

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room #115**

October 10, 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 October 10, 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: Flavia Burrell, Andrew Cibor, Chris Cockerham, Trohn Enright-Randolph, Jillian Kinzie, Karin St. John and Brad Wisler, the following members were present via Zoom, Ron Smith and Israel Herrera. Tim Ballard was not present.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 14, 2022 and September 12, 2022

Mike Rouker asked that the minutes for the March 2022 meeting include identification of who attended the meeting via Zoom and who attended in person.

****Kinzie moved to approve the March 14, 2022 minutes with noted changes. Cibor seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0 - Approved.**

Kinzie asked to be included as present for the September 2022 meeting, she was not listed because she arrived shortly after the roll call. But will be added with the indication of when she arrived in chambers.

****Kinzie moved to approve the September 12, 2022 minutes with noted changes. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0 - Approved.**

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Eric Greulich, Senior Planner with Planning & Transportation, wanted to make sure that everyone on the Plan Commission got the survey that was emailed out earlier today from Jackie Scanlan. The survey was from the Bloomington Ecommerce Development Commission.

The Plann Commission will need to appoint a Hearing Officer, there have been some promotions and new hires within the Planning & Transportation Department which has left this position vacant. Beth Rosenbarger was the previous Hearing Office when she served as the Planning Services Manager and she has recently accepted a new position as the Assistant Director. Ryan Robling has been hired as the Planning Services Manager, so there needs to be an official appointment to make him Hearing Officer. Scanlan also noted that Emily Herr has left her position with the City and she was the Alternate Hearing Office, would like to appoint Beth Rosenbarger as the Alternate Hearing Officer until an adequate replacement is appointed. Need a motion from someone to appoint Ryan Robling as Hearing Officer and Beth Rosenbarger as Alternate Hearing Officer for the rest of 2022.

****Cibor motioned to appoint Ryan Robling as Hearing Officer and Beth Rosenbarger as Alternate Hearing Officer for the remainder of 2022. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0 - Approved.**

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: November 14, 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-24-22 Cutters Kirkwood 123 LLC
115 E Kirkwood Ave**

Request: Major site plan approval to allow construct a 4-story building with 3 floors of residential units over a ground floor parking garage and retail space in the MC-CS zoning district. The upper floors will consist of 15 dwelling units for a total of 38 beds.
Case Manager: Karina Pazos

PETITION: October 10, 2022

**SP-27-21 Michael Cordaro (Johnson Creamery)
335 W 8th Street**

Request: Petitioner is requesting an extension of the site plan approval granted under Case SP-28-21 on October 18, 2021.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich reported on this request from Michael Cordora for the property at 335 W 8th Street. This property is just adjacent to the north side of the Johnson Creamery building and as you may recall you heard a petition for a site plan approval in 2021. One of the conditions of approval was they seek an alley vacation for a portion of an alley that goes through the property. They are working through the Common Council process right now to get the ally vacated, it is taking a little longer than anticipated. The site plan approval is good for one year unless the Plan Commission grants an extension. The petitioner are requesting a one year extension in order to give them time to work through the Common Council process for the alley vacation. Planning & Transportation is recommending approval with the one condition mentioned in the staff report.

PETITION REPRESENTATIVE:

Joseph Patrick did not have anything to add, but does appreciate the Commission hearing his request for extension.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Kinzie asked if this extension is not granted then the petitioner will have to come back and present the site plan again. Greulich said that was correct, they would have make a new filing and the come back to the Plan Commission again.

Wisler if there were any changes or were they just extending the approved filing. Greulich confirmed there are no changes, just extending the exact site plan and elevations that were previously approved last year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

St. John motions for approval of SP-27-21 for extension of the site plan approval with the condition listed, which is that it will be effective through October 18, 2023.

**** St. John motioned to approve petition SP-27-21 with the condition outlined in the staff report. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0 - Approved.**

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

Karina Pazos presented this petition, the site is located at 3000 and 3070 S Walnut Street, the property is currently zoned Mixed-Use (MC) Corridor. It is located on the west side of South Walnut Street and contains two parcels. The properties to the east and south are also zoned MC, the properties to the north and west are zoned Residential Multi-family (RM). Currently the western most parcel located at 3070 S Walnut Street contains a Force Fitness Center which is a 10,000 sq. ft. fitness center and the parcel contains a driveway and sidewalk that connects to the fitness center parking lot. The parcel to the west side of the property has a 75 foot riparian buffer along the southern portion of the lot and continues into the part of the eastern lot. The eastern driveway location was approved via a variance SP/UV-40-12 which allowed for the 37 foot riparian buffer on the eastern lot, which is why the existing drive jogs south as it approaches the western end of the site. There is also a flood plan that runs along the southwest corner of the site and an existing detention basin was designed east of the flood plan to accommodate storm water drainage for the entire site.

This petition is requesting a major site plan approval for three new self-service storage buildings that will be located on both parcels of this property. All three buildings will contain storage units accessed from the interior hallways and each building will provide a loading area for trucks and cars to drive inside to load and unload storage items via the garage doors which are facing the interior of the property. The property includes the narrowing of the drive to meet the UDO requirements of a 24 ft. maximum width but the drive location is the same. These is an existing transportation route in front of the parcel adjacent to the South Walnut Street. The UDO requires that transit facilities include benches, shelters or other similar transit stop amenities and such facilities will be built to meet the requirements of the Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation. The petitioner is proposing to install a bench and we will work out details with Bloomington Transit. The ten foot sidewalk shown on the plans does not fully extend to the southern property line and the plans do not state whether there will be dedicated right of way or an easement to the fort-five foot line which is shown on the plans. Pazos believes the petitioner is proposing to record an easement and will need to state that on the plans during the grading permit process, a condition for this item was added.

The three new buildings will be finished with a mix of split face blocks, cement board siding with reveals, steel canopies and metal awnings and trim to match the materials of the fitness center. The siding and split face block are permitted primary finished materials and the design does meet the architectural standards. The UDO also requires street address displays consist of numerals no less than 8 inches in height and shall be placed above all exterior entrances, visible from a public street, private drive or parking lot and shall contrast with the color of the surface on which they are mounted,

consisting of reflected materials to be clearly visible. The proposal meets the standard for one of the buildings, which is the building closest to South Walnut Street, but must incorporate the address display for buildings two and three, they have facades visible from a public street or public drive. The mixed-use and non-residential uses bordered by any R1, R2, R3, R4 or RH zoning districts shall be allowed a total light output of not more than forty thousand lumens per acre. There are additional outdoor lighting requirements and the proposal does not include exterior lighting on the three new buildings or the parking lots, so that is something we are asking the petitioner to clarify. The self-service storage use allows for public access between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. so the petitioner may need to incorporate adequate lighting depending on the proposed hours of business and the current lighting on site.

The petition meets all requirements of the UDO except those mentioned in the conditions and those that have received variances. The petition will add interior self-service storage units with three new buildings. Although, the City Comprehensive Plan designation of Neighborhood Residential does not align with this use, the design proposes a storage facility with architectural variations to break up the monotony in the design and will improve the pedestrian facilities along South Walnut Street, but also with an amenity near residential that is often used for residential storage. The scale of this development is appropriate for the neighborhood. The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission adopts the proposed findings and approve SP-06-22 with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner must receive a grading permit before earth moving.
2. The petitioner must incorporate street address displays for buildings 2 and 3 before a building permit will be issued.
3. The petitioner must clarify what the hours of business will be and present lighting specs of existing and proposed lighting on the site that meet the standards before a grading permit will be issued.
4. The petitioner shall work with Bloomington Transit on BT's desired upgrades to the existing adjacent transit facility and an agreement must be met before a recommendation for final occupancy will be issued.
5. This site plan review does not approve signage. A sign permit will need to be applied for.

PETITION REPRESENTATIVE:

Ryan Strauser with Strauser Construction said they are working on trying to integrate these three buildings to bring more use to the site, improve the parking for both Force Fitness and this use. Is available to answer questions.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Smith asked about the environmental 35 foot riparian buffer was designed after the variance, wants to know what the variance means to him. Pazos said that was a variance from 2012 and 2104, it was a variance request for the driveway to remain in that location on the eastern lot that was encroaching the 75 foot riparian buffer. The variance was to allow for the 35 foot riparian buffer along the eastern portion so the driveway location could remain the same.

Smith requested clarification on the statement in the report that said the use does not align with the neighborhood use. Pazos said the comprehensive plan designates this area as neighborhood residential, so this self-storage use does not really align with that designation. Scanlan said the

description of neighborhood residential and what that should be in the comprehensive plan doesn't really foresee this type of scale of single use commercial, which is what we were pointing out. People who use self-storage are people who live in Bloomington, so it is supportive of people in neighborhoods, but whether or not the comprehensive plan envisions this type of single use in or immediately adjacent to neighborhoods, we believe probably it does not.

Wisler would like to follow up, the current zoning is mixed-use corridor and self-storage is permitted use in the current zoning. You are pointing out there is no conflict with zoning, maybe there is an inconsistency with what the comprehensive plan calls for and what is allowed under the UDO in that particular zone. Scanlan said in the findings we have to look at the comprehensive plan and when we do that we narrow down, that kind of broad brush descriptions in the comprehensive plan, maybe these is an inconsistency with what the comprehensive plan calls for and what is allowed under the UDO in that particular zone.

Kinzie asked for clarification of the pedestrian sidewalks. Pazos said the Transportation Plan requires at least a ten foot wide sidewalk along this typology, as well as an eight foot wide tree plot, which they currently don't meet, so that is what the improvements were focused on. They are making the sidewalks wider and they are removing some of the asphalt from the street to make the tree plot nine feet wide. Kinzie noted in the packet it indicates that the sidewalk if fragmented, will this complete the sidewalk or is that something different. Pazos said that was referring to the sidewalk that was not extending all the way to the northern property line and this would complete that, it would have to be along the front of their parcel.

Kinzie asked about parking, she noticed there was a elaboration of the exploration of shared parking options with Force Fitness and she wonders if Pazos can describe a little bit about that. She is always happy to see when there is some consideration given to existing nearby parking in plans like this, but it sounds like ultimately that was not viable for this project. Pazos said the petitioner did receive a variance to add 15 more parking spaces to the existing parking lot for the Force Fitness center. Both parcels are owned by the same owner so that is what is meant by sharing the spaces. In this case the parking for the fitness center is not intended to be used for the self-service storage that is why the petitioner is proposing to add 15 more parking spaces. Those spaces will be added to the southern end of the existing parking lot which is adjacent to their third storage building, as well as another parking lot between the first and second storage buildings. Kinzie asked for a comment from the petitioner. Strauser said this is an interesting case because they are doing self-storage, but the self-storage isn't really in the typical model that would see all the garage doors for a pool up on the outside. So in this case you have more customers that will need to pull up and park, unload and go in the building, the current UDO was only allowing for parking spots based on self-served kiosk square footage in the building which only was going to allow a couple of parking spots for all 30,000 sq. ft. of development. In addition, there were some things with the UDO that was going to cause them to need to update the Force Fitness parking, so they consulted with Desmond Parking Consultants to analyze the peak use demand for Force Fitness as well as peak use demand for this self-storage. They aligned what the peak usage was a certain times of the and how that would overlap between the fitness center and the self-storage use and then tried to land on a number for parking spots that would allow the fitness center not to become overwhelmed, where the parking lots are just so full with people from the other use that could hamper their business. While at the same time allowing enough parking for two or three people to come, park and go in and use each storage building at the same time. There was a lot of analysis to look into what the optimal amount of parking to allow both business to function properly would be.

Enright-Randolph had general comments, and it is regarding connecting some trails that have been

envisioned by the City. For the petitioner to note, if you're doing an exercise facility and the county builds a trail it would be great to have a safe passage across the street. He sees a lot of people using the trail to exercise, the trail may be built before there is sidewalk connectivity through that area. He also mentioned the storm water initiative and compliance and how it was addressed in this petition. It is one of the critical drainage ways, so the repair and buffer is going to do a great job of helping to protect our environmental resources.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION COMMENTS: None

****Kinzie motioned to approve petition SP-06-22 with the six conditions as indicated on the slide presentation at the meeting. Cibor seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0 - Approved.**

**ZO-40-22 Monroe County Government
Northeast Corner of I-69 and Fullerton Pike**

Request: Map amendment (rezone) of one roughly 87.12 acre parcel from Mixed-Use Employment (ME) to Mixed-Use Institutional (MI).

Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Jackie Scanlan presented this case, this is a petition to rezone a parcel at the southwest corner of the city. The parcel is located at the northeast corner of West Fullerton Pike and State Road I-69. The parcel is 87.12 acres that is currently zoned Mixed-Use Employment (ME) and the comprehensive plan designation is employment center, also a focus area for I-69 interchange. Surrounding uses include an active quarry to the east, to the north is vacant land and the northeast is an old abandoned quarry, there is a medical and office to the north of the quarry and immediately to west is the highway and interchange.

The request is for map amendment, UDO term for rezone, from Mixed-Use Employment (ME) to Mixed-Use Institutional (MI), map amendments require two hearings, sometimes when we see amendment requests like this there is a request for waiver of the second hearing, which did not happen in this case, the Commission will be hearing it tonight and in November.

The site is owned by Bill C Brown and it has not been developed, it has had a previous PUD at the location, there have been a number of things discussed for the site over the years. It was most recently used as a top soil borrow site for I-69 construction. It was before the Plan Commission and they were able to sell the top soil of the non-environmentally sensitive area of the site and then re-seeded for regrowth in those areas that they sold the dirt off of.

Some of the concerns identified and discussed in the packet are related to four basic topics, environmental considerations, access, site design and comprehensive plan. The request before you is a rezone and the rezone is for a particular use, the County would like to rezone the property so they can build a new jail or detention facility. Per the petitioner's statement they will need a least 25 acres for that new facility and through conversations with the County they will possibly need additional acreage in the future for supportive services. At this time the plan would be for the jail to be at this location but in the future they may need to move other services, such as the courts or other officers of the court, to this location. The use of a jail or detention facility is not allowed in the current ME zoning.

Scanlan covered the four concerns briefly discussed earlier, environmentally constraint areas which are those that are listed as conservancy easements, and slope restricted. Taking out those areas that are not slope restricted, less than 12 percent, there is roughly 36 acres that can be developed. This area does have some karst and also quite a bit of close canopy, tree development in the same area, which is only allowed limited disturbance. Though the County does not have specific plans for the future there are no plans to disturb those areas. There have been some concerns from neighbors related to potential impacts for storm water runoff. Much of this site drains into some of the old quarries in the area that are privately held. The Planning Department said some of those neighbors have been in touch with the petitioner to answer their questions. Regarding access, the main concern is that a facility such as a jail, or any large facility, it would probably be best situated on some sort of transit line. There are no buses there currently, the petitioners are going to reach out to Bloomington Transit to talk about future connection to the site. The lack of transit does raise some concerns for the Planning and Transportation Department. There is a planned roadway along the west side of the parcel, the petitioner has to dedicate right-of-way for a roadway that are in the Transportation Plan. Petitioner needs to keep in mind there is a neighborhood connector plan to run through this parcel all the way to Tapp Road. The comprehensive plan is the largest of concerns for the department thus far and something we wanted to raise here for discussions with the Plan Commissioners. There are concerns about whether or not this rezone supports the basic goals of the employment center, which it does seem to do that. Scanlan read from the 2018 Comprehensive Plan – Employment Center Background and Intent as well as the I-69 and Interchanges Background and Intent.

This is the first of two hearings so there will be a lot of discussion questions to help you formulate a recommendation for Common Council. The criteria that the Plan Commission will be looking at are our general compliance criteria and additional criteria for zoning map amendments. Specific approval criteria, compliance with utility and service standards as well as the comprehensive plan, any intergovernmental agreements minimization or mitigation of adverse impacts, making sure the property is being used for its most desirable use while protecting environmental features. There are concerns about this particular map amendment request and how it does or does not align with the comprehensive plan.

The Department is recommending that the Plan Commission continue the case to the required second hearing at the November 2022 hearing.

PETITION REPRESENTATIVE:

Jeff Cockerill, Monroe County attorney, first wanted to point out the County was not looking to have a vote tonight on this topic. Believes another month of thought is appropriate and should happen. They have done an environmental study, jurisdictional and wetlands report and are in the process of getting some geo-technical reports done. A geologist will be visiting the site and giving them a report on that as well. Believes these are all important pieces of information and want to make sure Plan Commission has this information. Mr. Cockerill wants to point out the 25 acres was what they have been told was the minimum needed for the project, not necessarily 25 buildable acres, the building footprint would be 2-3 acres. They understand there are concerns regarding drainage from the neighbors. They have talked with Bloomington Transit as an initial conversation and they indicated if this was approved they would work with the County to provide access. Bloomington Transit mentioned they wanted to explore a park and ride at this site. County is here because this site will best fit their needs. Looking at the site for more than just a jail, would like to see if there could be transitional housing, detox center, work release, etc.

Mr. Cockerill gave a brief history of the current facility. Because of overcrowding the County has been

under a federal order for the facility since 2008. There was a jail assessment done and when the report was released in 2021 the County began the process of looking for sites. They wanted to plan for the future and look for a site that would meet future needs. We're looking for a site with utility access and transportation connectivity. Did not want the new facility next to housing, wanted something with a buffer. By time this project is complete the connection between Kroger south and I-69 (Fullerton Pike project) should be complete, which will provide the connectivity to Bloomington.

The reason for the MI requests, there are only two designations allowed for the jail use, MI and EM, MI allows for Medical Clinic, Opioid Rehabilitation homes and supportive housing. Believes this use of the land will meet five of the items in the Comprehensive Plan.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Kinzie asked about the storm water concerns that have been raised. Mr. Cockerill is aware that is something they need to take into account as they do the design. They have reached out to the State about utilizing some of the State right-of-way and some of their drainage. Kinzie's other concern for MI category is the transportation issues, if this is public institutional, we need to make sure the transportation issues have been addressed. Scanlan wanted to clarify that institutional-civic is a designation for particular areas of the city in the comprehensive plan, and this area is not one of them. The petition site is currently mapped as employment and they are requesting mixed-use institutional, are we actually moving away from the comprehensive plan designation of employment center? Julie Thomas, President of the Board of Commissioners, wanted to address the storm water issues. Sometimes land is best left fallow and untouched, which helps drainage, but that is not what happening now. Getting this property developed with appropriate drainage and retention basins will actually make things better for those surrounding areas. Ms. Thomas said the issues of transportation is vital to them, they are not going to do anything without transportation. If the rezone is approved and Bloomington Transit is unable to service the area the County Board of Commissioners will have to figure out the transportation issue.

Enright-Randolph noted that Bloomington Transit doesn't have plans to go a lot of places until there are demands for transportation in these areas and in the past Bloomington Transit has addressed the needs. Enright-Randolph said the road connectivity was planned prior to I-69, curious if that connectivity still yields a significant benefit, he noted that previous petitioners have pulled their petitions because of the cost of the capital improvements to building that road. Believes the county does a very good job of looking at the potential storm water drainage needs. Comprehensive Plans are fluent, they get updated base on county needs and this is something that the county has found themselves in a position to address.

Cockerham noted the parcels to the south and east are under county jurisdiction, has the county thought about any of the zoning around those areas. Ms. Thomas said the county is in the midst of completing their County Development ordinance right now, and they would be receiving to whatever gets onto that property with an appropriate zone surrounding the property.

Burrell asked if Monroe County Jail would have to be within city limits or can it be anywhere in Monroe County? Mr. Cockerill said the jail could be anywhere in Monroe County, but the majority of the people brought to the jail are from within Bloomington city limits. Moving the jail further out of the city boundary doesn't make a lot of operational sense for combined public safety they have. Burrell asked if it is problematic for the jail to be outside the city limits, if you are not close to water and sewer. Mr. Cockerill does not think this is problematic but wanted to have the opportunity to work with Bloomington Transit to provide transportation to and from the facility. Burrell asked Scanlan if there

were any MI lots within the City that would be big enough for this project. Scanlan said most of mixed-use institutional land is already being used or not big enough.

St. John asked for an explanation regarding the top soil removal during the I-69 project. Scanlan said because there is a lack of top soil, because the owner sold the top soil to I-69 project, they are still required to meet the requirements for the UDO and they need to consider that in their redevelopment costs. St. John asked Mr. Cockerill about the size of lot they actually need for this facility, he replied they consulted with jails designed and they said they would need 25 acres, but all of those acres don't have to be buildable acres, but that includes what is needed for adequate drainage and utilities. St. John asked if there was adequate space to include supportive services, Mr. Cockerill said he wasn't sure, they are currently studying this, there is room for some additional services but he doesn't have a direct answer to that question. St. John asked about the size of the new jail, Mr. Cockerill said the square footage of the jail will be about the same. The problem with the current jail is it has three floors in the one acre justice building, and there is constraints because of the going up and down floors, not necessarily adding square footage, removing those constraints of have more than one level. St. John asked Scanlan to confirm that something will have to be rezoned if this is to be built within City limits. Scanlan said she will do a deeper dive on the map before next month's meeting, with the small review done those existing MI districts there are no larger MI areas available at this time.

Cibor asked for a little background on how the County got to this place, there was mention in the presentation about the Thompson PUD and was potentially zoned to allow this use, sounds like an assessment of multiple sites was completed and this location was the top location. Cibor wanted just a little more insight on how the site was selected. Cockerill said they spoke with elected officials on what would be needed in the new location and the Sheriff expressed the need to be close to the interstate, cost of utilities and is it in City limits. They looked at several sites, and for one reason or another they didn't check off all the boxes. This site was best for a variety of reasons, excellent access to the interstate, the completion of Fullerton Pike to the east will provide good access to the City and over half of the current staffing are living on the southwest side of Bloomington and the property being in an area with fewer residents is appealing. The landscaping could be comforting in the rehabilitation process. Cibor asked why 25 acres, noting that they has been discussion already but he is looking for more details. Cockerill said he would put together a document with more details, would be hard to explain from the podium. Cibor said after the rezone, if approved, this would need a conditional use, what other options were considered, like a PUD which would not require a conditional use. Cockerill just said this is what they are working with. Cibor asked about the transportation plan and the adequacy of the road systems, believes they will lose the opportunity to capture what is in the transportation plan and this is a concern. Cockerill said that was a difficult question to answer at this time. There is a conflict between the Karst Conservatives and the Transportation Plan, this will require more discussion in the future. Cibor's last question is regarding the comprehensive plan and the use of this being employment, asked about the number of staff at this facility, thinks this will be useful information for the Plan Commission's consideration of the petitioners request for rezoning. Cockerill said there are currently 70 jailers and they will probably move the Sheriff's department to the new facility and utilize more mental health professionals. He believes they will have enough employees to match what may have been there if he property were to be developed as ME.

Greulich presented a map of where current MI zones are within the City of Bloomington. As Scanlan pointed out earlier most of the land in the MI zones are currently occupied by facilities.

Enright-Randolph wanted to make a clarifying statement, they were talking about "elected official's" people being involved in the selection process, him being the elected county surveyor, he was not

involved in the selection process at all.

Wisler asked what other properties were available in the ME zone if this property were to be rezoned to M1. Greulich said the other large area zoned ME is off of Fountain Drive and it has no direct access to I-69.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Maggie (would not give her last name), does not understand why the County is building a new jail, if it is the same size as the current facility. There has been no budget done for the current facility, she is interested in seeing what the budget will look like for the new facility. Believes the site of the new facility is out of town, out of sight, out of mind, clearly just a slap in the face to people who struggle with addiction and mental health. Jail is traumatizing, it is isolating and is not a place for people to heal not matter how many programs, rooms or trees you plant.

Duncan Campbell is the neighbor to the northeast of this site, does not have any objections to this being a jail site but is concerned about the roadway that would go out to Tapp Road. The Environmental Commission did extensive work, wetlands were discovered, there is a flood plain, delicate plant life and there are lots of things, if you go back and look at the report, that tell you not to put a road through there. His personal issue is with water drainage, most of his property is karst, and the problem with karst is the water moves through it unpredictably and it is very hard to plan where the water goes. He is not sure it is possible to protect the environment from water running off a parking lot. He thinks they need to be very careful when they think about putting a major transportation artery through there.

Sam Holdeman has a few concerns about this site, one of the biggest is transportation for court appointments and mental health. Also has environmental concerns, feels like there needs to more research, also wonders if the public could get more information on what the problem is exactly with having multiple floors in the current facility because that is the reason given for needing a new facility.

Barbara via zoom could not be heard in chambers but she sent a chat which Greulich will pass along to the Commissioners. St. John encouraged Barbara to attend the next meeting since the Commissioners could not hear what she said.

Cockerill wanted to point out that there is a link in the packet to the Criminal Justice Report and most of the answers to those questions regarding why a new facility is necessary can find the answers in that report. He would encourage anybody who is listening to read those reports, even if you are in support of what the County is doing, and definitely if you are not in support because it provides good information that everybody in the community should know.

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Herrera asked if Bloomington Transit does not provide transportation to the facility what is Plan B for that facility. Cockerill said they have reached out to Bloomington Transit and they are interested in working the County. If Bloomington Transit does not expand its routes then the County would reach out to Rural Transit to see if they had anything available and try to work through the issues. As Commissioner Thomas said earlier that they are committed to making transportation happen, they will make sure they have some public transportation that would get people to that facility. Herrera asked for a list of materials that would be used, was not in the Plan Commission packet, Greulich said he would pass that along.

Enright-Randolph wanted to point out that if you go to the Monroe County website under the Commissioner's Office there is the Criminal Justice Assessment Report.

Cockerham said if you have ever toured the jail, and unfortunately he has, it obvious there is a need for an upgrade, he does like the site because of the buffers that Mr. Cockerill has talked about. The challenges that he sees is losing the potential ME uses that we currently have, and there is a need for employment sites.

Kinzie is going in that same direction, she thinks there is a lot more that we need to understand about what we are giving up for the employment center.

St. John agrees, it is important to know what we would be giving up and not everyone agrees that we need a new jail. She would like to know more about the statement made by the Major and administration suggesting that it needs to stay within the city limit.

****Smith motioned to continue petition ZO-40-22 to the November 14, 2022 hearing. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.