
Plan Commission minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Recordings are available in the Planning and Transportation Department for reference. DVDs are also available for viewing in the Audio-visual (CATS) Department (phone (812) 349-3111 or E-mail address: moneill@monroe.lib.in.us) of the Monroe County Public Library, 303 E Kirkwood Ave.

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PLAN COMMISSION) met on January 11, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. via a virtual (Zoom) meeting due to COVID-19. Members present: Flavia Burrell, Beth Cate, Chris Cockerham, Israel Herrera, Jillian Kinzie, Neil Kopper, Susan Sandberg, Karin St. John, Brad Wisler and Trohn Enright-Randolph.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None at this time

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Elect Officers: President – Brad Wisler
 Burrell nominated Brad Wisler, Kinzie seconded, vote carried 9:0
 Vice President – Jillian Kinzie
 Sandberg nominted Jillian Kinzie, Burrell seconded, vote carried 9:0
 BZA – Flavia Burrell
 St. John nominated, Sandberg seconded, vote carried 9:0
 BZA Alternate – Brad Wisler
 Sandberg nominated Brad Wisler, Kinzie seconded, vote carried 9:0
 Hearing Officer – Beth Rosenbarger
 Sandberg motioned to appoint, Kinzie seconded, vote carried 9:0
 Hearing Officer Alternate – Karina Pazos
 Sandberg motioned to appoint, Kinzie seconded, vote carried 9:0
 Monroe County Plan Commission – Beth Cate
 Kinzie nominated Beth Cate, Sandberg seconded, vote carried 9:0
 Monroe County Plan Commission Alternate – Susan Sandberg
 Cate nominated Susan Sandberg, St. John seconded, vote carried 9:0

Will elect Plat Committee members in March.

Jackie Scalan has one announcement, they had received a request for an update for the UDO and map revisions. Special sessions will begin starting this month, working on updates and hope to have those finalized this month and to Administration.

Andrew Cibor is the new Director of Engineeing and will be begin attending Plan Commission meeting next month.

Jillian Kinzie appreciates the work that Scanlan and Eric Greulich have put into the updates of the UDO and map.

PETITIONS:

PUD-17-20 McDoel Business Center, LLC
 300 W. Hillside Drive
 Request: Amendment to the preliminary plan and district ordinance for the Thompson PUD to allow 88 multi-family dwelling units and 21 single-family lots on Parcel E.
 Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Chris Cochram has recused himself from this discussion.

CHANGES SINCE SECOND HEARING: At the last hearing the petitioner presented a revised site plan proposing 4 townhome buildings with 19 units, two mixed-use buildings, and a residential building south of Hillside Drive. The Plan Commission and Staff expressed concern regarding the look of the townhomes facing the B-Line Trail and the petitioner has revised those elevations to redesign the buildings with front doors facing the Trail. There were also several discrepancies and areas of clarification needed within the proposed District Ordinance that have been fixed as well. Renderings of all of the buildings have been submitted showing all of the proposed changes. In addition, the Department was able to solicit comments from Schmidt and Associates regarding the architecture and other design elements and that has been included in the packet. Some of the details from that report will be incorporated into the review of the final plan.

REPORT: The site is located at 300 E. Hillside Drive and is zoned Planned Unit Development (Thomson PUD). The petition site is at the east end of the Hillside Drive stub and includes a 2.85 acre property on the north side of Hillside Drive and a 0.85 acre property on the south side of Hillside Drive. Surrounding zoning includes the Thomson PUD to the north and south, Residential Small Lot (R3) to the west, and Mixed Use Institutional (MI) to the east. The surrounding properties have been developed with a mix of single family residences to the west, a storage warehouse to the north, Crosley Warehouse (community center) to the south, and the Switchyard Park to the east. This site has been developed with a 150,000 square foot warehouse that has a property line about 2/3 through the warehouse and a surface parking lot. The northern 1/3 of the warehouse, which is owned separately and contains Storage Express, is not part of this petition.

The petitioner is proposing to remove the southern 2/3 of the warehouse and redevelop the property north of Hillside Drive with several buildings, including a four-story, mixed-use building with 5,000 square feet of commercial space, 18 internal parking spaces, and 30 units; a five-story, mixed-use building with 2,000 square feet of commercial space, 16 internal parking spaces, and 32 units; and 4, three-story owner-occupied townhome buildings with a total of 19 units. A surface parking lot behind the units with 60 parking spaces would span all of the development north of Hillside Drive to be used by the residents. The property to the south of Hillside Drive would feature a five-story, multi-family building with 42 units and 90 internal parking spaces. The bottom two floors of the building south of Hillside Drive would be entirely parking. A 5' wide tree plot and 5' wide sidewalk from this site to Rogers Street has been shown along the north side of Hillside Drive. No sidewalk or tree plot on the south side of Rogers Street has been shown yet. The petitioner has committed that the mixed-use and multi-family buildings will be LEED silver certified. The townhome buildings will also be built to a comparable requirement. Each building will have a minimum of 15% of the units set aside for affordable housing as required by the UDO.

One of the main continuing areas for discussion with this petition has been the desired housing type, density, and building design along the Switchyard Park. Last year, at the request of the Administration, a conceptual design for the redevelopment of two large areas adjacent to Switchyard Park was envisioned by the design consultant of Switchyard Park. One of the two areas in the study was this location. The other location in that study is the area where Night Moves was located and Meineke currently exists on S. Walnut Street. The desire of the Administration was to explore redevelopment opportunities of these important properties. The study aimed to provide a guide for appropriate development that would place as many eyes as possible on the trail for security, provide optimal utilization of a public open space and park, add housing stock to the community, and provide high quality development along a major open space and trail system reflective of the City's substantial investment in the Park. The Consultant's design showed four story buildings along the entire frontage of the park with the 4th floors stepped back. The design also showed buildings directly facing the trail. A commercial

component along the ground floor of the buildings is also desired to provide services to the residents, neighborhood, and trail users. The plan scaled back to two stories closer to the neighborhood to the west with a parking area along the back for further separation from the neighborhood. Although that study and conceptual design was an internal request and not a publicly approved document, it showed a design that complimented the Switchyard Park and its purpose was to envision a development that placed an appropriate design and density along the Park.

The petitioner's redesigned site plan more closely matches that document and desire to place more units along the Switchyard Park. The location of this property directly on the Switchyard Park creates an important need for architecture and interaction along the facades facing the Park and the Department feels that possible additional improvements can be made to the townhome buildings to improve the look of them along the Park façade.

CONCLUSION: Based on the revised elevations and submitted renderings, the Department believes that the proposed preliminary plan and District Ordinance matches the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and needs of the community. The review from Schmidt and Associates provides several good recommendations for small design improvements that will be most closely reviewed with the final plan approval.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission forward this petition to the Common Council with a positive recommendation and the following conditions of approval:

1. The proposed buildings in the Final Plan must be consistent with the currently submitted elevations including orientation, modulation, and materials. The west elevations of all building must be similar to the design of the east elevations as presented.
2. The District Ordinance shall be amended prior to allow a maximum 80% impervious surface coverage and minimum 20% landscape area for the Lot with Building #7 and the maximum height of that building shall be limited to 4 stories or 50'.
3. Per the petitioner statement, the townhome buildings must be designed to LEED standards and the commercial buildings must be LEED Silver certified.
4. A minimum 6' wide concrete sidewalk and 5' wide tree plot are required along the south side of Hillside Drive adjacent to Building #7.
5. The District Ordinance shall be amended to require two design elements for the Pedestrian Entrances as required in the UDO.

PETITION REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS: Doug Bruce said they agree with the staff report with the exception of two items. First is the impervious surface requirement, the issue there is at Building 7 there is an 30 ft easement, that runs north to south, so the warehouse to the south at some point can connect to Hillside Drive, so there is 30' of easement there that they have no control. The reason they asked for the 100% was because they can't plant anything there or put benches there, or anything else there because they may need future access at the warehouse to put a dock in at some point. The other issue is the lost of the height, this is the one place where the city had the m 39.20 plan from January of 2020 which had tall buildings and parking structures on the site, not proposes to doing structures on this site, but this building because of grade and its access to Hillside and proximity to the commercial we would like to see become vibrant in our building on the north side of Hillside, they need to levels of parking. The other issue is on the site 30 of the existing parkings spaces, 20 of these spaces belong to the storage facility and 10 belong to the apartments directly to the west. One level of parking doesn't give them enough space for the tenants in the building let alone viable commercial they would like to see at this location. This is the reason for the taller building for the site.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:

Cate asked petitioner who they easement was owned by. Mr. Bruce said the easement is owned by the Warehouse to the south, and it is a 30' in width easement, and it keeps us from doing anything in that space. Mr. Bruce says he is okay with pervious surfaces until which time the Warehouse decides to do something with that space. Cate asked Greulich if the easement is planted in grass, how close will that get them to the 20% of landscaped area. Greulich said that with the grass in the easement they would reach the 20% requirement but if the Warehouse ever puts in a driveway then there will be no pervious area on that lot, it will be all impervious coverage from property line to property line. Cate followed up with a question about on how to get to 80%, is to change the area coverage outside of the easement. Greulich said they could use grass that would be fine or change the footprint of building, there are lots of possibilities to meet the 80% pervious coverage. Scanlan added the 80% is actually more than the base zoning is allowing, so the staff has acknowledged the impervious surfaces are important but there competing interest allow that to be reduced for this project.

Sandberg asked Greulich to comment on the second exception the developers has asked for, which is the height of the building. Greulich said the staff concern, as discussed internally and comments from Schmit and Associates, when they did the review, was the difference between this building and the buildings to the north, to the north

PUBLIC COMMENTS: No public comments.

FINAL COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:

****Kinzie motions to forward petition to January 11, 2021 for a second hearing, Cate seconded the motion. Motion approved by roll call 8:0.****

ZO-23-20 Bill C. Brown Revocable Trust

3100 W Fullerton Pike

Request: Rezone 87 acres from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Mixed-Use Corridor (MC). Also requested is a waiver from the required second hearing.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

CHANGES SINCE SECOND HEARING: This petition was last heard at the December 14th Plan Commission meeting. At the hearing the petitioner mentioned the possibility of restricting possible uses and wanted additional time to work with the Department on a possible zoning commitment restricting the list of uses on this property. The petitioner has submitted a list of proposed uses to be excluded from the allowed uses on this property.

REPORT: This 87 acre property is located at the northeast corner of State Road 37 and W. Fullerton Pike. The site is currently undeveloped. This property was zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) in 1988 (PCD-36-88) largely for industrial uses. The property received a final plan approval for an assisted care living facility in 1997 (PUD-6-97) and a PUD amendment in 1999 (PUD-15-99) to include a nine-hole, Par 3 golf course to the list of approved uses. This site was also evaluated in 2003 and 2004 in association with rezoning requests for the large vacant property to the north (Southern Indiana Medical Park II). No formal approvals for this parcel were sought at that time. A site plan approval (PUD-10-15) was approved in 2015 to allow for some of the topsoil from this site to be removed for the construction

of I-69. The portions of the site that contain tree canopy coverage and riparian buffers were set aside in the required easements with the 2015 site plan approval.

The petitioner is requesting to rezone this property from a Planned Unit Development to Mixed-Use Corridor (MC). No development plan is being requested at this time and no conceptual site plan has been submitted. For reference, on the draft zoning map that has been proposed, this area is proposed to be rezoned to Mixed-Use Employment. While there are some uses within the Mixed-Use Corridor that are also allowed in the Mixed-Use Employment district, there are some specific uses that may or may not be appropriate for this area including big box retail, vehicle fuel station (e.g. truck stop), car washes, vehicle sales, and vehicle repair. Through the map update and text amendment process, the Department is evaluating possible changes to the use list for the Mixed-Use Employment district, however it is unlikely that the uses listed above would be proposed additions.

CONCLUSION: The Department believes that the rezoning of this site to Mixed Use Corridor would not match the Comprehensive Plan designation of the site as Employment. While some of the uses in MC are conducive to employment, many more uses are not and the EM or ME zoning districts are more appropriate for this prominent intersection, and in line with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Department has proposed to rezone this Planned Unit Development to Mixed Use Employment in the proposed draft zoning map and approving this rezoning to a Mixed Use Corridor District could create problems for other properties with the Employment designation within the City.

RECOMMENDATION: The Department recommends forwarding this petition to the Common Council with a denial recommendation.

PETITION REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

FINAL COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:

****Cate motions to forward petition to January 11, 2021 for a third hearing, St. John seconded the motion. Motion approved by roll call _____.****