

These minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) Audio-visual Department of the Monroe County Public Library at 303 E. Kirkwood Avenue. Phone number: 812-349-3111 or via the following website: catsv.net

The Plan Commission met on April 25, 2017 in the Council Chambers at 401 N. Morton St. at 5:30 p.m. The members present: Andrew Cibor, Carol Stewart Gulyas, Joe Hoffmann, Nicholas Kappas, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, and Brad Wisler.

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Hoffmann stated that the schedule for the Plan Commission (PC) to meet to address the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) has changed. The Plan Commission will not meet to address the CMP during the month of May. Both the public and other boards and commissions need time to review the draft of the plan. The new schedule to meet on the CMP will be made public Monday, May 1. The amended version of the plan will also be made public May 1. May 31 will be the new deadline for public submission of amendments. After amendments have been submitted, Plan Commissioners will have the opportunity to sponsor amendments for consideration at the Plan Commission meetings. There will be two amendment meetings of the PC. The first will take place Monday June 5, and the second will take place Monday June 19. The formal adoption meeting of the amended plan would hopefully take place Monday June 26. The Commission was meeting on April 25 to hear amendments (#27 – 51) that were not able to be presented during the April 24 meeting. After the new amendments are heard, the Commission will come back to two tabled amendments from the last meeting. These two amendments (#9 and #23) had needed further revision before being voted on.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, stated that the amendments being looked at had been posted online. Amendments 27 – 45 have staff support because they are largely clarification of text. There were a few amendments that could need further clarification.

Hoffmann said that the amendments staff supports are more enhancements of text than clarification of text. The enhancements were considered to be positive.

Robinson Said amendments 46 – 51 potentially needed discussion. After covering all new amendments, the PC would circle back to #9 and #23.

Hoffmann said that the PC would start with Amendment 27, in keeping with previous meeting structure.

Robinson stated that Amendment 27 addresses the intent of the text regarding annexation. The amendment was clearly stated.

There were no questions from the Commission or comment from the public.

****Piedmont-Smith moved for approval of Amendment 27. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Amendment 27 passed with a unanimous 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 28 deals with how Bloomington is viewed by those external to Bloomington and seeks to strengthen Bloomington's reputation as an excellent place to work, live, and play.

Hoffmann stated that the amendment was a definite improvement.

Brother David Smith, member of the Council for Community Accessibility, suggested it may be common knowledge that Bloomington is a great place to live, work, and play but that the statement was not true for those who are disabled. The Commission was invited to add language to the amendment stating that Bloomington was a great place to live, work, and play except for the disabled. The Commission was also encouraged to work to make Bloomington a great place to live, work, and play for all citizens.

Piedmont-Smith encouraged Brother Smith and the Community Accessibility Council in general to propose specific text amendments in the second round. The Commission strives to make Bloomington more accessible and would welcome specific amendments to that end.

Hoffmann stated that the Commission agrees with the goal being expressed by Smith and hoped that there will be plenty of language in the CMP to address accessibility. Amendment 28 removed the language that referred to Bloomington being a great place to live, work, and play as "common knowledge".

****Cibor moved for approval of Amendment 28. Piedmont-Smith seconded.**

Cibor stated that the Commission would continue to revise the CMP to strengthen the language that shows Bloomington's commitment to address and improve accessibility within the city.

Amendment 28 was approved with a 6:0 voice vote.

Robinson said that Amendment 29 addresses the vagueness of policy 1.1.2 and strives to add detail to the policy.

Hoffmann summarized that Amendment 29 is an attempt to provide additional definition of diversity.

Stewart Gulyas stated that a comma should be added after the word "abilities".

Hoffmann viewed that as friendly.

Piedmont-Smith agreed.

Hoffmann brought Piedmont-Smith up to date on the Commission's decision to use the Oxford comma.

****Cibor moved for approval of Amendment 29 as amended. Kappas seconded. Amendment 29 was approved as amended with a 6:0 voice vote.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 30 seeks to clarify the role of city government in regards to public education. The text amendment clarifies the language in policy 1.2.4.

Hoffmann clarified that the amendment states that the city supports the public school system but is not directly responsible for it.

****Cibor moved for approval of Amendment 30. Kappas seconded. Amendment 30 was approved with a 6:0 voice vote.**

Robinson said that Amendment 31 defines what is meant by access and avoid redundancy between policies 1.3.1 and 1.3.3.

Hoffmann summarized that Amendment 31 puts in the word “accessibility” and indicates that it is wanted for all users.

Stewart Gulyas stated that a comma is needed after “trails”.

Hoffmann stated that it was an Oxford comma situation. The Oxford comma will be added after “trails” because it has become precedent.

Cibor said he felt Amendment 31 was important because he had struggled with the difference between the two policies.

****Cibor moved for approval of Amendment 31 with the additional comma. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Amendment 31 was approved, with the comma, by a 6:0 voice vote.**

Robinson said that Amendment 32 is to avoid redundancies between policies 1.4.4 and 1.4.5. The suggestion was to delete 1.4.4 and revise 1.4.5.

Hoffmann explained that if 1.4.4 were to be deleted, 1.4.5 would be renumbered and become 1.4.4. Two redundant provisions would be revised into one.

****Cibor moved for approval of Amendment 32 as renumbered. Kappas seconded. Amendment 32 was approved with a 6:0 voice vote.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 33 addressed redundancy and would remove policy 1.4.7. The difference in intent for 1.4.7 and 1.4.6 is very subtle. The intent behind 1.4.6 is providing the policy guidance that developments should be locating around the facilities and amenities listed. 1.4.7 is looking at new development proposals that should be incorporating some of these aspects into their projects.

Hoffmann asked if staff is comfortable that one policy overlaps enough with the other for one to be removed.

Robinson responded that there are subtle differences between the two. Language to clarify would be better.

Hoffmann asked Piedmont-Smith if she agreed with staff because she was the Commissioner who proposed the amendment. Hoffmann stated that he did not see a difference between the policies either. He also asked if the policies could be combined into one policy.

Robinson said that staff could revise the language to boil both policies down to one while clarifying the points that need to be made.

Wisler asked if 1.4.6 referred to city government incorporating certain elements into plans while 1.4.7 referred to developers incorporating the same elements into plans.

Robinson responded that 1.4.6 is looking at leveraging existing assets.

Hoffmann gave the example of connecting paths to existing parks.

Robinson said Hoffmann was correct. 1.4.6 seeks to use existing assets as opposed to developers building new ones.

Hoffmann summarized, as an example, that 1.4.6 was about connecting a development to a nearby existing park while 1.4.7 was about asking a developer to build a park as part of his/her development.

Robinson said that the policies may not deal with a park, but perhaps a public space.

Wisler said it seemed that 1.4.6 needs more differentiation or staff could combine the two into one. He said it was not clear that 1.4.6 was referring to connection to existing facilities.

Hoffmann gave an example of how 1.4.6 could be phrased better to show the policy's intent for developments to take advantage of existing facilities. 1.4.7 refers to new facilities.

Cibor stated that he understood the policy differently. To Cibor, the policy stated that the new facilities would be incorporated into project development plans. He did not read the policy to say that new project developments should be adjacent to existing facilities.

Hoffmann stated that the amendment appeared to be headed towards being tabled.

Hoffmann asked Piedmont-Smith is she was comfortable with tabling the amendment to give staff a chance to revise the policies.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the tabling would be fine as long as the intent becomes clearer. There was no preference as to one of two policies.

****Wisler moved to table Amendment 33 with the request that staff draft new proposed language for 1.4.6 and 1.4.7. Kappas seconded. Amendment 33 was tabled with a 6:0 voice vote.**

Robinson said that Amendment 34 looks to provide more policy and programs in regards to local food production. The city has adopted the local food charter. The amendment is looking to add policy 1.3.4 and two new programs in Chapter 1.

Hoffmann stated that the Parks Board approved, an hour prior, a public nut tree grove in Winslow Park. Hoffmann was very excited.

Vociferous arm movement was noted from the public audience.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to approve Amendment 34. Kappas seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 34 was 6:0.**

Robinson said that Amendment 35 is a text amendment to clarify what is meant by equity in the context of a basic foundation to a modern civilization versus essential aspect to a democratic society.

Hoffmann said that the amendment is less about the nature of what equity is and more about the nature of whether all civilizations have equity.

Robinson agreed that the amendment was about modern societies and democracies.

Hoffmann stated that it was a good clarification either way.

****Cibor moved to approve Amendment 35. Piedmont-Smith seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 35 was 6:0.**

Robinson said that Amendment 36 looks at the Bloomington Food Charter and adding narrative under the heading “Food and Agriculture”.

Hoffmann asked if the amendment was an elaboration.

Robinson confirmed that it was.

Hoffmann said that amendment had revised formatting because of the addition of a paragraph.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to approve Amendment 36. Piedmont-Smith seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 36 was 6:0.**

Robinson said that Amendment 37 addresses redundancy in the text regarding food policy.

Wisler stated that the amendment contained a typo. The word “issues” is misspelled.

Hoffmann agreed that there was a misspelling and that the word should be corrected. He also noted that an Oxford comma was already in the amendment.

****Kappas moved to approve Amendment 37 as amended. Cibor seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 37 as amended was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 38 looks at the impact of local food on the local economy. The amendment also provides text clarifications.

Hoffmann said that the amendment provides a clarification and a stronger statement on behalf of the city.

****Cibor moved to approve Amendment 38. Kappas seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 38 was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 39 is looking to clarify a program on page 44 and provide text clarification.

Hoffmann clarified that the amendment references the Bloomington Food Charter.

****Cibor moved to approve Amendment 39. Stewart Gulyas seconded the motion. Voice vote to approve Amendment 39 was 6:0.**

Robinson said that Amendment 40 is looking for a way to measure progress in regards to local food.

Hoffmann asked what, if anything, is in place in the CMP that is an outcome or indicator that is related to the point of the Amendment. Hoffmann asked how the amendment fits into the rest of the existing document, and if the document discusses local food production and distribution.

Robinson said he did not believe the CMP addressed local food production and distribution in specific detail.

Hoffmann asked Piedmont-Smith if it would be more direct to say “an increase in local food production and distribution”. If the PC is doing what it can to facilitate the increase, progress

should be seen down the road. As written, the language suggests that if the regulatory structure is fixed, there is no expectation of increased local food production.

Piedmont-Smith replied that the Hoffmann's question fits under the outcome, which says "a local food culture has been promoted and protected". The outcome spells out that the goal is to increase local food production. The other indicators under the outcome are number of restaurants and businesses serving local food, number of home and community gardens, and economic value.

Hoffmann said that there are, actually, a lot of indicators in the document to show progress.

Piedmont-Smith agreed that there are three indicators.

Hoffmann stated that he is fine with the amendment.

Stewart Gulyas asked what exactly is meant by "regulatory framework".

Piedmont-Smith replied that, for example, the UDO had a revision to allow market stalls in front of houses with a small amount of regulation. That is the kind of regulatory framework envisioned. Fencing could be a part of the discussion.

Hoffmann said that the Commission could look at its own rules to ensure that facilitation of increased local food production is happening.

Cibor said that many of the indicators the Commission uses are measurable and asked how the Commission would measure the indicators for increased food production.

Piedmont-Smith replied that Cibor asked a good question. A way to measure indicators could be a lack of people who cannot produce local food.

Hoffmann suggested the Commission could measure progress by using the time when the CMP is adopted as a baseline to compare to a future point in time. This could show how much progress has been made since the Commission focused on the local food production issue. Hoffmann said that he did not feel that every outcome and indicator had to be reduced to a number.

Stewart Gulyas agreed that indicators did not have to be quantitative.

Hoffmann replied that his understanding was the same. A qualitative indicator would be an acceptable way to show progress.

Piedmont-Smith said that the first indicator discussed change of policies and programs. Such an indicator would not be reflected in numbers.

Hoffmann did not have a problem with qualitative outcomes and indicators. To say that 3 more regulations have been implemented does not tell much of a narrative about the quality of a plan.

****Kappas made a motion to approve Amendment 40. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Voice vote to approve Amendment 40 was 6:0.**

Robinson said that Amendment 41 seeks to acknowledge the concept of gentrification and threatening the sense of place downtown. The Amendment would add narrative on page 48 regarding gentrification.

Hoffmann clarified that the amendment consisted of an additional sentence to express concerns about gentrification.

Cibor stated that he appreciated adding to the particular section and ****moved for approval of Amendment 41. Piedmont-Smith seconded.** Hoffmann commented that he whole-heartedly supported the intent behind the amendment. **Voice vote to approve Amendment 41 was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 42 looks to clarify policy 4.1.1. The current version may not have flowed directly from CMP stated goals.

Hoffmann said that this amendment was discussed the week before and, after the changes that had been made, it is much better.

Cibor stated that the policy is clearer.

Piedmont-Smith added that if parking lots are approved, they should have swales or green space.

Hoffmann stated that Piedmont-Smith had jumped ahead, and the Commission was still on Amendment 42.

Piedmont-Smith realized the mistake and apologized.

Hoffmann stated that although the amendment removes words about the robust economy, that sentiment was expressed in other parts of the CMP.

Chris Sturbaum, City Council Member, stated that the word "Bloomington" was misspelled in the amendment.

Hoffmann thanked Sturbaum and asked him to speak into the microphone.

Smith said he would like the new statement to be worded in a more positive way. He suggested the use of the word "enhance". Smith also invited discussion on the extent to which Bloomington is pedestrian-friendly for everyone.

Hoffmann stated that the suggestion was to change wording from "do not detract" to "enhance". "Enhance" was identified as going with "pedestrian-friendly character". "Do not detract" was identified as being appropriate to go with "historic preservation". The city's investments would not enhance historic preservation, but should simply not detract from them. However, the CMP seeks to enhance pedestrian-friendly character.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she agreed with Hoffmann's assessment.

Hoffmann asked if Piedmont-Smith wanted to amend the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she would. Hoffmann's word choices were restated.

Unidentified member of the public asked if it was not possible to enhance historic preservation.

Hoffmann stated that public infrastructure and technology would be less likely to enhance historic preservation and more likely to not detract from it. "Enhance" was determined to work better with the second half of the sentence.

****Stewart Gulyas moved for approval of the revised version of Amendment 42. Kappas seconded. Voice vote to approve Amendment 42 as amended was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 43 seeks to clarify policy 4.2.3 by adding “an environmentally friendly” to the policy.

Hoffmann stated that the addition would enhance the policy.

Smith had a comment from the public, but due to restricted mobility had a difficult time getting to the microphone. Hoffmann offered to repeat what Smith had said so that it could be recorded by a microphone for those watching at home.

Hoffmann, for Smith, asked if the Commission could add pedestrian facilities to the list of public and private motor vehicle and bicycle facilities.

Hoffmann asked staff if the pedestrian facilities had been addressed elsewhere in the CMP or if this particular policy would be a good place to add it. The Commission would like to say the same thing about pedestrian facilities as it does about motorist and bicycle facilities.

Cibor stated that all of the policies under Goal 4.2 address motor vehicle and bicycle parking and wondered if perhaps the goal was missing the word “parking”. The goal might have meant to say motorist and bicycle “parking” facilities.

Piedmont-Smith agreed with Cibor and said the Commission should check with staff.

Josh Desmond, Assistant Director of Planning & Transportation Department and Director of the Bloomington/Monroe County MPO, stated that the policies are intended for the parking aspect of the CMP.

Hoffmann restated that the goal is intended to address parking facilities, and stated that Goal 4.2 would not be the appropriate place to address pedestrian facilities. The Commission should make sure that pedestrian facilities are addressed somewhere in the CMP.

Piedmont-Smith asked Desmond if the pedestrian facilities were being addressed in the CMP or if staff needed to add them.

Desmond replied that if staff had not already addressed pedestrian facilities, they would.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she was not sure where pedestrian facilities would be included in the current plan.

Hoffmann suggested that pedestrian facilities may be currently included in the Safe Streets section. Pedestrian issues had been attempted to be included in the Transportation section of the CMP, but the goal being discussed was only about parking facilities.

Smith asked about accessible parking.

Hoffmann said accessible parking is important and asked staff if accessible parking was covered anywhere.

Robinson stated that ADA compliance of public spaces is addressed in the section being discussed. Any parking space or parking facilities would be ADA compliant. In Chapter 7, in the transportation section, there is mention of accessibility, pro-ag, and other guidelines for accessibility.

Hoffmann asked if accessible parking was addressed in Chapter 4.

Robinson stated that one of the programs in Chapter 4 says “ensure ADA compliance in public spaces and incentivize universal design in private spaces to assure that the built environment will serve a market of all ages and abilities”.

Piedmont-Smith requested to amend the amendment to add the word “parking” for clarification with an Oxford comma used.

Hoffmann expressed his happiness at the use of the Oxford comma.

Wisler said it is important to address two-wheeled vehicle parking. Bloomington has a growing number of people using scooters and motorcycles, which have a lower environmental impact. There is not sufficient parking for the two-wheeled vehicles. Currently, two-wheeled vehicles have to take a full, four-wheeled vehicle parking space, which is inefficient. He asked staff if two-wheeled vehicles should be addressed in Amendment 43 or if a new amendment should be proposed to address them.

Cibor stated that policy 4.2.3 addresses designing vehicle parking in light of potential changing mobility solutions. The policy may be directed at all kinds of different issues, but may also be an opportunity to include two-wheeled vehicles. He did not believe that two-wheeled vehicles had been specifically addressed in either the Downtown or Transportation chapters.

Hoffmann stated that working in two-wheeled vehicles should not be worked in at the current meeting, but should be brought back up once the commissioners have time to put more thought into it.

Wisler committed to work on an amendment concerning two-wheeled vehicles.

Hoffmann requested another look at the CMP to look specifically for accessibility clauses.

****Wisler moved to adopt a revised Amendment 43. Kappas seconded. Voice vote to approve the revised Amendment 43 was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 44 is meant to address public opinion of how plan commissioners have handled the diversity of downtown housing options by adding a new goal and two policies. Policy 4.4.2 could need some clarification on the value judgment.

Hoffmann reiterated that the amendment would add a new goal and two new policies that would address diversity in types of housing downtown.

Piedmont-Smith asked to hear more from staff about the concern surrounding policy 4.4.2. She was not sure how to make the policy clearer without pre-judging a situation. There is a value judgment.

Hoffmann stated that he agrees with what he believes policy 4.4.2 suggests. He posed the question to Piedmont-Smith of whether the policy was intended to be a new stage of a redevelopment petition or a factor for the Commission to consider while looking at a petition.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that policy 4.4.2 would be another factor in the process of considering a redevelopment petition.

Hoffmann said that he had no issue with the policy. Staff was asked if they had further questions.

Desmond stated that staff’s concern was in understanding the intent surrounding the policy. Clarification from Piedmont-Smith was provided, so staff was fine with the policy.

Robinson agreed that the policy was fine.

Smith said that most of the new construction downtown is higher end and has to meet ADA requirements. The city lacks affordable, accessible housing.

Sturbaum said that as people add affordable housing to new projects, those units could be on the ground floor, making the units more accessible by design.

Hoffmann stated that existing, older, affordable housing might not meet accessibility requirements, whereas newer housing meets accessibility requirements but is not affordable.

Piedmont-Smith said she would think about the public comments regarding affordable housing being accessible. A third policy could be forthcoming at the next meeting.

Hoffmann asked if the amendment should be tabled so that a policy could be worked in.

Piedmont-Smith said no to tabling the amendment.

Wisler was not entirely comfortable with the wording of Goal 4.4 because it assumes mutual exclusivity between students, the workforce, and those in need of affordable housing. There are students who work and students who cannot afford what is considered traditional student housing. The Commission should not assume that all students attend IU full time and can afford whatever rent is charged.

Hoffmann asked if Wisler was distinguishing between students that can afford market rate housing and those who cannot.

Wisler said he was not comfortable with any language that lumped all students together into one category. The Commission cannot legislate based on who will occupy any given unit of housing, and so the Commission should not write the bias into its guiding document.

Piedmont-Smith expressed willingness to strike the phrase “geared toward the non-student population”.

Hoffmann said that striking the phrase should solve the problem.

Wisler said that he understood the intent, but that classifying people as student or non-student was dangerous.

Hoffmann said that the emphasis on affordable and workforce housing clearly distinguishes the kind of housing being discussed. Hoffmann asked Piedmont-Smith if she was giving a proposal of a revision to the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith said yes.

Cibor said, in reference to the public comment concerning affordable housing also being accessible, that Chapter 5, specifically Goal 5.1, deals with affordable housing specifically and may be the best place to add a policy statement to address the need of accessible affordable housing.

****Cibor then moved for approval on the amended Amendment 44. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote to approve the revised Amendment 44 was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 45 is looking to provide covered bike parking in the downtown area.

Hoffmann clarified that the covered bike parking would be a new program.

Piedmont-Smith commented that her bike is getting rusty.

****Kappas moved for approval on Amendment 45. Cibor seconded. Voice vote to approve Amendment 45 was 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 46 is trying to provide additional information on the program identified as Design Review Committee, and perhaps create a Design Review Committee (DRC). Staff was not supportive of the amendment because existing language does not preclude a DRC.

Hoffmann stated that a City Council member had proposed the amendment and invited Sturbaum to speak.

Sturbaum stated that he had been actively seeking a DRC from the time he became involved in local politics. Starting a DRC is talked about, but action has never been taken. The PC gets design issues dropped on them. In terms of design, the planners, the PC, and the Historical Commission all have a hand. A DRC could have an architect design alternatives to the developers' designs that may be more favorable to the overall aesthetic of Bloomington. All the people involved in design on the city's side are amateurs.

Piedmont-Smith asked if other cities have a DRC.

Sturbaum said that other communities certainly have DRCs. The DRC would show alternatives to petitioners that meet city regulations and guidelines. Having a city architect may not belong on the same amendment, but could be a good idea going forward. A city architect may not be a full-time job, but the position could work on waiver.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there are legal restrictions for a city to suggest designs to private developers.

Anahit Behjou, City Legal Department, stated that she was not aware of the legality either way, but could research the topic.

Hoffmann asked if Sturbaum envisioned the review committee as a formal step of an approval process or more as an informative body to help the PC make a final determination.

Sturbaum replied that the DRC would be advisory. The DRC was originally envisioned as being a part of the Plan Department with members that were not a part of the Plan Department. If there was an architect on staff, the architect would be on the DRC and also on the Planning Department's payroll.

Hoffmann asked if the committee would be a part of the review staff does of a proposal behind the scenes as opposed to a voting body that a petitioner would have to pass.

Sturbaum replied that a great deal changes in a petition before it comes before the PC. The DRC would be a part of the changing.

Hoffmann said he was trying to ascertain what the DRC's role would be in the process. The DRC being discussed would provide advice to staff as well as to the Commission.

Sturbaum stated that he would expect the DRC to be a part of the staff report.

Hoffmann said that the proposed DRC would act quite a bit like the current Environmental Commission that also comes as a preferred part of the staff report.

Sturbaum said that the Commission could direct staff to send the petition back and work with the DRC to make a better design. The petitioner could also meet with the DRC and work on the design with them.

Stewart Gulyas asked why staff was opposed to the DRC.

Robinson said that the language in the current draft did not preclude it, but the process to go forward with a DRC was very unclear. Staff is not against the concept of a DRC but needs more specificity.

Cibor asked to what extent the idea of a DRC has been studied and investigated in the past.

Robinson said that the DRC has been talked about for some time, especially with the overlay districts of the downtown. Amendments have been made to the UDO to address issues related to the downtown districts.

Hoffmann asked Sturbaum if a DRC would look at just proposed project downtown or if it would look at all proposals within the city limits.

Sturbaum said that cases that were determined to need the DRC would be sent to the DRC.

Hoffmann asked if Sturbaum meant that the Commission would decide which cases needed the DRC as opposed to every case having a DRC phase.

Sturbaum said he did not know yet. The DRC could inform different committees and commissions. The DRC is a tool that the city currently does not have. The city does care about design and how developments look in the end.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that this amendment is being proposed to go in Chapter 4, which deals with the downtown area.

Hoffmann said that just because something appears in Chapter 4 does not mean that it is limited to only apply to downtown.

Sturbaum said that he forgot to add the word downtown to the proposed amendment.

Hoffmann said that is why he asked if the amendment applied to just downtown or to the whole city.

Sturbaum replied that he thinks the DRC could be useful in most cases.

Hoffmann clarified that Sturbaum did not want the DRC limited to downtown.

Sturbaum said that it was not his intent to limit the DRC to downtown.

Smith said that a significant missing item to the amendment is to what end it is trying to achieve. He asked how a DRC would benefit the citizens of Bloomington.

Cibor said that there was an amendment previously to commit to and plan for some kind of project. Someone made a comment that plenty of ideas have been committed to, but were not planned for and implemented appropriately. More exploration into the legality of the amendment should be important. The administration is currently looking into the possibility of keeping an architect on retainer, which has some similarities to the DRC idea put forward by Sturbaum. Further discussion may be beneficial.

Kappas agreed that the investigative language option for the amendment is too loose, but it also may be too aggressive to suddenly decide to form a DRC. The Commission should assess whether or not a DRC is a viable option.

Piedmont-Smith proposed an amendment to Amendment 46. The language of the amendment was “create a design and architectural review committee for development applications to ensure compatibility with Bloomington’s downtown character”. The DRC has been considered for a long time. Plan Commissioners are not design experts, but sometimes have to pretend to be. The Commission could benefit from professional design guidance. Constituents are concerned with design, and will give feedback about buildings they consider ugly. Professional guidance would help the PC make more informed decisions about the petitions that come before them.

Hoffmann asked staff to discuss their position on the revisions to the amendment. He asked Piedmont-Smith if she means to suggest what role the DRC would play in the petition process or if she wants to defer to further discussion and decision.

Piedmont-Smith said that she is using the model of the Environmental Commission, but did not think that putting so much detail as to how the DRC would work was necessary at the time.

Hoffmann agreed that a model was not necessary, but was curious.

Sturbaum said he is hearing the Commission say that the scope of a potential DRC should not be limited, then stating that the DRC should only be involved in projects downtown. He mentioned that there will be some form-based review in areas going forward. There could be design issues in the Bryan Park neighborhood or adjacent to downtown. Some of the gateway corridors are not specifically considered downtown, but the DRC might want them in its purview. He suggested that the Commission not limit the DRC, because something will pop up outside the limit.

Piedmont-Smith said that she took to heart the question of “to what end” that was posed by Smith. Downtown has a certain character. Beyond the downtown, though, it becomes more difficult to decide what appropriate design is. The language of the amendment says that an architectural review committee would review designs of structures downtown. That does not preclude the committee from reviewing proposals outside of the downtown in the future.

Stewart Gulyas supported the DRC and believed that such a committee should not be limited to the downtown. Furthermore, she stated that the committee should have a professional architect on it. The Plan Commission has spent a great deal of time in the past talking about architectural issues without anyone having a professional qualification to do so.

Piedmont-Smith stated that hiring an architect would have a budgetary impact. She said that the inclusion of an architect was important, but the fiscal ramifications needed to be addressed first.

Hoffmann said that he was also uneasy about making a statement in the CMP that required an appropriation to be made. The original amendment said that the DRC would include “qualified members”. If the amendment specifies that an architect is needed, it may be going too far. Forming a DRC could be controversial going forward. If the DRC only covered that downtown at first, it would create the opportunity to show the public that the committee was not a bad thing. It

could then be expanded beyond the downtown if needed. City legal is not sure if the DRC crosses any lines.

Piedmont-Smith said that the language proposed in the amendment does not state whether the committee's decisions would be prescriptive or advisory. That may mean there is not a legal issue. If the DRC would not impose restrictions on developers, but merely advise staff or the commission, there would not be a legal issue.

Hoffmann asked for the inclusion of the word "help" between "to" and "ensure". Without the word "help", the amendment could read as if the DRC is a gatekeeper of sorts.

Piedmont-Smith agreed with Hoffmann.

Hoffmann said the inclusion of "ensure" left many of the legal questions in the background. He asked for staff's input on the revised amendment.

Robinson said that if creating a DRC were easy, it would have happened in the years it has been discussed. There has not been a thorough investigation on how to implement such a committee. The talk of an architect could be an issue.

Hoffmann stated that the architect portion had been deleted.

Robinson said that creating new boards or commissions has a long process and needs a great deal of thought.

Hoffmann asked staff if the amendment were approved who would need to take action for the DRC to come into existence.

Desmond stated that it would probably take the mayor and city council to create the committee. It would take legal exploration, directed by the administration, and then a proposal. If the committee had to be brought into existence by statute, the council would have to vote on it.

Hoffmann asked for confirmation on the statement that if the CMP gave guidance to create the committee that it would be up to other parts of government to act on it.

Desmond confirmed that Hoffmann's statement was correct.

Wisler said he agreed with Sturbaum that the goal of the amendment is to form a DRC, the existing language is too weak. He also said that he has wished an alternate design could be proposed when hearing petitioners. However, he did not think that Amendment 46 would be the solution. He stated that the words "design" and "committee" should never be in the same sentence. Design by committee often ends up worse than the original rendition. Under the amendment, there would be so many people involved with each project that there would be too many designs and contrasting opinions to be tenable. The idea of the committee also makes the assumption that there is an objective standard for a good design. Aesthetically-pleasing projects are subjective. City government should not make aesthetic judgments. There are ways to make the process by which developers take the Commission's feedback operate more smoothly and quickly. He did not think a DRC was the right approach to improve the process.

Kappas said that the amendment would be a good opportunity for the Commission. Instead of the Commission focusing on architectural issues, it could focus on planning issues. The amendment should be tabled so that the language can be worked out. Steps should be laid out to form the committee as opposed to a mandate to form the DRC.

Hoffmann said he had mixed feelings on the merits of the amendment. A definitive decision should have been made on whether a DRC should exist or not a long time ago. There are no people in the public audience to represent the Chamber of Commerce or local developers and give their opinion. The Commission should expect an outpouring of public comment. An intermediate step would be to say that the Commission will draft a proposal. Such a step would not be characterized as investigation, but rather a commitment to initiate the process of starting a committee. This would give government and the public a chance to decide where they stand on the issue of a DRC. Drafting a proposal would be a step in between investigation and creation of a committee.

Kappas told Hoffmann that he said everything Kappas had meant to say.

Hoffmann apologized.

Piedmont-Smith offered to withdraw the amendment because she felt that the stakeholders in such an amendment should have the chance to read and consider it. She was also in favor of Hoffmann's idea to draft a proposal for a Design and Architectural Review Committee. Any appearance of secretly drafting amendments should be avoided.

****Hoffmann stated that, without objections, the amendment was withdrawn.**

Robinson said Amendment 47 addresses downtown districts to amend a program that identifies the overlay of districts through form-based code. The amendment seeks to add language to the program as well as additional architectural guidelines. The amendment would extend to cover some of the traditional neighborhoods. Staff thought the idea of amendment was good, but there was some contradictory language that the amendment could do without. Form-based code typically does not address uses, but the amendment specifically speaks to restrictions of use. The amendment also raises the question of creep.

Sturbaum stated that he understands that the amendment process is moving fast, but he wanted the amendments to be introduced so that everyone could start thinking about them. Form-based code is not a magic bullet, and mistakes will happen with it. Developers would like to have residential instead of commercial uses on the first floor of many buildings, but that will hinder the urban climate Bloomington is trying to foster. Bloomington has already done a little bit of form-based code and has already made some mistakes. Lack of adequate parking is a misstep that has occurred with downtown development. Over the years, Bloomington has worried about how the downtown looks and how the forms fit together. The city needs to proceed with caution. Code should be revised using urban consultants with experience creating form-based code. The only way to protect character in neighborhoods is through the historical preservation route. The amendment seeks to bring form-based code into some of the neighborhoods.

Hoffmann apologized to Sturbaum for the pace with which the CMP has moved forward. Hoffmann asked Sturbaum if he would like to take more time to work on the amendment.

Sturbaum said that he was not opposed to taking more time to work on the amendment.

Hoffmann said that the amendment looked like it could benefit from more work and staff input.

Sturbaum agreed that he would like some more time to work on the amendment.

Hoffmann thanked Sturbaum.

Piedmont-Smith said she had two amendments to what Sturbaum had proposed. One is for Chapter 4, Downtown, and the other for Chapter 5, Neighborhoods. She asked if the revisions should be considered at the current meeting or held until Sturbaum reworks the amendment.

Hoffmann said he did not know any proposed revisions would be brought up. The revisions appeared to be positive ones. He suggested waiting to address revisions until after the public had a chance to read the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the amendment is complex and she was happy to table it.

Hoffmann agreed.

Sturbaum said that an important point of his amendment is that the city should not think it can write its own form-based code.

Hoffmann said he understood.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to table Amendment 47. Cibor seconded.**

Wisler thanked Sturbaum for bringing forward the amendment at the time and forum that he did. Form-based code is the alternative to use-based code. The language of the amendment needs to reflect the difference between the two. An example of the failure of use-based code is the old hospital site. The city zoned the area for use and now that the hospital is moving locations, the medical practices are fleeing and willing tenants cannot take over the vacant locations because the zoning only allows medical uses. Form-based code sets what the building looks like and the use will be attracted to the form of the building with which it is compatible. The downtown needs storefronts, but that can be accomplished with a form-based code. The PC cannot just call for a move to form-based code; there will be other steps that need to be taken.

Voice vote was called. Motion to table Amendment 47 passed 6:0.

Robinson stated that Amendment 48 seeks to provide additional narrative in Chapter 7 under the focus area for the old hospital site. The amendment directs the city to work with IU Health to hold a charrette about how to reuse the area. The city has done some negotiations regarding the future use of the area.

Sturbaum said that he was on the hospital committee, but was also a member of the original charrette for the 2005 Downtown Plan. The developers were fighting with the preservationists at the time. At the end of the charrette, there was language that everyone understood. The concern with the hospital is that there are multiple parties with different interests in what happens. The stakeholders need to be involved in the decision about what happens next in that area. A charrette facilitates all stakeholders to have a voice in the decision; it would prevent a top-down decision. The current understanding is that the old hospital will be taken down and something will replace it. IU SPEA is considering making the old hospital a Capstone Project. A Capstone Project would mean 100 graduate students would study what could happen on the site. The amendment formalizes the desire to have community involvement, in the form of a charrette, to guide the decision of what will happen next in the old hospital area.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she created revised language that clarified that a plan will be developed from a process that includes a community charrette.

Hoffmann clarified where the revision would be placed in the amendment.

Robinson said that what Sturbaum is proposing does not fit in the narrative section because it seems to be directive in nature. Piedmont-Smith's revised language is more appropriate for the section the amendment is seeking to be placed in.

Hoffmann clarified which sentence was being revised.

Piedmont-Smith confirmed that Hoffmann was looking at the right clause and further clarified that it included language about a community charrette.

Hoffmann stated that the amendment had been revised to include the charrette.

Cibor said that it was his understanding that IU Health was going to lead an initiative to study the area around the old hospital and that the city might contribute. The status of that initiative was unsure. He asked if the intention of the amendment was for the city to do their own focus on the area, and if it would be separate from the IU Health-led initiative to which the city was already contributing.

Robinson said that Cibor was correct that the city was working with IU Health to contribute to a charrette process with the Urban Land Institute. Staff was not aware of the status of that initiative. The Urban Land Institute had come to Bloomington in the past to do work similar to the hospital work. He said his understanding of the amendment was that it could either tie into the Urban Land Institute exercise or it could be something the city does on its own.

Hoffmann stated that whether IU Health or Urban Land Institute is still working on an initiative, the intent of the amendment is for the city to begin a charrette process to develop a focused area plan.

Cibor asked if there could end up being two focused area plans.

Hoffmann said that is not how he understood the amendment. The city is committing to having a focused area plan that comes out of a community charrette. The charrette process could be the one in which the Urban Land Institute is involved. If the other parties are not interested in holding a charrette, the city will do it. Whether there is a group effort for the charrette or the city takes it on, there will be only one charrette.

Cibor said that if, hypothetically, IU Health is leading a plan but does not include a charrette, but the city is doing a charrette that will inform a plan, that could mean that there would be two plans as a result.

Hoffmann said that the plan is not an IU Health plan; it is a city plan. IU Health has a building, but the entire area needs to be addressed. The plan should include a charrette, but the city is interested in being involved in any process IU Health is pursuing.

Sturbaum stated that he is concerned that executive-level IU Health personnel will make decisions about the area. The city would still need to zone and plan the area regardless of what IU Health decides to do.

Wisler asked to see where the revision would fit into the amendment.

Hoffmann explained where the revision would be plugged into the amendment text.

****Stewart Gulyas moved for adoption of Amendment 48 as amended. Kappas seconded. Voice vote was called. Motion to adopt Amendment 48 as amended passed 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 49 seeks to create a new program to install public restrooms in the downtown area.

Sturbaum said that he was talking to a downtown business owner who told him a back room of his restaurant were beginning to smell unpleasant. After investigation, it was discovered that people were urinating on the exterior wall of the room and the urine, along with the smell, were soaking through into the interior. The proposed restrooms would have solar panels and be enclosed but have gaps at the very bottom so that the feet could be seen and at the top above the head. This would prevent people from loitering in the restrooms. Everyone has the right to have a place to go to the restroom. Businesses do not wish to let the public use the restroom, so there is a restroom desert effect in downtown Bloomington. This affects all citizens.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she had an alternative to the amendment that is more cautious. Installing restrooms has a fiscal impact that must be understood. There is concern that the restrooms would be used for drug use. The idea should be investigated.

Sturbaum stated that the restrooms are year-round because they are heated.

Hoffmann asked if the restrooms are accessible.

Sturbaum said they are accessible as well as easy to clean and movable.

Hoffmann stated that they sounded cool and he wanted one.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was a price point for the restrooms.

Sturbaum said that he did not price them. He also stated that there are larger models. There is the option to hook the restrooms up to 110 power, but they are primarily solar power driven.

Hoffmann stated that he agreed with the spirit of the amendment. When visiting any city downtown anywhere in the world, a first priority is to find the public restrooms. It is time for the public restroom idea to be realized, but the Plan Commission cannot mandate expenditures. The City Council will have to find the funds for the restrooms, but the Plan Commission can start the process.

Piedmont-Smith said that she had done a Google search and it appears that two of the proposed restrooms would cost over \$550,000.

****Wisler moved for adoption of Amendment 49 as amended. Kappas seconded. Voice vote was called. Motion to adopt Amendment 49 as amended passed 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 50 provides narrative for the need of providing alternatives for non-profits and churches in the downtown area. This would be new policy 6.4.6 to support downtown churches and social service organizations through special parking regulations.

Sturbaum said that with all the redevelopment occurring downtown, the churches are suffering in terms of parking. Thinking as an urbanist and a preservationist, he was thinking about how difficult it is to reuse churches downtown once they become vacant. The churches provide social services, so it is in the city's interest to support them. Some older members of congregations are skipping services because they are unable to park close enough to their church. This might be an issue for the new Traffic Commission. It is important for the Commission to consider how to help the churches downtown thrive. The city has found ways to designate parking for social service-gear members of the downtown in the past. If the city wants the churches to stay downtown, they need to facilitate an environment that is conducive to the churches and their parishes

thriving. Some churches are seriously considering building a suburban church and leaving the downtown.

Piedmont-Smith stated that she had written up some alternative language for Amendment 50. She was not comfortable putting in language saying that churches would get special parking regulations or a shuttle service. The revised language is broader.

Hoffmann said that he likes the revised language because it avoids looking like a government favoritism of religion. Committing to “creative and collaborative” solutions as opposed to special regulations helps to avoid the church/state problem.

Sturbaum stated that he had forgotten about the shuttle part. It was a part of the amendment because the bank paid \$50,000 that will be shared by the churches. The shuttle would run from the parking garages. He said it might have been a \$90,000 investment from the bank.

Hoffmann asked if the shuttles would be accessible.

Sturbaum responded that he is sure the shuttles would be accessible. The city has discussed doing a shuttle before and decided it was too expensive. There will be a shuttle that is going to be purchased, but perhaps the city could use the shuttle on days besides Sunday for community events.

Hoffmann said that the shuttle sounded like a creative and collaborative solution.

Cibor said that this amendment would create a parking goal in the downtown chapter of the CMP as well as a parking section in the transportation section of the CMP. Amendment 50 should go into Chapter 4, under Goal 4.2, which covers the downtown. Cibor also stated that a supplemental program may encourage the Parking Commission to take on this issue.

Hoffmann asked if Piedmont-Smith was comfortable moving the amendment to Chapter 4 instead of Chapter 6.

Piedmont-Smith said that Chapter 4 was fine but was trying to find the right place in the chapter.

Hoffmann said that the Commission could work on where exactly the amendment should be placed in Chapter 4.

Kappas stated that the amendment could belong in Chapter 6, and if it were not placed in Chapter 6, perhaps a reference to the issue would make sense because there are churches in neighborhoods that do not have sufficient street parking. For example, there is a Methodist church at Grimes and Rogers that has a very small parking lot. This forces church-goers to park in the nearby area.

Hoffmann stated that he did not disagree with Kappas’s point. He said that in the case of downtown, the city is not only supporting a religious organization but is also supporting historic buildings that would be hard to replace if the congregation moved out of them.

Kappas said that this issue had been raised from a social services standpoint and not a historic one.

Hoffmann said that the historic consideration had been the starting point for raising the issue, but both social services and historic considerations were part of the amendment.

Kappas said he planned to come back with revised language.

Hoffmann said that Kappas's revised language would be helpful.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the amendment could be policy 4.2.4 which would be under the goal "encourage attractive, cost-effective, environmentally-friendly, and convenient public and private motor vehicle and bicycle parking facilities". She said that policy 4.2.4 seemed appropriate.

****Stewart Gulyas moved for adoption of Amendment 50 as amended. Cibor seconded.
Motion to adopt Amendment 50 as amended passed 6:0.**

Robinson stated that Amendment 51 looks to promote a new policy 6.1.12 that would address the city-wide system of greenways and traffic calming as needed to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Sturbaum spoke about the benefits of greenways for pedestrians, cyclists, and children. In cities like Portland, there are vast networks of greenways which are safer for bicycle and pedestrian travel. The city should not be squeamish about traffic calming.

Hoffmann asked staff about bicycle boulevards at an earlier meeting. He wanted to make sure that bicycle boulevards had not been included in the CMP already, which would make mention of greenways potentially redundant.

Robinson stated that he did not believe the term "bicycle boulevards" had been specifically used, but the term "neighborhood greenways", which is synonymous, is the term used in the amendment. Other city documents use the neighborhood greenways terminology as well.

Hoffmann asked if the CMP references neighborhood greenways.

Robinson said he would have to check. He was certain that no mention of bicycle boulevards was in the CMP.

Hoffmann stated that he did not think the Commission would disagree with the spirit of the amendment, but wanted to find out to what extent the issue was already being addressed in the CMP. Hoffmann asked Piedmont-Smith if any alternative language would be presented.

Piedmont-Smith responded that she had not written any alternative language for Amendment 51.

Smith said that the amendment lists pedestrians and bicyclists as beneficiaries of the greenways, but asked that wheelchair users also be listed.

Hoffmann asked Smith if it would be sufficient to add the word accessible to the city-wide system of greenways. There was hesitation to add wheelchair users because it could create a slippery slope of adding every mode of transportation seen on a greenway: Segway, rollerblades, etc.

Smith responded that accessible would be sufficient.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was already a greenways plan and if it was referred to in the CMP.

Robinson stated that there is already a bicycle and pedestrian greenways transportation plan. It should be updated soon. Part of the policy in the CMP would govern the Master Thoroughfare Plan (MTP). The department recently issued a request for proposals to update the MTP.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the greenways plan is a part of the MTP.

Robinson said that it is not.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the MTP needs to be updated separately from the greenways plan.

Robinson confirmed that it does.

Cibor stated that the city has issued an RFP to update the Transportation Plan. That should include the components of a thoroughfare plan and the bicycle and pedestrian plan. Staff will be looking at how the built environment serves all modes of transportation. By the end of the year or early next year, staff hopes to bring the Transportation Plan (TP) to the Commission for adoption. There is a hope that parts of the TP will identify future bicycle and pedestrian corridors. The CMP has a lot of language about bicycles and pedestrian infrastructure, but almost no mention of greenways or bicycle boulevards. Neighborhood traffic safety, or traffic calming, is being updated. The forthcoming TP will incorporate elements from the CMP. Cibor did not think the amendment proposed was necessary.

Hoffmann stated that often the Commission plans for good ideas that never actually get done. The proposed Amendment 51 says “design and complete”. That is a stronger statement than planning for the greenways.

Wisler asked to propose another modification. He said that when the Commission says “use traffic calming”, there is a preconceived notion about what that means because often “traffic-calming devices” are being discussed. Often, the devices that end up in the street slow traffic down, but are not bicycle-friendly. He suggested the amendment read “revise street design where necessary to enhance bike and pedestrian safety”.

Hoffmann asked Wisler to repeat his proposal.

Wisler said he proposed to replace “use traffic calming as needed” to say “revise street design where necessary to enhance bike and pedestrian safety”. The revision would take a look at the whole design of streets as opposed to retrofitting them.

Hoffmann said he liked the revision. The revision accomplished the idea of restricted traffic bicycle boulevards wherein only local traffic is permitted. This would have potentially been a separate amendment had Wisler not brought up the revision. The concept of restricted traffic bicycle boulevards is one that many forward-thinking bicycle-friendly cities have done. A bicycle boulevard works by choosing a main east-west road and only allowing local traffic or deliveries on it. This idea would be encompassed by the language “revise street design”.

Piedmont-Smith said that there are two separate issues being discussed. The system of greenways is one issue while revision of street design or traffic calming is a separate issue. There was not enough time to see where the amendment could fit into the CMP or if it was already covered. It could also be difficult to ascertain when street design needed to be revised; it was not clear what criteria the street design would need to meet. The amendment should be tabled.

Hoffmann asked if Piedmont-Smith would like to make a motion.

****Wisler moved to table Amendment 51. Piedmont-Smith seconded.**

Cibor commented that the word greenways means a corridor of undeveloped land preserved for recreational use or environmental protection. He was unsure how the City of Bloomington started using “neighborhood greenways” to mean something else.

Hoffmann stated that when he looked at the map, what is being referred to as greenways were roads.

Cibor stated that he supported tabling the amendment, but that the general idea of the amendment is good.

Hoffmann stated that there is a motion to table. Staff will look to see if there is already language in the plan that covers the amendment, then decide if the amendment should be two separate statements. The commissioners liked the idea, but were not ready to vote for the language.

Motion to table Amendment 51 with instructions to staff passed 6:0.

Hoffmann stated that two amendments were coming back around for a vote because they were tabled last time for changes in the language. Amendment 9 was submitted by a member of the public that instructed staff to promote public engagement, knowledge, and competencies. The amendment also had language regarding documentation and assessment of city departments' public engagement experiences and ability to share learning across departments. The core of the amendment was accepted by the Commission, but there was concern that the amendment sought to dictate internal city departmental policy. Staff revised the language to be less prescriptive and more suggestive.

Piedmont-Smith asked to see the context of the proposed amendment.

Hoffmann stated that the amendment would be policy 1.5.4.

Cibor said that this policy would fall under Goal 1.5 which seeks to “commit to transparency, open government, and high quality public engagement”, leading to excellent services for all city stakeholders.

Hoffmann said that the goal was about transparency, open government, and public engagement. The revision was the staff's version. He stated that the Commission felt, upon first reading, that the amendment was rather heavy-handed.

Piedmont-Smith asked why the amendment tells city staff to engage the public. It is the job of city staff to engage the public.

Hoffmann stated that the goal spells out public engagement. He was not sure why the goal needed to state the need for public engagement.

Piedmont-Smith suggested that the language needed a modifier. She said that as the language was written, it encouraged city staff to do their job.

Hoffmann stated that he thought the call to engage the public was meant to be specific. When a decision is made, city staff should reach out to, for example, neighborhood associations or have more public meetings. He felt the amendment did not refer to the times when the public comes into a city office to get a permit. The amendment seeks to increase public engagement surrounding the decision-making process.

Piedmont-Smith said that if what Hoffmann described was the intent of the amendment, language needed to be added to make that intent clear.

Hoffmann said that revised Amendment 9 was not ready to be voted upon.

Wisler said something had been lost from the original amendment to the revised one. The original amendment did not just seek to encourage departments and staff, but also to ensure that they knew how to do what was listed in the amendment.

Hoffmann responded that it was for that reason that staff pushed back saying that the amendment sought to manage internal city policy, for example personnel review or training. The CMP did not appear to be the place to tell the city how to manage its employees.

Wisler said that directing internal city policy was a concern, but that once the language had been taken out, the amendment did not say anything substantive.

Hoffmann suggested to scrap the amendment.

Smith stated that he would like to see stronger language in the amendment. He suggested changing the word “encourage” to the word “facilitate”.

Piedmont-Smith said she did not support the amendment.

Cibor said it needed additional work because, in its current form, it tells staff to do their job.

Hoffmann suggested that instead of tabling the amendment a second time, it should be denied. If someone should want to propose a new version of the amendment, they would have a month to do so.

****Kappas moved to deny Amendment 9. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Motion to deny Amendment 9 passed 6:0.**

Hoffmann said that Amendment 23, in its original form, was submitted by the Chamber. It was designed to modify a provision in the CMP that required an update in the UDO to address the provision of ride-share, autonomous vehicles, and electric vehicles charging stations in future new developments. The Chamber added that updating the UDO should be considered and only if there was demand. The Commission had discussed the amendment, and had said they wanted something that looked less like a mandate but was stronger than a wishy-washy statement to get to the issue someday. Hoffmann had been asked to revise the amendment. The new version called to “keep the UDO up to date with provisions that address the needs and impacts of emerging forms of transportation”. The Commission had found it odd that the amendment talked about ride-share and autonomous vehicles as if they were the same as the issue of charging stations for electric vehicles.

Wisler said that the amendment refers to the UDO, which is the current zoning and planning document. If the amendment is written in the CMP, it could last longer than the next form or forms of the UDO, which may not be called the UDO going forward.

Hoffmann said that the Commission needs a placeholder.

Wisler said that there are likely other parts of the CMP that refer to the UDO. He asked staff if this has been considered at all and if it would make more sense to refer to the UDO more generically.

Piedmont-Smith suggested the amendment read “update city policies as necessary” to address changing needs in transportation.

Hoffmann said the language should read “policies and codes”.

Piedmont-Smith agreed with Hoffmann.

Wisler said the statement is broader and the Commission should include ordinances as well.

Hoffmann stated he considered the changes friendly. The amendment changed to say “update city policies and codes as necessary to address...”

Piedmont-Smith said she did not like that the original language specified to keep the UDO up to date. It is a given that everyone wants to keep the UDO up to date.

Hoffmann restated the revised amendment.

Cibor said he thought the amendment was good. The transportation section of the CMP states that the UDO will be updated to include charging stations for electric cars. Perhaps the Chamber should be notified that the statement already occurred in the CMP.

Hoffmann said he believes the revision covers what the Chamber had intended.

****Stewart Gulyas moved for adoption of Amendment 23 as amended. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Motion to adopt Amendment 23 as amended passed 6:0.**

The agenda for the evening was over. The Commission will wait on the new, new version of the CMP on Monday. Amendments may be submitted by the public until May 31st. The Commission will meet again to discuss the CMP on Monday June 5th in Council Chambers.

Meeting adjourned.