

Plan Commission Summary Minutes Virtual Web Conference Meeting

March 14, 2022 - 5:30 pm

Plan Commission minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) Department of the Monroe County Public Library, 303 E Kirkwood Avenue. Phone number: 812-349-3111 or via e-mail at the following address: moneill@monroe.lib.in.us.

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on March 14, 2022 at 5:30 p.m., a hybrid meeting was held both in the Council Chambers, located in Room 115, at 401 N. Morton Street, City Hall Bloomington, IN 47404 and remotely via Zoom. Members present in Chambers Tim Ballard, Andrew Cibor, Jillian Kinzie, and Karin St. John, members present via Zoom were Flavia Burrell and Chris Cockerham. Absent were Israel Herrera, Ron Smith, Trohn Enright-Randolph and Brad Wisler.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 13, 2021 and February 7, 2022

December 13, 2021

****St. John moved to approve the December 13, 2021 minutes, with no changes. Burrell seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0- Approved.**

February 7, 2022

****Ballard moved to approve the February 7, 2022 minutes, with no changes. St. John seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0- Approved.**

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Resolution for Zoning Commitment for accessory dwelling unit 3121 E Tapps Turn – rescinding the zoning commitment at 3121 E Tapps Turn, did not build the ADU.

****Kinzie motioned to approve rescinding zoning commitment for 3121 E Tapps Turn. Cockerham seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0-approved.**

Fee schedule changes, proposing to update fee schedule. Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, said the fee schedule had last been updated in 2013 and before that it was updated in 1997, only updated twice in the last 25 years. Recently compared fee schedule to comparable college towns and other towns in Indiana, based on that comparison they are proposing changes to the existing fee schedule, some changes are to clarify the schedule, changing some terminology that was updated with the new code and clarifying fees for different site plans and plats. These fees are keeping in line with other communities similar to Bloomington. Permit fees are staying the same, keeping these fees reasonable so that individuals in the community are not out priced for their projects. The Use Variance, Outdoor Seating in ROW and Right-of-Way Excavation have been removed because these are things that Planning no longer handles, floodplain development permit has been added because it came into the UDO with the 2020 update. Proposing to increase grading permit fees to have a flat fee plus an amount per acre.

Kinzie asked for clarification on Outdoor seating in ROW and Right-of-Way Excavation are no longer issued by Planning. Scanlan said that these are no longer issued by Planning, they are now issued by the Engineering Department.

St. John asked about the Plat fees going from \$300 to \$1,000. Scanlan explained that the fee should

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes
Virtual Web Conference Meeting**

March 14, 2022 - 5:30 pm

actually be \$800, which is the total of the Primary and Secondary Plat fees. They would prefer that these be filed separately but if they chose to file together the fee would be a total of Primary and Secondary which is \$800, plus the lot fee.

St. John needed clarification about site/final plan fees, Scanlan explained that anything in red is what the new fees would be. St. John also asked about the grading fees, it is \$100 plus \$125 per acre, Scanlan confirmed that is correct.

Kinzie asked when these new rates would go into effect and if there is a process to notify people of the new rates. Scanlan said the new rates are effective as soon as they are approved and will update the administrative manual and get upload to the website.

Cockerham asked how much the budget is based on the fees taken in, Scanlan said the fees go to the general fund, Planning does not benefit from the fees collected. Cockerham stated that he cautioned in raising fees, to be able to maintain affordable housing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

**** Ballard motioned to approve Revised Fee Schedule, with one correction under Plats and Plat Amendments, Preliminary & Final should be \$800, not \$1,000. Burrell seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0-approved.**

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: April 11, 2022

PUD/DP-24-21 Robert V Shaw

N Prow Road: 3500 block of N Hackberry Street
Request: Petitioner requests Final Plan and Preliminary Plat amendment for Ridgefield PUD and Subdivision Section V.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

SP-05-22 MHG Apartments

1210, 1220, 1320, 1404, 1414 W. Arlington Rd.
Request: Major site plan approval to allow the construction of a multifamily Residential building with 211 dwelling units in the Residential Multifamily (RM) zoning district.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

DP-08-22 Walnut Pike Development LLC

3111 S Walnut Street Pike
Request: Primary plot approval of a 37 lot subdivision of 15.56 acres in the Residential Medium lot (R2) zoning district. Also requested a waiver of required 2nd hearing and vacation of Phase I of the Ivy Chase Plat.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

SP-06-22 Strauser Construction Co., Inc.

3000 & 3070 S Walnut St.
Request: Major site plan approval to construct a 9 building self service

Storage facility with 10 new vehicle parking spaces.

Case Manager: Karina Pazos

CONSENT AGENDA:

SP-07-22 Grant Properties

613 E 12th St.

Request: Major site plan approval to construct a 4-story building with 3 floors of residential units over a ground floor parking garage with 8 Vehicle parking spaces and 2 bicycle parking spaces.

Case Manager: Karina Pazos

Kinzie asked if any commissioners would like to have a full hearing the consent agenda item. No comments from commissioners. She then asked if there are any public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

****St. John motioned to approve consent petition SP-07-22. Cockerham seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

PETITIONS: March 14, 2022

PUD-03-22 Trinitas Ventures

1550 N Arlington Park Drive

Request: An amendment to the district ordinance and preliminary plan for an approval Planned Unit Development.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich presented the case, this is a request for signage to be placed at the entrances to the development. Trinitas Ventures is requesting that lots the will be 3' wide at the 17th area and 10' wide at the Arlington area to be used for signage. Overall project is not changing, just wanting to add signage at the entrance to the development along the public road. 74' Wide lot by 430' long strip was purchased for road connection between the development and Arlington Road, with a 5' tree plot and 10' multi-use path on the north side and a 5' tree plot and 5' path on the south side, those would all be remaining. They would be keeping a 3' wide strip leading out to Arlington Road, widening out to 10' out at the road containing a sign. The reason for the amendment is for the signage is on the property that is owned by petitioner and is continuous with the rest of the development. There is not a provision within the district ordinance or allowance in the UDO for frontage signage, so they have to have land that is continuous with their development in order for them to have signage on it. It is a very similar situation for the signage along 17th Street, 3' wide strip of land that would connect with the development and then extends out to 17th Street which would house the signage. In both of these situations the signs are identical, both signs would meet allowances within this district for size and height.

The petitioner's request is to allow for the creation of lots that are extremely narrow in width, are unbuildable, and are extremely out of sync with standard UDO length/width ratios. The type of lot creation is not desired by the UDO and does not present 'new and imaginative concepts' or 'create distinct developments with unique urban design'. The development will have frontage on public roads, including Arlington Park Drive, one the secondary plat is complete. Signage can be placed on the site of the development with frontage on those public roads. The proposed changes to the PUD

would allow the creation of lots solely for the purpose of signage on road frontages that are not immediately adjacent to the development and does not seem to warrant the requested deviations just for what amounts to off-premise signage.

The Department recommends that the Plan Commission forward the petition to the Common Council with a negative recommendation.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

Austin Tracy, Development Manager on project, is seeking to amend the PUD for signage and retail space within the development. Their goal is to allow for monument signs along Arlington and 17th Street to guide public and emergency vehicles to the property, this was a solution that was coordinated with staff. Signage along these two frontages were agreed to in the approved PUD. They have one proposed sign at the entrance at 17th Street and one at the entrance on Arlington, they feel the signs at these locations are critical to the marketing effort for this project and safety of the property. Since the property is tucked behind a residential area they feel it is necessary to have signage at these locations to direct traffic (i.e. emergency vehicles) to the location. It is imperative for them to have this signage on the main corridors. They acknowledge that it is not ideal to have signage in the public right of way, but it is the only solution to get signs there. The other issue is the modification of language in the PUD regarding commercial usage in the Area C. They currently considering some studio space, which is not specifically mentioned in the PUD. Wanted to add that to the language in the PUD.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Tim Ballard asked about other uses for the land, Mr. Tracy said there really are no other uses for the narrow land that these signs would set on.

Andrew Cibor asked for clarification on the PUD language change requested by Petitioner for the studio space. Greulich replied they were requesting modification of the commercial space use and staff has no problems with those modifications. Cibor also asked petitioner if there were any public safety providers that have requested that there be signs at these locations to direct emergency vehicles to this development. Mr. Tracy said this request came from their property management team.

Karin St. John asked for clarification of language modification of the PUD. Greulich stated their request is expand the usage of the commercial space to include podcast/YouTube studio space.

Kinzie asked about roadway maintenance concerns. Greulich replied the concerns were raised by the petitioner's property managers and not by the police or fire department. This situation is no different than other developments in that they don't have frontage on a main road. Kinzie is concerned about the maintenance of the road with the 3' strip of land for the signage, does that present a unique challenge in terms of maintenance. Greulich said that will not be changing the maintenance of the road, nothing has changed regarding the cross sections of the intersection, the road will be maintained as usual. Kinzie asked if there were other logical places for signs to go and was this thought about at the beginning of this project. Greulich said they can have signs at the entrance of the development on Telluride and the new street from Arlington, but they are asking for signage at the main streets. Mr. Tracy said the intent was always to have signs at the entrance off of Arlington and 17th Street. Scanlan added these will be public roads from Arlington and 17th to the development, which will have road signs and those looking for the development will be looking for these roads off of

the main roads. Signs are allowed at the entrance to their development but we want to be careful about setting a precedent in allowing signage outside of the entrance.

St. John asked for explanation of item number 3 on page 34 of packet, which states “it appears that the desired ROW along Arlington Park Drive may be reduced below 50 feet, which is not desirable to the City of future maintenance of the road right-of-way”. Scanlan said based on the transportation plan for smaller roads they would like 60 feet and they are only getting 50 feet with this road and it is tighter than the City would like, and it is unclear from the drawings where the extra 3 feet is coming from for the signs. The City has to maintain the public right-of-way, i.e. sidewalks, trees, we will be doing that from a narrower right-of-way and if you take away another 3 feet for the signs that is not desirable. St. John asked if there are names for the new road that are going to be constructed and what is the address of this new development. Scanlan said the streets in the development all have names and will have streets signs associated with those streets. Mr. Tracy clarified that the space for the signs is an additional 3 feet, not included in the 50 feet.

Cibor asked for clarification about the width, is it 50 feet ROW and 3 feet for the sign or is the sign within the 50 feet. Mr. Tracy said it is 3 feet addition to the 50 feet.

Burrell has a question about ownership of this small piece of land. Greulich clarified there will be 50 feet of right-of-way and 3 additional feet owned by the petitioner where the sign will be placed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Kinzie has concerns on both sides, understands the need for signage and the value in signage, but also sees some real concerns with a lot of businesses that might want to get signage out on a main roadway in order to improve their visibility. Concerns about fairness to other business who don't have signage on major roadways.

Kinzie suggested there be two votes, one for the signage and the other for the proposed usage. Mike Rouker, with City Legal, said with was okay to do two votes.

Ballard sees the signage request as a small request and being reviewed on a case by case. He believes this a fair request given the scope of the project.

Cibor sides with the staff's recommendation regarding the signage, but has no issues with language change on the PUD. Cibor has worked a lot with emergency responders and he has never had one that requested a monument sign to help with emergencies. He fails to see the public need or benefit from the request.

St. John is sympatric to the petitioner's request but don't find the reasons compelling. Agrees that emergency responders are going to have no problem finding this neighborhood or the streets associated with this area. Feels it is too much a break in the rules to approve the request.

Cockerham appreciates what the developers are doing, but since this will be a public road with signage that we need to trust the system that are in place.

Burrell said knowing this is a public road and approved in the PUD, what was the understanding of that language. Greulich said the PUD allows for a free standing sign on the property, the location

wasn't deviated on the drawings. The location of the signs just doesn't work with what the City would like to see for the precedent of signage.

**** Kinzie motioned to forward the petition to the Common Council with a negative recommendation for the change in sign ordinance. St. John seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

**** Cockerham motioned to forward the petition to the Common Council with a positive recommendation to allow for additional uses of retail space in Area C . St. John seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

SP-09-22 Trades District Technology Center

617 N Madison Street / 422 W 10th Street

Request: A major site plan approval to allow for one nonresidential building in the Mixed-Use Downtown Showers Technology Character Area (MD-ST.)

Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Jackie Scanlan presented this case. This is a request for a major site plan approval, the site area is a portion of a .95 acreage parcel located at the corner of Maker Way and Madison Street in the Mixed-Use Downtown with a Showers Technology Park Character Area Overlay (MD-ST). The properties to the north and west are also vacant, with Monroe County Government Center to the south and The Mill and a parking lot are to the northeast and east. The reason this is on the agenda is because the development will contain more than 15,000 square feet. This proposal contains 21,000 square feet.

The site plan is pretty straight forward, one building in north area of plot with a plaza area at the northeast corner. The front building setback will not meet code therefore if this is approved tonight there is a condition stating they will have to apply for a variance regarding setbacks. This site is over the impervious surface maximum, the lot size for this development has not been established yet and they are proposing to develop just the northern portion and because of this they can either adjust the size of the hardscape or adjust the lot line to the south so they meet the impervious surface requirement. Twenty-five percent of the lot needs to be green space and right now they are at 19.8 percent, the petitioner must file a Preliminary Plat amendment to create the lot within six months.

The building will be mostly office space, two stories with a small third story on top. Metal will be used to reflect the industrial history of the area, the use of metal will likely require a variance. On the first floor there is a combination of masonry and brick with metal above. Lots of open windows, which meets the City requirement. There is not parking on site, which is not required but there is bicycle parking on site.

The petition is compliant with most UDO guidance, except two required variances for setbacks and materials. The proposal is in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Plan for the Trades District.

The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve SP-09-22 with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner must file a Preliminary Plat amendment to create the lot for the parcel within six months of approval of this site plan. The Secondary Plat must be approved before a grading permit will be issued.

2. The petitioner must adjust either the hardscape or lot size in order to meet impervious surface requirements.
3. The petitioner must submit a compliant landscape plan once the parcel size is finalized and before a grading permit will be issued.
4. This petition is approved contingent upon approval of variances for both front building setback and materials. If the approved materials list changes to allow metal, no variance for materials is required.
5. The petitioner must receive a grading permit before any earth moving on the site.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

Jane Kupersmith, with Economic & Sustainable Development, is representing the City of Bloomington on the project. This a collaboration between the City and the City of Bloomington Redevelopment Commission. Ashley Thornberry, from Axis Architects and Interiors is also present.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Kinzie has a question about pedestrian entry points, what is the main entry point into the building. Ms. Thornberry said there will be two pedestrian entry points , the main entrance will be off of Madison and there will be a second entry point on the west side of the building. There will also be a staircase on the south side that will provide an egress, which will have limited access. Kinzie confirmed that Makers Way will not have an entrance, Ms. Thornberry confirmed this. Kinzie asked for thoughts from petitioner on how they will meet the green space requirement. The petitioner would like to move the property line to the south so they don't have to change the hardscape.

Cibor asked about trash enclosure and transformer will be located. Ms. Thornberry is proposing that these remain in the ally area, will be secure within the property boundary.

Cockerham asked about the intended use of the building. Ms. Kupersmith said the space would be used as tech commercial space.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

****St. John motioned to approve petition SP-09-22, including the five conditions outlined in the staff report. Cibor seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

Scanlan asked if agenda item ZO-10-22 UDO Technical Text Amendments could be moved to the last item on the agenda.

**** Kinzie motioned to move petition ZO-10-22 UDO Technical Text Amendments to the last agenda item. St. John seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

ZO-11-22 UDO Chapter 3, Use Regulations, Amendments - Technical corrections for text amendments that add, remove or edit text to clarify existing standards and generally are not substantive.

Scanlan said the Planning and Transportation Department is recommending amendments to the

UDO, these are changes that are more in line with housekeeping, working with the code and finding things that need to be changed.

Scanlan gave an overview of what is included in this item. There are eight amendments identified and a majority of them are related to a maximum building floorplate (size of each floor) for student housing. Proposing to reduce the base of the floorplates in student housing in some of the districts, Mixed-Use Neighborhood, Residential Multi-family, Downtown Zoning, Residential High Density, and mixed use districts, Mixed-Use Corridor (MC) and Mixed-Used Institutional (MI). Those are all scaled based on the district. For example, we are reducing the square footage, for Mixed-Use Neighborhood (MN) is going from 2,500 square feet to 2,000 square feet but if they wish to do an incentive then they could have 3,000 square feet. If both incentives, affordable housing and sustainable housing, are used then they could have 5,000 square feet. Building with more than 20 dwelling units cannot have a floorplate larger than 10,000 square feet, can have up to 15,000 square feet if using either of the incentives. If utilizing both incentives allows up to 30,000 square feet per building.

Adding architectural requirements for garages since there are currently none, finding it hard to implement existing architectural requirements for garages.

Allow for families to have attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit) and have internal access through their home. Currently this is not an option by code.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Kinzie really appreciates the process to bringing these changes to the Commission. The UDO is supposed to be a living document and changes are what makes it that living document. Thanks staff for making this a regular part of the process.

Kinzie asked how did the ADU issues came about. Greulich said there were a few request for permits, people who had individuals who wanted to live in the house but still wanted their own space.

St. John asked what the process that brought on these changes was. Scanlan said for example, in working with the code it was noted that most of those using incentives was using the sustainable housing incentive and if we wanted them to use the affordable housing incentive there needed to be a changes. St. John clarified that these changes are based on what has been seen in the last couple of years vs. a change of heart. Scanlan confirmed that was the case.

Ballard asked for a condensed report on how the new UDO incentives are working and if it is meeting the goals intended. Scanlan said she could give them a synopsis of what has been done, verses what the intent was.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

****St. John motioned to forward proposal to Common Council with a positive recommendation for ZO-11-22 UDO Chapter 3, Use Regulations, Amendments. Cibor seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

ZO-12-22 UDO Chapter 4, Development Standards & Incentives, Amendments - Technical corrections for text amendments that add, remove or edit text to clarify existing standards and generally are not substantive.

Scanlan reported there are 21 amendments for Chapter 4, details related to design requirements for all the amendments as discussed in Chapter 3. The first amendment is the impervious surface coverage and landscape area requirements for the Bloomington Hospital Site Reuse Master Plan, would like to change to 85% impervious surface coverage for five lots zoned Mixed-Used Medium scale (MM) on north of 1st Street south of 2nd Street, east of Maple Street and west of Morton Street and the landscape area minimum shall be 15%. The change will sync the UDO with the Bloomington Hospital Site Reuse Master Plan (pages 62-63) with lot areas available for redevelopment (Table 04-3).

Next amendments are for Table 04-4, Side and Rear parking setback for Downtown Character Overlays (DCO), change to make those standards to existing standards. Also for Table 04-4, this change is related to the Showers Technology center which was discussed earlier. Would change MD-ST Impervious Surface Coverage/Landscape Area split 75%/25% to 85%/15%.

There are a number of small corrections, for Table 04-7 delete DU=dwelling unit, add Solar Collector and reference 20.03.030(f)(2). There are some clarifications, no changes, to drive isle widths, street stub expectations in subdivisions, cleaning up the code by deleting redundancy, adding architectural standards for Multi-family developments, now matches the Mixed-Use standards. Revised species allowed for street trees. Adding a section for small projecting signs which are currently not in the code.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

St. John is abstaining from this because of a potential conflict regarding the first item in this section.

Kinzie likes the projecting signs and asked about the origin of the solar ready added to the code. Scanlan said the Sustainable Plan was done by the City was led by the Economical Sustainable Plan which suggested that we codify a solar ready rule. Scott Robinson, Director of Planning and Transportation, did some research and proposed the regulations that have been added.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

**** Cibor motioned to forward proposal to Common Council with a positive recommendation for ZO-12-22 UDO Chapter 4, Development Standards & Incentives, Amendments. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 5:0:1 (St. John abstained from the vote)—Approved.**

ZO-13-22 UDO Chapter 5, Subdivision Standards; Chapter 6, Administration & Procedures; and Chapter 7, Definitions, Amendments - Technical corrections for text amendments that add, remove or edit text to clarify existing standards and generally are not substantive.

Scanlan reported these three chapters had 13 amendments. The first clarifies easements required per Chapter 4, that the easement language and conditions surrounding it are adhered to per Chapter 5 standards, adding the following language “or set aside in easements on a deed in situations where no plat is required”. Clarifying that the Engineering Department shall review and approve a street lighting plan. Would like for it to be required that a petitioner/petitioner’s representative attend the Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting held with all departments prior to public hearing.

UDO currently states there must be public notifications in the local paper 21 days prior to a Plan Commission and Plat Committee Meeting, would like to sync our public notifications with the State requirements. The State currently requires a 10 day notification. Prior to the updated UDO all notifications were 10 days, did not get translated to 10 days in the new UDO, just needing to sync notifications with the State Code. Modify triggers for minor or major site plans, increasing the standard slightly for the bottom threshold of minor subdivision. These changes are coming from working with the site plans, there have been some that have been brought to the Commission that seem small, right sizing with the intention of the UDO.

Increasing triggers for grading permits from 1,000 square feet to 2,500 square feet, and excluding some projects, if they are just doing one building without site improvements which is not disturbing anything outside of the foundation. Allowing minor modifications to be done as part of a certificate of zoning compliance so that these can be applicable to building permits which was part of the original intent.

Clarification of excess asphalt, clarifies that excess asphalt can be required for removal even if it not parking spaces, this applies to impervious space. Added a definition of ground cover, there wasn't a definition in the code, but it was referenced. Front Setback is updated to reflect applications for this section (20.07.010) to maintain current building setbacks in area of the City with varying degrees of current substandard right-of-way. Revised definition of student housing or dormitory to include dwellings "with more than 10 dwelling units". Change abandonment language from 6 months to 12 months. And last, changing language to separate clauses and removes the addition of bedrooms as a trigger in section 20.07.10.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Burrell is glad to address the 3 bedroom threshold so small developments can be done. Kinzie agrees.

Kinzie asked if there is a hardship for the petitioner/petitioner's representative attending the DRC meeting. Scanlan said that it doesn't seem to be, they have been encouraging them to attend and they have been thus far, so she doesn't feel it is a hardship.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

John Zody, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) with the City of Bloomington, expressed his appreciation for the changes to the DRC process, it is very helpful to have the petitioner/petitioner's representative present to talk about affordable housing.

**** Cibor motioned to forward proposal to Common Council with a positive recommendation for ZO-13-22 UDO Chapter 5, Subdivision Standards; Chapter 6, Administration & Procedures; and Chapter 7, Definitions, Amendments. Burrell seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

ZO-10-22 UDO Technical Text Amendments -Technical corrections for text amendments that add, remove or edit text to clarify existing standards and generally are not substantive.

Scanlan said there are 22 amendments, they range from wrong terminology used to missing a words. Captured the proposed changes to Chapter 4, cross-reference for Chapter 4 Hospital Revitalization

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes
Virtual Web Conference Meeting**

March 14, 2022 - 5:30 pm

Plan language, syncing with Chapter 4 regulation in Landscaping section. Syncing the impervious surface coverage 85/15% to the urban design envisioned in plan. Removes metal as a prohibited primary façade material, syncs with Plan. Fixed incorrect citation in 20.03.030(b)(13)(B). Clarification of floorplate limitation that applies to the size of each building, not the cumulative square footage. Updating terminology, for example “Accessible Ramp” vs Handicap Ramp. Making sure things that need to be routed through Engineering Department go through Engineering, such as trees being planted in a vision triangle. Update table to reflect an amendment made last year to reflect that Staff can approve the secondary plat. Modify definition of home occupation to clarify they can be done in accessory structure when appropriate.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Kinzie appreciates the update of language.

St. John just wanted to clarify that the words “homeless shelters” in 20.03.030(d)(7) and Definitions is being removed, Scanlan confirmed this to be true.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

**** Ballard motioned to forward proposal to Common Council with a positive recommendation for ZO-10-22 UDO Technical Text Amendments. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:0—Approved.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.