitioner applied for a building permit on April 14, 2022. Planning and Transportation Department staff received a complaint that work was taking place at the site on May 2, 2022. Staff observed work taking place on May 12, 2022. The Department sent a Notice of Violation with Fine Letter on May 13, 2022 for one day’s worth of fines, totaling $500.00.

As can be seen in the attached NOV, 20.06.050(f)(20(A)(i)(1) states that a CZC is required for any activities involving the alteration, erection, construction, reconstruction, division, enlargement, demolition, partial demolition or moving of any building, structure, sign, or mobile home. No CZC was issued before work initially commenced, or before work continued after the Stop Work Order was issued. No Certificate of Zoning Compliance has been issued to date, as the materials being used on both the new roof portion and new wall portion do not meet the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION: In accordance with UDO Section 20.06.080(d)(3)(B)(ii), because this petition is an administrative appeal, the staff report shall not make a formal recommendation.
May 20, 2022

I do hereby appeal the alleged violation concerning my property at 221 East Allen St. I began a reroof and was issued a stop work order. At that point the roof was open to elements, and water was running into the house. I made the necessary provisions to protect the house, and ceased all further roofing. This was to protect the health and safety of the tenants. No further work will be done until the government issues a building permit.

Sincerely,

John C Mackey, Owner

(812-327-5180) or johnwestx@g-mail.com
May 13, 2022

John and Chris Mackey
PO Box 5446
Bloomington, IN 47407

Tenant
221 E. Allen St.
Bloomington, IN 47401

James Johnston
3525 E. Bluebird Lane
Bloomington, IN 47401

Re: Notice of Violation (warning)
Failure to Obtain a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC)

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter serves as a Notice of Violation and Fines for a violation of 20.06.050(f) [Administration & Procedures; Development Permits and procedures; Certificate of Zoning Compliance] of the Bloomington Municipal Code ("BMC") at 221 E. Allen Street ("Property"). Records show you are the owner or responsible party of this property.

The City of Bloomington Planning and Transportation Department received a complaint of unpermitted roof work taking place at 221 E. Allen Street on 05/02/2022. On 05/12/2022, staff observed roof work taking place without a permit. While the Planning and Transportation Department had received a building permit application for the roof work on 04/14/2022, a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC) has not yet been issued as of the date of this letter. The property is located in the Residential Small Lot (R3) zoning district.

According to Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Section 20.06.050(f) [Development Permits and Procedures; Certificate of Zoning Compliance]:

(1) Purpose: The Certificate of Zoning Compliance procedure is intended to provide a mechanism for City staff to ensure that the establishment of and alterations to uses, sites, and structures conform to the standards of this UDO.

(2) Applicability
(A) Generally
   i. A Certificate of Zoning Compliance shall be required for any of the following activities:
      1. Alteration, erection, construction, reconstruction, division, enlargement, demolition, partial demolition or moving of any building, structure, sign, or mobile home;

As a reminder, a Stop Work Order has been issued. Any work done on the property without a permit may result in additional fines.

As a result of this violation, pursuant to BMC Section 20.06.100(d), John and Chris Mackey, are hereby assessed a fine of $500 (five hundred dollars). Payment of the full amount of $500.00 shall be made to City of...
Bloomington Planning and Transportation, 401 N. Morton St., Suite 130, Bloomington, IN 47404, no later than 05/27/2022.

You may appeal this Notice of Violation to the City of Bloomington Board of Zoning Appeals, provided that the appeal is in writing and is filed with the Board of Zoning Appeals no later than five (5) days from the date of this NOV. Fines levied for violation of this title may be contested in the Monroe County Circuit Court.

If the assessed fine is not paid by 05/27/2022, the City of Bloomington ("City") reserves the right to initiate suit against you in the Monroe County Circuit Court in order to reduce the fines to a judgment.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Carter
Senior Zoning Compliance Planner, Planning and Transportation

Enclosures: (2)

CC: Scott Robinson, AICP, Director, Planning and Transportation
    Jackie Scanlan, AICP, Development Services Manager, Planning and Transportation
    Mike Rouker, City Attorney
Photo 1: Roof of 221 E. Allen Street on 05/12/2022.
Photo 2: Roof of 221 E. Allen Street on 05/12/2022.
R-22-444
Residential Alteration Repair Permit

Status: Active

Date Created: Apr 14, 2022

Applicant
James Johnston
plumbnbob808@outlook.com
3525 Bluebird lane
Bloomington, in 47401
8123405209

Location
221 E Allen ST
Bloomington, 47401-5833 IN

Owner:
MACKEY, JOHN C & CHRIS P
PO BOX 5446 BLOOMINGTON, IN 47407-5446

Project Info

Scope of Work
Add new section of roof where both ridgelines overlap to eliminate the blind valley that exists now in the process of adding new metal roof to whole house.

Estimated Project Cost (Do not include the dollar symbol [$].)
3,000

Because this property is a new residential building permit, you must apply for an 'Activity in the Right-of-way' Permit first. You can call Highway at 812-349-2555 if you have any questions.

Is this property on sewer?
Yes

Is this permit needed as a result of storm damage?
No

Primary Contractor

Contractor Name
James Johnston

Contractor Email
plumbnbob808@outlook.com
Certify Application

The applicant hereby certifies and agrees as follows: (1) I am authorized to make application. (2) I have read this application and attest that the information furnished is correct, including that contained in plans. (3) If there is any misrepresentation in this application, or associated documents, Monroe County may revoke any permit or Certificate of Occupancy issued based upon this misinformation. (4) I agree to comply with all Monroe County Ordinances, permit conditions and State statutes which regulate building construction, use, occupancy and site development. (5) I grant and will request Monroe County Officials to enter onto the property listed on this application for the purpose of inspecting the work permitted by this application and posting notices. (6) I will retain the Certificate of Occupancy in my records upon completion of the project. NOTE: Plans shall mean all site and construction plans and specifications, whether furnished prior to or subsequent to the application date. All plans furnished subsequent to application date constitute an amendment to the original application and must be specifically approved by the County with an appropriate endorsement and the signature of the approving official prior to plan implementation. The Permit is not valid, and work is not permitted until signed and issued by the agent of the Monroe County Building Department.

James Johnson
04/11/2022

Staff Dept Section - General

Staff Use - Building Front Office

Staff Use - Building Inspectors

Planning Staff Review
REQUEST: The petitioner is requesting Conditional Use approval for a ‘dwelling, duplex‘ in the Residential Small Lot (R3) zoning district.

REPORT: The property is located at 110 S. Roosevelt Street and is currently zoned Residential Small Lot (R3). All surrounding properties are also zoned R3. The property currently contains one 1-story single-family structure that is proposed to be demolished with this proposal.

The petitioner is proposing a 1.5-story duplex with each dwelling unit to contain two bedrooms. ‘Dwelling, duplex‘ is listed as a conditional use in the R3 zoning district and the petitioner is therefore requesting conditional use approval to allow for this dwelling type. The petitioner held a neighborhood meeting on June 6, 2022 where there was a concern about parking and the amount of cars currently at other surrounding properties. To address this concern, the petitioner has proposed to maintain the existing two off-street parking spaces.

CRITERIA AND FINDINGS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

20.06.040(d)(6) Approval Criteria

(B) General Compliance Criteria: All petitions shall be subject to review and pursuant to the following criteria and shall only be approved if they comply with these 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: There are use-specific standards that apply to a duplex within the R3 district. In the R3 zoning district, each unit of a newly constructed duplex shall have a separate exterior entrance facing a public or private street. The design shall incorporate similar design elements as the majority of the existing dwelling structures on the block face. Additionally, no duplex dwelling structure shall contain more than six bedrooms, and each unit shall have separate utility meters. The proposed duplex structure meets the design requirements. The petition complies with other applicable regulations, utility, service, and improvement standards as required by the general compliance criteria. The petition request constitutes new construction, which requires full compliance with the following development standards in the Unified Development Ordinance.
**Dimensional Standards:**
- **Setbacks:** The R3 zoning district has a front build-to-line of 15 feet, or the median front setback of abutting residential structures, whichever is less, a minimum of six feet for sides on the first floor and a minimum of 10 feet for each story above the ground floor, and a minimum of 25 feet for the rear setback. The proposed site plan meets the setback requirements.
- **Height:** The maximum height in the R3 zoning district is 35 feet. The proposed building will be 25 feet in height. The proposed building complies with the maximum height requirement.
- **Impervious Surface Coverage:** The maximum impervious surface coverage in the R3 zoning district is 45%. The proposal meets the impervious surface coverage requirement.

**Environment:**
- **Siltation and Erosion Prevention** – The petitioner has not provided specific plans for siltation and erosion prevention, but will be required to comply with the requirements.

**Access and Connectivity:**
- **Driveways and Access** – The petitioner is proposing to use the existing driveway that is less than the 18-foot maximum width for duplex uses.
- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation** – Per the Transportation Plan, the adjacent street typology is designated Neighborhood Residential and has a functional classification of local street. The Transportation Plan calls for a 6-foot wide sidewalk and 5-foot wide treeplot. The existing sidewalk and treeplot facilities meet these standards.

**Parking and Loading:**
- **Minimum Vehicle Parking Requirement** – A duplex use in the R3 zoning district requires a minimum of 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit. The proposal meets this standard.
- **Maximum Vehicle Parking Allowance** – A duplex use has a maximum of two spaces per dwelling unit. The proposed total number of spaces is two, so the proposal meets this standard.

**Site and Building Design:**
- **Building Design** – The proposed duplex structure incorporates separate exterior entrances that face the street, matching roof pitch and front porch size as other dwelling structures on the block face. The proposed duplex structure will be finished with cementitious horizontal lap siding and wood-grained board-and-batten vertical siding.
  - Materials – The UDO requires that a primary exterior finish material covers at least 20 percent of a façade. The proposal meets this standard.
  - Minimum Coverage – The UDO requires that exterior finish building materials shall extend from roofline to within six inches of finished grade. The proposal meets this standard.
  - Foundations – The UDO requires that all buildings are placed on permanent foundations. The proposal meets this standard.
  - Roofs – The UDO requires that sloped roofs consist of shingles, shakes, tile, standing-
seam metal or V-grain metal. The proposal meets this standard.

- **Rain Gutters and Downspouts** – The UDO requires the installation of rain gutters and downspouts. The proposal meets this standard.

- **Uniform Architecture** – The UDO requires that when the rear or side facade of a newly constructed building is adjacent to a street, the architecture of these facades shall be made to match that of the front facade. Such matching shall occur through use of similar materials, window/doorway openings, variation in rooflines, or fenestration. This standard does not apply to this proposal.

- **Patterns** – The UDO requires that in the case of new construction of multifamily units in the RM and RH zoning district, all facades of a primary building visible from any roadway shall contain the following color and texture changes. This standard does not apply to this proposal.

- **Primary Pedestrian Entry** – The UDO requires that in case of new construction of multifamily units in the RM and RH zoning districts, pedestrian entry standards shall apply. This standard does not apply to this proposal.

- **Exterior Facades** – The UDO requires that in the case of new construction of multifamily units in the RM and RH zoning districts, all facades of a primary building shall incorporate three or more design elements every 40 feet to avoid blank, uninterrupted walls. This standard does not apply to this proposal.

- **Anti-monotony Standards** – The UDO requires that in the case of new construction multifamily units, any development containing more than three individual buildings shall incorporate variations to break up monotony in design. This standard does not apply to this proposal.

**Solar Ready Building Design** – All new construction of primary structures shall either design the building as solar or renewable energy ready or submit a completed U.S. EPA Renewable Energy Home Solar Site Assessment. The petitioner has not specified either. A condition has been added.

**Outdoor Lighting:**

*General Standards* – The petitioner has not provided specifications on proposed lighting. A condition has been added.

**Additional Criteria Applicable to Conditional Uses**

i. **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Other Applicable Plans**

*The proposed use and development shall be consistent with and shall not interfere with the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and any other applicable adopted plans and policies.*

**PROPOSED FINDING:** This proposal is in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as “Indiana University,” which is within the “Institutional/Civic” land use category. While the Comprehensive Plan discusses public and semi-public land uses in this category, this property is located in a residential area and the proposal pays attention to how it interacts with adjacent properties. Additionally more housing near the University is desired, and this proposal adds a unit through redevelopment.

ii. **Provides Adequate Public Services and Facilities**
Adequate public service and facility capacity shall exist to accommodate uses permitted under the proposed development at the time the needs or demands arise, while maintaining adequate levels of service to existing development. Public services and facilities include, but are not limited to, streets, potable water, sewer, stormwater management structures, schools, public safety, fire protection, libraries, and vehicle/pedestrian connections and access within the site and to adjacent properties.

PROPOSED FINDING: This site is well served by utility service and no problems with providing utility service to this site are expected. There is an existing sidewalk along the majority of this block, which connects to existing sidewalk infrastructure along the 3rd street corridor that has Bus 3 service. Replacing the existing dwelling structure on this lot with two smaller dwelling units should not put undue strain on surrounding public services. The petitioner is required to hook each unit up to separate utility meters, and no issues have been identified.

iii. Minimizes or Mitigates Adverse Impacts

1. The proposed use and development will not result in the excessive destruction, loss or damage of any natural, scenic, or historic feature of significant importance.
2. The proposed development shall not cause significant adverse impacts on surrounding properties nor create a nuisance by reason of noise, smoke, odors, vibrations, or objectionable lights.
3. The hours of operation, outside lighting, and trash and waste collection must not pose a hazard, hardship, or nuisance to the neighborhood.
4. The petitioner shall make a good-faith effort to address concerns of the adjoining property owners in the immediate neighborhood as defined in the pre-submittal neighborhood meeting for the specific proposal, if such a meeting is required.

PROPOSED FINDING: There are no natural or scenic features that will be impacted. The building is not in a local historic district. The creation of two 2-bedroom units is not expected to have any adverse impacts on surrounding properties. No nuisance regarding noise, smoke, odors, vibrations, lighting, or hours of operation is found. A pre-submittal neighborhood meeting was required as part of the filing process for this conditional use approval. During the meeting, a neighbor expressed concern about the duplex adding vehicles to on-street parking, and the petitioner is proposing to keep the existing parking area for this lot to mitigate residents parking on the street instead of on the lot.

iv. Rational Phasing Plan

*If the petition involves phases, each phase of the proposed development shall contain all of the required streets, utilities, landscaping, open space, and other improvements that are required to comply with the project’s cumulative development to date and shall not depend upon subsequent phases for those improvements.*

PROPOSED FINDING: No phasing is proposed with this plan.

RECOMMENDATION: The Department recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopts the proposed findings and recommends approval of CU-25-22 with the following
conditions:

1. This conditional use is limited to two 2-bedroom units, as proposed in the filing documents.
2. A compliant minor site plan is required before issuance of a building permit.
3. A building permit is required before construction can begin.
4. The petitioner must provide information about solar ready building design before issuance of a building permit.
5. The petitioner must provide specifications on proposed outdoor lighting before issuance of a building permit.
Petitioner’s Statement

110 S ROOSEVELT DUPLEX

Attention: City of Bloomington Board of Zoning Appeals
Petitioner: Doug McCoy (Grant Properties)

Property Description

The .11 acre (4,725 sf) property at 110 S Roosevelt St currently has a small 1 story single-family structure that will be removed prior to the new proposed development. It is bounded by a pedestrian walk and tree plot to the east, an easement to the west and single-family properties to the north and south. The property is designated R3 (Residential) under the 2021 UDO.

Project Description

The petitioner is proposing a new 1.5-story structure that will include 2 – 2 bedroom/2 bath units. The gable bungalow design incorporates the requirements of the Duplex section of the UDO (20.03.030.b.3.C) by incorporating separate exterior entrances that face the street and generally matching the roof pitch, front porch size, front building setback and vehicle parking access of surrounding properties. New water service and sanitary connection will be coordinated with City Utilities along with electrical service (to be coordinated with Duke Engineering).

The petitioner is filing for a Conditional Use per the UDO requirements for duplexes in an R zone and hopes to begin construction in late summer/early fall of 2022 with completion by August 2023.

Thank you for your consideration of this petition.

Matt Ellenwood, AIA (on behalf of the petitioner)
PROPOSED:
DIAL '811' BEFORE YOU DIG
PER INDIANA STATE LAW IC8-1-26.
IT IS AGAINST THE LAW TO EXCAVATE WITHOUT NOTIFYING THE
UNDERGROUND LOCATION SERVICE TWO (2) WORKING DAYS
BEFORE COMMENCING WORK.
BLOOMINGTON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

STAFF REPORT

CASE #: V-26-22

DATE: August 25, 2022

Location: 200 E Kirkwood Ave

PETITIONER: Bailey 8, LLC
601 N College Ave., Suite 1A
Bloomington, IN

CONSULTANT: Studio 3 Design – Tim Cover
8604 Allisonville Rd., Suite 330
Indianapolis, IN

REQUEST: A variance from height standards to allow for the construction of two additional stories for a total of four stories at a height of 60 feet, a variance from development standards to allow for the existing drive-thru located on E Kirkwood Avenue to remain, and a variance from the downtown character overlay standards to allow for the existing windows and doors on primary facades and the façade articulation to remain and for new portions of the building(s) to mimic the existing design related to the new windows, doors, and façade articulation in the Mixed-Use Downtown with University Village Character Overlay zoning district (MD-UV).

REPORT: The property is located on the southeast corner of Kirkwood Avenue and Washington Street. The lot is bounded by an alley on the south side and the Graduate Hotel on the east side. The property is zoned Mixed-Use Downtown with University Village Character Overlay zoning district (MD-UV). The properties to the north, east and south are also zoned MD-UV, and the properties to the west are zoned Mixed-Use Downtown with Courthouse Square Character Overlay zoning district (MD-CS). The site currently contains Peoples State Bank in a building that was voted on June 15th by City Council to be designated as its own historic district with a rating of Notable.

The petitioner is proposing two stories above the existing building and a 4-story building that will attach to the southern (rear) exterior wall of the existing building. Commercial space will remain on the first level of the existing building, with the second level being converted to residential use. The upper levels above the existing building and the upper three levels in the new 4-story structure will contain residential units for a total of 21 dwelling units. The ground floor of the new 4-story structure is to contain bicycle parking, mail room, storage, trash receptacle area, elevator and stair access to upper levels, as well as one accessible vehicle parking space with an aisle. Access to the accessible vehicle parking space is proposed from the existing drive-thru lane that enters from the alley and exits onto Kirkwood Avenue. The use of sustainable development incentives is proposed to achieve four floors with a total building height of 60 feet, which exceeds the maximum height of 52 feet that use of the extra height incentive allows. The petition is subject to major site plan review by the Plan Commission, and has been placed on the schedule for the Plan Commission’s public hearing on September 12, 2022.

The petitioner is requesting three variances from the development standards and the downtown character overlay standards. The first variance is to allow for a total building height of 60 feet. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) states that projects that satisfy the sustainable development criteria shall be eligible for one floor of building height, not to exceed 12 feet beyond the maximum primary structure height established for the zoning district, which is 40 feet in this case (20.04.120(d)(3)(B)(i)). The second variance is to allow for the existing drive-
thru located on E Kirkwood Avenue to remain. The UDO states that on Local streets, no entrance or drive shall be installed within 100 feet of any intersecting street (20.04.050(c)(2)(E)(ii)). The existing drive-thru is located approximately 70 feet from the Washington Street intersection. Because this project requires full compliance, the separation requirement applies. The third variance is to allow for the existing windows and doors on primary facades and the façade articulation to remain and for new portions of the building(s) to mimic the existing design related to the new windows, doors, and façade articulation. The UDO requires a minimum of 60 percent of the first floor façade facing a street in the Kirkwood Corridor area of the University Village overlay district to be transparent glass or framed façade open areas consisting of display windows. The upper floors facing a street shall have a minimum of 20 percent of transparent glass or façade openings and shall have the appearance of double-hung windows (20.02.050(a)(6)). Additionally, the façade articulation module maximum length is 50 feet and the minimum length is 20 feet in the University Village overlay district (20.02.050(a)(8)). One of the purposes for these standards is to encourage site design that engages directly with the public realm of the street and to promote pedestrian accessibility, instead of the site uses being buffered from the pedestrian zone. A second purpose is to reflect the historic design and use patterns of the University Village overlay district.

The proposal includes up to 60 feet of total building height, which is due to the existing building having two stories with a total height of 30 feet. Each new story is a standard story height, but the existing building is larger than a typical two-story building. The proposal also includes retaining the existing drive-thru that is located approximately 70 feet from the Washington Street intersection, which is supported by the Historic Preservation Commission. However, it is unclear what the commercial use in this building will be and it may not utilize the drive-thru. There is opportunity for the drive-thru service window to be kept as a historic element while being utilized as a pedestrian drive-thru window service. As proposed, the development will maintain the existing windows and doors, roughly 30 percent of the ground floor on the façade facing Kirkwood Avenue, upper floors lack the appearance of double-hung windows, and the façade articulation minimum and maximum lengths are not met. There are practical difficulties with the use of the property if these architectural requirements cannot be met due to the constraint of having to keep the existing historic building.

CRITERIA AND FINDINGS FOR DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS VARIANCE

20.06.080(b)(3)(E)(i)(1) Standards for Granting Variances from Development Standards: Pursuant to Indiana Code 36-7-4-918.5, the Board of Zoning Appeals or Hearing Officer may grant a variance from the development standards of this UDO if, after a public hearing, it makes findings of fact in writing, that:

BUILDING HEIGHT MAXIMUM VARIANCE

(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for 60 feet of total building height will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The building could be taller with additional incentives. The existing building is two stories for a total of 30 feet in height, and an additional eight feet over the maximum
will facilitate the addition of more dwelling units.

(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for 60 feet of total building height will not affect the use and value of the area adjacent to the property in a substantially adverse manner. Given that the surrounding buildings are at a similar height, this proposal is appropriate in scale.

(3) The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in questions; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties.

PROPOSED FINDING: The denial of the variance to allow for 60 feet of total building height will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. The existing building is two stories and 30 feet tall. The building has been locally historically designated and must remain on the property. A four-story building is not out of character with the area, and is allowable with the incentives. The only reason that the height cannot be met is because of the existing conditions on the parcel, which are of a tall two-story building that is locally designated and creates a peculiar condition for additional development of the property. Granting the variance will allow a four-story building that adds units to the housing stock, while accommodating the protection of the historic structure.

SEPARATION DISTANCE BETWEEN DRIVE AND INTERSECTION VARIANCE

(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for the existing drive cut located on E Kirkwood Avenue to remain will be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The drive cut is located less than 100 feet from an intersection and disrupts the pedestrian zone by limiting the public realm-facing and pedestrian-accessibility aspects of the site design.

(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for the existing drive cut located on E Kirkwood Avenue to remain will negatively affect the use and value of the area adjacent to the property in a substantially adverse manner. The drive cut is located less than 100 feet from an intersection and disrupts the pedestrian zone by limiting the public realm-facing and pedestrian-accessibility aspects of the site design. The design guidelines are included to protect the use and value of adjacent properties so that infill developments can maintain the character of the area, and with Kirkwood Avenue having a street typology of Shared Street, the site design should limit drive cuts that negatively impact the adjacent pedestrian experience.
The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties.

PROPOSED FINDING: The denial of the variance to allow for the existing drive cut located on E Kirkwood Avenue to remain will not result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. Given that the drive cut is too close to the intersection and is not required for any commercial use that may go in here, there is nothing peculiar about this property that requires the site to not meet the distance separation minimum between a drive and an intersection by removing the drive cut in this case. Additionally, the historical component of the drive-thru can still be highlighted on the building with the drive cut removed, and there is creative opportunity for the drive-thru window to serve as a pedestrian drive-thru service.

ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS VARIANCE

(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for the existing windows and doors on primary facades and the façade articulation to remain and for new portions of the building(s) to mimic the existing design related to the new windows, doors, and façade articulation will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The window requirement is included to reflect the historic pattern of large picture windows in the area. The community and UDO anticipate and encourage infill development, but adherence to the design standards helps to protect the character of the pedestrian experience in the area. However, given that the existing building is historic and cannot be demolished, maintaining the existing windows, doors, and façade articulation will not adversely affect the existing context and allowing the new pattern of windows, doors, and façade articulation to follow the existing pattern will help maintain and enhance the existing character.

(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for the existing windows and doors on primary facades and the façade articulation to remain and for new portions of the building(s) to mimic the existing design related to the new windows, doors, and façade articulation will not negatively affect the use and value of the area adjacent to the property in a substantially adverse manner. The design guidelines are included to protect the use and value of adjacent properties so that infill developments can reflect historic patterns and maintain the character of the area. However, given that the existing building is historic and cannot be demolished, maintaining the existing windows, doors and façade articulation will not negatively affect the existing context and may be benefited by an effort to match the existing pattern of windows, doors, and façade articulation of the existing historic building that was likely influenced by its surrounding architecture of that time.

(3) The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in
practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties.

**PROPOSED FINDING:** The denial of the variance to allow for the existing windows and doors on primary facades and the façade articulation to remain and dictate the new windows, doors, and façade articulation will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. The peculiar condition is that the proposed development includes the existing historic building which cannot be altered without approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. The design elements related to this variance are important to identification of the historic design and are unlikely to be allowed to be altered. The Preservation Commission has also looked at this design and has approved this design where the new building portion being designed to reflect and not detract from the historic building.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based upon the report and written findings of fact above, the Department recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopts the proposed findings for V-26-22, and approves the first and last requested variances from building height standards and downtown character overlay standards, but deny the requested variance from development standards to allow for the existing drive cut to remain.
August 11, 2022

City of Bloomington Planning Department  
P.O. Box 100                  
Bloomington, IN 47402

Attn: Ms. Karina Pazos

RE: 200 E. Kirkwood

PETITIONERS STATEMENT

Karina,

Studio 3 Design is pleased to submit the attached development located at Kirkwood and Washington Street.

The following document outlines the project scope. Please take time to review and contact us with any additional questions.

The attached petition is based on the current UDO.

Project Location

The project is located at 200 E. Kirkwood Ave at the intersection of Kirkwood and Washington Streets. Current building is the Peoples State Bank.

Historic Designation:

On June 15th, 2022 the City Council voted to designate the property and building at 200 E. Kirkwood as its own historic district with the classification changed to Notable. We worked with HPC staff over the following months to develop a great project that respected the original historic project while still allow the site to be developed to it’s full potential. The final building has a simple elegance that takes its architectural cues from the existing building. In working with the HPC the building was simplified to read more as a box set back from the original box (Peoples State Bank). Detailing was streamlined and colors softened to work in harmony with the existing while still standing as a recognized addition. The process of work with HPC to create an end product that allowed the historic building to remain significant and identifiable, while successful, did put the building in conflict with the current UDO.

We are here today, supported by the Historic Preservation Committee to request a series of variances that are directly linked to the preservation of the historic structure and development of an addition that respects that structure.
Variance includes:

1. Building Height: Tied directly to working with the existing tall two-story historic building.
2. Building exit drive onto Kirkwood: Original exit drive, still in use today and serving the same purpose as it has since the 1960’s.
3. Building glazing percentage on level 1: The new addition, level 1 windows have been designed to follow the same size, style and rhythm of the historic bank structure.
4. Window fenestration/ detail: the windows have been designed to follow the style, type and proportions of the original historic structure in lieu of a double hung window style.
5. Building Module: The building addition has been maintained as a simple clean box with the modules set where they make sense with the existing building in lieu of jumping in and out at the UDO required modulation. The massing has been kept simple and clean.

**Project Description**

The project will consist of a single building that fills the majority of the site. The district allows for 100% site coverage, 3 levels and a max of 40 feet in hgt. We will be seeking the addition of a 4th level through the use of environmental incentives.

With the designation of the building, we will be saving the current 31’ tall two-story building and providing an addition of two levels on top of the existing as well as an expansion of the building to the East (toward the Graduate Hotel (6 story structure) and to the south to the alley. The first floor will be utilized as retail (currently looking at a bank) with a drive thru on the East side of the building where the current bank drive-thru exist. The drive-thru has been a part of the site and function of the building since the property was first built in 1960.

The second floor of the existing building and addition, as well as the 3rd and 4th floors will be utilized for market rate apartments. We are proposing the creation of 20 units, (7 each on levels 2 and 3) and (6 on level 4) over the top of the existing retail space. The 4th floor has been peeled back to lessen the buildings impact at the corner of the historic structure.

The height and historic designation of the current structure will cause the project to need a series of variances as noted above and outlined in the paragraphs below.

**Project Site Access:**

The site is currently accessed off of Washington street on the west side of the property. An existing bank drive-thru enters off of Washington street, wraps around the building to the east side and then exits onto Kirkwood. The first-floor retail is accessed off of Kirkwood into the existing building. A new stair with access to the upper levels will also be available for residents entering off of Kirkwood. On the West side of the building at the interface of the existing and new building addition, there will be a new primary entrance to the building that faces Washington Street. This entrance will serve the addition and the upper levels of the new and existing building.

Vehicular site access will shift to enter off of the alley on the south side of the property. The drive will access an accessible parking space for the apartments and serve as queuing for the buildings drive-thru window. The drive will then exit onto Kirkwood as it currently does today.

**Variances:**

Based on the new UDO, there are (5) variances that we are aware of that will be requested thru the BZA process. Each variance is tied to the project (building and site) being designated as it’s own historic district and the development of the design in conjunction with HPC staff to be respectful of the existing structure.
1. Variance 1

Building Height exceeding allowable height

This site (located in an opportunity zone – designated for redevelopment) was purchased with the intent to take down the structure and build a new denser development that fit within the parameters of the UDO.

The ability to meet all the requirements of the UDO changed when the building was designated and the project now needed to be modified to build over the top of the existing building. Height is 29'-9" at Kirkwood – 31'-4" at rear of building.

In order to add use the site and add density, we now need to build over the existing building with a separate structural system to support additional floors. This not only adds substantial cost- but to the point of this request, adds unusable height.

The UDO allows for a 40’, 3 story building by-right and provides, through incentives, the opportunity to add an additional story (12 vertical feet max) to the zone’s allowable height. This equates to a 4 story, 52’ high building. The UDO w/ incentives (52’) easily allows for a 4-story building in new construction.

The existing historic bank building is 31’ tall (excluding an additional 3 feet of grade fall down to the alley. This is tall for a two-level building. The existing wall structure is not designed to carry upper floors which forces the addition of a new steel framework through and over the top of the existing building in order to add the additional desired floors and provide the appropriate density for the site.

The sub-structure adds approx. three feet (3'-0") of interstitial space between the roof of the existing building and the floor of the third level.

A typical intermediate level is 10'-8" floor to floor for a 9’ clg. and a top-level w/ a 9’ clg and 3’ of roof structure is approx. 12’ (plus parapet (generally a 12” min.)

Doing the Math for a 3 story bldg: 31’ bldg. + 3’ interstitial + 12’ top floor Plus 2 ‘ parapet = 47’ w/ no allowance for the 2'-3’ of grade change on site (depending on location).

Realistically a minimum of 47’ is needed for 3 stories and a min of 59’ is needed for 4 stories as a direct result of maintaining the existing building.

In any case, maintaining the existing building does not allow for the development of the site based on what has been defined by the UDO.

We are requesting a variance to allow for an additional 8’ of vertical height to be added to the height limits (40’ in this district). This coupled with the use of incentives (additional 12’) would allow for a building that is up to 60’

As shown, the highest point on our building is 59'-4” with the average parapet in the 58’ height range.

a. Approval will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the Community

Approval of this variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. The additional Eight vertical feet requested allows the existing historic building to remain and the same number of floors to be built that the UDO would allow if the site was cleared and the building was built new.

b. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner:

The neighboring properties will not be impacted in a negative way by allowing the additional height. Currently the 6 story Graduate hotel towers over the two-story bank. Adding height to the building will help it not get lost against its neighbors.
c. The strict application of the terms of this UDO will result in practical difficulties in the use of the Property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties:

The site is in an opportunity zone that was set up to encourage redevelopment and the creation of a denser use of the land in the downtown area. The designation and subsequent adaptive reuse of the tall two-story bank building makes it unrealistic to be able to build to the potential that the UDO allows. Not allowing the extra 8 vertical feet in height to account for constructability over and around the historic structure results in practical difficulties in the use of the land.

2. Variance #2
Allowing for an exit drive within 100’ of intersection

A 20’ wide drive exist on the east side of the property. The drive exits onto Kirkwood between an existing bank building and the new Graduate hotel. The drive has existed since the bank building was constructed in 1961 (60+ years in existence) and will continue to serve the same purpose- a one-way drive-thru lane that exists onto Kirkwood Ave. The Site (including the drive thru lane was designated as a historic district in June of 2022. The current UDO, under location and separation of drives, 1. states that a drive may not exist within 100 of an intersection. 2. For non-residential uses located on a corner lot, drive access shall be located on street assigned to lower functional classification according to transportation plan.

The current downtown site is only 66’ wide long Kirkwood. Measured from the right of way the drive would be 46’ away.

We are Requesting a variance to maintain an exit only drive onto Kirkwood Ave. The drive has existed as a part of the historic fabric of this site for over 60 years without issue.

a. Approval will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the Community

Approval of this variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. The drive-thru lane has existed as part of the historic bank structure and site since the project was built in 1961. The drive thru operates today with no negative impact to the surrounding areas and would continue to function in the same manner as it has for the past 60+ years. As an added benefit to the community and safety to the public, the entrance to the drive thru is being moved from Washington Street to the alley, removing the potential of a pedestrian being hit by a car pulling in mid-block in lieu of at a defined alley way.

b. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner:

The neighboring properties will not be impacted in a negative way by allowing the drive-thru to remain. It has always been there and has functioned without concern for over 50 years.

c. The strict application of the terms of this UDO will result in practical difficulties in the use of the Property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties:
Practical difficulties:
The commercial component of this development is ideal for either a bank location to continue on or for a restaurant location to come in. With the limited space available on site for parking, the ability to maintain a drive-thru allows the commercial component of the site to remain viable.

Variance will relieve practical difficulties associated with Site:
The variance will allow the commercial component of the site to continue to be marketed as a bank with a drive-thru and or to attract future commercial businesses that would desire to have a drive-thru. The site is only 66’ wide, there is no way to modify the site to incorporate the existing drive 100’ away.

3. Variance #3
Allowing for a reduction in building glazing percentage on level 1
The existing historic structure has a simple rhythm of single punched window openings set in the limestone façade. The building addition picks up on that same rhythm on level one setting 5 single punched openings of the same size and proportion in a limestone paneled building base to tie the new and existing building together.

We are Requesting a variance to maintain the level 1 windows designed in a manner that relates to and compliments the existing building structure.

a. Approval will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of The Community

Approval of this variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. Punched window opens in lieu of floor to ceiling glazing will in no way impact public health.

b. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner:

The neighboring properties will not be impacted in a negative way by providing a lower percentage of glazing on the first floor of the addition.

d. The strict application of the terms of this UDO will result in practical difficulties in the use of the Property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties:

Practical difficulties:
The building addition has been developed in conjunction with the HPC to be complimentary and secondary to the existing historic structure.

Variance will relieve practical difficulties associated with Site:
The variance will allow the buildings first level to read as a continuation of the design style of the historic structure, both in character and detailing. The nature of developing a building addition that works with an existing historic structure is unique to each situation, style and era of the historic structure in question. The UDO guidelines are not designed to address this situation and stands in direct conflict with the guidance of the HPC on this issue.
4. **Variance #4**
   **Allowing for a the window detailing to reflect the style of the Historic structure.**

   The existing historic structure has two styles of windows wrapping the building. A storefront system and single punched openings articulated with horizontal mullions. The UDO requires that the windows be detailed as double hung windows.

   **We are Requesting a variance to allow the window pattern and “look” to remain as shown with a combination of storefront windows and punched openings with horizontal mullions aligning with the existing historic buildings window systems.**

   a. **Approval will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of The Community**

      Approval of this variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. Detailing the windows to be sensitive and reflective of the historic buildings window style will in no way impact public health.

   b. **The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner:**

      The neighboring properties will not be impacted in a negative way by providing a a different window style. It will be enhanced by allowing diversity in the area.

   c. **The strict application of the terms of this UDO will result in practical difficulties in the use of the Property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties:**

      **Practical difficulties:**
      The building addition has been developed in conjunction with the HPC to be complimentary and secondary to the existing historic structure.

      **Variance will relieve practical difficulties associated with Site:**
      The variance will allow the addition to read as a continuation of the design style of the historic structure, both in character and detailing. The nature of developing a building addition that works with an existing historic structure is unique to each situation, style and era of the historic structure in question. The UDO guidelines are not designed to address this situation and stands in direct conflict with the guidance of the HPC on this issue.

5. **Variance #5**
   **Allowing for a change in the modulation requirement**

   The façade of the historic building does not match UDO requirements for a max 50’ module and a min 20 module. The façade is 40’ wide and 80’ foot deep on Washington street. The building addition is designed to be sensitive to simple clean international building style of the historic structure.
We are Requesting a variance to step away from the UDO module requirements of 50’ max and 20’ minimum and allow the building modules to relate to the historic building is a sensitive and complimentary fashion.

a. Approval will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of The Community

Approval of this variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. The building still steps back in both horizontal as well as vertical plains on both Kirkwood and Washington streets providing visual interest in a manner that compliments and works with the historic building in lieu of forcing a pattern onto the addition that has no relation to the building it is meant to compliment. Modulation exist, It simply does not match the 50’ and 20’ modules outlined in the UDO.

b. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner:

The neighboring properties will not be impacted in a negative way by providing a a different modulation to the façade of the addition. It will be enhanced by allowing the simplicity of the historic building to read and the addition to follow it’s lead in a clean, uncomplicated way.

c. The strict application of the terms of this UDO will result in practical difficulties in the use of the Property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties:

Practical difficulties:
The building addition has been developed in conjunction with the HPC to be complimentary and secondary to the existing historic structure.

Variance will relieve practical difficulties associated with Site:
The variance will allow the addition to read as a continuation of the design style of the historic structure, both in character and detailing. The nature of developing a building addition that works with an existing historic structure is unique to each situation, style and era of the historic structure in question. The UDO guidelines are not designed to address this situation and stands in direct conflict with the guidance of the HPC on this issue.

Thank you for your consideration of these Variances.

Respectfully submitted,

STUDIO 3 DESIGN, INC

Tim Cover, Architect
The topographic information shown hereon was obtained in the field during (RTK) correction service over the internet. The surveyor further does not warrant that the underground utilities shown comprise all such utilities in the area, either in available from utility companies. The surveyor makes no guarantee that the This survey reflects above ground indications of utilities and information interval.

The contours elevation = 756.13' (NAVD 88) surface elevations are accurate to within 0.10 feet. The contours
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BLOOMINGTON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

STAFF REPORT

Location: 115 E Kirkwood Ave

CASE #: V-27-22

DATE: August 25, 2022

PETITIONER: Cutters Kirkwood 123, LLC
121 E Kirkwood Ave, Suite 302
Bloomington, IN

CONSULTANT: Ryan Strauser, Strauser Construction
453 S Clarizz Blvd
Bloomington, IN

REQUEST: A variance from downtown character overlay standards to allow for a smaller percentage of total ground floor area dedicated to a nonresidential use other than a parking garage use, and a variance from downtown character overlay standards to allow for a smaller percentage of total first floor facade area dedicated to large display windows in the Mixed-Use Downtown with Courthouse Square Character Overlay zoning district (MD-CS).

REPORT: The property is located on the north side of Kirkwood Avenue, and is bounded by an alley on the north and west sides, and a historic building (CVS) on the east side. The site is located north of the Buskirk Chumley Theater. The property is zoned Mixed-Use Downtown with Courthouse Square Character Overlay zoning district (MD-CS). All the surrounding properties are also zoned MD-CS. The site currently contains a surface parking lot.

The petitioner is proposing to redevelop the site as a 4-story mixed-use building containing a ground floor parking garage with the entrance off the alley to the west of the site and roughly 2,202 square feet of retail space facing the street. The proposal includes three upper stories containing 15 dwelling units and will implement sustainable development incentives to achieve the fourth floor with a maximum height of 52 feet. The petition is subject to major site plan review by the Plan Commission, and has been placed on the schedule for the Plan Commission’s public hearing on September 12, 2022.

The petitioner is requesting two variances from the downtown character overlay standards. The first variance is to allow for a smaller percentage of total ground floor area dedicated to a nonresidential use other than a parking garage use. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) requires that a minimum of 50 percent of the total ground floor area of a building located along each street frontage identified by a black line in Figure 47 of the UDO shall be occupied by nonresidential primary uses listed in Table 3-1 of the UDO as Permitted or Conditional in the MD zoning district. Enclosed parking garages shall not be counted toward the required nonresidential use (20.03.010(e)(1)). Figure 47 indicates that Kirkwood Avenue, from Madison Street to Indiana Avenue, is required to meet this standard. The second variance is to allow for a smaller percentage of total first floor facade area dedicated to large display windows. The UDO requires a minimum of 70 percent of the first floor facade facing a street in the Courthouse Square overlay district to be large display windows and shall incorporate transom windows and window bases/kick plates, as well as a frieze or sign band above the display windows (20.02.050(a)(6)). One of the purposes for these standards is to encourage site design that engages directly with the public realm of the street and to promote pedestrian accessibility, instead of the first floor site uses being buffered from the pedestrian zone. A second purpose is to reflect the historic design and use patterns of the Courthouse Square overlay district. The
proposal designates less than 50 percent of the ground floor to a nonresidential use other than parking garage but has made revisions to increase the total percentage to approximately 19 percent of the ground floor. The proposal incorporates large display windows in less than 70 percent of the façade but has made revisions to increase the total percentage that is currently at approximately 51 percent. The proposal has made efforts to support the same goals of engaging directly with the public realm and promoting pedestrian accessibility, but may not support the reflection of historic patterns. As proposed, the development will provide approximately 19 percent of ground floor retail space, and approximately 51 percent of the façade as display windows. This is below the minimum percentages required and no practical difficulties with the use of the property have been found.

CRITERIA AND FINDINGS FOR DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS VARIANCE

20.06.080(b)(3)(E)(i)(1) Standards for Granting Variances from Development Standards: Pursuant to Indiana Code 36-7-4-918.5, the Board of Zoning Appeals or Hearing Officer may grant a variance from the development standards of this UDO if, after a public hearing, it makes findings of fact in writing, that:

GROUND FLOOR NONRESIDENTIAL USE OTHER THAN PARKING GARAGE USE VARIANCE

(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total ground floor area dedicated to a nonresidential use other than a parking garage use will be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The overlay desires robust nonresidential uses on the first floor, while providing ample percentage for garage or residential space. A reduced retail space devalues the interface between the public and private realm on one of the City’s busiest downtown commercial/retail corridors.

(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total ground floor area dedicated to a nonresidential use other than a parking garage use will not affect the use and value of the area adjacent to the property in a substantially adverse manner. The site is providing 19% of the ground floor as commercial space.

(3) The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in questions; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties.

PROPOSED FINDING: The denial of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total ground floor area dedicated to a nonresidential use other than a parking garage use will not result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. The site can be developed
meeting the 50% requirement. No information has been presented or found that indicates that there are peculiar conditions of this property that create practical difficulties in its use while meeting the 50% requirement. Properties to the west, east, and south all maintain more than 50% non-residential/garage space on their ground floors. There is nothing peculiar about the site that requires reduction in ground floor nonresidential or garage space.

FIRST FLOOR FAÇADE LARGE DISPLAY WINDOW VARIANCE

(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total first floor façade area dedicated to large display windows will be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The proposal currently indicates 51 percent of the ground floor façade, but is under the minimum of 70 percent. The window requirement is included to reflect the historic pattern of large picture windows in the area. The community and UDO anticipate and encourage infill development, but adherence to the design standards helps to protect the character of the pedestrian experience in the area.

(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the development standards variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and

PROPOSED FINDING: The granting of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total first floor façade area dedicated to large display windows will not negatively affect the use and value of the area adjacent to the property in a substantially adverse manner. While the design is under the requirement, no adverse impacts are anticipated on neighboring properties, as a result.

(3) The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in questions; that the development standards variance will relieve the practical difficulties.

PROPOSED FINDING: The denial of the variance to allow for a smaller percentage of total first floor façade area dedicated to large display windows will not result in practical difficulties in the use of the property. The property is vacant, and new construction can be done to meet the 70% requirement. Given the configuration of the particular desired façade, there is sufficient façade area to incorporate large display windows. There is nothing peculiar about this property that requires a building to not meet the large display window requirement. No information has been presented or found that indicates that there are peculiar conditions of this property that create practical difficulties in its use while meeting the 70% requirement.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the report and written findings of fact above, the Department recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopts the proposed findings for V-27-22, and denies the requested variances from downtown character overlay standards to allow for
less dedicated space to a nonresidential use, other than a parking garage use, in the ground floor and less large display windows in the first floor façade facing the street.
June 23, 2022

City of Bloomington Board of Zoning Appeal
401 N. Morton Street
Bloomington, IN 47403

Re: Plan Approval at 115 E. Kirkwood Avenue

Dear Commission Members:

The purpose of our request is to construct a mixed-use project featuring 15 residential owner-occupied condominiums on a small urban infill lot located at 115 E Kirkwood Avenue. This project originally was approved by the Plan Commission in 2018 by a 9-0 vote. Our desire to offer the community condominiums rather than apartments delayed the normal time to begin construction due to the requirement to have a majority of the units presold. We were in the process of pulling our construction permit when Public Works asked if we might go ahead and connect our water and sewer for the building in Kirkwood due to a repaving project. To expedite the work and meet Public Work’s timeline, Strauser installed the connections prior to any permits being released. We were prepared to move forward on construction when the COVID pandemic struck. Due to the global uncertainties of how COVID might impact the economy and life in general, we decided to delay any construction until such time as we all better understood the lasting impacts of the pandemic. During this waiting period our approval expired. During this time, we continued the market the units and have secured a number of reservations for the project which has enabled us to work with a local lender for construction financing. Clearpath is prepared to begin construction in the late summer/fall of 2022. We are back before the Plan Commission for reapproval of essentially the same project that was approved in 2018.

The lot has served as a parking lot for adjacent businesses such as Workingmen’s, ONB and CVS for well over 60 years. The proposed project is a continuation of Clearpath’s overall Bloomington redevelopment plans to add to the fabric of the Kirkwood corridor. An affiliate partnership purchased the former Workingmen’s building and adjacent parking lot in 2015. Phase 1 of our efforts was an adaptive reuse of the building. Initial efforts brought a much-needed full-service pharmacy to the building and returned the 3rd floor to Class A office condos for four professional businesses including Meitus Gelbert Rose, Clearpath, JPF Properties, and CGR Services. Phase 2 is the redevelopment of the adjacent parking lot. Our plan is to construct a four-story, 47,200 SF mixed-use building that includes approximately 9,000 SF secured parking area with 20 private parking stalls for condominium owners,
1,100 SF of Kirkwood retail and approximately 35,400 SF of owner-occupied residential condominiums consisting of 16 units (15 residential and 1 commercial).

Bloomington’s Comprehensive Plan recognizes the need for density and diversity of housing. Specifically, Chapter 4 encourages outlines policy goals and objectives that support the essence of our overall mixed-use development plans—a pharmacy, professional offices and owner-occupied housing combine to create a “sense of place.” Under Goal 4.5: Promote a Sustainable Downtown, recognizes and encourages the need for such owner-occupied housing as being vital to creating and sustaining a sense of place in downtown:

“Develop strategies to stabilize and diversify the Downtown residential population by identifying and encouraging missing housing forms in the Downtown area (such as row houses, condominiums and live/work space).”

Two goals worth noting are goals 4.4 and 4.6. Goal 4.4 Diversity Housing notes that the community should encourage a range of diverse housing types in the Downtown. Policy 4.4.3 encourages developers to build and market housing to non-student residents. Goal 4.6 Optimize Parking encourages “attractive, cost effective, convenient and environmentally public and private motor vehicle and bicycle parking facilities.” ONE15 aims to meet this Goal and related policies by providing sufficient parking for the project for resident’s cars, including electric vehicles, and bicycles to support vibrant economic activity. Additionally, residents with more than one vehicle will be encouraged to use two adjacent City garages.

It is worth noting that there remains a common thread in our long-term community planning that encourages such a development as we are proposing to build. The former Growth Policy Plan and Downtown Vision and Infill Strategy Plan has longed recognized the need for diverse housing options. The GPP Vision Statement echoes the same sentiments as heard in our Comprehensive Plan and UDO:

V. A thriving city center that offers diverse residential housing, government services, specialized shopping, community-centered activities, and entertainment. More residential housing must be encouraged in the downtown area to insure continued demand for services in the city center. Attractive, quality high-rise buildings, with parking, should be considered. Parking should be consolidated, and surface parking reduced and converted to high density residential uses. Public parks that are safe, well maintained, and offer recreation, sports, and leisure activities for our families should also be encouraged.

Additionally, Policy 2 of the GPP’s Policy Essence Statement noted:

Policy 2: Increase Residential Densities in the Urbanized Area As a counterbalance to policies that limit the spatial expansion of growth, denser infill development in areas that already contain City services must be encouraged. Increasing the density of residential development within the community can provide several benefits. Concentrating densities in certain areas allows others to be preserved as greenspace, a vital urban amenity. Further, as densities increase, the efficiency and quality of urban services can be improved, and public transit becomes a much more feasible service.

Furthermore, the GPP specifically addressed the need for increased residential density/diversity in Geography of the Policies:
Land Use: A mix of office, commercial, civic, high-density residential and cultural land uses are recommended for the downtown. New residential, retail, and office growth must be redirected to the downtown if Bloomington is to slow the sprawl at the city’s edge. Several land-use policies are necessary to achieve the active and engaging downtown that is so important to this community.

- The Downtown area should be targeted for increased residential density (100 units per acre) and for intensified usage of vacant and under-utilized buildings.

The Downtown Vision and In-fill Strategy Plan echoes the need for a mix of residential options in the downtown:

Residential Development Strategy Diverse housing options in downtown should be available in a range of product types and prices, including market rate and affordable categories. Construction of new residential units in mixed use complexes, as well as adaptive reuse of upper floors in older commercial buildings are envisioned. These product types should be promoted in the downtown area:

- High amenity, market rate units, historic
- High amenity, market rate units, new

Creating projects that combine these residential types is particularly encouraged.

The Strategy Plan recognizes the potential need for variances from some standards to achieve certain community goals:

- Projects which may need exemptions on some design requirements that fulfill other downtown goals (e.g. affordable housing, owner-occupied housing, base employment, etc.)

Our multi-phased mixed-use development proposes to address a long-ignored residential segment—owner occupied housing that has been encouraged by community leaders in every strategic visioning plan. Clearpath is offering an urban residential product that offers from one to three-bedroom options with amenities desired by owner-occupied residents. The project will be marketed to young professionals, retirees and downtown/university based employees. This residential demographic is a much-needed addition to our downtown core.

The proposed building’s design and density is driven by the unique nature of an infill owner-occupied residential project on a smaller city lot. Our research indicates that the market desires downtown condominiums that provide a unique urban experience. As such, we are offering a design that offers 10-foot ceilings, large outdoor rooms, lobby entry off of Kirkwood, unique common area amenities and secured parking. The Kirkwood level footprint is comprised of street retail, condominium lobby entrance and secured parking. The residential units are located on floors two through four.

Additionally, there are other site related expenses unique to an urban infill project that drive the need for additional density: these include land costs, infrastructure (e.g. need to bury electrical lines in both alleys) and construction staging. In order to address this density need, the design steps-back at Kirkwood to bring the scale down. Additionally, the canopy along the street level will bring the street front down to a human scale consistent with Kirkwood.

The project and design is in scale with historical structures and recently approved/constructed projects. The Buskirk, KP building on the Square, Oddfellows, CVS and Uptown buildings are examples of multistory buildings adjacent to the lot. Newer projects such as the Sullivan’s building and downtown
hotel projects are representative of Bloomington's evolution towards recognizing the need for greater density for urban infill projects.

The overall design, through the use of brick, limestone, glass and metal breaks the façade up to visually integrate the building into the fabric of Kirkwood and surrounding buildings. The structure itself is to be built with a steel beam/concrete core. This, combined with the use of quality and timeless exterior materials on all four sides, will result in an attractive building that will add to the long-term character of downtown and Kirkwood. Unlike many of the new apartment structures, our project utilizes a design that owner's will be proud to call home for many years to come.

The project is being designed to meet or exceed LEED Certified equivalency. The condos, as such, will incorporate numerous environmentally friendly features including:
  - Solar Panels on Roof
  - Car Charging Station
  - Recycling Program
  - Energy Efficient HVAC Systems
  - No/Low VOC Materials
  - Locally/Regionally Sourced Materials
  - LED Lighting
  - Energy Efficient Appliances/Systems
  - Water Efficient Fixtures
Please refer to the “Green Building Initiatives” exhibit for additional details.

In order to reduce the likelihood that these units may be converted to rentals, the condominium association documents will prohibit owners from offering units for short-term rental such as Airbnb. Additionally, the documents will prohibit the units from being occupied by more than two unrelated adults. These restrictions will aid in the maintenance of a strong owner-occupied environment.

Finally, the addition of nearly 1,100 SF of retail will provide new modern space for the downtown retail scene. The following is a summary of project per the previous submission including the addition of solar panels and garage entry off of Kirkwood.

**Residential Density and Owner Occupancy:** The proposal offers 15 residential condominiums and 1 commercial condominium. The residential units range from 3,264 SF to 1,582 SF. The commercial condominium is approximately 1,100 SF.

**Height:** Our proposal is for a 4-story building. The design features an average building height 50’6” feet using the average elevation. It is worth noting that the height is being driven by market demand of owner-occupied housing. Our commercial space has open ceiling heights from 14-16 feet. The owner-occupied housing has 10-foot clear ceilings.

**Architecture/Materials:** The architect, Ryan Strauser, has blended contemporary design with more traditional elements. Numerous punched openings with distinctive sills/lintels have been added. The renderings show a distinctive base, middle and cap. The extensive use of glass and key entries for the condominiums and commercial space along Kirkwood, including on the garage entry door, will create a pedestrian friendly streetscape with opportunities for outdoor seating and planters.
**Building Height Step Down:** The design contains a step-back at the front façade facing Kirkwood and adjacent to the alley. Our proposed building is separated by an alley. Our side is across the alley from the Book Corner’s rear elevation. Visually, we achieve the required step-back from the Kirkwood/alley perspective.

**Void-to-Solid Percentage:** See architect’s comments.

**Solar Panels:** Since our last submission, we believe it makes economic sense to add solar panels to the roof of the project. It is projected that addition of the panels will at a minimum cover the costs of electricity for all the common area including the lobby and garage. Additionally, we are seeking the sustainable incentive under the UDO (see Zoning Compliance/Sustainable Incentive section below).

**Garage Entry:** Our previous submission had the garage entry off of Washington utilizing the loading dock area used by CVS as the entry access. Clearpool did not and does not have a legal easement to use the loading dock for such purposes. In our original petition, we had an arrangement with the owner of the CVS space. This has subsequently expired and will not be considered moving forward. As such, access to the garage off of either of the alleys is not feasible due to grade changes and economics. Under our revised proposal, the garage entry will be on the east side of the building facing Kirkwood. We currently have two very active curb cuts that serve the surface lot. This will now be reduced to one curb cut. The activity from the garage will be significantly less than current uses as it only serves the residents of the condominiums. Additionally, the garage door will be designed to complement the design of the Kirkwood storefronts/streetscape.

**Zoning/Sustainable Incentive:** The site is currently zoned MD-CS (Mixed-use Downtown with Courthouse Square Downtown Character Overlay. Our previous submission was approved under slightly different regulations. Clearpool is seeking to build a structure that contains 4 floors and that is taller than 40 feet. For the additional floor, we are pursuing the sustainable incentive and will pursue any other required variances either via the BZA or Hearing Officer process. Per 20.04(d), we plan to comply with, at a minimum, four of the six noted qualifying criteria including covered parking, cool roof, solar energy, and building efficiency. In conclusion, we are offering essentially the same project that the Plan Commission unanimously supported in 2018. We look forward to our formal meeting to discuss the project and answer any remaining questions.

**Variances Sought:** We seek two variances from the BZA.

1. Variance from 20.03.010 (e)(1) Nonresidential Ground Floor Standards. This section requires that a minimum of 50% of the total ground floor area located along Kirkwood. Our previous approval did not have this requirement; thus it was approved with a significant portion of the ground floor with residential parking. As currently designed, One15 has one retail space (@1,100 SF), the condo entry/lobby, and the garage entry. The project as designed is critical to the success of the project. Providing at least one parking spot per condominium unit is market driven by our owner-occupied buyers. Without the parking, the project is not economically sustainable. The design balances the need for an “active” streetscape with the market need for parking. The parking is not public and only for residents. As designed, the retail space qualifies as approximately 10% of nonresidential ground floor space. With the condo entry and other miscellaneous uses (trash, EV charging area and etc), the percentage is closer to 15%. While still considerably less than the 50% requirement, it balances the project’s need for parking and the economic realities of retail. We are comfortable with trying to lease an additional 1,100 SF of retail space but do note that there is widespread availability of retail space in the downtown area.
area. Our desire as a community to have an active retail environment must align with market realities. We believe we have struck a good balance that serves the greater need of the community—housing while providing some retail opportunity. We respectfully request a variance form this requirement.

2. Variance from section 20.02.050 (6) Windows and Doors on Primary Facades. The UDO in this overlay requires 70%. As was previously designed/approved and with the addition of the glass garage entry door, we are approximately at 58%. Architecturally, the additional brick in the modulation provides the building distinct “entry points” for the retail, condo lobby and garage. This provides opportunities for planters and needed wall space in interiors. The small brick sections flow to the upper floors providing needed balance. We would like to maintain the original design balance and respectfully request a variance from this standard.

3. Variance from 20.04.070 (e) (2) Alignment with Setbacks. This section of the UDO requires that new building abutting a notable building align with the existing setback where the façade modules meet. To meet the façade modulation requirements, the design incorporates several different setbacks along the entire Kirkwood façade. When previously approved, the “CVS” building (which we developed and continue to own part of) was not part of any historic designation. The approved designed at the façade modulation that meets the existing building is set back approximately 1’6”. This was done to provide modulation relief. Additionally, the “CVS” building has a deeper setback on the ground floor of approximately 8 feet. Visually the existing building has some modulation and is not designed/constructed like some of the traditional courthouse square buildings. We think given the design and age of the existing building combined with the need for façade modulation in the UDO our existing design continues to work well with the abutting façade and request a variance from this requirement.

Respectfully submitted by: Randy Lloyd
One15 Kirkwood
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BLOOMINGTON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
STAFF REPORT  
Location: 1420 W. Kirkwood Ave  
CASE #: V-34-22  
DATE: August 25, 2022

PETITIONER: Adam Jackson (Caritas-Indiana, LLC)  
PO Box 12128,

CONSULTANTS: Springpoint Architects, Inc.  
522 W. 2nd Street, Bloomington

REQUEST: Variance from buffer yard standards to allow construction of a 16-unit multifamily building in the Residential High Density Multifamily (RH) zoning district.

REPORT: This 50’x141’ (7,050 sq. ft.) property is located at 1420 W. Kirkwood Ave and is zoned Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH). The property is developed with a single family residence and detached accessory garages. Surrounding properties to the east and west are zoned Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH), Residential Multifamily (RM) to the north, and Mixed Use Medium Scale (MM) to the south. Surrounding land uses include single and multifamily residences to the north, a contractor’s yard to the east, a mobile home park to the west, and a church to the south. The property has public roads running along the south (W. Kirkwood Ave.) and west (N. Hopewell St.) property lines. There are no known sensitive environmental features on the site.

The petitioner is proposing to remove the current structures and construct a new four-story multifamily building with 16 units. The petitioner is proposing to construct 2 new on-street parking spaces on Kirkwood Avenue and 5 on-street parking spaces on Hopewell Street. There are no on-site parking spaces required. New 6’ wide concrete sidewalks will be required along both frontages and have been shown. New landscaping will also be installed within the site as well as a minimum of 6 bicycle parking spaces. Since the adjacent use to the east is a contractor’s yard, the UDO requires a Type 3 buffer yard along the east property line. This adds an additional 20’ onto the minimum setbacks of the district, requires one deciduous tree every 20 feet, and an evergreen tree every 10’ or a 6 foot-tall opaque fence or 5-foot tall undulating berm. The petitioner has incorporated the required plantings for the buffer yard. No specific architecture has been submitted or reviewed with this petition. The proposed building will be required to meet all of the architectural standards of the UDO.

The side yard building setback in this district is 10’ and the Type 3 buffer yard adds an additional 20’ onto the base setback which results in a 30’ setback from the east property line. The front yard setback is 15’ from the property line. The 15’ front yard setback and 30’ side yard setback leave only a 5’ wide buildable area on this 50’ wide lot. The petitioner is requesting a variance from the buffer yard standards to allow a 10’ setback to the east property line.

CRITERIA AND FINDINGS FOR DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS VARIANCE

20.06.080(b)(3)(E) Standards for Granting Variances from Development Standards:
A variance from the development standards of the Unified Development Ordinance may be approved only upon determination in writing that each of the following criteria is met:

1) **The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.**

**PROPOSED FINDING:** The granting of the variance to allow the reduced side yard setback will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community. The building will meet the typical side yard setback distance required and does not exceed the allowable maximum height of the district. While the 20’ for the buffer yard is not shown, the petitioner has shown the required buffer yard landscape plantings as required to provide a visual screen.

2) **The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the Development Standards Variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.**

**PROPOSED FINDING:** No adverse impacts to the use and value of surrounding properties as a result of the requested variance are found. As mentioned, the building will meet the typical side yard setback distance required and does not exceed the allowable maximum height of the district. The petitioner has shown the required buffer yard landscape plantings as required to provide a visual buffer to adjacent properties.

3) **The strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property; that the practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question; that the Development Standards Variance will relieve the practical difficulties.**

**PROPOSED FINDING:** The Department finds that the strict application of the terms of the Unified Development Ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property as they would not allow for the property to be developed in any manner due to the limited buildable area. The practical difficulties are peculiar to the property in question because the width and size of the property in combination with the required setbacks do not allow for any development to occur on the property without the granting of a variance. The petitioner has designed the building to meet the base setbacks of the district while balancing green space surrounding the building and installing all of the required landscaping. The granting of the variance allows for the property to be redeveloped in a manner consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, zoning district, and provide improvements to the area.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Department recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopt the proposed findings and approve V-34-22 with the following condition:

1. Site plan approval is required prior to issuance of a grading permit.
2. This approval is for the submitted site plan only.
3. No variances from building architecture standards are approved with this petition.
August 11, 2022

Eric Gruelich
Senior Zoning Planner
City of Bloomington
401 N. Morton Street
Bloomington, IN 47404

Re: Caritas-Indiana 1401 W. Kirkwood Avenue Apartments

Dear Mr. Gruelich,

Our client, Caritas-Indiana, seeks to build a (4) story, sixteen (16) unit apartment building at 1420 W. Kirkwood Avenue. This affordable housing project will meet the rent requirements for the HUD Housing Choice Voucher Program Section 8.

As a corner lot in the Residential High Density (RH) zone, the front setbacks are 15 feet and the side setbacks are 10 feet. Since the use on the property to the east is a commercial business, a 15 foot wide, type 2 buffer yard is required.

The property dimensions are 50 feet by 141 feet which, after the setbacks, leaves an allowable building footprint of 25 feet x 116 feet. The type 2 buffer yard requirement along the east property line that is in addition to the building setback would leave an allowable building footprint of 10 feet by 116 feet. Due to the dimensions of the property, the buffer yard requirement results in a practical difficulty in that the allowable building footprint will not permit a feasible building size. As a result, the property could not be developed.

We are therefore requesting a variance from the 15 foot buffer yard. We will accommodate the type 3 buffer yard requirements within the 10 foot building side setback.

Thank you for your consideration,

Barre Klapper, AIA
Springpoint Architects, pc
**GENERAL PLANTING NOTES**

1. **CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING UTILITY LOCATIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. CALL 811 FOR UTILITY LOCATIONS.**

2. **ARCHITECTSPC BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47404 812.318.2930 www.springpointarchitects.com**

3. **DAMAGE OCCURRING DURING CONSTRUCTION THAT FALLS BEYOND THE LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPAIRED BY CONTRACTOR TO ARCHITECT APPROVAL.**

4. **PROTECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION. TREE PROTECTION FENCING SHALL BE LOCATED AT A THREE-FOOT MINIMUM RADIUS SURROUNDING THE DRIPLINE OF THE TREE. NO EQUIPMENT OR SUPPLY STORAGE, EQUIPMENT MOVEMENT, REST OR PICNICKING AREA, OR ANY LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES SHALL BE ALLOWED IN THE TREE PROTECTION MULCH THROUGHOUT PLANT BEDS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLAN.**

5. **EDGING: BED EDGES SHALL BE SPADED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLAN.**

6. **PLANT MATERIALS SHALL CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED IN THE LATEST EDITION OF THE PLANT BED EDGE SCHEDULE FOR ON CENTER 3" MULCH.**

7. **CONTAINER OR BALL AND BURLAP ARE ACCEPTABLE. PRUNE ONLY BROKEN OR DAMAGED BRANCHES USING TRIANGULAR PLANTING LAYOUT. REFER TO PLANT SCHEDULE FOR ON CENTER 3" MULCH.**

8. **PLANT BED EDGE PRUNE ONLY BROKEN OR DAMAGED BRANCHES USING TRIANGULAR PLANTING LAYOUT. REFER TO PLANT SCHEDULE FOR ON CENTER 3" MULCH.**

9. **SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL 1"=1'-0"**

10. **THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLETELY GUARANTEE ALL UNDISTURBED OR COMPACTED DISTANCE BETWEEN TREE TRUNK AND UTILITY MAINS SUCH AS WATER, SANITARY SEWER, GAS, AND STORM. TREES SHALL ALSO MAINTAIN AN 8' CLEARANCE BETWEEN TREE TRUNK AND STRUCTURES, BUILDING OVERHANGS, WALLS, FENCES, AND OTHER OBJECTS IN THE PROXIMITY OF THE TREE.**

11. **TREE GATOR OR EQUIV. PORTABLE DRIP OPERATIONAL IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ALL PROPOSED MED/SMALL TREE LOCATIONS.**

12. **DISEASE OR OTHER AFFECTS ON TREE MUST BE TREATED OR REMEDY TO BE PROVIDED.**

13. **LAWN: SHALL BE SEED/STRAW.**

**OVERALL PLANT LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QNTY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GL TR</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos 'Skyline'</td>
<td>Honeylocust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2&quot; cal</td>
<td>6'-8'h TI AM Tilia Americana Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM GR</td>
<td>Amelanchier x grandiflora 'Autumn Brilliance'</td>
<td>Serviceberry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>multi-stem</td>
<td>29' h AM GR Amelanchier x grandiflora 'Autumn Brilliance'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC SA</td>
<td>Acer saccarum 'Barrett Cole'</td>
<td>Apollo Maple 'Barrett Cole'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2&quot; cal</td>
<td>6'-8'h TI AM Tilia Americana Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT VI</td>
<td>Itea virginica</td>
<td>Virginia Sweetspire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>gal</td>
<td>1420 W KIRKWOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>