

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 July 9th, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers #115. Members present: Cibor, Kappas, Sandberg, Maritano, Stewart Gulyas, Hoffmann

ROLL CALL

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED: June 2018

****Maritano moved to approve the June 2018 minutes. Hoffmann seconded. Motion passed by voice vote****

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Andrew Cibor reported that there is a public meeting to review the draft Transportation Plan at 5:30PM on July 12th in Council Chambers.

Nicholas Kappas reported that the County Plan Commission expressed great interest in the City and County coming together for more frequent meetings, especially with the Transportation Plan, UDO, and CDO.

WITHDRAWN:

ZO-05-18 **JB's Salvage, Inc.**
1816 W. Fountain Dr.
Rezone from Residential Single Family (RS) to Industrial General (IG).
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

CONTINUED TO AUGUST:

SP-14-18 **Waterstone Bloomington Land LLC**
310 W 11th St.
Site plan approval to allow a 51,720 sq. ft. mixed use building with 22 parking spaces
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

PUD-16-18 **Whitney Gates**
410 N Gates Dr.
Site plan approval to allow construction of a 4,000 sq. ft. commercial building and preliminary plat approval of 2 lot subdivision
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

PUD-13-18 **Trinitas Development**
1550 N Arlington Park Dr.
Approval of Preliminary Plan Amendments & District Ordinance to rezone Business Park to PUD to PUD
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

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

Eric Gruelich, case manager, presented the petition. This is a request from Public Investment Corporation for a Planned Unit Development final plan approval and approval of a preliminary plat. This came to the Plan Commission in April this year to seek initial guidance in the development of this site. This particular site is part of a Planned Unit Development that was approved in 1987 for an industrial park. The petitioners today are coming forward to carry forward with that approval to subdivide the property. The site plan approval tonight is for the internal road layout and network and the preliminary plat approval for the subdivision request. The property is about 54 acres in size and is located at the northwest corner of West Tapp Rd. and south Weimer Rd. This property is part of an overall PUD. The PUD to the north of this is still undeveloped. This is the first part of the PUD that will be developed with actual lots. There was an approval given for an access drive to Debra Dr. in the early 90s. Since then, the property has remained undeveloped. This outline plan was before any of the current environmental regulations, so it does not give any deference to the sinkholes on the property, creeks on the property, or steep slopes on the property. The approved outline plan called out for the entire site to be developed with roads and lots. The petitioner has worked for the past several months to come up with a site plan and a plat approval that does take into account all of the current environmental regulations. The site is pretty heavily covered with trees, 80% covered with trees. The petitioner is required to save 60% of that. There are also 2 creeks that run through the property that are subject to riparian buffers. There are also several sinkholes on the site. The Unified Development Ordinance requires the sinkholes to be placed in Karst preservation easements, which have all been shown on the proposed plat. Three lots are shown as common area. Lot 24 could be dedicated to the Parks Department. Conversations are still ongoing for that. One of the items that was discussed at the April hearing that Staff came to the Commission for guidance on was the overall lot layout and also to make the Plan Commission aware that with this petition there would be a major improvement to the road network to this portion of the City because Weimer Rd. would be relocated to the West. Weimer Rd. is currently on the east side of this petition site. It is a narrow two-lane road and much of it is located in a flood plain. The Parks Department has called out for a connection in this portion of the City between Clear Creek trail on the south side of Tapp Rd. to the other portion of the Clear Creek Trail that are further north than this. One of the highlighted areas for the Clear Creek Trail was identified as the current Weimer Rd. road bed. About 10 years ago, plans were made to relocate Weimer Rd. Right of Way was purchased from this property that was centrally located to align with the Southern Indiana Medical Park to the south with the desire that Weimer Rd. would run through this property. The relocation of Weimer Rd. also moved it out of the flood plain, resolved a lot of flooding issues that were at that intersection. It eliminated any chance of dual parallel roads running right next to each other and achieved better connectivity through this corridor of the City that aligns with other further undeveloped properties to the south. The relocation of Weimer Rd. was something that was planned a while ago and it is something the City has been working with the petitioner over the past several months to incorporate with this petition. The redevelopment commission and the petitioner are still working on these conversations. This development would be constructed in three phases. The southern phase would be lots 1-8 as well as the common area lot. The second phase would be lots 9-11. The last phase would be lots 15-24. These lots would be platted as the need arises for them. The internal roads would be constructed initially and then the lots would be sold as needed. The petitioner has submitted several exhibits that show how the site plane is complying with current regulations. Lot layouts have been centered around the portions of the site that do not have tree coverage on them. There are several portions along the south side that are in the trees. They are meeting the current tree preservation requirements. The previous approval did not have any tree preservation at all, so it is a significant deal that this is meeting current environmental regulations while still allowing for the site to be developed in a very similar manner the outline plane was approved. There would be a new side path installed along the west side of Weimer Rd. This would carry forward with the Clear Creek Trail should Weimer Rd. become abandoned in the future. The side path on the west side of the current Weimer Rd. would then take the place of the Clear Creek Trail. There would also be new sidewalks installed along all of the internal roads. Staff has worked with the petitioner on an appropriate cross section for Weimer for the new Weimer Rd. with bike lanes on both sides, as well as a tree plot, and sidewalks. There is a side path currently along Tapp Rd. that stops within a sidewalk. The sidewalk is stopped at the improvements that were done to Tapp Rd. several years ago. The petitioner will be removing the old sidewalk and putting in a new side path to provide for a continuous side path along the north side of Tapp Rd. The petitioner of the previous hearing is along the north side of the extension of Schmaltz Dr. Schmaltz Dr. connects to the existing Hoosier Energy Site and the World Wide Automotive site to the west of this. Schmaltz Rd. comes in and extends to the east here. They are requesting to not install a sidewalk on the north side of that street in order to minimize environmental disturbance along there. All other streets would have sidewalk and street trees along both sides. The petitioner has also submitted a

schematic site plan showing the extension of Weimer through the site. There are no plans to develop this property as of yet and there are no approvals to be given to the property of the north. This was simply to show how this site could be laid out and to show how it makes sense to align with the Weimer Rd. curve north of this. This would still allow for the two 10 ft. travel lanes, bike lanes on both sides, tree plot, and sidewalk. One of the aspects of this petition is a reduction in the amount of right-of-way that would be dedicated for the new Weimer Rd. It would be required to have 65 ft. of ROW, however to try to minimize disturbance, it has been reduced down to 60 ft. of right of way. All of the required amenities and improvements would still be in this ROW, so Staff is comfortable with this reduction of ROW given for this phase only. The future phases to the north of this would still be required to do 65 ft. of ROW. The petitioner is coming to the commission tonight for the site plan approval for the road network layout and preliminary plat approval for the location and size of all the lots. At the April meeting, modifying the use list to use the current commercial general use list rather than the use list that was approved for this petition was briefly discussed. The petitioner is not interested in that any longer, so the original use list would still apply here. The proposed plat and lot layout meets all of the subdivision requirements that were approved with the PUD as well as our current environmental regulations. Staff is recommending approval of the site plan and the preliminary plat with the five conditions listed.

Steve Brehob, the petitioner, noted that it's taken a long time to get here, citing Hoffmann seeing the original PUD in 1987. Brehob said that one of the conditions of approval is including a sidewalk on the north side of the extension of Schmaltz. The north side of that road is adjacent to the most environmentally constrained area on the site with steep slopes, adjacent to a sinkhole, and its heavily wooded. The farther out things like a sidewalk or tree plot are built, the more trees will need to be cleared and the more environmental disturbance will take place. Brehob understands the concerns for pedestrians who want to walk along that side, but pointed out there is a sidewalk on the other side of that street. Brehob said that the plan submitted is extremely schematic in nature and that they are not requesting any approvals of the north, later phase this evening. Brehob asked that the second condition of approval be changed to, "A zoning commitment is required to be recorded to the effect that when the property to the north develops, a right of way must be recorded through the site when an extension of the roadway is funded by the City". Brehob says this change is keeping with everything they've worked with the Redevelopment Commission on this project. Brehob says because they are not seeking approval at this time, this condition needs to be modified so it can reflect an agreement with the City or RDC at a later date.

Cibor asked Staff about the street tree requirement regarding spacing.

Greulich responded that street trees are required for every 40 ft. of frontage. With front drive cuts, things get a little more clustered. Sometimes street trees are a little bit closer. If there is 400 feet of frontage, the requirement is 10 trees. These trees might be 40 feet apart because you have to get a raw number in there.

Cibor asked if Staff foresees the final plat for this going through the Plat Committee.

Greulich said this is on the August Plat Committee agenda.

Cibor asked for an overview of what is part of the facilities maintenance plan. Cibor asked particularly about the maintenance of the trees, tree plots, and grass in the common areas.

Greulich said the facilities plan deals with the maintenance of all open space and common ground. It can be tailored to each specific site. If more specific detailed need to be addressed with this site, Staff can make sure it is clearly identified in the facilities plan who is maintaining what.

Cibor asked if there is a sidewalk adjacent to a common area, who is responsible to maintaining it.

Greulich said that if it is in the Right of Way, the adjacent property owner must maintain adjacent sidewalks.

Cibor noted that the Home Owner's Associations could potentially go away over time.

Greulich said they are required to be maintained in perpetuity.

Cibor asked the petitioner about the temporary cul-de-sac at the northern end of phase two. When phase three comes through, the cul-de-sac would no longer be needed, would phase three still need a cul-de-sac?

Brehob responded that if there was one at the end of phase two and phase two extends all the way up to the preservation area, it would provide a turnaround at the end of the road. There'd be an intersection there so someone could do a three point turn. The next phase where the road would be extended on across the stream area, a temporary cul-de-sac could be installed at that end. Brehob foresees the pavement and curve line being removed so there is no bubble in the middle of the roadway.

Hoffmann asked Staff how the sidewalk issue relates to the policy on sidewalk waivers and the BZA procedure for this.

Greulich said that this is not a variance situation, it is a PUD. The Plan Commission can find whatever appropriate site plans are appropriate here. Plan Commission doesn't have to find that there is practical difficulty or that topography prevents it or that there are adjacent sidewalks. Some of those are factors Staff looked at. One of the reasons for the recommendation is that there are sidewalks on the north side of Schmaltz now, which is just to the west of this. This would extend that sidewalk along the north side of Schmaltz, as it currently is. Greulich says they are only talking about the section of Schmaltz between the new Weimer Rd. and where Debra Dr. comes in. Staff's basis on the recommendation for the sidewalk was because this is continuing an existing system that runs along the north side of Schmaltz and it connects with other sidewalk systems along this drive. If someone was walking from Hoosier energy or another lot on the north side of the sidewalk, they would stay on the same side of the street as the sidewalk and be able to enjoy that area. Staff recognizes that it would increase the amount of disturbance in that environmental area. The benefit of the pedestrian connection seemed to outweigh the minor increase in environmental disturbance.

Hoffmann asked if this was the only access that would be provided back to that area and what the nature of the pedestrian easement.

Greulich said the idea behind the easement was to connect the bike trails behind the Wapehani to the road network. There are not any plans to install any facility. There are no trees in this area, so there is no need to do much in this area. There would not be a sidewalk.

Hoffmann asked if there would be a sign posted so people know that they were not on private property.

Greulich said they did not get into that level of detail. Signage could possibly be put up.

Brehob said the idea is to provide a connection from this development on this roadway to Wapehani to the east cul-de-sac through another easement to what is now Weimer Rd. The idea is to connect Wapehani to Clear Creek Trail through this development.

Hoffmann asked if this is something that would be discussed at final platting.

Greulich answered no. Putting in some kind of improvement, like a sidewalk, side path, or mulch trail was discussed. The Parks Dept. did not want to maintain these type of facilities. The bike riders ride as they need to. No facilities would be installed because the Parks Dept. did not want to own it or maintain it. If the home owners association of this development wanted to do something like that, Staff would not stop them at all. It would be a benefit. The Parks Dept. and the City did not want to own or maintain something out here.

Brehob said that at a minimum, signage of the route would be appropriate so that people would know its available.

Hoffmann confirmed with Brehob that having something in conditions of approval to work out something regarding signage for this location.

Hoffmann asked Staff about their views of the proposed change to conditions of approval.

Greulich responded that the reasoning behind the zoning commitment was to make the future owner aware of the requirement to dedicate and extend Weimer Rd. through that site. There is never a situation where ROW is dedicated and nothing else is done. The zoning commitment is there so the future owner knows that not only must they dedicate Right of Way, but they also have to extend and build a street. It doesn't matter to Staff how it is paid for, but the owner is responsible for dedicating and extending that road through the site. Staff would recommend the condition as worded in their report.

Hoffmann clarified that this is functionally an amendment to the Thoroughfare Plan because it is putting the world on notice that this road is on the plan, not on this site, but to the site to the north of this proposal. It will be dedicated and built at that time.

Greulich responded that Staff is working on updating the Thoroughfare Plan next year and in the coming months, Staff will be making that change formally.

Brehob said that they just revised this whole plan to put a road through the middle of the site because it is not on the Thoroughfare Plan, but it was something the City had requested. The petitioner worked with the Redevelopment Condition and Staff to do this. The original plan included a connection up to Weimer and a cul-de-sac, not a road through the middle. The petitioner is concerned about committing to this road extension and paying for it at this time. The Weimer Rd. extension was not on the Thoroughfare Plan and was agreed to because the petitioner thought it was in the best interest of the City to pursue this.

Hoffmann asked Staff if he was correct in saying that once this was built, this would be the way to access the north property because old Weimer Rd. is going away.

Greulich confirmed this.

Hoffmann went on to say that either this road gets built through this north property or the north property ends up having no road access.

Greulich confirmed this.

Hoffmann opened the forum to the public.

****Kappas moved for approval of PUD-27-17 with the five recommendations from Staff. Sandberg seconded.****

****Kappas moved for an amendment to delete condition of approval #1 of PUD-27-17. Stewart Gulyas seconded.****

Kappas said he is not seeing the full pedestrian benefit in comparison to the environmental impact with the sinkholes on this property. Kappas noted there are more sinkholes to the west. Kappas believed that people at this juncture can easily cross to the south and then go up. Kappas sees no benefit to this recommendation that the amendment strikes.

Cibor said he supports the Staff recommendation to include the sidewalk on the north side. Cibor respects the environmental concerns and the tradeoffs with the proposal. Cibor said there is a lot of value in that sidewalk connection. If sidewalks are only put in on one side, pedestrians have to cross the street two times more. Cibor sees this as a continuation of an existing facility. A sidewalk on the cul-de-sac of the east of the new Weimer alignment provides benefit, but on the west side to Debra it provides benefit. Cibor will vote against the proposed amendment and if there is a significant amount of concern to stay away from sinkholes or save trees, an alternative would be shift the road 5 ft. further south. This would decrease lot sizes by 5 ft.

****Kappas moved for an amendment to delete condition of approval #1 of PUD-27-17. Stewart Gulyas seconded. The amendment failed a roll call vote for lack of 5 votes.****

Hoffmann proposed a friendly amendment, as follows: As a sixth condition of approval, if the pedestrian access through the site to serve Wapehani Park occurs, the petitioner will then work with Staff to design signage for that access.

Sandberg said that she will be approving this. The Environmental Commission hopes that this project can be respectful of habitats. Everything else looks to be in good shape.

Cibor said the discussion about Weimer and continuing north of the site highlights the importance of the City's Transportation Plan. Cibor shared his support and gratitude with the petitioner for trying to follow the environmental requirements of the current code, which was not required with the current PUD in place. Cibor noted that what they're approving tonight is not 100% final, as there are still many details to be worked out.

Hoffmann pointed out that nothing the commission is doing tonight suggests that there will not be negotiations about how best to pay for Weimer Rd. on the north side in the future. What being decided tonight is that the road will go that way and old Weimer will eventually go away.

****Kappas moved for approval of PUD-27-17 with the five recommendations from Staff. Sandberg seconded. Motion passed by 6:0 roll call vote****

DP-06-18 **Whitehall Associates**
3477 W 3rd. St.
Final plan & preliminary plat approval for a 3 lot subdivision of an existing PUD
Case Manager: Amelia Lewis

Amelia Lewis, case manager, presented the report. The property is located on the far west side of town off of 3rd St., slightly west of the intersection of 3rd St. and State Road 37. The property is part of a PUD that was approved in the 80s and has gone through several revisions since then. The site is 12.5 acres. It is designated as a Regional Activity Center per the 2018 Comprehensive Plan, which calls for high intensity retail uses. This is in a commercial node, so the surrounding uses are commercial. The petitioner would create two new lots from the existing one lot in the PUD. There would be a new restaurant on proposed Lot #2. The subdivision process does not require full compliance with the UDO. However, new building construction does. For this reason, Staff will be looking at requirements and how these are met on the proposed Lot #2. Any change to the PUD requires Plan Commission approval. There is a Hardee's, Outback Steak House, and Monroe County Pizza nearby. Lot #1 is 12.5 acres and it would be dividing and creating two new lots. The proposed Lot #2 on the east is approximately .45 acres. The new Lot #3 to the west would be approximately .37 acres. There would be no proposed changes on Lot #1. Right now, there are two existing bank buildings on Lot #2. Lot #3 was a bank as well. The petitioner is proposing to develop Lot #2 with a approximately 3,000 sq. ft. fast food restaurant building. The petitioner is proposing 5 ft. wide sidewalks on the east side running north-south. There are no other existing sidewalks throughout the PUD or across west 3rd St. There is also a sidewalk proposed east-west at the corner of the site, which would ideally connect to sidewalk when Lot #3 is developed. This site has been developed into 15 parking spaces, which is the maximum amount allowed per the UDO parking. This site is accessed via private drive north-south. The Department recommends the Plan Commission adopts the proposed findings and approve the petition with the following conditions: 1. Grading and building permits shall be issued prior to any site work. 2. On Lot #2, the proposed bicycle parking area should provide 4 spaces. 3. If at any time the structures on lots #1 and #3 are removed, the vacant lot landscaping requirement shall apply.

Don Kocarek, the petitioner, said the proposed restaurant on Lot #2 would be a Freddy's restaurant. The existing buildings, which are on Lot #1 and Lot #2, include an Old National bank that's been abandoned for years as well as an IU Credit Union building that's been abandoned for close to the same amount of time. The IU Credit Union building has been partially demolished. Part of the project would be to remove both of those buildings completely and then on Lot #2 is where Freddy's would be developed on. Working with Staff, the petitioner has determined that the drive coming in from Gates Dr. from 3rd St. would be the front. The building is situated so that the front door would be on that access, including sidewalk, patio, and seating. Freddy's is similar

to Steak N Shake, where they serve froze custard and burgers. They do not serve breakfast. Their hours are generally 10:30AM to 11:00PM. Lot #2 is close to .5 acres.

Cibor asked Staff what the process is for determining frontage for properties that do not traditionally front a city street.

Lewis said that because it does not have any frontage along a public road, the requirements are less strict. Even though it is a private drive, it should still create a street-like feel to develop the eastern portion of that lot with a sidewalk.

Hoffmann asked Staff about the past issues with cross traffic in this area when the banks were operating and whether this would be taken care of in the development or if a condition needs to be added. Hoffmann suggested this may have been due to a striping issue.

Lewis said that this issue might need to be looked at on site.

Hoffmann asked that if a condition of approval was added, if it can be left to Staff's discretion.

Lewis said if the petitioner is amenable to this, Staff would be as well.

Hoffmann asked if the petitioner would be amenable to working with Staff to ensure adequate striping and signage is installed.

Kocarek said yes.

Maritano asked if the front is to the east for Freddy's, what the front would be for the next lot over.

Lewis said she does not know at this time exactly, but assumes it would be treated as an internal lot.

Hoffmann said there is a drive way that runs down to the north that runs down the west side of the western most part of this site. There is a driveway just to the north of it. Cars cut across that and this is a part of what needs to be dealt with. Cars need to be directed and know where the through way is so they know if they are cutting across parking spots or not.

Lewis said that potential development on Lot #3 might involve redistribution of parking from Lot #1 to make it clearer.

Maritano asked if the little section of sidewalk that is adjacent to the patio dining area connects to nothing.

Lewis said there is no sidewalk. It is not necessarily decorative, but hopefully a sidewalk would eventually be connected to that. Staff felt it was best at this time to at least provide some sidewalk that would make connections easier in the future.

Maritano noted that the frontage on Lot #3 could be in several directions and it's very complicated.

Hoffmann opened the forum to the public.

****Maritano motioned for approval of DP-06-18. Sandberg seconded.****

Hoffmann asked for a friendly amendment of the additional condition, "The petitioner will work with Staff to provide adequate lot striping or other methods to facilitate safe vehicular access to and from the new lots, Lot #2 and Lot #3".

Maritano said she is very happy to have any improvement in this lot, as it has been an eyesore for a very long time.

Cibor noted that the frontage along the state highway will have a multi-use path in the future.

Hoffmann noted that someday in the future, if more development happens, maybe this sidewalk can be connected to the aforementioned path.

****Maritano motioned for approval of DP-06-18. Sandberg seconded. Motion passed by roll call vote 6:0.****

PUD-12-18 **Fountain Residential Partners**
4500, 4518 E 3rd St, & 306 SSR 446
Preliminary Plan Amendment and expansion of an existing PUD & Preliminary Plat Amendment
with a lot addition
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Jackie Scanlan, case manager, presented the report. The property is located at the south west corner of east 3rd St. and SSR 446, so the very eastern side of town. The property is 14.07 acres. It is zoned PUD. There is a property in the northwest corner that is part of the adjacent PUD that the petitioner is requesting to add in. The Comprehensive Plan designation is Urban Corridor with some Neighborhood Residential along the bottom. What's currently on the site are the empty Chapman's building, B97, an office use with parking lot, and the Century Village Hotel on the eastern portion. The petitioner tonight is requesting a preliminary plan amendment to the Century Village PUD. They are requesting to add three new uses. The PUD currently allows Multifamily, but only above the first floor. They are requesting to add first floor residential possibilities. They are also requesting to add the uses Medical Clinic and Fitness Training Studio. These are two uses they believe could be helpful on this side of town and useful to future residents. They would also like to increase the permitted densities that are currently allowed. Two of these uses, Restaurant Limited Service and Banquet Hall, have their own definitions which were written before the UDO. Staff agrees that the Restaurant Limited Service definition that is included in this PUD should stay. The banquet hall definition should be transferred to what's used in the UDO because they are so similar. Something more impactful they want to do is adding the Dwelling Multifamily with a maximum of 250 units. They would apply the DUE standards that are used in the UDO for the Residential High Density zoning district. The second part of the amendment is adding the .71 acres from the adjacent PUD. The overall density is limited to 50 units per acre of above ground multifamily, which breaks down to 3.64 units per acre in the current PUD. What they've proposed is allowing multifamily dwelling, that's the way the UDO defines units that are allowed to have ground floor residential, to be limited to 250 units. Using DUE calculations, that is about 17.76 units per acre. While they are proposing to make changes to the larger PUD related to use and size, the actual site plan changes are only to the vacant portion. Third St. is to the north and SR 446 is to the east. The PUD proposal includes 221 units with a total of 632 bedrooms. It would be a mix of studio, 1 bedroom, and 4 bedroom apartments. These are townhouse style buildings, so they are 3 stories tall along the frontage of 3rd St. and the "frontage" of the main entrance of the property on the east and west. There are also four story more traditional apartment flats buildings. They are currently proposing an in-out on 3rd St. and there is an existing driveway to the east of their proposal. They would be aligning their entrance with Morningside, which is across the street on 3rd St. This would require moving it west to line it up. There would also be an entrance on SR 446 and a potential connection possibility to Knightridge. There would also be two throughways through parking lots to the existing development and the rest of the PUD. They are also including pedestrian connections. This would include a sidewalk along 446 in the new portion as well as along east 3rd St. They are proposing a connection into the development to the west, a connection to the existing PUD, and 2 connections to the south. Some of the amenities shown on the plan include a club house and pool area, which is typical for an apartment complex. They are also including a transit stop. They have been working with Lou May from Bloomington Transit to get a stop from Bloomington Transit. The 6 bus typically runs down 3rd St. in this area and turns right on SR 446 to do a loop inside Knightridge apartments immediately to the south and then heads back. This developer in the past has done the shuttle buses to and from their developments in other cities. Staff has encouraged them to speak with Bloomington Transit because these shuttles stifles their ability to have on-time, reliable bus service and would prefer to work directly with developers in the future. They have been working with Lou May and having on-going discussions about having the 6 bus run on this property instead of the Knightridge property and make sure those tenants would still be able to easily access this transportation. Parking for the site is surface parking. 478 parking spaces are shown in the current plan, which is .76 parking spaces per bedroom. As part of the PUD amendment, they have proposed a maximum is .85 per bedroom. They would like to set this cap for future development at this PUD. They are proposing some back-in angled parking. They are not proposing public roads. They want the north south driveway and east west driveway to serve as the main artery for the property by using back-in angled parking and parallel parking on that

portion of the site. It is not allowed by code yet, but it may be something interesting to see in action that has not been seen yet. They are required to have 53 covered class 2 spaces, 27 class 1 spaces, and 26 regular class 2 spaces for bicycles. This is something that would be seen at the development plan stage. Scanlan reviewed the schematic renderings of the buildings. The last part of the request is a preliminary plat amendment. It ends up being five separate lots from two separate plats and also some unplatted land. They are requesting to amend the existing plat that is present in Century Village to clean up that line and allow for one lot for the Fountain Residential Partners portion. This portion of the lot where the site plan will take place has been vacant for 40 years. The PUD has been in place for about 40 years and has been amended several times to try to make it more attractive for development by adding uses and changing requirements. It is a part of a mixed-use development. Additionally, it is not immediately adjacent to any Single Family, it is in a commercial area, and along a major artery. It has good transit access. With the possibility of having additional transit to that site, it would be an upgrade for that area. For continued discussion, some of the 4-story buildings are a bit long and different from what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. Having smaller developments along blocks instead of long buildings is another design decision petitioner and Staff have been in discussion about. Additionally, at this stage, a landscape plan is not required but more discussion about what is being preserved on the site, like percentages of preservation on the PUD. Additionally, they are working with the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department on diverse housing incorporation, which is a goal listed for the designation of Urban Corridor in the Comprehensive Plan. Nothing has been set in stone regarding Bloomington Transit, but they are moving forward with that. These are all things Staff wants to address before the next hearing. The Department is recommending continuing this petition to August.

Steve Smith, representing the petitioner, introduced the owners of the PUD as well as the petitioner Trevor Tallett from Fountain Residential Partners. He thanked Scanlan for her work on this petition. The PUD has been there since 1975. The restaurant has had multiple different people there. This is not a high demand commercial location. The PUD has been revised to add more commercial and make it more flexible. The commercial does better by the mall and does not do as well this far away. With the changing Comprehensive Plan and the encouragement of mixed-use, it looked like the door was open to change this to have a larger residential component. This is reflected in the petition. Medical clinic and fitness studio uses were added because these could be in the demand with the hospital moving in the next 10 years. Park Ridge Neighborhood Association was contacted and did not have any feedback or interest in meeting. The latest discussion was about the bus coming through the site and go on the road to the south immediately adjacent to Knightridge and put a bus stop down there for their residents. The petitioner is looking for feedback tonight.

Trevor Tallett, Fountain Residential Partners, introduced Fountain Residential Partners and said they are based in Dallas, TX. Fountain Residential Partners are a boutique student housing developer. They want to keep it small, keep it boutique, and only do projects that they are passionate about. They aim to do 2-3 projects a year in order to focus on quality. They are a nation-wide company. Fountain Residential Partners identified Bloomington because of the demand for student housing. While analyzing the supply and demand of student housing in Bloomington, the majority of the new student housing being built is concentrating on the top 10% of the demographic that can afford \$1000 a bed. These are mostly in the downtown area. They have found that there is a high demand for a quality project with a moderate price point about a mile and a half away from campus. This project checked all the boxes, such as the straight shot down 3rd St, proximity to College Mall, pre-existing transit, and the ability to use the building plan used at the University of Houston. They want to offer IU students a better price point. They chose to focus on studios, 1 bedrooms, and 4 bedroom. There is a larger demand out there being met for graduate students, young professionals with the hospital being built to the northwest, and other out of college students. There are also the four bedrooms for the college students who make up the demand for housing. This product type has been successful in other markets, with the Williamsburg architecture and craftsman type architecture. With the transit stops, townhomes out front, different unit mix, and having the front porch stoops of the townhomes will engage the sidewalk and the street.

Sandberg asked about how this site can be made more of a gateway and not so much a big, imposing structure per the Environmental Commission's memo regarding this property. Sandberg said she would be looking forward to that. Sandberg asked if they met with Park Ridge neighbors.

Smith said that he met with the former president who passed the plan onto the new president. The former president said he didn't think there would be much impact and did not inquire about a further meeting.

Cibor said he was intrigued with the coordination Bloomington Transit, especially with the target of students. Cibor asked what the long term implications be. He asked if there would be an access easement that allowed the buses to

access this private facility. He said he wonders if Knightridge's roads were not in good shape because they were never designed for the weight of buses and if this would continue to cause issues with buses serving this area in the future. He asked what the next steps would be with Bloomington Transit and how a continued partnership would be ensured.

Smith said the discussions with Bloomington Transit have been very solid. Lou May is on board. If this includes a permanent easement across the site's drive, then so be it.

Cibor asked if there have been any discussions with INDOT (Indiana Department of Transportation) about the drive cuts, moving things, access points, and traffic generated.

Brehob answered that previous discussions and proposals included making sure the northern drive lined up with Morningside to the north. At that time, this was INDOT's main concern. To the south, making sure the driveway is as south as it can be. It cannot be lined up with the drive of the residential subdivision to the east, so they must ensure they provide adequate separation. Driveway permits would be required for this. At this point, they are basing locations off of discussions they have previously had with INDOT.

Cibor asked Staff what mixed-use is and what makes Staff comfortable labeling this as mixed-use, as most of this site seems to be residential.

Scanlan said mixed-use is more than one kind of use in one area. Usually what comes to mind when people say mixed-use is commercial on the ground floor and apartments above. The Comprehensive Plan makes a point to say that it can also be separate uses adjacent to another. Because it is one large PUD with a large functioning commercial component, Staff felt comfortable identifying this PUD as a whole as mixed-use. It did have approvals to have the upper floor units, but never came to fruition over ten years ago. Looking at the allowable uses, the majority are commercial and then there are also some residential allowed on the site. This will be highlighted more in the next report.

Maritano asked Staff what some comparable apartment complexes with this level of density.

Scanlan said she does not know, but will find out.

Maritano asked if a traffic study had been done.

Scanlan said no.

Maritano said she would be interested in the impact of traffic in this area.

Smith said he is the traffic engineer in the office. When the project was proposed, he was concerned about traffic. He designed a study. At Reserve on 3rd, which is a similar apartment complex, there is an entrance out to 3rd St on Park Ridge Rd. It has a stub out to Smith Rd. If someone is at Reserve on 3rd and going to campus, they can take the road over to Smith and come out at the signal to turn left and go into town. Smith said many people, more than half the people leaving the complex that morning were taking mass transit. Reserve on 3rd also has their own bus that runs every half hour. They did have an early morning flow out of this complex. Most went directly to 3rd St. and had an easy left turn on 3rd St. 9 out of 10 went straight to 3rd and took the left. They are coming out at 8:30AM-9:00AM and not 7:30-8:00AM at its peak, so by the time the students are leaving, it is not a peak traffic time. Reserve on 3rd is about the same size project as this. They go straight north on Park Ridge Rd. to 3rd St. or they can go to Hagen St. to Smith Rd. Smith said he doesn't believe there is a traffic problem. There are good roads to get into traffic and out. The patterns of traffic do not present a problem.

Tollett said that the four story buildings are townhomes on top of townhomes. Within them, there are also 1 bedroom units. This is a different product type than the traditional flat units. Talking about 50 units to 250 units, from a units per acre standpoint, this is a lower density product than some of the most recent developments, such as Evolve by the Stadium. They have 40-50 units per acre, while this is 17-18 per acre. Units per acre, this is a much lower density product than what's been built in Bloomington in past years.

Maritano said she would still like to see developments with comparable density. She asked what building materials are

planning to be used.

Tollett responded that the craftsmen style is a mixture of stone and other materials.

Maritano asked about the medical clinic and exercise facility and how the residential portion fits on this property.

Scanlan showed where Chapman's restaurant, B97 building, office building, and the hotel was on site. There may be some redevelopment opportunity in the commercial portion. All of the vacant part would be developed with multi-family.

Kappas asked about the environmental building practices that would be employed.

Tollett said that water, sewer, and electricity would be covered under the utility package they offer, so it is in their interest to use energy saving hardware and practices. They are happy to entertain any suggestions. There will be bike spaces and recycling bins. These are good business practices and clients demand it these days.

Kappas asked Smith if Park Ridge being at the top of the hill was taken into account of the traffic study in terms of safety and taking the left-hand turn on 3rd St.

Smith said that the site is pretty similar. You're at the crest of the hill, but its hard to see over when you're at the top. That's what makes it a dangerous intersection. It was considered for a traffic light many years ago. It was thought that that traffic could go to Smith Rd. and it does, but not all of it. In off peak times, it is pretty easy to get on 3rd St. Smith said yes, you're still at the bottom of the hill but you can still see up to near where the gas station is from the Century Village exit. Smith said still, its not perfect and needs to be approached with care because people come in fast. Mass transit will help with the bus going through the project and also two buses on the fringe of the project. If this was not as student focused as it is, it would be a significantly bigger concern.

Hoffmann asked Staff why they would put a sidewalk on E 3rd St. when there is a multiuse path to the west.

Scanlan said she was incorrect in saying sidewalk, it would be the multiuse path. They have also talked to the petitioner about filling the gap between Office Lounge.

Hoffmann asked if it would be a forward vs. continue. If it is continued, it would still be considered its first hearing in August.

Scanlan said yes, she meant forwarded to a second hearing.

Hoffmann opened the forum up to the public.

Thomas Schwandt, resident of Cedar Springs subdivision, recommends speaking to their Home Owners Association because they would be far more effected by this petition. He asked to see the empirical evidence of the need of student housing, such trends of enrollment at the University or migration to the city that would justify this. The Reserve buses go past the funeral home and go out to Smith Rd. and do not try to make that lefthand turn at the top of the hill.

Hoffmann asked where that is located.

Schwandt and Scanlan pointed it out on the map. It is east of the potential development in the county.

Sheri Knight-Schwandt, a resident of Cedar Springs subdivision, is concerned with the increase of traffic from this new development. She also asked what is considered a moderate price point. She pointed out that there have been many multifamily and mixed use developments being built in the past few years. She asked if the numbers support the demand. She asked for empirical evidence.

Hoffmann asked Staff if there is any requirement to add a meeting with the Cedar Springs neighborhood.

Scanlan said that the requirement now is only Neighborhood Associations registered with the City of Bloomington.

Because this is in the county, they are not registered with the City of Bloomington. Staff can encourage them to meet with Cedar Springs, but Scanlan is unsure if it is actually required.

Hoffmann said another question was about traffic studies on 3rd St and asked if it is in the cards.

Scanlan said that it is not something Staff has required, but if the Plan Commission thinks it is necessary, they can ask for one.

Hoffmann asked if there was any price point information.

Scanlan asked the petitioner to answer this question.

Tollett said the efficiency would be around \$950. The one bedroom would be around \$1080. The 4 bedroom townhomes would be \$650-\$700. These prices are fully furnished, all utilities included, internet and cable. These are \$300 less than Park on Morton, the Evolve, Station 11. This opens it to a larger portion of the market that can afford those kinds of rents. With the one bedrooms, a significant amount of one bedrooms opens it up to graduate students and young professionals.

****Kappas moved to forward PUD-12-18 to the August 13th meeting. Sandberg seconded****

Kappas would like to know if the other HOAs in the city were notified, such as Gentry Estates, Gentry Honors, etc.

Scanlan said that the rule is all neighborhood associations within 500 ft.

Kappas requested notification of the Home Owners Associations within a 1-2 mile radius.

Hoffmann said that two miles would get you to the university.

Kappas asked for notification of Home Owners Associations 1 mile out of the potential site. This area is urban corridor, we do want more massing, but asked if this goes against what massing is when it is so far away from the core. Kappas asked if it would be massing in the wrong place. 46 is a well traveled road for people traveling into the city that work and traveling out of the city into Brown County. It is 650 beds, so basically individuals in that area. The Diverse Housing corporation, there's not much diversity in that. Kappas requested a list of environmental practices that would be able to help to incorporate it into this area.

Maritano requested to hear more about the mixed use and agrees with the public comment regarding their concerns about this being student housing and being marketed to a specific population. Maritano agrees with Sandberg about it being a gateway to the city and from the schematics, seems very massive and not keeping with the feel of that area.

Sandberg asked if this has made it to the radar of the Council's Land Use Committee.

Scanlan said that this is the first petition that they saw out of order.

Sandberg said she would like feedback from that body. Sandberg said there is a lack of housing in general in Bloomington. Many in leadership are concerned with affordability of housing. The prices are so high because of this lack. IU is growing and students as well as people in all residential price ranges are having issues finding housing. Sandberg says her concerns lie within where this housing is, the density of it, the massive scale of it, and all the concerns fellow commissioners have raised about traffic, who has been alerted to this. Sandberg says there is a lot more work to be done and more people need to weigh in. Bloomington needs more housing and more affordable housing. To get there, the development of housing needs to be allowed, but needs to be very carefully placed to avoid strains on the surrounding areas. Because this is a gateway, it needs to be attractive, not impacting any environmental concerns, not impacting traffic concerns, and not negatively effecting the people already living in this area.

Cibor said he appreciates this site has not been a high demand commercial location, it has been a PUD approval for 40 years. He also appreciates the fact that there is a high demand for student housing. He does question if 600

additional beds, if the demand for commercial increases and if there's an opportunity to bring more mixed-use into the picture. Cibor looks forward to hearing more about the discussion with Bloomington Transit. Cibor wants to hear what INDOT has to say about this project and if there are any concerns. Cibor wonders if they need all of that parking if most residents would be using public transit. Cibor is also wrestling with the Comprehensive Plan and wonders if this is the appropriate location for it.

Hoffmann said that this is an unusual proposal in the sense that this is functionally the same as a rezone. Plan Commission does not get these often, they usually review site plans. Nobody is entitled to anything that is being requested in this proposal. Plan Commission has discretion to decide whether this fits with the vision for the community and can turn it down if it does not. It is an amendment to a PUD, but that functions in the same way legally as a rezone. Hoffmann is not opposed to the density. Bloomington's occupancy continues to be the highest in the state and that drives prices of housing up, making housing unaffordable for everyone. Hoffmann would also like to see more development in this particular location. It is a site that has languished for a long time in terms of intensity of development. Hoffmann thinks more development needs to be encouraged in this location. Hoffmann wants to see more student apartments in Bloomington. Hoffmann says the best way to get more housing in general is to get more student housing and then drive some of the older student complex out of the business to transition into housing for other people in Bloomington. Hoffmann doubts that anyone could prove a need for this particular student housing, but if its built, they would drive someone else out of the student housing business and it would become housing for seniors, workers, etc. Hoffmann says he looks at this proposal and thinks it is flatly inconsistent with Section 5.3.4 in the Master Plan, "Redirect new student oriented housing developments away from the downtown and nearby areas and towards more appropriate areas closely proximate to the IU campus that already contain a relatively high percentage of student oriented housing units, are in easy walking distance of the campus, and have direct access to University provided parking and the university transit system. A few years ago, there was an emergency amendment to the zoning code and created the PRO 06 Zone. This zone is what got Bloomington most of the student housing mentioned. This was thought to be for relatively dense single family housing, but wasn't anticipated that developers would use it to create student housing that was less dense than a typical apartment building. There was an emergency amendment to this to stop the use of this for student housing. Putting student housing 2-3 miles from campus ensures that half to 2/3^{ds} will drive to campus. This clogs up all the roads in town. It is not the intersection of Morningside and 3rd St. that is worrisome, it is what this does to 3rd St. as you try to get to the center of town. There is already a problem with all the students lining up on 3rd St. dropping off and picking up their friends. This makes it impossible for buses to get through and anyone else trying to get through. Hoffmann said it looks like they're walking into this trap again. The Plan Commission is getting ready to hear a petition on the old K-Mart site, another very large site, less than a mile east of this. Hoffmann said it will probably look similar to this proposal. Hoffmann said he is skeptical that this proposal is the type of high density that should go in this particular location. When the new UDO is adopted, it might not be allowed in this location. If a new category is created for private dormitories, it is possible that this will not be a permitted use in this location. Another thing said in the Master Plan is any new student housing development should be designed in such a way that it would ensure easy transition to becoming non-student housing. Nothing about this development is useful for anyone else but students, so Hoffmann hopes this will get fixed as well. Hoffmann said it would help if the housing being proposed was somehow related to the commercial uses on this site. It does not appear they are related at all. There is no indication that people in this housing would use these commercial businesses. There is another provision in the Master Plan that states, "Site design must reimagine the built context into a mixed use district. Emphasis must be placed on urban design and creation of a distinct design style in each area, site design features to consider include building street frontages, structures that are multi-story and pedestrian scale, and provide safe and convenient access for pedestrians". The whole idea is if its mixed use is you want the mixed uses to interact with one another. There is much more that could be done on this site that could be used to bring the student housing into a conversation with the commercial part of the Century Village site. This would make it feel more like mixed use. Hoffmann asked if they are amending the Master Plan to allow large student housing developments on the fringes of town, where you're going to get a significant amount of students driving to campus. Hoffmann said they could address this issue if they wanted to and make drop off lanes on 3rd St. to get student cars off 3rd St. No one has tried to do this yet. This may have to happen anyway with the rise of Uber and Lyft. This petition seems inconsistent with the Master Plan. Hoffmann is very skeptical about this, as it feels like a problem from the past that they are getting themselves back into.

Kappas moved to forward PUD-12-18 to the August 13th meeting. Sandberg seconded. Motion passes by roll call vote 6:0.

Meeting adjourned.

