

Plan Commission 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 email at the following address: moneill@monroe.lib.in.us

The Plan Commission met in the Council Chambers at 5:30 p.m., members present: Cibor, Stewart Gulyas, Kappas, Kinzie (arrived late), Maritano, Mills, Piedmont-Smith, and Wisler.

ROLL CALL

NOMINATION OF TEMPORARY PRESIDENT

****Piedmont-Smith nominated Brad Wisler. Maritano seconded. Wisler accepts nomination. Motion carried unanimously.**

James Roach, Development Services Manager, introduced Kathleen Mills, who is sitting in for Joe Hoffman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 17, 2017

****Kappas moved to approve the 4/17/17 minutes. Cibor seconded. Minutes approved by roll call - motion carried 7:0.**

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Roach reported that the commission lacks an administrative staff member so he will serve that role for tonight's meeting.

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: June 12, 2017

- SP-06-17 **Mara Jade Holdings, LLC. – 318 E. 3rd St.**
- ZO-09-17 **City of Bloomington – UDO Amendment (Accessory Dwelling Units)**
- ZO-11-17 **City of Bloomington - UDO Amendment (Pocket Neighborhoods)**

CONSENT AGENDA

- ZO-14-17 **Shelby Bloomington**
1920 W. Fountain Dr.
Rezone 1.18 acre property from Residential single-family (RS) to Industrial General (IG) to allow the construction of a 5,000 square foot building.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

No members of the public were present to speak for or against this petition.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve the petition. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Consent Agenda approved.**

PETITIONS:

- SP-07-17 **Annex Student Living (Kyle Bach)**
313, 317, 325, 403 & 409 E. 3rd St., and 213 S. Grant St.
Request: Site plan approval for a 4-story mixed use building and a 5-story mixed-use building
Case Manager: Amelia Lewis

Amelia Lewis, Long-Range Zoning Planner, presented the staff report. The properties are located on the northeast and northwest corners of 3rd and Grant Streets in the University Village Overlay (UVO) downtown. The east-side and west-side properties measure 0.4 acres each. The Growth Policies Plan (GPP) designation for this area is downtown near multi-family residence, Restaurant Row, commercial, office, and the Restaurant Row Historic District to the north. The east site is currently designated as multi-family residences and office space. The west site is primarily multi-family structures, including Baked of

Bloomington. The circled property on the staff presentation screen is a historic structure and will therefore be looked at by the Historic Preservation Commission on Thursday. This property will remain on the site, so the area in question is the L-shape on the image. The commission is required to review downtown proposals and any proposal more than 15,000 sq. ft. of floor area or residential units with more than 50 bedrooms and adjacent to residentially zoned districts or residential uses. The petitioner proposes to demolish the existing structures on-site with the exception of the historic structure. Each structure is a 5-story structure with partial underground garage parking, 3rd street grade retail space and three floors of residential units above. The site plan does not involve the standards of the UDO including minimum parking, height, impervious surface, modulation and building height step-down. Lewis will walk through those aspects, as well as the requirements it meets. The maximum density is 33 dwelling units per acre in this district and overlay. This translates as a maximum density of 13.2 dwelling units per site. The east site is proposed at 12.35 with 53 studios and 7, 1-bedrooms. The west side is 12.56 DUEs (Dwelling Unit Equivalent) with 43 studios and 6 units of 2-bedrooms. The district's height is 40 ft. maximum and the proposed building on the east measures 60 ft. in height and the west measures 58 ft. in height. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) measures height from the lowest point on the site to the highest built feature. Both sites have significant slope with the east having approximately 17 ft. of fall and west side with approximately 8 ft. of fall. The parking is not met. There is no required parking for commercial, only residential. On the east side, they lack 4 spaces and on the west side, they lack 11 spaces. There are 5 street parking spaces proposed along Grant St. The impervious surface allowed in the district is 85% maximum. On the east site it is 89% and on the west site it is 90%. The east site has approximately 2,700 sq. ft. of green roof and the west site has about 2,000 sq. ft. of green roof. While the green roof does not count toward impervious surface calculations, it can be considered a benefit when looking at the overall impact in design of the project; the sites also utilize permeable pavers and landscaping areas towards their pervious surface count. There are two architectural standards this project does not meet. One is the building façade modulation, requiring that no length of a wall be greater than 50 ft. There is one exception, on the south façade of the west building on 3rd street. The second is the building height step-down. The building is located next to a square structure, which may not be one-story taller or 14 ft. taller than the surveyed structure. Neither building meets the step-down requirement. Lewis shows the portions of the building that do not meet the step-down requirement. In relation to the Dats building, part of the proposed structure is stepped back. In order to meet the step-back, this portion of the building would need to be stepped back even further. The historic district runs north of the east site and includes a portion of the west site. This is the historic structure in the district; the building wraps around. At least a portion of it needs to be stepped back to meet standards (Lewis indicates the portions using a diagram). At the garage level each building has one secure vehicular access point through the garage. The access point to the east building is located on the NW corner of Grant St. and the entrance was set back and side-loaded so as to not place it just directly next to the sidewalk, creating unsafe conditions for pedestrians. Vehicle access for the west site is in the alleys to the north and west of the building, as opposed to Grant Street. This allows for more pedestrian interaction along Grant St. Lewis indicated the first floor plan with retail spaces contained within the east building, approximately 7,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and a 2,400-sq.-ft. clubhouse for residents. The west building contains 7,200 sq. ft. of retail space and a shared lobby for residents. The proposal meets the requirement to have a minimum of 50% of the ground floor area used as non-residential. In addition, each floor has four dwelling units, accessed from the ground floor. On the third level, the east building has a C-shape around a green roof and a patio. The west building is an L-shaped building with a step-back from the historic structure to the north and a green roof patio on the second level. The fourth level has a patio creating a step-back from the Dats building to the north. The fifth level, which continues to build straight up leaves the spaces open on the interiors. Lewis shows the view on 3rd St. facing north. Pedestrian access to the buildings is provided on both street frontages. Due to the slope on the site, the retail is stepped along street grade and the pedestrian entrances are at varying heights. Pedestrians can enter the site at grade off of 3rd and Grant Streets into the retail space and under a metal canopy. The primary residential entrance to the east building is located on the south façade of the building off of 3rd street with a retaining wall wrapping around the entrance. The primary entrance to the west building is located on the east façade of Grant St. These entrances provide residents access to a common lobby. Lewis shows the view looking south from Grant Street. The east building has architectural materials approved by the UDO. The white is a metal panel, the grey is stucco. The other surfaces are brick veneer and limestone accents. The east building has significant slope. Next to the Dats building there is a step-back on two sides to mirror the shape of the

existing structure. Lewis also shows the east site to the north and along the east elevation, both bordering alleys. On the west site looking at the south elevation (the area along 3rd St.), the retail is stepped along with the street grade. Materials are the same as the east building. Looking at the east elevation of the west site (along Grant St.) one can see the historic structure, which Lewis believes the petitioner would like to convert to a restaurant, similar to those on Restaurant Row. The building is stepped back, and the 2nd floor has a patio and a green roof. The west site has the elevation which features the alley with the garage entrance. Lewis shows images looking southeast, southwest, and northwest at both buildings. The site meets the requirements for 50% ground floor retail and non-residential. All façades meet the requirement except for the south façade of the west building along 3rd Street. The void to solid percentage requirements are met on both buildings. The environmental recommendations to use the landscaping plan provided, on site recycling, and to salvage, recycle, reuse construction and demolition material when possible, and to incorporate green building and site design practices. The petitioner has submitted a series of sustainable development design features, including the green roof, which is over 18% (east building) and 13% (west building). They have utilized green-friendly building materials with recycled content and locally-sourced materials. The petitioner has committed to recycling 50% of the construction and demolition debris by utilizing permeable pavers, and other features as shown on the presentation list. The UDO outlines five findings for site plan approval. The department has not yet made findings for this case and would like to review the project as a whole before proceeding. Lewis summarized the criteria and findings for site plans. Looking at the fifth requirement, the Plan Commission may approve any project that does not comply with all of the developmental and architectural standards if the Commission finds that the project complies with the standards of the site plan review on the previous slide. They satisfy the design guidelines set forth in the UVO. The commission is encouraged to consider building designs which may deviate in character from the standards but still add innovation and unique design to the built environment of the overlay area. Additionally, the plan commission is encouraged to consider the degree to which the site plan incorporates sustainable development and design features such as vegetated roofs, energy efficiency and resource conservation measures. Staff concludes that the project does not meet all the standards of the UVO (University Village Overlay) including height, modulation, minimum parking, step-down and impervious coverage. It does, however, provide positive aspects related to wider city goals, including the addition of a commitment to providing a diverse housing mix, additional commercial space downtown and green roofs. The department recommends that the Plan Commission be cautious of approving projects that do not meet all overlay requirements in the transition period prior to the adoption of the draft of the Comprehensive Master Plan with subsequent UDO updates. The petitioner should continue to work with the department, the Historic Preservation Committee and with guidance from the Plan Commission. Staff recommends SP-07-17 be continued to the June Plan Commission meeting.

Wisler opened the floor to the Planning and Transportation Director.

Terri Porter, Planning and Transportation Director, said that there are some gaps with this project. However, Planning and Transportation is committed to working with the petitioner to resolve the pending requirements and present a good project for the June meeting.

Kevin Robling, representing Annex Student Living and the Mecca companies, echoed the Director's comments, expressing pride in the proposed project while conceding that there is still work to do. Robling discussed the definition of the word "innovative." He worked with the architects at Access Group and came back with a different look for the project. Robling said "diverse housing" means a mix of affordable housing and other housing. Robling committed to making a better project. The group of architects is aggressive and innovative. Annex will do an abbreviated presentation. He introduced Joy Skidmore, who is the development manager.

Joy Skidmore with Annex Student Living explained more about her company. Annex is a subsidiary company of Mecca Companies, which started as an affordable housing developer in 2006 and created its subsidiary in 2009. It specializes in development construction, acquisition of student housing assets near colleges and universities and tertiary and secondary markets primarily throughout the Midwest. Their mission is to create housing opportunities through economic development and community advancement. It is one of Indiana's fastest growing private businesses and takes pride in creating communities with high community belonging. Skidmore listed the specifications mentioned in the staff report and the goals of public seating areas in addition to landscape features, underground parking, and the green initiative for

sustainability. Skidmore listed the amenities to be offered by property management, which they call the PAWS program (philanthropy, academics, wellness and social). From each category, they provide two programs or activities every semester. The goal of these is to promote the development and future of the residents. Fitness facilities, study areas, and a kitchen in the clubhouse are a few of these features, in addition to valet parking for retailers; washer/dryer in units; and green roofs for retail and residents. In planning with the developer, Annex first considered stepping the sidewalk, but instead prefers to step the building to promote more pedestrian interaction, providing steps in the retail area instead of on sidewalks. In the previous design, there was not enough brick. This new design features more brick and the modification of the steps, and the addition of landscaping on 3rd street. Based on staff comments, developer has changed plans in order to provide parking access from alleys to increase pedestrian safety.

Steve Brehob from Smith, Brehob and Associates, talked about site design to overcome significant grade issues and how it fits into the surrounding area. He explained the features that Annex would not like to replicate from the surrounding area, such as retaining walls and front porches. Some of those front porches and doors are not inviting, in his opinion. Baked has sidewalk and outdoor area that have an inviting pedestrian feel. Annex wants to replicate front porches, entry features, sidewalks, and outdoor seating on 3rd street. The strategy to do that is to step retail to follow street grade changes, to enable more pedestrian entrances. The petitioner does not want to replicate the current retaining wall that exists on the east site. The heart of the project is its pedestrian feel and the restaurant area that currently exists on Grant St. north of 3rd street. Landscaping, patios in the right of way and sidewalk entries into the businesses are features that resulted from former residences having been converted to businesses. Annex seeks to replicate the porches and patios on Grant Street and envisions reproducing outdoor seating and patio areas around entrances at the east site by using landscaping and tree plots. On the east site, there is a “pocket park” with outdoor seating open to any pedestrians to sit down, socialize or eat a meal. Brehob reiterated that the parking entrances have been moved to alleys to reduce vehicular interference with pedestrian areas.

Robling stated his desire to continue to work with Director Terri Porter, the Mayor, and the Planning Department to improve this project.

Piedmont-Smith thanked the petitioner for the changes made since first design. She asked about environmental considerations such as a green building. The petitioner’s statement mentions installment. She asked to know when the petitioner would know what will be installed and when.

Robling promised commitment on such installments no later than the following week. They have been keeping the case manager updated as changes arise.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the coverage of the green roof. She wanted to know about the square footage to be planted.

Eric Anderson, Architect with Access Architecture, said the areas would be a “holistically” green roof. With 4-inch trays, the plants would be spaced around. The square footage of hardscape is undetermined as of yet, with the exception of the patio spaces as they are labeled in the documents. Around those areas, for instance in the east site, some areas will be a hard space which will be decking (pavers or composite wood material). On the western site (the space labeled “roof deck”), the green area on the diagram will be the green roof area and the brown will be the deck. This is still tentative and the square footage is not specific.

Piedmont-Smith asked about more details on green roof, in terms of plant life and necessary maintenance.

Anderson said it would be sedum-type planting with extensive 4-inch trays, with several different species included, which will bloom at different times of the year. They are resilient plants that do not require much watering, although general maintenance like weeding is necessary.

Piedmont-Smith observed that extensive maintenance would be necessary.

Anderson concurred.

Piedmont-Smith asked about upper-story residential windows that would also be store-front windows.

Anderson said that the larger areas are transition areas, such as elevators and other common spaces. The use of windows in these places is meant to bring more natural lighting and warmth. All other windows within units are 5x3 feet, which are large and traditional scale.

Piedmont-Smith asked about modulation of façades longer than 50 feet, referring to the west building, south façade. She asked about how long that unmodulated side is.

Anderson stated that the brick portion is approximately 60 ft. in length. The reason it is longer is because it matches up with the units inside the building to avoid having one irregular unit with a significantly smaller square footage. The modulation, in their opinion, met the intent of the requirement with the exception to extend further to avoid an odd unit. There are three units making up that area. If the 50-foot modulation were followed strictly, the unit to the far west would be made smaller.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the height step-down. The part of the building closest to Grant Street is already stepped down. She asked for a specification of the height of that step-down.

Anderson answered that the green roof area referred to earlier is lower than the future restaurant roof. It is roughly 17.5 ft. above grade. The adjacent property is roughly 22 ft. from grade.

Piedmont-Smith asked how far back it is.

Anderson said that it sits flush with the face of the house, a portion of which protrudes further.

Piedmont-Smith asked how far back the 17.5 ft. building sits.

Anderson asked to refer to the plan. In the plan view, it is a number of feet behind the house, probably 20-25 feet from the back side of that home to the face of the units in question. On the east side, it is 5 to 10 feet behind the back side of that restaurant. The height of the step-down there is roughly 38 feet, 11 inches above grade. That is effectively 3 stories, since the garage is underground on one side but because of the slope, it is essentially a full level. Above that floor is retail, then residential.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the Grant Street frontage where the Dats is located is 38 feet tall, and asked about the Dats building height.

Anderson said that it is roughly 19 feet tall, which meets requirements.

Roach explained that the step-down on the project does not meet the requirement to the letter, but it is very close to or almost meeting the step-down requirement. Technically the entire length of the lane behind the store structures needs to be stepped down to meet the height requirement. The solution is different, to bring the short portion close to the store structure, but the mass of the building further back from the lots which may be a perfectly appropriate grade, to achieve the same goals, even if it does not meet the requirement literally.

Anderson stated that the goal was to break down the scale of the buildings as they got closer to restaurants. They chose to have the building at the south stepped down to some extent and stepped down at the end, near the restaurant.

Cibor asked about on-street parking spaces, asked for specification of whether the 5 parking spaces included existing spaces or if they are all new spaces.

Brehob answered that there are 5 existing spaces along the west side of Grant Street, but they are not protected with the corner bump; that would be added at the 3rd street intersection.

Cibor concluded that there will be the same number of parking spaces as exist now. He asked about the retaining wall on the southeast corner of the east building.

Brehob said that it is a curb of 6 inches.

Cibor asked about the green roof. Is there a scenario in which the green roof would count as an impervious surface area?

Roach said that according to the code, impervious surfaces are described as many types of surfaces (including roofing) that stop the water from entering the ground. The roof will do that. The planning commission has the power to approve plans that do not meet the requirements to the letter, yet this proposal for the roof can help in getting closer to the impervious surface requirement.

Cibor referred to the development review and the traffic study and asked to know about the timeline for those conclusions.

Brehob answered that the traffic study has not been completed by A&F Engineering, but that he would report with the results of that review as soon as they became available.

Cibor asked to know more about the valet parking permit. How it would operate? Where it would be situated?

Skidmore answered that those details are not yet determined. This may serve the retail needs on busy evenings.

Wisler opened the floor to questions from commissioners.

Kappas referred to the review stating that pervious surfaces are those that put water into the ground. He asked if the petitioner had designated a way to put water back into the ground, for instance, through a cistern.

Robling did not have details as of yet. Consulting the UDO, the petitioner seemed to interpret that it did meet the impervious surface requirement. The petitioner is dedicated to working through that.

Anderson described the drainage system as an extensive tray system that would hold about ½ inch of rain before it starts to disperse into other existing drainage systems in place. In the case of ½ inch of rain, none of that will go into the sewer system.

Kappas mentioned the downside of insufficient drainage, which causes a flooding of Kirkwood and other downtown areas.

Maritano asked about diverse population mix. The description is marketed to student housing downtown, given the description of a student experience. How is that a diverse mix of living downtown?

Robling conceded that it did not sound diverse. The Mecca Company's mission in the past has been almost exclusively to provide student housing. Their projects have been done in Richmond, Kokomo, Indiana State University and Ivy Tech West. That is not the case here, especially since the Historic District applies. The UDO and the administration's understanding of the UDO obscure the application of standards. This developer seeks to set the standard for what the Mayor's office requires. Robling stated that "diverse housing" in this case means a mix of market housing and affordable housing, which should be 10-15% of the units. This development can commit to needs-based affordable housing, if necessary.

Maritano said that the consideration could also include urban professionals and families.

Robling said that there could be even more market segments.

Maritano asked about marketing for "memorable college experience" and "resident life and community belonging."

Robling mentioned the PAWS programming.

Skidmore gave specific examples of the terms Maritano asked about, like pitch-ins, financial planning for residents, and transition programs for students leaving school. These programs are not exclusively for students.

(Inaudible) asked about whether there was a mix of students and urban professionals in other developments of the same kind.

Julie Elliot, general counsel for Annex Student Housing and Mecca Companies, explained that students are not a protected class under fair housing. Similar developments in other Indiana cities are purpose-built, which are better lent to students, but they do have non-student residents. By offering 1-bedroom and studio units, the intent is to have more of a mix of students and non-students. It is difficult to guarantee non-student housing.

Robling alluded to IU Living-Learning Center dormitories, which not only provide a place to live, but other services and programs. This development will not offer classes, but its programs will foster learning for its residents.

Wisler opened the floor to questions/comments from the public.

Lee Sandweiss from the Historic Preservation Commission spoke for Chris Sturbaum, who asked Sandweiss to attend on his behalf. She read from Sturbaum's statement: The HPC met on April 13 and discussed the current development. What was the architectural style of the proposed development? No answer was given. "Boxism" was the term that came to mind. This is the type of project that builds a cheap structure with large units. Annex student living was the least compatible project proposal he has seen over the years. Allowing such projects to be built wrong will remain that way forever.

Jan Sorby, also a preservationist, referred to the downtown plan, which prioritizes maintaining and reinforcing the university villages. She said that she saw no front porches or front doors. The downtown plan recommended drawing design inspiration from Restaurant Row. Creative, innovative design can happen, as in Amsterdam. She encouraged developers to prepare project drawings in relation to adjacent historical properties and think about the streetscape and pedestrian experience, and to remove the top floor. The modulation gives the pedestrian variety and a nice look, and reflects the historic plan and lot lines downtown. To have more variety in retail, there need to be small spaces. She implored them not to build too tall and to respect other parameters. Architectural features of the surrounding area should be considered.

Miles Rider, a life-long Bloomington resident, urged the commission to consider the development not just in the context of the plot of land in which it will be built but in all of downtown. The ripple effects include a shortage of parking for all of the development's residents, which pushes the parking shortage to surrounding areas, affecting long-term residents. Bloomington is more than just IU, and recent development projects have not catered to long-time residents.

Eric Sandweiss, a neighbor and citizen, studies the history of cities and what makes them work. He encouraged the commission not to be shy about the inquiries and demands the city requires of it. He had observed that the commission's reservations from the previous hearing on this project were deplored and dismissed in the press and by the public. The interests of investors are not always consistent with the interests of the city. He asked the commission to consider the draft Comprehensive Master Plan and its Preface. The cultural values and diversity the Master Plan seems to uphold are not consistent with this project. Past decisions on 3rd street have been unfortunate for the area, infringing on past existing architecture on the south side of the street. This site is a resource that can be used to knit back the character of the area. Additional housing will be added on the Wells quadrangle in the near future. Bloomington, as an international destination, is perhaps of a higher "division" than the other cities in which the developer has worked.

John Lawrence, Executive Committee Member of the Council of Neighborhood Associations, comes as a citizen, not on official business. He was concerned with the issue of parking, and with making the retail successful. This would require a pleasant streetscape, accessibility and parking. Valet parking will only work with restaurants, not stores. Retail will only survive if people who drive by can access it. The height of this project presents the same issue as a recent hotel that was too tall. Lawrence asked the commission to keep this project's height at standards.

****Kinzie motioned to continue SP-07-17 to Plan Commission meeting June 12, 2017. Kappas seconded.**

Piedmont-Smith thanked the public for community comments. She recommended following those suggestions. She asked developers to reduce the design height for consideration later on. Retail must be successful; therefore, there must be more parking provided. There must be more green building. The structure is too “box”-oriented and must integrate more materials.

Kathleen Mills said that valet parking is incompatible with her idea of Bloomington. Tipping will be unlikely for valet parking; customers will not welcome this idea. Another aspect difficult to imagine is the likeness of this community to a living-learning center on the IU campus. The concept is great, but will not work well off-campus without the limitations of the on-campus communities (the prohibition of alcohol, for example).

Stewart Gulyas said that the development looked too “clinical.” Furthermore, retail, which has suffered lately in Bloomington, does not seem to be well-thought-out. She said that it did not seem clear why another student housing development would be needed downtown. Another idea that seems odd for Bloomington is the valet parking.

Cibor said that he wanted to see the traffic study and how it would relate to the safety of the intersection of 3rd and Grant St., as well as the input and recommendations of the Historic Preservation Committee. Positive aspects of the development that resulted from changes made since the first hearing are the elimination of drive cuts, and access to parking via alleys. He asked about the construction impacts and hoped to hear such details at the next hearing, including road and sidewalk closings and possible issues arising from the north alley’s utility poles.

Kappas agreed that student-oriented housing is being developed at an alarmingly rapid rate. Height is another issue that causes a need for caution. Most of his comments will come at the next meeting, since his impression is that the design will be quite different after changes are made. He urged the petitioner to consider public comments.

Kinzie shared the concerns echoed by the public, especially those relating to restaurant row and surrounding structures. She asked for more detailed illustrations at the next hearing. Such illustrations should show how much this development would dwarf surrounding structures. She was skeptical of the community-building aspect of the development. She commended the architects for dealing with the difficult grading issues.

Maritano said that the term “innovative” was too ambiguous and became meaningless since it lacked context; this is unfair to developers, the public and the Commission. Clarity must be provided. Development works with marketing, which will be targeted based on who will be living there. There is a great deal of retail that is under-utilized. It’s much like existing structures that are vacant now.

Wisler said that more height and density will meet the demand of the increasing student population. This height and density is appropriate in the area. However, it is tricky because of its proximity to restaurant row. The parking issue is related. The more this type of housing exists, the more possible it is for someone to live in downtown Bloomington without a car; that is only if they can live there and access everything necessary on foot. What goes into the retail is something to come up at the next hearing. The possibilities are: restaurants, convenience stores, or other things that will facilitate residence downtown. The modulation is an important issue: he agreed that not splitting a unit is the correct decision. The objective is to make it look like there are multiple buildings. If the roof heights do not vary, it will be obvious that it is one massive building. He also requested images from 4th street to give perspective. Diagonal parking is ideal. Although this is likely not possible on 3rd St., he wanted know if that would be possible from Grant considering its width.

****ROLL CALL to continue case SP-07-17. Motion carried 8:0 - Petition SP-07-17 continued.**

Robling thanked everyone on the commission and the public for the recommendations which will be considered and implemented for a final project to make Bloomington proud.

- PUD-08-17 **Mecca Companies**
1100 N. Crescent Dr.
Request: Rezone 8 acres from Residential Single-family (RS) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to approve a PUD District Ordinance. Also requested is preliminary plan approval to allow a new affordable housing multi-family apartment complex.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich (Zoning Planner) presented the staff report. The petitioners seek to rezone from Single-family Residential (RS) to Planned Unit Development (PUD). Greulich presented a visual of the surrounding area with details on surrounding zoning. It has sat empty for nearly its entire existence. It is heavily wooded. The Crescent Point single-family subdivision was created 7 to 8 years ago. There are attached and detached single-family homes. It is in great shape. This petition would be developed by the owners of that property for another affordable housing project. Some constraints are shown on the contour map: there are steep slopes and sink holes on and adjacent to the site, as shown in black circles on the image. The steep slopes greater than 18%, within which the UDO does not allow any development. Other portions of the site fall between 12% and 18% slopes, in which the UDO allows 50% development. The petitioners put together the list of environmental constraints. In red is the riparian buffer which surrounds the intermittent stream. The black area with hatch marks represents the 18% slope in that area. The area with a blue line designates the sink holes to the southwest and south. The preservation area extends beyond the site. The southeast sinkhole has several houses in it that have a preservation area site set aside as well. The site plan and environmental constraints were shown. The buildings and road will be focused in the center. There is an access point to the west. A road stub was extended to this property 7 or 8 years ago when the development to the north was built. To the east, an unbuilt portion of 14th street stubs into this property. There are 3 access points to be implemented. This site plan avoids the difficult environmental factors. 4 buildings are proposed on this site (shown in dark grey). They have walk-out style design, whereas the back side of the buildings has another layer that is below ground. From the street, it will appear to be 3 stories, while the back will appear to be 4 stories. The overall height will be 52 feet for some of them, but for the largest building, it will be a maximum height of 72 because of the walkout design. For this PUD the petitioners are seeking, there are a few deviations from the (UDO) for the RH district. One deviation is the maximum height limit. The others are the prohibition for the disturbance within the steep slope, the prohibition for the encroachment in the riparian buffer, and the encroachment into the Karst feature that is on this site and to the southeast of this site. The petitioners have clustered the development within the center of this property and have avoided placing anything in the Karst feature or the buffer areas. The areas of steep slope outlined in black on the image are used within building envelopes, and will not be raw exposed soil in the end. The Growth Policies Plan (GPP) mentions areas in which there are environmental constraints, to employ best management practices to the maximum extent possible, to mitigate environmental impacts. Staff and petitioners have worked together to determine the best management practice to mitigate these encroachments. Incorporating the building into the areas with steep slopes helps stabilize those areas. Impacts resulting from construction can be mitigated with redundant erosion control measures. Petitioners are not proposing any buildings within the Karst feature. The only encroachments for that area will be for a parking lot and a covered bike rack. All of the buildings have been situated away from the sinkhole buffer areas. A portion of the driveway and a building are in the riparian buffer in the north. Staff is still working with petitioners to determine other possible mitigation measures that can be used, such as landscaping or other measures. There would be 149 parking spaces (one space per unit) and 0.58 parking spaces per bedroom. This project is not over-parked by any regard. This site is accessed and served by Bloomington Transit from 17th St. down Crescent Drive. With this petition, they would also install a side path along Crescent Drive, as a possible extension to the B-Line network that would go along Fountain Drive that would come down the line later on. There would also be a sidewalk system that would connect out to 14th Street to the east and to Glendora Drive to the north. Petitioners provide vehicular access and sidewalks for pedestrians, and bicycle parking for all residents as required. The exterior rendering includes a mix of materials, like stone masonry, veneer, lap siding, fiber cement boards. They request to allow that the buildings be higher than the 50-foot height limit. They are

residential style buildings with pitched roofs, the increased height as seen from the back view has an additional level which is below grade. From the front it's a 3-story building and from the back it's a 4-story building. The backside of the long building is shown (the largest building). The Growth Policies Plan is consulted heavily for this petition. It has a high level of connectivity to the surrounding properties. There are 3 access points. Staff felt that a project of this magnitude with tall clustered buildings, that allows for development focused in the center of the property, and still achieves the connectivity desire, would be a hard combination to achieve. A single-family subdivision development would be spread all over the site, and unable to achieve the infrastructure required. This type of high-density affordable housing project with all of the housing and parking clustered in the center accomplishes many of the goals set out in the GPP while trying to avoid all of the environmental factors on this site. It provides the opportunity for in-fill development and affordable housing. 70-80% of the units in this project will be used for affordable housing. The petitioners can speak of the specificity of the affordable housing. But 60% of the area low income demographic would be the prospective tenants. This provides a needed affordable housing market for Bloomington. Staff is here to discuss whether this location is appropriate for a high-density affordable housing development. Other affordable housing projects in this area have done quite well. Deviations from the environmental standards mentioned can be mitigated with certain measures, which staff and petitioners are working together to determine. Green building practices to be further incorporated may need to be commented on. The petitioner will be using solar lighting for all of the site lighting (street lights and perhaps building lighting). The affordable housing time commitment is proposed as a 30-year cycle (or perhaps a longer commitment). The amount of affordable housing with this petition is highly significant. This is the first petition of this type to cross the Plan Commission's docket in quite some time. It is a unique project.

Joy Skidmore, representing petitioner Mecca Companies, described the history of Mecca Companies, including its past projects, mission, experience in financing structures, commitments, and goals. Skidmore presented a project overview, including acreage, units, access points, and percentage (70-80%) of affordable units. Skidmore requested continuance to return for the June hearing, since Mecca is still working with the administration to specify the percentage of affordable housing and its time commitment to affordable housing. She invited feedback from the commission.

Wisler opened the floor to Commissioners' questions.

Maritano asked about the definition of project partnerships related to sustainability, long tenant and project partnerships.

Skidmore said that the petitioner has partnered with municipalities from a financing standpoint and in order to deliver the communities desired by the municipalities. They also partner with other investors.

Maritano asked about what will happen to the four acres on the perimeter in terms of tree preservation after the four acres in the middle are developed.

Brehob stated that the green highlighted area is the area of tree canopy coverage that would remain after development. One of their recent projects made a similar tree preservation commitment, and was placed in a conservation easement, which is defined in the UDO as far as what can be done. He anticipated that the same would be done for this project.

Kinzie asked if the site plan was designed to allow for maximum developable space.

Brehob said that nothing else could be squeezed in. Horizontally nothing can be added, only vertically.

Kappas asked staff if the petitioner has been able to see the Environmental Commission's memo.

Greulich surmised that the petitioner should have been able to look through the packet from the Environmental Commission (EC) thoroughly.

Kappas observed that this is only the second case in which they denied a petition for a number of reasons. He asked the petitioner how seriously they had looked at the Commission's memo to weigh what can and cannot be done.

Skidmore said that the petitioner would continue to look at green initiatives in the buildings. The Commission also mentioned a concern about tree clearing; the explanation was that the geotechnical engineer went to do soil borings to make sure that they would not be building on top of caves that would fall in. These individuals cut a path to get their truck through. It happened to be the same day that staff was on site; the assumption was that the petitioner was clearing, but that was not the case. Since then the geotechnical engineer has met with staff, including Greulich, to make a plan for a grading permit for initial borings done to ensure that they can build as planned.

Kappas said he would wait until June to find out more on this matter.

Mills asked about the level of success of other affordable housing in the area.

Greulich mentioned the Crescent Pointe single family neighborhood (attached and detached single-family housing). It's in great condition. There have been no problems with the infrastructure. The houses and properties are very well maintained. Staff would like to see more of those types of affordable starter homes. To the east, the Crestmont neighborhood is a well-maintained property in use. Staff firmly believes that the petitioner will be able to carry forward with a project similar to what was done to the north of this area. This project is unique because it is rental housing as opposed to owner-occupied housing, which provides a diverse type of housing instead of just the owner-occupied housing.

Roach mentioned an affordable housing project just north of 17th Street, named The Reserve at Chandler's Glen. It is also an affordable multi-family rental project that was built about twenty years ago. This is one more element of the cluster of affordable housing in this area.

Piedmont-Smith referred to Kappas's question, which she believed was not sufficiently answered. The Environmental Commission had several recommendations. She asked the petitioner which, if any, they intended to follow before the next meeting.

Skidmore stated that they very recently received the staff report the previous Friday. The petitioner is still working to review how to address those comments at the next meeting.

Piedmont-Smith asked to see the map of the riparian buffer and how much it overlaps with the development. Will it be part of the building itself, not just the driveway?

Greulich said that yes, there is a portion of the building on the north that will be in the riparian buffer as well as the steep slope area. This portion of the creek is what he would call the headwaters of the creek. It is not a defined channel, but rather the area that drains into the intermittent stream that is downstream from there. It is heavily wooded, like a series of gullies that runs through that area and connects to form a larger stream downhill. It is an intermittent stream, not a continuous stream. However, downhill there is a defined stream bed. It flows from west to east. The EC memo asked for additional borings on the site. Staff worked with petitioner to come up with a few more boring areas. Staff is trying to balance some of the EC's request for grid space network of borings all over the site, which would result in high amounts of disturbance and removal of vegetation and understory. Boring sites can be chosen based on the areas that will be accessed for the actual development, in order to limit the area that needs to be cleared to provide access for borings.

Skidmore said that the petitioner did not intend to carry out construction during the period when it is prohibited due to limits in place because of the bat habitat. She believed it was in September.

Piedmont-Smith said that it seemed that the petitioner would avoid doing a study to see if there are bats, assuming that there were bats there and avoiding construction in September.

Skidmore said that the petitioner would also do a tree inventory to record which trees would be removed as part of the project.

Piedmont-Smith asked about tree cover connectivity. This project would cut the tree canopy, leave most of the remaining canopy in the southwest and some in the northeast. She asked how that related to the green space around the site and asked staff to elaborate.

Greulich said that to the north of this property, there was a common area or conservation area that was set aside by the petition that is contiguous with the current property under question. The property to the south is still zoned residential single family. There are single-family houses up Crescent Drive. At some point in the future, if they were to develop in that area, there would be an opportunity to set aside more contiguous areas. But everything around here is already developed. There will be no future development in this immediate area. To the east, there is a single-family house that has undulating slopes and topography across it. However, most of this area is built out. There is an established single-family neighborhood to the east and a development to the north that was built out. There is an industrial PUD to the west on the west side of Crescent Drive but it is undetermined what may happen to that in the future.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was connectivity on the northeast corner.

Greulich answered that the land to the north and northeast of the property in question is owned by the petitioner and was slated to be incorporated in the single-family development but due to some power lines that were running through that track of land, there would be problems created with its development. It has therefore sat empty. The creek corridor is sitting empty and contains wooded area that will likely remain that way.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether that area was owned by Mecca or by the owners of the single-family development.

Brehob answered that it is owned by the owners of Crescent Pointe, some of whom are also involved with Mecca. When Greulich said "petitioner," that was partly accurate.

Greulich clarified that the lineage is somewhat diverse.

Maritano asked about the traffic impact.

Greulich said that staff anticipates that most of the traffic will come from Crescent and from 14th to the east. INDOT is currently working on the overpass for 17th St. and the City of Bloomington will be doing improvements to 17th street in the very near future to help reduce some of the sight distances and street problems. Recently (8-9 years ago) the City also fixed the intersection of Crescent and Fountain drive, which got rid of the 90-degree turn there with bad sight distance. That intersection was improved rather recently. Additionally, the roundabout that was done on 17th and Monroe fixed many of the sight distance issues.

Wisler opened up the floor for the public to comment.

Iris Wood, a Bloomington community member, stated that she and her husband have lived within walking distance of the property in question for 30 years. There are traffic concerns, including high traffic on 11th street. This development would only add to it. 14th Street only goes to Oolitic Drive. It could not be extended, Wood believed, because there is a house there. 14th Street is not accessible there. Crescent Point is a nice area, with all single-story housing. The idea of adding the development would create concerns because of the Karst Feature. Where Vernal Pike goes over State Road 37, after 17th is opened, a great deal of traffic will go into the roundabout at Monroe and 17th St. Traffic-wise and environmentally, she does not like the proposed development. And she and her husband just decided to improve the home where they live. (Inaudible speech as Wood walks away from the podium.)

****Piedmont moved to continue petition PUD-08-17 to the June 12, 2017 meeting. Kappas seconded.**

Wisler requested final comments from commissioners.

Piedmont-Smith agreed with the Environmental Commission's opinion that this is not an appropriate place for development. There are too many encroachments on sensitive environmental areas. She did not believe that the environmental integrity should be sacrificed for affordable housing. She may be convinced otherwise in the next month's hearing.

Cibor mentioned the need for more affordable housing, work force housing and diverse types of housing. He said that he was extremely happy that there was development with 70-80% of its units devoted to

affordable housing. However, he had some concerns about the location in relation to other types of low-income affordable housing. The environmental concerns are an issue, at the same time that the project improves connectivity. There are three access points that provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to various facilities; these are positive aspects. It ties into stubs that were put there for a reason. The next month's hearing will bring a tough decision and he looks forward to how the petitioner will address the Environmental Commission's comments. The connectivity presents a benefit. The bat issue usually becomes relevant when there is tree trimming or cutting, not when construction is going on. Building may not be an issue in timing, but rather when the bat habitat (trees) is being cleared or cut. The timing of affordable housing commitment has been ninety-nine years in the plan commission's recent record.

Kinzie said that much of the project is positive: where it is, who it serves, and its proximity to Bloomington Transit. One concern is the mass of the project's main building, and the environmental concerns are serious. She said she is concerned about too many encroachments on sensitive areas. She would like to see consideration on how to address the environmental concerns even more by reducing the mass and size of the buildings to ensure safety despite these environmental encroachments.

****ROLL CALL vote passed 8:0 - Case PUD-08-17 continued.**

Meeting adjourned.