

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

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on April 9, 2018 at 5:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers #115. Members present: Cibor, Kappas, Sandberg, Maritano, Wisler, Hoffmann, Cate.

SPECIAL HEARING:

DP-24-17 City of Bloomington Redevelopment Commission
610 N. Rogers St.
Final plat approval of a six-lot subdivision of 4.97 acres.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Brad Wisler recused himself from this hearing. He is on the board of directors for Dimension Mill, Inc.

The property is in the commercial downtown district in the Showers Technology Park overlay. The GPP designation, filed before the Comprehensive Plan approval, is downtown. The current use is Open Space and Parking. This final plat was approved at the September 27th Plan Commission on the via the consent agenda. Final plats are good and must be recorded within six months of approval. 6 months has elapsed since this plat's approval. During the time since approval was given, the parties have been moving toward being prepared for final platting and missed the deadline. The plat is ready to be recorded now. The Department is requesting that the petition be reapproved based on the findings in the report distributed to the Plan Commission. The only thing that has changed is that two conditions listed have since been removed because they are already requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance. The third condition that was modified slightly requires that covenants and restrictions be reviewed by staff before they are recorded. Those will not be ready by the time the final plat is ready to be recorded. The UDO does not require that these be recorded at the same time. The Department recommends approval with the one condition mentioned previously.

Hoffmann reiterated that this is a final plat that was approved in September by Plan Commission and it needs to be reapproved for the technical reason that it was not recorded within the 6 month time limit.

****Kappas moved to approve DP-24-17 with the conditions as listed. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by a 6:0 roll call vote.**

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on April 9, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers #115. Members present: Cibor, Kappas, Sandberg, Maritano, Wisler, Hoffmann, Cate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January, February, March 2018

****Sandberg moved to approve the January, February, and March 2018 minutes. Cate seconded. Motion carried by a voice vote.**

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO MAY:

SP-41-17 Chi Group USA LLC
408 E. Sixth St.
Site plan approval to allow the construction of a new mixed-use building with 4,700 sq. ft. of commercial space and 8 apartments.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

***Note: Per PC Rules, a vote is needed to continue.**

****Cate moved to continue SP-41-17 to May 14th. Maritano seconded. Kappas abstained. Motion carried**

by a voice vote.

SP-48-17 **Grant Properties (Doug McCoy)**
114 E. 7th St.
Site plan approval for a 4-story, mixed-use building with 22 condominium units in the Commercial Downtown (CD) zoning district.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Anahit Behjou, Assistant City Attorney, gave an update about House Bill 1035 or short term rentals. At this time, there are no regulations for the City of Bloomington. The change of the law does not affect those municipalities who had regulations in place before January 1st, 2018.

Hoffmann clarified that this was being reported because one of the members of the Plan Commission attended the County Plan Commission heard a report that the County did not have to make any changes to their current ordinance relating to short term rentals because they had something in place before January 1st, 2018. The Plan Commission then requested an update about this, which Behjou provided.

Kappas reported no new developments from County Plan Commission. They are looking to have a first draft of the Condensed Development Ordinance soon.

CONSENT AGENDA:

ZO-47-17 **City of Bloomington**
Amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance concerning sidewalk construction requirements and sidewalk variance standards and procedures.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

UV-03-18 **David Howard**
608 N. Dunn St.
Use Variance review and recommendation to the BZA to allow a ground floor residential dwelling unit in the Commercial Limited (CL) zoning district.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

****Sandberg moved to approve ZO-47-17 and UV-03-18. Cibor seconded. Motion carried by 7:0 roll call vote.**

PETITIONS:

PUD-27-17 **Public Investment Corporation**
2700 W. Tapp Rd.
PUD Final Plan approval and preliminary and final plat approval of a 24-lot subdivision.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Terri Porter, Director of Planning & Transportation, made a brief statement regarding both of the petitions on the agenda. They both require two hearings and this hearing is the first of two for both of the petitions. Typically Staff likes to give a recommendation for approval or denial and explain the rationale. The Commission will not be asked to vote tonight because it is the first hearing for both.

Eric Greulich presented the Staff report. This property was rezoned in 1987 to allow for an office, commercial/industrial park. It received its development plan approval in 1991 and the same year, a development plan approval was issued to allow for Deborah Dr. and Schmaltz Dr. to be extended and wrap through the site. In 1973, the environmental preservation standards were very different than they are now. There was very little

environmental preservation on the site. The site has several sinkholes, creeks, and tree preservation throughout the site. The property to the west of this was approved and built out as an office park. World Wide Automotive went in along Schmaltz and Hoosier Energy occupied the remainder of the lots. In 2003, there was an attempt to redevelop this site as well as the northern and western portion of this site with a much larger vision for a commercial retail corridor as well as single and multi-family housing. This petition was eventually withdrawn due to obstacles they faced. The petitioner is coming forward today to redevelop this. The site as a whole is 54 acres with another 50 acres to the north of this included in the PUD. This petition only deals with the southern part of the site. To the south of this site is the Southern Indiana Medical Park. They did purchase Right-of-Way across from the site with the idea of putting in a roundabout. The idea at this time was to relocate Weimer road to the west. The thought behind this was to make it easier to travel in this part of town but to also to give the Parks & Recreation Department a location for the Clear Creeks Trail. The petitioner filed this petition in August 2017. Staff did not believe the relocation of Weimer Rd. to be high priority. Since then, Staff has further discussed it and the potential benefits. Staff has determined it would most likely be best to move Weimer Rd., but hopes to hear the Commission and public's thoughts. There have been flooding issues at the intersection of Weimer Rd. and Country Club Rd. The bridge across Clear Creek is narrow as well. Moving Weimer Rd. would widen that bridge and get the intersection out of the floodplain. In addition, it provides a more direct alignment of the future path of Weimer Rd. through this area down to Fullerton and through the Southern Indiana Medical Park and Bill Brown Properties. The location of the ROW/roundabout purchase in the center of this property aligns it between some of the sinkholes to avoid them. There are many steep slopes in the site as well as a ridgeline. The location of the drive cut were chosen to give the best access to the Southern Indiana Medical Park. The petitioner has attempted to meet all current environmental preservation regulations from the UDO. There is a large portion of this project that has trails on it from Wapehani Park to the west. The petitioner is working with the Parks Dept. to give one of the lots here in order to allow for the trails to still be located on Parks property. This is a great benefit to the community. This site is required to preserve at least 60% of the existing tree canopy coverage, which the petitioner is meeting. The sinkholes on the site have been set aside in the required Karst preservation easements. There is a 10 foot no-build required adjacent to the sinkholes and Staff will ensure that that is shown on the upcoming plats. This petition would involve extending Schmaltz Dr. through the site and the relocation of Weimer Rd. through the site. One of the other areas of comments being sought from the Plan Commission is, "What mechanisms might best allow or guarantee that Weimer Rd. will be extended and connected to the existing Weimer Rd?". Sometime in the next 10-25 years, the northern portion of the PUD will develop. This portion of the city, the remaining portion of the Woolery PUD to the east, and the Sudberry PUD to the northeast of this site have been slowly building out. When I-69 is finished, there will be more residential interest in this area. While Staff is confident that the remainder of the PUD will build out at some time in the future, they are seeking ways to ensure that Weimer does get extended all the way to the current Weimer alignment. The internal roads would all be public. There would be two cul-de-sac roads coming off of the Weimer Rd. extension. The northern most road is proposed to be a normal public road with 50 feet of Right-of-Way dedication, sidewalk, and street trees on both sides. The southern road that is the extension of Schmaltz Dr. has adjacent sinkholes. For this reason, the petitioner is requesting to modify the typical cross-section for a public street to only require a sidewalk and street trees on the south side. The north side of the street would not have a sidewalk and would only have street trees installed afterwards to minimize disturbance, preserve trees, and preserve Karst features in that area. The extension of Schmaltz Dr. would be treated differently than a typical public street. The Weimer Rd. extension through this site would present the opportunity to design a primary connector street. Staff is accommodating vehicle traffic but also being attentive to alternative transportation needs. The cross section for the new Weimer Rd. would include bike lanes, sidewalks, and tree plots on both sides. This is all being fit into a 60 feet of ROW. The cross section for internal roads would have sidewalks and street trees on the north side of the road with 50 feet of ROW with two 12 ft. travel lanes. One of the other items Staff wants to bring to the Plan Commission's attention is the use list that was approved with this petition. The use list was approved under the 1973 zoning code and it was based on the manufacturing light zoning district. It was somewhat industrial park in nature, but had a lot of commercial uses as well. Staff has routinely run into problems when trying to apply a use list where there are not definitions for the uses listed. Staff is seeking any comments from the Plan Commission making an interpretation from the use list of this development that it would be those of commercial general district. Four uses from the currently allowed use list that would not be allowed uses in the commercial general district are: auto truck sales, motorcycle sales, taxi stands, and auto repair. Staff wishes to hear the Plan Commission's comments on the following questions: 1. The Department seeks clarification on how the relocation of Weimer Rd. will best serve the city? 2. Resolution on how to ensure that Weimer Rd. will be extended north to connect with the existing Weimer Rd. 3.

What measures should be incorporated to offset the environmental impacts of the proposed bridge crossings. 4. Is the current list of permitted uses for the Commercial General zoning appropriate rather than the previous list of ML uses? 5. Is no sidewalk along the north side of Schmaltz Drive appropriate? 6. Are the proposed phasing lines shown on the plat appropriate? The petitioner is also proposing that this project happen in three phases. The first phase would be the lots along Tapp Rd. on the south side of the site. It would include Weimer Rd. relocation up to the north and would stop around where lot 17 and 16 are. Phase 2 would be the extension of the cul-de-sac to the east. Phase 3 would be the extension of Weimer Rd. to the north property line, involving the second creek crossing.

The petitioner, Steve Brehob of Smith Brehob & Associates, introduced himself. He explained that he and his team have been working with staff on this for a while in order for the project to meet the City's goals as well as the developer's. He clarified that the first phase would be lots 1-8, the second phase would be constructing Weimer to the north (lots 9-20), and the third phase would be the lots adjacent to Weimer Rd. Lastly, they would extend the Weimer Rd. north. They would want to tie phasing to market demand, as the timing may be unpredictable.

Maritano asked what Schmaltz Rd's traffic is like, referencing back to the sidewalk request.

Brehob answered that Schmaltz Rd. intersects Deborah Dr. and makes a 90 degree turn and goes south. They would continue Schmaltz Rd. to the east and end it in a cul-de-sac. The thinking behind not having sidewalks on the north side was the development lots being on the south side of the road, making the north side of the road adjacent to the preservation area. If they were to make a sidewalk on this side, they would need to grade further as well as clear further.

Maritano clarified that there would be nothing to walk across the sidewalk to.

Brehob said it would make more sense to not have the sidewalk in that area in order to not disturb the landscape for no reason.

Maritano asked what would happen to the existing Weimer Rd.

Greulich responded the petitioner would construct a 12 ft. wide asphalt side path on the west side of Weimer Rd. Instead of installing a sidewalk that would be removed at a later time, they would install this side path. When the final stage of this gets done and Weimer Rd. would connect to the existing S curve, all of Weimer Rd. would be most likely removed. It depends on the condition of Weimer Rd. at the time.

Cibor asked how the proposed roundabout and relocated Weimer Rd. would be connected and tie into each other.

Brehob said that he assumed the Plan Commission would have input on how Weimer Rd. would tie into the S curve on the north end, which is why the plans don't show it extending all the way at this point. Right now, it is pointed up toward the ridgetop. When this discussion first came about when the City purchased the Right-of-Way to extend the road, it ran north, tied into the S curve, and Weimer Rd. was taken out. It made a T intersection with the entrance that goes back to Wapehani Park. Other than pointing the road in the right direction, no design has been done regarding how it would tie into the S curve.

Cibor asked for clarification about whether the creek on the site would be where there is one crossing.

Brehob said that the crossing would be where it forks and this development would be to the east of where the fork is.

Cibor asked if it would roughly follow where the trees are cleared.

Brehob said yes, and that as the development goes to the north, they want to hug the tree line on the west side. The cleared area is not very wide. If a road was run down the middle, the resulting lots would be small. The wooded area to the north is more encumbered with mountain bike trails than the wooded area to the south. The idea is to get the road over to the edge of the woods and have the development lots to the east side of the road.

Cate asked if the new road goes between two sinkholes.

Greulich answered that Weimer Rd. going through between the sinkholes would avoid the preservation areas and the no-build areas.

Cate asked if any instability in the area around the sinkholes could pose a threat to the roads.

Brehob said that they have done development similar to this several times. There is adequate distance between the two sinkholes to provide a buffer area. There is a portion in the UDO in the environmental section that has a regulation about two sinkholes being within so many feet of each other, then they are a compound sinkhole. These sinkholes are not near being close enough together for this. If they were closer together, there would be more concern.

Kappas asked if the petitioner owned the lot north to the PUD.

Brehob confirmed.

Kappas asked if this was how they would ensure Weimer got built all the way through.

Brehob confirmed.

Wisler said many years ago the Plan Commission looked at a proposal that involved some reclamation of the quarry and there was a lot of concerns about the drainage. Wisler asked if there were any similar concerns with this project, like runoff to the south.

Brehob said for this project, they will have to install storm water detention basins. Rather than having them on individual lots, they will have two larger basins in the common area lots. They have enough area that they will be able to meet the needs of drainage and detention.

Hoffmann noted he was on the Plan Commission in 1987 and 1991 when this PUD originally came through. He asked for clarification on the number of sinkholes: are there 5 or are there 7?

Greulich said there are a few sinkholes in the common area. He only highlighted the sinkholes in the development areas.

Hoffmann asked if there were 4 phases to this project.

Brehob said that it depends and the work in phase 4 could be done in phase 3 theoretically.

Hoffmann asked how people who turn on to Weimer and turn around if Weimer does not lead anywhere if there are no cul-de-sacs until phase 3.

Brehob said that there will be enough pavement for the person to turn around at the end of the road and that this would only be an issue in phase 2. He said there would also hopefully be a no outlet sign.

Hoffmann asked if they can design-in during the process to ensure there is enough room for someone to turn around at the end of Weimer Rd.

Brehob said yes, there are various options they would have to do this.

Hoffmann asked Staff about how long the old Weimer Rd. would remain.

Greulich responded that Weimer would remain in its entirety until the northern portion of this PUD develops and completes that connection.

****Wisler moved to forward PUD-27-17 to May 14th. Maritano seconded.**

Hoffmann asked for final comments from the Plan Commission.

Cibor commented that planning for the relocation of Weimer Rd. serves the city, especially in a larger context of the transportation network as a whole. He recognizes that the lack of sidewalk on one side of Schmaltz Rd. would be beneficial to lessen environmental impact but he also sympathizes with pedestrians losing out on a sidewalk. He would also like to coordinate a meeting with Staff and the petitioner going over the details of this PUD.

Sandberg thinks all modes of transportation should be accommodated as the City grows and develops.

Kappas wants to wait until the Environmental Commission issues their memo concerning this plot to have any more feedback. Looking at the list of permitted uses under CG 20.02.300, Kappas questions the need to have a bar/dance club in this area. Looking at the Bike/Ped Commission, there needs to be more time to consider their concerns. He expressed his main concern is Weimer and the extension south.

Hoffmann said he supports the relocation of Weimer Rd, as discussed in the last 15 years. It would be great to have Weimer extended quickly, the City can afford to wait for the development of the northern segment. He agreed with Kappas that he wants to see the Environmental Commission report in order to better weigh the pros and cons of having no sidewalk on one side of Schmaltz.

****Wisler moved to forward PUD-27-17 to May 14th. Maritano seconded. Motion carried by 7:0 roll call vote.**

PUD-02-18 **Loren Wood (Loren Wood Builders)**
2005 S. Maxwell St., and 1280 & 1325 E. Short St.
Preliminary plan amendment to a previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD).
Case Manager: Amelia Lewis

Amelia Lewis presented the staff report. The site is located in the southeast area of town, near the intersection of south Maxwell and Short St. With the exception of the property to the far west, the properties are located within the PUD known as the co-housing PUD that was approved in 2014. This petition would amend the existing boundaries of the PUD to include the lot to west, which is zoned Residential Single Family, and also making several changes to the PUD itself. The site is approximately 3.41 acres including City owned right-of-way. The 2002 GPP has it classified as Urban Residential. This petition was filed before the 2018 Comprehensive Plan and was approved, which also has it as Neighborhood Residential. Surrounding land uses include Single Family Residences to the north, a green area and conservancy easement to the east for the single family subdivision, the Bloomington Montessori School playground to the west, and the YMCA to the south. In addition to amended boundaries, there are 27 single family detached units with the option for 5 accessory dwelling units proposed instead of the 20 single family attached units the PUD currently has. The design for this PUD is built around the concept of co-housing, smaller individual housing units and larger shared spaces. Maxwell St. is to the south of this site and Short St. is to the east. There are three structures on site that will be remaining, including a single family house in the northeast corner, a log cabin structure in the southeast corner, and a barn area which will serve for a common house for the resident of the PUD. It is centered around a common green area with two detention ponds at the southwest corner and along the east edge. A Planned Unit Development creates their own zoning regulations. The proposed density compared to other single family developments is denser. This is the co-housing's intentions. The new development is similar to the existing neighborhood in that it is single family. Some considerations should be taken with the increased density of 27 new single family homes being created on an existing dead end street. The proposed density of this for this development is 10.06 units per acre with the 27 detached single family houses and five ADUS. In 2014, the density was 9.68 with the approved plan. If the RS zoning standards for the area were followed, it would likely result in around 9 or 10 lots. In order to accommodate the increased density that was proposed in 2014, the development standards were based around the RH zoning (Residential High Density). As proposed, there is only one public road that leads to the site: S. Maxwell Street. E. Short St. to the west does not connect to S.

Highland Ave. A condition of the PUD approval is that Short St. is connected in order to provide another access point for emergency situations. This would make it so S. Maxwell is not the only street available for traffic. This connection would be built under the Thoroughfare Plan's standards for neighborhood street connection. These require the street to be 20 feet wide with 5 feet wide tree plot and sidewalk to the north with a side path to the south. This was an original condition of the 2014 approval but was removed by City Council. The pedestrian facilities proposed within the development are 5 ft. sidewalks along Short St. and Maxwell St., as well as a connection and network of interior sidewalks. The 2008 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation & Greenways System Plan calls for a side path or connector path running east-west along Short St. and through the east property line, leading to the conservancy easement to the east. While the route identified in the plan is conceptual, it seeks to provide a valuable pedestrian/bicycle connection between the existing neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods. A side path is defined as a hard surface path that would be physically separated from the road with a grass plot, allowing for two-way traffic for bicyclists and pedestrians. This would be located along the south side of Short St. These are not improved on the currently proposed plan. The houses will be smaller in nature, compact Bungalow style houses. This petition was originally filed under the 2002 GPP. In addition to following many guidance points from the GPP, it includes various positive aspects relating to larger City goals, such as compact urban design, infill development, green building practices, and ideally the provision of housing opportunities for a diverse set of homebuyers. Looking to the future to future revisions, the UDO states that a PUD is to "provide a public benefit that would not occur without deviation from the standards of the UDO". Staff feels the development provides substantial benefit to future homeowners, but little benefit to the existing neighborhood and public as a whole. This can be improved by working on existing infrastructure as well as a few points discussed earlier. Staff views this project favorably and anticipates recommending it for approval once some further issues have been discussed during this meeting and May's meeting

Marc Cornett, the architect and urban planner working with Loren Wood, introduced himself and his team. Btown Cohousing is the development's name. The previous iteration of the approved PUD had 25 houses without the Dwelling Unit Equivalency Overlay, this proposal has 27. The Short St. connection was previously considered adequate. Cohousing a type of development that promotes community within community. Instead of building streets in typical development patterns, the street becomes a lawn. The parking is located to the edges of the development. You walk into the project. The homeowners themselves have collaborative effort. There's a common house, not a club house. There is common gardening and common agreements that are met within the development. Cornett noted he was the primary architect on S. Dunn St. as well as the B-Line Station project and that to him, this is a continuation of those projects. He praised Loren Wood Builders, their work, community involvement, and how they treat their employees. He further described the feel of the development. There will be a common house, a garden, the YMCA next door, BDLC, and the Montessori school. The common house will be next to the common garden. There are some storm water management issues in the area so there are plans to remove water from the adjacent drainage ways through detention strategies. There will be frontages on Short St. and Maxwell St. Cornett asked for feedback about bicycle use, pedestrian use, and diversity of home owners. There will be an open picnic shelter for the community. There will be five two-car garages on the west side of the property. This is in response to a concern for the elderly's easy access to their cars, no matter the weather. The ADUs are slated to be above the garages.

Cate asked why the council removed the condition to have Short St. connected in 2014.

Lewis responded it was due to a concern regarding increased traffic near the Montessori school.

Cate asked if the school is voicing this same concern now.

Lewis said not at this point.

Kappas asked the petitioner to speak to the level of commitment this community has to green building, tree preservation, and environmental stewardship. A concern was raised by the Environmental Commission.

Cornett said the lack of commitment for these were intentional. There are three concerns regarding green practices and they have to do with off-site improvements. They depend on the cost of the Short St. connection, bicycle and pedestrian connections, off-site sidewalks, affordable housing commitments. These contribute to

unknown development costs. The list of green practices that will be done will get longer the more efficient off-site improvements are. In terms of energy standards, they will meet green energy requirements such as Energy Star, LEAD, Passive House. They hope to go above and beyond, but these commitments depend on how much money is left.

Kappas asked if there is foot traffic from Short St. & Maxwell St. to YMCA.

Lewis responded that yes, you can cut through from the site to the YMCA property.

Kappas asked if there are plans for existing neighborhoods to be able to access the YMCA through a walking path through this proposed community.

Lewis said that the YMCA is not comfortable with a path leading directly to the YMCA, but is generally supportive of the project.

Cibor asked if the next step after this going through Plan Commission and City Council would be platting and site plan approval.

Jackie Scanlan, Interim Development Manager, explained that this approval, which is an amendment to the preliminary plan, will go to City Council. A lot of the site plan details will be discussed at this point and need to be approved by Council. After that will be the platting procedure, which could go through Plan Commission or Plat Committee. When the petitioner does their development plan, it could end up at Plan Commission or with Staff.

Cibor brought up concerns about increased traffic on Maxwell as well as parking.

Lewis said the addition of 27 houses will cause a large increase of traffic on a road where there were no houses at the end of before. There are 53 parking spaces planned to be on site. This is almost 2 parking spaces per household.

Cibor asked about more details on property lines and setbacks in this situation.

Lewis said that each house is on its own individual lot. The site is regulated as a site as a whole. The intention is that each lot is very small and the house will take up most of the lot itself. Most of a property owner's greenspace is the common area. The setback could be zero up to the property line. There will be distance between the houses to maintain the detached single family feel.

Cornett clarified the internal property lines between the houses are regulated by building code. There is a 4 ft. setback between each house. There is an 8 foot space between each house. Fire code dictates the space between.

Sandberg asked if there will be more level of detail to the plans of the houses and buildings.

Cornett said the front elevations are similar to something you would see on S. Dunn St. Painted siding, similar materials, and siding. These houses will be built according to the homebuyers' desires. They will ensure the architecture will not diminish on the sides or the rear of the house.

Wisler asked if the common house will be constructed no matter the phasing on the houses.

Cornett explained there is an existing barn where the common house will be that is 36 square feet. They will remove the second floor, retain the first floor foundation, and build from there. There will be a kitchen, bathrooms, and all will be fully accessible. Home owners will participate in this process and make the more detailed decisions on what this common house will entail. The common house itself will be built regardless of the process.

Hoffmann asked what the multiple sanitary laterals are mentioned in the report from Schmitt & Associates.

Jon Thomas, a Bynum Fanyo civil engineer for Loren Wood, said that because each house will still produce its own sanitary matter, each one will need its own sanitary lateral coming out. The desire is to have some kind of metering. City of Bloomington Utilities have not expressed any issues with the way utilities are planned on this property.

Hoffmann asked if extending the sewer system a better solution than sanitary laterals, quoting a question posed by Schmitt & Associates.

Thomas responded that they are extending the sewer system into the property and that the laterals will extend to this.

Hoffmann asked Staff if they had specific questions they wanted commissioner feedback on.

Lewis said the main issues are what exactly will be required of the developer, like off-site improvements such as the Short St. extension as well as an adjacent side path for pedestrians and bicycles.

Hoffmann asked for any comments from the public.

Linda Hitchings, lives close to the potential site, reiterated the concern about increased traffic. She encouraged a real road through Short St.

Susan Williams, a neighbor immediately to the North of the site, asked about the plan for mosquito prevention for the water retention ponds. An issue with Short St. is that it is a ravine-like and marsh-like area. She also noted an issue for making this a real street is many students from the Montessori school cross this area to get to their playground.

Jason Winkle, the CEO of the YMCA, explained that the YMCA facilities including the gymnastics center are adjacent with the project. He asked for more consideration regarding the increased traffic mixed with the amount of small children running around the YMCA Gymnastics Center and Montessori school. He also explained the apprehension about the path from the development leading to the YMCA is due to the area being where children play, raising safety issues.

Hoffmann asked the commission for final comments.

Cate said she would like to hear from the Staff and petitioner to speak to the concerns of the public regarding a safe crossing for children, in addition to concerns raised regarding increased traffic. She is interested in the solutions and alternatives available.

Kappas recommended Staff to work with Utilities or Public Works about the need for storm water in this area as well as the street extension. He also expressed concern about this seeming like an exclusive community and would like to hear more about how this community is going to enrich the larger community. He also expressed concern about the safety of extending the street, but thinks it should be extended.

Cibor said going forward, it would be interesting to have questions from Schmitt & Associates memo answered. In regards to the connection of Short St. and the bicycle/pedestrian connectivity in the site, it is important to follow the Bike Ped Plan because it is an adopted document. Maxwell St. is a thousand ft. dead end street right now, so there is a lot of value in adding more connectivity for emergency services. Without a connection to the YMCA from the site, the route there for bicyclists and pedestrians is very long. Having a direct path would be valuable, but it will not be an easy connection to make.

Sandberg said there is a lot of promise in this development. This is appealing to seniors who want to be in a community and connected. With this density though, it is extremely important to look at how this site would affect those around it, especially the children and their safety. With more adults in the area, there is opportunity

for public benefits, like additional supervision for all the children around; this can only happen with careful planning and consideration. She also wonders about visitor parking for this community.

Wisler commented that this is the type of housing the Commission wants to see in Bloomington and it is in line with the pocket neighborhood ordinance recently passed. The issue of connectivity is key. The difference of this being a community within community and feeling like an elitist compound is whether or not it's connected to other areas. The connection to Short St. is critical. Wisler suggested the street be a very narrow two-way street with a very visibly marked and possibly raised cross-walk to make it clear that it is a high pedestrian traffic area. The connection to the YMCA is critical as well, not only for the direct path but for the sense of community. Wisler encourages a requirement for an ADU if the homeowner wants a detached garage.

Hoffmann commented that he was supportive of the basic outline of this project in 2014 and is supportive of it again now. This is the kind of creative housing approach that should be encouraged. He highlighted that there was a question asked regarding mosquito control and wants to ensure they get an answer for that. Short St. needs to be connected, it would be unwise not to from a planning perspective. As for the side path for bicyclists and pedestrians, Hoffmann agrees with Cibor that this issue has been identified for some time and this is a chance to achieve the east-west connection. Unlike Short St., where the development needs to be responsible for construction, the developer should only be responsible for what's onsite regarding bike/ped. Hoffmann understands why the YMCA does not want a direct connection, but says that people will cut through anyway. Hoffmann encourages a free and open conversation about how to manage this traffic. One of the great things about this development is that it is supposed to be a creative and innovative, new take on housing. Hoffmann said it's important to think about the bike/ped issue differently than the traditional way and noted an example of a creative, successful bike path. There are all sorts of creative way to solve the problems pointed out about this development.

****Wisler moved to forward PUD-02-18 to May 14th. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by 7:0 roll call vote.**

Meeting adjourned.