

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, January 17, 2018 at 6:33pm with Council President Dorothy Granger presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL  
REGULAR SESSION  
January 17, 2018

Roll Call: Ruff, Sturbaum (arrived 6:37pm), Chopra, Piedmont-Smith, Granger, Volan, Sandberg, Sims, Rollo  
Members Absent: None

ROLL CALL  
[6:31pm]

Council President Dorothy Granger gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION  
[6:31pm]

There were no minutes for approval at the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont Smith read a passage from a speech given by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

REPORTS [6:33pm]  
• COUNCIL MEMBERS

Councilmember Allison Chopra recognized the members of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Commission and complimented them on a recent program.

Jim Blickensdorf, Chair of the Parking Commission, presented a financial report on the city's parking system, a copy of which would be kept in the City Clerk's Office. He reviewed the 2016 financial status of the parking system, the Parking Commission's approach to parking policy, and how pricing might influence consumer behavior.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES

Councilmember Andy Ruff asked if differential pricing referred to pricing that would change based on time, location, or both factors.

Council Questions:

Blickensdorf said it generally referred to pricing based on location.

Chopra asked if there were data that showed how the installation of parking meters had changed parking utilization rates during May and June.

Blickensdorf said that occupancy rates could only be tracked by looking at meter data. He said there were no data about utilization rates before the meters were installed.

Councilmember Steve Volan said there had been some counts completed as part of previous parking studies, but those counts had not been paired with data from the meters. He imagined that parking utilization rates had not decreased after the installation after the meters. He thought that data could be better organized for a future report.

Councilmember Jim Sims asked if the Parking Commission had given any consideration to the idea of shared parking at various large lots in the city.

Blickensdorf said it had been discussed generally but specific locations had not been discussed.

Sims noted that the neighborhood parking program was not put in place to generate revenue, but to help provide parking for neighborhood residents. He asked if raising the amounts for violations of those regulations had been considered.

Blickensdorf pointed out that many of the neighborhood zones had changed over time. He suggested that fee structures could be different depending on the zone. He pointed out that permit fees for the neighborhood zones had not been raised in years.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum asked whether the high number of tickets issued in the neighborhood zones was evidence of high competition for those spots and the need to continue providing protection for those neighborhoods.

Blickensdorf said that was one way to look at the issue. But he cautioned that there were only a limited number of spots available in the zones. He said some zones did not have enough available spots for the permits issued.

There were no committee reports.

There was no public comment.

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

There was no additional public comment.

Clerk's Note: On August 29, 2017, the Common Council called to order a Special Session, which began the Council's consideration of Resolution 17-28 to be completed over a series of meetings. At its meeting on October 24, 2017, the Council adopted a motion to extend its deliberations of Resolution 17-28. At its meeting on January 10, 2018, the Council introduced Resolution 18-01 while also affirming and ratifying all actions taken in regard to the Comprehensive Plan (Plan) in 2017. Please refer to the minutes from those meetings for a description of the procedure for consideration of the resolution and amendments thereto.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt amendments (115, 119, 121, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173, 176, 178) listed under the consent agenda.

The motion to adopt amendments listed under the consent agenda received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Councilmember Dave Rollo introduced and described the amendment. He read the text it would add to the Plan introduction.

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, said that staff supported the amendment and had no concerns about many of the upcoming amendments. He explained that staff requested that the amendments not be placed on the consent agenda largely because the amendments added new text to the Plan, which he thought warranted discussion.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 116.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 116 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Gwen White, Jan Sorby, Cynthia Bretheim, and Jon Lawrence spoke in support of the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Rollo for proposing the amendment.

Ruff thanked Rollo for the amendment.

#### REPORTS (cont'd)

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

- PUBLIC

#### APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

#### ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

#### CONTINUATION OF CONSIDERATION OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (PROPOSED IN 2018 BY RESOLUTION 18-01 AND IN 2017 BY RESOLUTION 17-28) [7:30pm]

#### Resolution 18-01 - To Adopt the City's Comprehensive Plan

#### CONSENT AGENDA:

#### Vote on Consent Agenda Items [7:35pm]

#### Amendment 116

#### Amendment 01 to Amendment 116

#### Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 116 [7:45pm]

#### Public Comment:

#### Council Comment:

Volan said that Bloomington had been steadily growing, in large part because of larger enrollments at Indiana University (IU). He cautioned that growth should not be a substitute for sustainability. He supported the amendment.

Amendment 116 (cont'd)

Councilmember Susan Sandberg noted that IU had recently admitted its largest class. She expected that its growth would continue and thought that the city should plan accordingly within the framework of sustainability.

Rollo said the amendment did not specify what type of quality of life indicator should be used, so that an appropriate indicator could be selected later.

The motion to adopt Amendment 116 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 116 as amended [8:01pm]

Ruff introduced and read the amendment.

Amendment 117

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Rollo said he supported the amendment and the idea that growth should not be confused with quality of life.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith thanked Ruff for proposing the amendment. She thought it did a good job of providing context for the Plan. She agreed that physical growth, by itself, was not sustainable. She appreciated the clarifications provided by the amendment.

Ruff thanked staff for working with him on the amendment. He clarified that the amendment was not in response to some intentional statement by staff that called for growth as a proxy for economic development. He proposed it to avoid misinterpretations of the Plan.

The motion to adopt Amendment 117 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 117 [8:10pm]

Ruff introduced and read the amendment. He thought that labor had been inadvertently omitted from the Plan and explained that the amendment was meant to rectify that.

Amendment 118

Robinson said the omission of labor in the Plan was not intentional and staff supported the amendment.

Jackie Yenna spoke in support of the amendment.

Public Comment:

Sandberg thanked Ruff for the amendment. She thought conversations about affordability in the community were incomplete without conversations about wages. She noted the important role labor played in fighting for fair wages.

Council Comment:

Rollo agreed with Sandberg's comments and thanked Ruff for noticing the oversight.

Piedmont-Smith read another passage from a speech given by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr that emphasized the importance of the labor movement. She thought it was important to include the labor community as part of the Plan.

Amendment 118 (cont'd)

Ruff thanked the members of the labor community who had provided suggestions for the amendment.

Granger thanked Ruff and commented on the importance of labor organizations.

The motion to adopt Amendment 118 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 118 [8:23pm]

Ruff introduced and read the amendment. He thought the concept of import substitution was important to include in the Plan.

Amendment 120

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 120.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 120

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 120 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 120 [8:29pm]

Piedmont-Smith thanked Ruff for the amendment. She agreed import substitution was important and should be a part of sustainability.

Council Comment:

Volan expanded on the concept of import substitution and said he supported the amendment.

Rollo said the amendment was a valuable addition to the Plan. He encouraged people to buy local products and reviewed some of the benefits of doing so.

Sandberg said supporting local businesses also helped local non-profit organizations.

Ruff spoke about how conserving energy allowed local money to stay in the community.

The motion to adopt Amendment 120 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 120 as amended [8:37pm]

Sandberg introduced and described the amendment. She explained that an amendment previously considered had included confusing language and Amendment 122 was intended to revise and clarify that language. She detailed the methodology used to create projected population levels and housing needs for the city through 2040.

Amendment 122

Volan agreed that concerns over the previous amendment were warranted and more context was needed. He thanked Sandberg and staff for the effort put into Amendment 122.

Sandberg added that a more comprehensive housing study might be needed in the future.

Robinson thanked Sandberg and Volan for working with staff on the amendment.

Councilmember Jim Sims hoped that any future housing study would look at individuals who worked in Bloomington but lived outside Monroe County due to its high cost of housing.

Amendment 122 (cont'd)  
Council Comments:

Volan agreed with Sims' comment and looked forward to such a housing study.

Piedmont-Smith said she appreciated the amendment, because having good data was important. She, Volan, and Amelia Lewis, Zoning and Long Range Planner, discussed the chart included with the amendment.

Sturbaum noted that the chart reflected that many residents were paying more for housing than they could afford.

Sorby spoke in favor of the amendment.

Public Comment:

Volan said the data in the amendment made was more reflective of the trends in Bloomington than the previous language. He said the amendment also reflected the disparity in available housing for people with certain income levels.

Council Comment:

Granger said data were important and she appreciated the graph that accompanied the amendment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 122 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 122 [8:54pm]

Ruff introduced and described the amendment.

Amendment 125

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Sorby thanked Ruff for the amendment.

Public Comment:

Sturbaum said the amendment made good changes that better reflected the spirit of Bloomington.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 125 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 125 [8:59pm]

Rollo introduced and described the amendment.

Amendment 131

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Sturbaum asked if Rollo considered creating a Bloomington happiness report, based on Bhutan's Gross National Happiness concept. He thought such a report could be done annually.

Council Questions:

Rollo said the amendment called for a general quality of life survey, but he thought whatever measurement tool was used should have utility and be comparable to other cities.

Piedmont-Smith asked why "Quality of Life Survey" was capitalized in the amendment if it did not refer to a specific survey. She suggested amending the amendment.

Sturbaum thought it was appropriate to capitalize the term, as it could refer to a specific report in the future.

John Kennedy spoke about the importance of local control and input on a future quality of life survey.

Public Comment:

Terry Amsler suggested amending the amendment to indicate the survey would be recurring.

Amendment 131 (cont'd)

Sturbaum suggested adding that the quality of life survey would be citizen-created and recurring.

Council Comment:

Chopra asked if Sturbaum's suggested changes would pose problems when it came time for the city to actually conduct the survey.

Robinson said the Plan should be general and not specify how the city would phrase the request for proposals.

Rollo thought inserting the word recurring was appropriate.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 131

Rollo moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 131.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 131 [9:14pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 131 was approved by unanimous consent.

Vote on Amendment 131 as amended [9:15pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 131 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Amendment 132

Piedmont-Smith introduced and described the amendment.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Council Questions:

Sims asked if the amendment was directed at the administration.

Piedmont-Smith said that the Plan as a whole applied to all of city government, but said that the administration often initiated annexation proposals.

Public Comment:

Lawrence spoke in support of the amendment.

Council Comment:

Sandberg thought the amendment was a good idea. She noted that the city and county had been in discussions during a recent annexation proposal before the state legislature passed legislation to end the city's annexation efforts.

Volan echoed Sandberg's comments.

Sturbaum said discussing such proposals with the county made sense.

Chopra believed the administration would discuss such proposals with the county regardless of whether the Plan called for it or not. She said she supported the amendment.

Vote on Amendment 132 [9:20pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 132 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Amendment 138

Rollo introduced and described the amendment.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Council Comment:

Sims asked if the standards included in the amendment were the minimum federal drinking water standards.

Rollo said that was correct, and added that the Utilities Department already attempted to meet those standards 100% of the

time. He explained the amendment simply encapsulated that goal within the Plan.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Rollo for proposing the amendment and for incorporating her suggestions into the amendment.

Rollo thanked the Friends of Lake Monroe group, who had suggested the amendment to Rollo.

The motion to adopt Amendment 138 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rollo introduced and described the amendment. He explained the amendment was the product of revising the previously introduced Amendment 100. He said the amendment was meant to encourage maintaining the rhythm and character of a particular area.

Piedmont-Smith added that the amendment allowed contemporary or modern architecture as long as that architecture fit with the existing characteristics of an area.

Robinson noted that a reference in the amendment needed to be updated to reflect a change in the policy numbers. He also questioned the need for the amendment. He noted staff supported the original language in the Plan and thought the amendment actually contradicted other portions of the Plan.

Sturbaum said there was a difference between diversity of housing types and diversity of housing design. He asked why there was encouragement for diverse design.

Robinson said it fit within Goal 5.2 and was consistent with the overall structure of that goal. He thought the amendment was a directive to do nothing but maintain, which conflicted with other portions of the Plan that encouraged diversity in housing. He said there were regulations within the city's zoning ordinance to ensure compatibility with things like set-backs, heights, and materials. He said he did not see the need to revise the original policy.

Piedmont-Smith thought the amendment flowed naturally from the goal by sustaining neighborhood character and building neighborhood pride through the built environment. She also agreed with Sturbaum that there was a difference between diverse housing types and diverse housing designs. She thought there was no conflict.

Volan asked what other aspects of a type of housing existed other than prevailing pattern of development, building distribution, and scale.

Piedmont-Smith said one could distinguish between single family or multi-family housing. She said a house could fit in with the surrounding building character but be a duplex or triplex.

Volan said he still saw contradictions and was not persuaded by the explanation.

Granger asked Dan Sherman, Council Attorney, if a friendly amendment was needed to correct the reference to Policy 5.2.6.

Sherman confirmed that the change was in writing.

Lawrence commented on the distinction between housing types and housing designs. He thought the amendment was meant to encourage compatible design.

Amendment 138 (cont'd)

Vote on Amendment 138 [9:25pm]

Amendment 100-R

Council Questions:

Public Comment:

Sorby spoke in favor of the amendment.

Amendment 100-R (cont'd)

Bretheim spoke in support of the amendment.

Council Comment:

Rollo asked staff to respond to the comments pointing out a contradiction between sustaining neighborhood character but also encouraging diverse architectural design.

Robinson said the goal was talking about housing in the community, not just neighborhoods. He reiterated that staff supported the original language in the Plan and did not understand the need to amend it. He did not think the original language would allow someone to build something in a neighborhood that was out of context.

Sturbaum thought the amendment made the language clearer and would support it.

Piedmont-Smith did not think the amendment prevented diverse architecture and said it would help allay concerns for neighborhoods, so she would support it.

Volan thought the amendment created a conflict with Amendment 141, or would confuse readers of the Plan who had not followed the meetings where housing types were discussed.

Rollo said he supported the amendment.

Granger said she would support the amendment and did not think it was incompatible with Amendment 141.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 100-R

Granger moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 100-R.

Vote on Amendment 100-R as amended [9:58pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 100-R was approved by unanimous consent.

Council Comment:

Ruff said he agreed with staff and would vote no on the amendment.

Sims said he was concerned the amendment would discourage neighborhoods from having a diverse range of income levels.

Piedmont-Smith said Policy 5.1.3 encouraged a wide range of housing options and types for all income levels.

Vote on Amendment 100-R as amended [10:02pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 100-R as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 3 (Ruff, Volan, Sims), Abstain: 1 (Chopra).

Amendment 104-R

Rollo introduced and described the amendment. He explained that a previous version had been introduced and withdrawn, but was reintroduced after revision.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Public Comment:

Sorby spoke in support of the amendment.

Bretheim requested that the Council listen to the concerns of residents and spoke in support of the amendment.

Council Comment:

Chopra said she appreciated the amendment for affirmatively stating what the city wanted as opposed to what it did not want.

Vote on Amendment 104-R [10:08pm]



The motion to adopt Amendment 104-R received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Ruff introduced and described the amendment. He explained that even if the city had the ability and means to expand roadways, there would be limited interest in doing so.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 148 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rollo introduced and described the amendment.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Sorby spoke in support of the amendment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 159 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Piedmont-Smith introduced and described the amendment. She explained that the amendment was an attempt to describe where increased density would be appropriate.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Sturbaum said he read the amendment as leaving open the possibility of three or four-story buildings but not as prescribing them.

Piedmont-Smith agreed.

Volan asked if College Avenue was an urban corridor.

Piedmont-Smith thought that a portion of the street might fall into that category, but a majority of it was in the downtown district.

Volan asked if urban corridors were not considered part of downtown.

Piedmont-Smith said that was correct.

Volan asked if urban corridors were the only place that were appropriate for taller developments.

Piedmont-Smith said no. She said the amendment merely encouraged higher densities in urban corridors.

Volan asked if a similar statement was made in other districts.

Piedmont-Smith thought not, but said there were already taller buildings downtown.

Volan pointed out that many residents opposed taller buildings, even downtown. He asked why taller buildings would be accepted in urban corridors.

Piedmont-Smith thought that most residents opposed buildings taller than four stories but there was still a need for additional development and increased density somewhere. She thought the urban corridors were an appropriate location for such density.

Sorby, Lawrence, and Brethem spoke in support of the amendment.

Sturbaum thought the amendment was broad but said he would trust that the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) update process and other systems would not allow buildings in inappropriate locations.

Amendment 148

Vote on Amendment 148  
[10:11pm]

Amendment 159

Public Comment:

Vote on Amendment 159  
[10:13pm]

Amendment 170

Council Questions:

Public Comment:

Council Comment:

Granger said she liked the amendment and appreciated that it stated things in positive terms rather than listing what the city did not want.

Amendment 170 (cont'd)

Volan said he thought members of the public were mostly concerned with building height and size. He suggested that the Council and the Council of Neighborhood Associations (CONA) should educate the public about the UDO and the Plan. He said he did not oppose the amendment.

Sandberg said she had heard concerns about increased density, but she said additional housing had to go somewhere. She liked that the amendment specified where it was most appropriate to put such housing.

Rollo thought the urban corridors were logical locations for higher densities. He thought additional details could be worked out later and would support the amendment.

Volan reiterated his earlier comments.

Piedmont-Smith said some residents had concerns other than height, including lack of modulation, uninteresting architecture, and little interest for pedestrians.

Chopra said she also heard complaints about big, tall buildings, but wondered what the alternative to such buildings would be. She did not think the answer was urban sprawl. She said she would be voting no because she thought the UDO update process was a more appropriate time to discuss the issue.

Vote on Amendment 170  
[10:36pm]

Amendment 174

The motion to adopt Amendment 170 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 1 (Volan).

Piedmont-Smith introduced and read the amendment. She described the concept of a Lifetime Community and explained that the Commission on Aging had been working on the concept for some time.

Council Comment:

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Sandberg said the concept of a Lifetime Community was exciting and interesting. She said she would help encourage and support such developments any way she could.

Vote on Amendment 174  
[10:40pm]

Amendment 175

The motion to adopt Amendment 174 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan introduced and described the amendment.

Vote on Amendment 175  
[10:43pm]

Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Amendment 177

The motion to adopt Amendment 175 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan introduced and described the amendment.

Robinson said staff supported the amendment. Robinson also thanked the Council for its time and attention to review and amend the Plan as a whole. He appreciated the effort the Council put into the review process.

Volan thanked Robinson and staff for their efforts.

Amendment 177 (cont'd)  
Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked how the acknowledgements page could be edited if names were missing.

Volan suggested that the page could be edited after adoption but before it was published. He also suggested that Council could authorize staff to make amendments.

Sherman suggested that the Council President could be authorized to review the page and approve it.

Chopra suggested that Council staff be listed on the page.  
Volan said he would support that.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 177

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 177.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 177 [10:52pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 177 was approved by unanimous consent.

Vote on Amendment 177 as amended [10:54pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 177 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Resolution 18-01 - To Adopt the City's Comprehensive Plan

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-01 be adopted.

Council Comment:

Ruff, Sturbaum, Piedmont-Smith, Granger, Volan, Sandberg, Sims, and Rollo expressed appreciation and thanks to all those who had worked on and provided input for the Plan.

Vote on Resolution 18-01 [11:06pm]

The motion to adopt Resolution 18-01 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [11:07pm]

The Council and Sherman spoke about the upcoming schedule.

Volan moved and it was seconded to cancel the Committee of the Whole scheduled for January 24, 2018. The motion was approved by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08pm.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 2nd day of May, 2018.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

Dorothy Granger  
Dorothy Granger, PRESIDENT  
Bloomington Common Council

Nicole Bolden  
Nicole Bolden, CLERK  
City of Bloomington