

*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: [catstv.net](http://catstv.net)*

The Plan Commission met on June 26, 2017 in the Council Chambers at 401 N. Morton St. at 5:30 p.m. The members present: Nicholas Kappas, Heather Maritano, Brad Wisler, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Joe Hoffmann, Darryl Neher, Andrew Cibor, and Carol Stewart Gulyas.

## **ROLL CALL**

## **REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, stated that there had been a question in the last meeting regarding rules and quorum. The rules and state code state that a quorum is based on membership, not who is present.

Hoffmann stated that a quorum would be 5 of 9. To enact anything, a decision must be made by a majority of membership, which is also 5. Regardless of what a quorum would be, to make a decision 5 members are needed.

Robinson said that Hoffmann's description was correct. He said the earlier confusion had been about who was present versus membership. There had also been a request to outline the next steps of the process for the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP). The process is regulated by state code. If the plan is approved by the Plan Commission (PC), it will go on to City Council. Council can adopt, reject, or amend the CMP. Amendment would be done through resolution, and there is not a deadline for the Council to make a decision. The plan is not effective until the Council adopts it. If Council amends or rejects the CMP, it will come back to the PC with an explanation. PC would have 60 days to take action on the Council's amendments or rejection; the PC could ask for an extension on the 60 days if needed. If the PC does nothing on the Council's amendments, the CMP will be adopted as the Council has amended it. If the CMP is rejected and the PC does nothing, it will be rejected. If the PC amended the CMP once it comes back from Council, the CMP would go back to Council for another vote. The only time consideration would be after Council sends the CMP back to the PC after either amending or rejecting the CMP.

Hoffmann said that on the agenda for the present meeting is the adoption of the 2017 CMP. If it is adopted by the PC, the CMP will go to the City Council. The City Council, at its discretion, can schedule whatever time period it wants for consideration of the CMP. He asked if the PC had any guidance as to what the timeline from Council might be.

Robinson said he was not aware of anything specific yet. He said that Council was aware that the CMP would be headed to them soon.

Hoffmann said the Council has other items on its plate. City Council can adopt the CMP without changes, amend it and send it back to the PC. The PC would have 60 days to consider and change the CMP. If the PC gets the CMP back with amendment, the PC can approve the amendments, reject them, or do nothing. Approval would cause the amendments to go into effect immediately, rejection would cause them to go into effect if the Council did not agree, and doing nothing would cause them to go into effect after the 60 day deadline passes.

Robinson said PC could also ask for an extension or report back to Council that the PC had rejected the Council's amendments and give reasoning.

Hoffmann said that no matter what the PC does, the Council has the final say. Even if the PC revises amendments made by the Council and sends the CMP back, the Council can still decide it liked its own wording and reject the PC's revisions. At the end of the day, the Council action

becomes final. He asked if there was anything else that needed to be explained. No more amendments will be considered at the present meeting. It is an up or down vote regarding the adoption of the CMP. Going forward, issues with amendments will go directly to the City Council. He also asked if there will be more special meetings if the CMP comes back from City Council, or if further discussion of the CMP after it comes back from Council could be done at regular PC meetings.

Robinson said typically the discussion of the amendments would happen in the regular meeting.

Hoffmann said that the PC had discussion of the Council's action to look forward to in a later regular meeting.

**PETITIONS:**

- **MP-12-17      Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington**  
*Case Manager: Scott Robinson*

Hoffmann stated that the PC was there to consider one petition, MP-12-17, which is the adoption of the June 2017 draft of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington.

Robinson acknowledged the participation from community members throughout the last year. He also appreciated all the time spent by PC members thoroughly looking through the document. The PC members improved the document vastly and were very thorough. Staff supported the recommendation to approve the document. He stated that the process had been long and thorough, but that the CMP reflected what the community needs and desires.

Hoffmann pointed out that throughout the months that the PC had considered the draft 212 amendments were formally voted upon by the PC. He thanked Robinson and the entire staff on behalf of the PC. He stated that the PC had a petition to adopt the June 2017 draft of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington. There was not a staff report, so the public was invited to comment.

There were not any members of the public who wished to comment.

**\*\*Neher moved for the adoption of MP-12-17, June 2017 Draft of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington. Kappas seconded.**

Kappas thanked the Planning & Transportation Department and the community at large. He said working on the CMP was a fulfilling, but tiring, process. The process had been needed for a few years. He hoped that moving the CMP to City Council, and the amount of transparency the PC had shown already, would encourage community involvement. He expressed his hope that community involvement would help create a solid document that would remain in place for the next 20 years.

Maritano said that being a part of the CMP had been interesting and exciting. She felt that the process had been an opportunity to combat some criticisms that are heard in the community. She also said that the integrity, involvement, and investment from everyone had been incredible.

Wisler thanked staff, commissioners, and members of the public for their hard work. He also apologized for missing the previous meeting, and said that he understood some pivotal amendments had been discussed in the meeting. He asked about Amendments 4.4.3 and 5.3.5., which were related to student housing. His understanding was that they had passed, but he did

not see them in the version of the CMP posted online. He wanted to make sure that the right version of the document was being voted on, but he said that he may have downloaded the wrong version.

Hoffmann said it was a good question and important to look at before the vote. There were two amendments that directly addressed student-oriented developments that were voted on at the previous meeting. The draft in front of Hoffmann, which he had downloaded a few minutes previously, had policy 4.4.4 updated to reflect the amendment. The second amendment appeared as policy 5.3.4. Both amendments had appeared in the draft Hoffmann had just downloaded.

Wisler said he must have been looking at an older draft.

Hoffmann said that was possible because staff has been updating the drafts in real time. As recently as a few days prior, the draft had probably not been updated. He said that he was sorry that Wisler had not been able to be present at the last meeting, because he knew that Wisler had comments on the two amendments. He told Wisler that he could certainly take the comments to the City Council while they review the CMP.

Wisler said that he would briefly comment at the current meeting, and then share his comments with the City Council later. He said that it was his hope for the document is that it would address a significant issue facing the community in terms of the built environment: segregation. He felt segregation of use and population was a large problem in Bloomington. He said that the document addresses segregation of use. The document addresses issues in residential areas regarding integration, and proposes issues that were already in the works, such as Accessory Dwelling Units. His hope was to bring people of different background and stations in life together. The community must become more integrated, and stop putting one group or class of people in one geographic location and another group or class of people in another. The way the last few amendments were written had concerned him, although Wisler said he understood the reason for the amendments. The CMP will set the tone for the community, so it is not appropriate to write language that targets one particular group of Bloomington residents. The PC does not target any other group in the community and try to push them into living in only one area. He wished there was a better way to address the concerns than the one that the amendments had spelled out. He apologized for not being present at the meeting to put forth alternative language. Largely, the CMP paints a vision of a more integrated community.

Piedmont-Smith said that the CMP was at least 10 times better than the draft from the summer 2016. She praised staff and their hard work. She mentioned that she would continue to work on the CMP as a City Council member, but she believed that the hardest work had been done, and done well. She appreciated all of the different viewpoints brought forth by the other Commissioners. She said it is valuable to get different points of view, and hoped to get the different points of view on City Council when they debate the CMP. She was pleased to support the document.

Hoffmann read a message from Commissioner Kinzie – she wished she could be at the meeting to recognize the significant progression point for the Bloomington CMP. She thanked staff, Commissioners, and all those who weighed in on the CMP. She was hopeful that the goals, policies, and outcomes identified would lead the community into the next phase of Bloomington Planning.

Stewart Gulyas said she wanted to thank staff for thorough work as well. She also thanked Hoffmann for the efficient way he lead meetings in a productive way. She was also grateful for all the time Piedmont-Smith put into the process. She said that everyone put in a lot of time, but Piedmont-Smith went through the CMP with a very fine pencil.

Piedmont-Smith reminded everyone that the CMP is just a planning document. It is an important document, but it does not have the force of law. The next step is to update the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), and that has the force of law. She encouraged everyone to stay involved as the PC crafts the laws based on the vision of the CMP.

Hoffmann stated that the UDO has the force of law, so it was not time for anyone to rest on their laurels.

Cibor had no additional comments.

Neher expressed gratitude to staff. The early work has endless possibilities, and staff has to begin to focus it in. The CMP is a jumping off point to really start doing the work. He encouraged everyone that had comments, questions, or ideas to get involved with the CMP at the Council level. He also said the document is for the entire community. He said he understood Wisler's concerns. He stated that the UDO is where the heavy lifting will end up taking place. He thanked the administration for letting the PC slow down to include more time for the public to submit amendments.

Hoffmann thanked staff, Robinson in particular, for being remarkably patient with the PC as they have gone through the process. Robinson will continue to work with the CMP at the Council level, and his work is reflected in the document. He thanked the public at large, all the various boards, commissions, stakeholders, neighborhood organizations, and the Chamber. He hoped and believed that the document reflected the best aspirations of the community. There has been disagreement about some specific aspects, but notwithstanding those disagreements the document reflects where Bloomington is as a community and where it would like to go.

**The motion passed 7:1 with Wisler dissenting.**

Meeting adjourned.