Plan Commission Hearing Summary Minutes (DRAFT) **August 13, 2018 - 5:30 pm**
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room #115

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 August 13th, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers #115. Members present: Cibor, Kappas, Sandberg, Maritano, Cate, Hoffmann, Wisler

ROLL CALL

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED: July 2018

Sandberg moved to approve the July 2018 minutes. Kappas seconded. Motion passed by voice vote

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Jackie Scanlan, Development Manager, reported that Andrew Cibor, the City Engineer, will be moving on from the City of Bloomington. Scanlan said Cibor has been a very valuable member on the numerous teams he's been on a part of in the City since spring 2015.

Cibor said it has been a pleasure serving on this Plan Commission for the last three and a half years. Cibor wishes them luck going forward, especially in regards to the UDO and the Transportation Plan.

CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER:

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

Hoffmann said there has been a request to continue DP-09-18 to the September meeting and this would require a vote, as it is a late request.

Scanlan said that Plan Commission rules provide for request for continuance up to a week in advance. If within that week, Plan Commission gets to make that decision. DP-09-18 at 1924 E. 2nd St. have asked to be continued to the September 2018 hearing. Continuation requests are meant to give the neighbors and petitioners more time to review and continue conversations that have been raised with the petition.

Wisler moved to continue DP-09-18 to the September meeting. Sandberg seconded

Carwina Weng, on behalf of the eastside neighborhood association, said they would be happy to consent to the continuance.

Dave Rollo, City Council District IV, said the east side neighborhood is within District IV. Rollo has met with the eastside neighborhood and they received information very late about this petition. They would like time to review. Rollo said it would be prudent to continue this case and urges the Commission to do so.

Wisler moved to continue DP-09-18 to the September meeting. Sandberg seconded. Motion passed by voice vote.

Scanlan said PUD-16-18 was intended to be on the consent agenda, but there was an error when the packet went out. Scanlan requested PUD-16-18 be put on the consent agenda.

Hoffmann asked if there was anyone on the Commission who would like to leave PUD-16-18 on the regular agenda for a full hearing tonight.

There were none.

Hoffmann asked if anyone in the public would like a full hearing on PUD-16-18 at N. Gates Dr.

There were none.

Scanlan said that because of Plan Commission rules, the rules need to be suspended in order to add this case to the consent agenda.

Hoffmann asked for a motion to suspend the rules in order to place PUD-16-18 on the consent agenda.

Wisler moved to suspend the rules to place PUD-16-18 on the consent agenda. Maritano seconded. Motion passed by roll call vote

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

Wisler moved to approve the consent agenda. Sandberg seconded. Consent agenda passes by roll call vote.

PETITIONS:

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

Scanlan presented the Staff report. This is the second month for Fountain Residential Partners. The property is located on the eastside of Bloomington at 3rd St. and 446. This petition was heard at the July hearing. Some of the changes to the site plan include inclusion of street design for a north-south connection and east-west connection on the southern portion of the site and a second east-west in the middle of the site. The parking configuration has changed as well. The petitioner submitted their requested traffic study. Staff has received information from Bloomington Transit recently. Building design and layout has changed as well. The petition site is 14.07 acres. It is zoned Planned Unit Development, part of Century Village Planning Unit Development. The Comprehensive Plan designation is Urban Corridor with some neighborhood residential along the southern portion of the site. The site currently contains some commercial office and the remainder of the site, which is what the petitioner wants to develop, is vacant. The petitioner is asking for a number of things for this petition, the first being a preliminary plan amendment. This is an amendment to the entire PUD to allow for some use changes. These would allow for first floor residential, addition of medical clinic, and the addition of fitness studio. Residential on the second floor or above is currently allowed, but they would be asking to extend this down to the first floor. They want to add .71 acres from the immediately adjacent PUD from the west and increase the permitted density. The uses they are asking to add is Dwelling Units, limited to a maximum of 250 units. They would like to apply the DUE standards of the residential high density zoning district. They would like to carry over a couple of their unique uses that exist in the PUD but not in the UDO, while also adding medical clinic and fitness training studio. There is one parcel that is actually in the PUD to the west that the petitioner would like to bring into this PUD for the development. Currently, they are limited to 50 units of above ground multifamily units, which comes out to about 3.64 units per acre. They would like to increase this to 250 units of dwelling, multifamily, which includes ground floor residential. This would be 17.76 units per acre. Along 3rd St., there would be three story town houses shown. This is similar to last time. Along 446, there would be three story town houses. In the previous site plan, there were four 4 story buildings. In the previous site plan, there were 11 total

buildings and now there are 7. At the last meeting, there was a request to break up the parking and break down the buildings. Some of the buildings were quite long. The petitioner's response to that was to break the buildings down and turn them sideways. This way, going through the connector roads, you would only see the ends of the buildings and they wouldn't seem so massive. Plan Commission and Staff felt there may be too much parking there. There are now parking decks and parallel parking spots. Because there is a natural rise here, the top and bottom will be accessible from the same road. The petitioner is proposing 440 parking spaces, which is .73 parking spaces per bedroom. They previously proposed 478 parking spaces. They are also proposing a parking maximum of .8 parking spaces for the PUD. Some of the amenities on site include a club house, pool, and two transit stops. There is one stop across from the clubhouse that would allow for a bus to come in and park and wait for travelers to board. The second stop is immediately adjacent to Knightridge, where the bus currently goes in, that the Knightridge residents would be able to easily access as well. The bus would go back out and go out again and head north on 446. The route 6 bus is the campus bus that comes out to this area. It turns around in Knightridge apartments. The petitioner has spoken to Bloomington Transit and Bloomington Transit feels that they could pull in off of 3rd St., have a holding pattern, go down and pick up on the south side, and back out on 446 to get back to campus. It currently arrives in the area every 40 minutes. All riders of that bus, over one million riders in 2017, almost 93% were IU students using their passes. They anticipate high ridership here as well. Depending on the ridership they got from this project or future projects, they would look at increasing service to this area. Last meeting, the numbers of units was 221 units and 632 bedrooms. Tonight, they are proposing a total of 240 units with 600 bedrooms. It is 32 bedrooms less than what was seen last month. 120 four bedroom units and 120 one bedroom units. Another part of this request is a preliminary plat amendment, as they want to combine numerous existing lots into one lot. The department and the administration have been working with petitioner to improve the petition since last month. Staff is recommending approval because the petition is a large, mixed-use development, bringing a residential component to what otherwise is solely a commercial PUD and has been for a number of decades, and bringing housing to a community that is on an existing transit route and a thoroughfare. They will be preserving 75% of the trees that are on the site currently in the tree canopy area. Including electric vehicle parking, they are adding a piece of the bicycle and pedestrian connection. They have also worked with the administration towards diverse housing contributions. Plan Commission received an email from Director Porter with the details of that. They would be contributing $500,000 to the Affordable Housing Fund and 5 acres of an existing PUD at Fullerton and 37 with stipulations that a roadway would be built to the 5 acres and it could be used for workforce housing. There were some timelines on when this needs to be completed. They have also increased the possibility for future roadway connections by designing their road connections to City standards, so in the future if either of the adjacent properties were to develop to the west or to the south, a public road could be put in through a platting process and obtain the right of way on this parcel to connect to the adjacent areas. The improvements they made regarding parking were in line with what was requested. The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission approve the preliminary plat amendment and forward the preliminary plan amendment to Common Council with positive recommendation with 9 conditions, as follows: 1. PUD Final Plan Approval is delegated to the Planning & Transportation Staff. 2. All landscaping for this project will meet RH landscaping requirements with the exception of parking lot island totals, which can match but not be less than those shown on the Preliminary Plan. 3. Utility plan must be designed so as not to conflict with required street tree locations. 4. Final Plat approval is delegated to the Plat Committee. 5. All required bicycle parking to meet Chapter 5 Unified Development Ordinance standards shall be included at the Final Plat Stage. 6. Petitioner shall install the side path adjacent to the site along 3rd St., the sidewalk along State Road 446, and the off-site side path, as described in the petitioner statement, before final occupancy will be issued for any new buildings. 7. Right-of-way dedication is required for all streets that do not currently have the required amount of right-of-way. This must be done within 180 of Council approval. 8. Petitioner shall install electric vehicle charging stations to support at least 10% of the final parking spaces. 9. Petitioners shall submit for approval of a long-term maintenance plan for the on-site permeable pavers before final occupancy will be issued.

Terri Porter, director of Planning & Transportation, reiterated that Planning & Transportation Staff has communicated that this project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. However, from the discussion last month, Porter was reminded of some of the vague language in the Comprehensive Plan. It is purposefully vague, so it can be open to interpretation. Even though the Comprehensive Plan has been adopted, it is still in a transitionary period because the UDO and the accompanying land use map is still in progress. Student housing has yet to be defined and where the City wants it. It has not been defined what "relatively close to the university"

or "closely proximate to the university" specifically mean. By the end of the Unified Development Ordinance process, there will be answers to these questions for community discussion. Even though there are not answers to these questions yet, there is still a strong need for additional housing stock. We don't want to stop development, we don't want a moratorium, and we don't want to stop a good project just because these questions are still unanswered. Once the UDO has been adopted, these types of projects will not need to be debated any longer. We will know what student housing is, we will know where we want it, and we will zone for that area appropriately and make it easier for developers to develop. Approving this project does not, in Porter's opinion, set a precedent for where student housing should go. In fact, it is possible that through the process of discussions with the UDO, we may decide this location is too far from campus for additional student housing. Right now, Staff is recommending approval of this project because a good project should not be stopped from going forward just because some things are still undefined. It increases housing stock. We appreciate the roads around the development are to standards and the activation of the commercial area. It contributes to the public good by helping the City's affordable housing challenge. It also addresses many of the Environmental Commission's concerns by preserving most of the woodlands, planting native species, and 10% of parking spaces having electric charging stations.

Steve Brehob, from Smith Brehob & Associates, thanked Scanlan for outlining what changed about the petition from the first meeting to this meeting. They have connected roads where possible, they have connected sidewalks where possible. The purpose of this is to integrate this project with surrounding developments.

Cibor asked how many parking spaces is this per unit and if .7 is sufficient and if so, why request more.

Brehob responded that when talking about parking, they are requesting for the entire PUD, which includes the commercial part. Requesting .85 provides flexibility. Just at the apartment project, it would not be possible to get to .85 on that.The developers have other projects around the country and believe that .73 will work at this location because it is on the bus line. It comes right through the site. With public transit, .73 will be fine.

Cibor asked if 50% of the trips will include transit, why there are still so many parking spots being requested.

Brehob said that on a day to day basis, up to 50% or more will use transit. The fact of the matter is, people bring their cars to the community. On the weekend, they may use their car. They don't anticipate cars being used to get to campus. It would defeat the purpose to drive to campus and take a bus from the Stadium. At Reserve on Third, they thought they would see many people driving their cars in the morning. The majority of people got on public transit and went to campus. Because students don't have class early, they did not contribute to peak traffic times.

Cibor asked if there was any exploration of sharing the spaces between the varying uses in order to minimize the total overall parking spots.

Brehob said no, they did not explore this. The parking that primarily serves the radio station and the office is pretty much full. During the evening, parking could have turnover. There may be another building built over in that area, so they did not look into the possibility of using that parking.

Cibor asked about access easements, especially transit easements, in regards to this development.

Brehob said they could certainly do this. They have talked to Lou May from Bloomington Transit about it. They could create a transit easement to allow the buses to go in and drive on the roads, as long as they remain private. This was always a key concern of May's. They would need some type of easement for where the bus will pull off and wait.

Cibor asked about the recommendation of the final plan approval's process.

Scanlan explained that this PUD already exists, so they are not doing a preliminary plan, but they are doing an amendment to the preliminary plan that already exists for this PUD that has to be approved by Council. When there is a final decision made about this request, it will be a recommendation to City Council for that portion of

this request. At this stage, they are amending a special ordinance. If this is approved, then they will have to do the site plan stage. In a PUD, this is called a final plan. The final plan would be all the landscaping details that aren't seen here. This is why it is called a conceptual site plan, but some things may be tweaked. The level of detail here is not necessarily the level of detail there will be at the next stage. Staff is anticipating that if this is approved by Council, the final plan will be very close to matching what has been seen. It comes back to Plan Commission unless it is delegated to Staff. Scanlan answered that it is 1.8 parking spaces per unit. It is number of parking spaces per bed.

Sandberg asked the petitioner what the reconfiguration of the units do to the unit costs.

Trevor Tollett, Fountain Residential Partners, said that many more one bedrooms have been added in the redesign. It was originally 30% one bedroom units and is now 50% one bedroom units. By arranging the site, the same price point has been kept.

Sandberg asked the price of the units.

Tollett said the price point estimated is the same price as before. The four bedrooms are between $650 and $700. The one bedrooms and efficiency units would be between $900 and a little over $1000. This is substantially below what can be found in the downtown area.

Wisler asked the petitioner if they have any elevations for the parking deck.

Brehob asked if Wisler was looking for a rendering.

Wisler asked for rough estimates so they could visualize what they're talking about.

Brehob said they do not have a rendering, but can describe it. The parking deck that is located in the southwest corner. The entrance drive between the two buildings would bring you to the top level. The top level would be at roughly the same elevation as the units. The units would seem to be looking out at a parking lot. Floor to floor difference will probably be in the 10-11 ft. range. The other drive between the buildings brings you around to the lower level. The view from the east, from the four small buildings, would be of both levels of the parking deck. The area to the south, the parking deck is immediately adjacent to the parking area of the Reserve. Similarly, the parking deck that is internal to the project, will not be seen from the adjacent streets because it is surrounded by buildings by all four sides.

Wisler asked if the units adjacent to the deck would walk out onto the top of the parking deck.

Brehob answered yes.

Wisler asked about the electric charging stations.

Brehob confirmed it would be about 40 charging stations.

Wisler asked for the petitioner to speak to how the layout and design makes it marketable as student housing.

Brent Little, President & CEO of Fountain Residential Partners, thinks that the unit mix makes it less student housing. Projects have been built all across the United States over the past 17 years and many are adjacent to medical and university complexes working together. They foresee first year residents living there, assistants for the medical facility, and others who work in other places in the community. The one bedroom units will be attractive to not just students, but those who work in the university or surrounding environment.

Wisler asked about the addition of medical clinic to the use list and what the reasoning was behind the request.

Brehob said the original PUD had various uses. The original PUD is 10-20 years old. The addition of the medical use and fitness use is to bring more current uses to the PUD.

Hoffmann asked Staff how the proposal is intending to help fill the bike-pedestrian path on 3rd St.

Scanlan said along 3rd St., they will do the bike path as a part of the site plan approval in front of the portion of property that is being developed.

Hoffmann asked where the path will go once it gets to the eastern location.

Scanlan said it will stub on this property. They are only doing site plan on a vacant portion, the UDO only compels them to put it on this portion.

Hoffmann asked if they are going through the site on the path.

Scanlan said yes, it will go through the site and it will link to the south.

Hoffmann asked if the other site was to the west.

Brehob said there is a vacant parcel between the mortuary and the law office that is owned by IU Credit Union and there is no trail or sidewalk on that portion. This project would connect those two.

Scanlan said there is no sidewalk or anything there.

Hoffmann asked if this was over near Smith Rd.

Brehob said this over by Office Lounge.

Hoffmann said a question was raised about sight lines and asked if this has been looked at.

Brehob said they looked at intersection sight distance at both the existing connection of Park Ridge and 3rd as well as the proposed connection at Morningside. The proposed connection at Morningside has greater sight distance looking back to the west than Park Ridge has from the top of the hill even though it comes out at the top of the hill. The reason for this is that the grade at both sides of that hill are steep enough that even though you're coming out from the top of the hill, you cannot see as far to the west or east as you would like. That is the reason there are perceived issues with that intersection. The intersection at Park Ridge has greater sight distance for a vehicle to make a left or right turn.

Hoffmann asked if the Environmental Commission would have looked at whether this project would raise issues for the Lake Monroe Watershed.

Scanlan said in the County Plan jurisdiction, they have environmental constraints and overlays depending on the distance from the lake. There are areas 1, 2, and 3. Some of the Area 3s come in this general area. They do not have jurisdiction here, so it does not apply. It is part of their zoning code. This is something the Environmental Commission would have looked at. It is not something they included in their analysis. It is something that would have been in their purview if they thought development in this area would have a negative effect on the watershed.

Hoffmann asked if there were any regulations on watershed protections via the City.

Scanlan said she was not sure that the City has something that would apply here that would preclude this type of development at this location.

Brehob said because the site is larger than one acre, water quality enhancement is required, regardless of whether it is in the Lake Monroe watershed or not.

Hoffmann asked what this would mean.

Brehob said rain gardens, bioswales, extended detention, mechanical BMPs. There are various ways to include water quality enhancement. Indiana Department of Environmental Management requires that for any site over one acre in size, which this site is.

Hoffmann asked if that needs to be specifically included in the approval process.

Brehob said it is mandatory due to the size.

Scanlan said in the UDO in Chapter 5 under Environmental Standards, the portion of our lake water shed area protection focuses on steep slope disturbance, which does not apply in this situation. Staff could require a recordable commitment to address storm water runoff quality mitigation matters. Because there is not a steep slope issue on this site, Scanlan thinks they would expect these things would be contained and treated as they usually are on a site like this.

Hoffmann asked about the meetings between the neighborhood and the petitioner since last Plan Commission Meeting.

Scanlan said that Smith sent out invites to neighborhood associations in a one mile radius, per Kappas' request.

Hoffmann asked if this meeting ever took place.

Brehob said there was an open house at their office. Based on what Smith said, no one showed up.

Dave Rollo, City Council Representative District IV, said what he sees here is the scale and size of a development on the periphery of the city that is anathema to the Comprehensive Plan. The intention of the community was a neighborhood residential mixed with commercial. This is a high density student development shoe horned into that definition. Yes, Bloomington needs housing. With it, comes sprawl. With it, comes traffic congestion. Rollo has supported high density in the past, when it was proximate to the campus. The university should take more responsibility of their student body and build more student housing. However, Rollo has voted yes in the replacement of Varsity Villa because students could walk downtown and to campus. Rollo asked if this demonstrates public benefit, which is the goal of the PUD process. There is ambiguity about student housing and where it should be, what it should look like, and this is a debate for the UDO. Rollo said we should be prudent, conservative, and wait for the UDO process. Rollo says we should not expedite something we could look back and say "we were mistaken".

Hoffmann announced that 8 emails were included in their packet for this case.

Margaret Clemens, said she has been involved in Bloomington since the 1960s and has 3 degrees from Indiana University. The university student enrollment is up to 44,000 students and it appears it could go as high as 60,000. There does not seem to be a cohesive plan with the City with student housing. Until that is done, Clemens believes a moratorium should exist on building further student housing. Of a city this size, it is not sustainable to have the student body exceed the general population. It creates dependencies throughout our society. The mayor had hired three night ambassadors, another word for "RA", to help out with nighttime activities in the middle of the town at the cost of $325,000. That is a tax on the working poor. The university is receiving too much good grace from the working population of the City of Bloomington. University growth is not economic development; it is a lazy city's response to a realization of a vision of a greater idea. We cannot just be in a responsive mode, we must be in a proactive mode. There have been buzzwords in this discussion about saving trees, electric car charging stations, and how this could be equated with affordable housing. We should recognize at the outset that that is not the intention. The intention with the photos placed before the Commission, with sand pit volleyball nets and a pool, is advertising for students. Until we understand where the university is going and what their vision is for housing the students. Right now, Indiana University has 13,000 beds for 40,000 students. They have reduced the number of beds by converting double beds into single rooms. There should be a moratorium on further student housing. Zoning is our only defense.

Ron Remack has been agent for the organization for about 16 years and the sole owner of the business and the building between Chatman's and B97. On behalf of the agents and 15 staff people, Remack thinks it's a good thing for the east side and for the community.

Charlotte Zidlul, said the university and the City need to sit down together and talk about what the future of the university in this town is. The university is one of the biggest employers in the City. The City and university do not talk to each other in a way that talks about the future. She urges this conversation to start and be serious.

Sherry Knighton-Schwandt said she is a resident of Cedar Springs, which is across 446 where this development is being proposed. As a resident of Cedar Springs, Knighton-Schwandt did not receive an invitation or announcement for their Home Owners Association about the open house. Knighton-Schwandt finds it remarkable and amazing that the Plan Commission of Bloomington would move ahead with the approval of any development, particularly a development of this size, without having an explanation or definition of "student housing" and how far away it should be from the university. Knighton-Schwandt said you cannot go back on this decision making process. The big picture is getting lost here. It seems like everything is being done piece-meal and these developments are being thrown out there without true evidence and data to back it up. According to the Be Clear Portal, there are 20,000 rental bedrooms. This equates to 34,000 occupants. If you take that number and add the 13,000 beds that IU has, which are not enough, and you get to where enrollment is currently at IU. Knighton-Schwandt asked after this development is approved, how many more beds the City will need. Knighton-Schwandt said that they have multi-family in this proposal, but this does not mean multi-family. The target market is students and young professionals. Knighton-Schwandt asked if this demographic is the one being targeted for affordable housing. Knighton-Schwandt said the commentary from the developers points to the fact that this is definitely student housing and for single young professionals. The last time the gentleman who spoke said a studio apartment is going to be $900 and up. Knighton-Schwandt asked the builders and developers what evidence they have to support their claim that 50% of occupants are going to take public transportation. There is so much more that can be done to a commercialized area to bring money and people into the City that are not student housing.

Knighton-Schwandt, said the primary entrance and exit is on SSR 446, which is located less than 100 yards to the entrance of the Cedar Springs subdivision across 446. If this goes through, there will be 4 roads that feed into SSR 446 within a few hundred feet of each other. One that goes into the parking lot by the radio station, one that is behind Cedar Springs that comes out the entrance to Knight's Ridge apartments, and now this new thing. The traffic study that is reported in the revised proposal is two years old. It does not account for the fact of the increased development at Summer House. It does not account for the building of the Cedar Springs subdivision and the traffic going in and out of there. It has no evidence whatsoever about the amount of accidents that occur at the intersection of 46 and 446. It is a study focused on an old study of people turning out of Morningside Dr. and onto 3rd St. Schwandt does not believe that this data is relevant to this development. It seems incredulous to Schwandt that adding a 600 bed apartment complex to what is now an empty restaurant meets the definition of a mixed-use development. The definition of this is residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, or entertainment uses, where those functions are physically and functionally integrated and provide pedestrian connections. There is no integration of these apartments with anything else there. Schwandt asked to respectfully contest the point of view of the developer that members of the workforce would occupy a single bedroom apartment in the $900-$1000 per month range when the salaries are around the $30,000 range, meaning they would be spending 40% of their income to have an apartment. Finally, given the proximity of these apartments to the new hospital and the medical park, Schwandt asked why the commission would not consider something that would combine housing with medical office space. Schwandt read Goal 5.2 in the Comprehensive Plan, "Guide growth change and preservation of residential and business areas through planning policies that create and sustain neighborhood character and greenspace, and that build a sense of community, civic involvement, and neighborhood pride". It is difficult for many of us to believe that student housing with market rate apartments fit that goal.

Dave Landis, resident of Bloomington for 45 years, said he has nothing to do with Fountain Residential developers. He said this site has been undeveloped for many, many years and abandoned for many years. There is no doubt that with the Plan Commission's efforts, we will come up with a project from these developers that will benefit the City. More importantly, this development will greatly increase the value of that property and

increase tax dollars that come into the City to make it a better place to live. Landis supports this petition and hopes the Commission will too.

Mike Mervosh, resident of Cedar Springs, said that when heading east on 3rd St, at Mr. Hibachi and the gas station across the street, you come to the point where people in the left lane who want to continue onto 46 to Nashville. Somebody stops to turn into the gas station or the apartment complex, slamming on breaks, and immediately going into the right lane. Everyone going on 446 now has to dodge this car going into that lane and come back around him. This is a consistent problem at all times of day. Without traffic lights, if this project goes through, there might as well be an ambulance stationed there. It is that serious now and with 600 beds, Mervosh can't imagine what that would do to that whole traffic situation. Mervosh said he has to be very careful when stopping for gas because people fly up over the hill. Mervosh asked that they look at traffic flow and how to control traffic flow.

Peter Gould, thanked Scanlan for her patience and kindness. Gould said he wants to talk about traffic and the big picture. 446 is an eastern gateway into Bloomington. Traffic is a problem. SR 46 is the only incoming way coming east. Gould leaves east of town on 46. There is going to be more traffic on that road because of the IU School of Design in Columbus now. If you're headed west into town, someone without using a signal will make a left at Mr. Hibachi or makes a right into Circle K. At the same time when someone is trying to hang a left out of Park Ridge to go west on 3rd St. because someone is stopped there, even though the person who is going around to the right of that person heading west on 3rd is already cutting back into that lane. The other thing is SR 446 is the main entryway from Lake Monroe and Hoosier National Park. As planners, this is an opportunity to make a statement about Bloomington. One of the problems with the site drawings in the packets is that they are just not big enough to include Park Ridge Rd. Gould said the red circle is Park Ridge Rd. and SR 46. The orange circle is a new entrance that is going to align with Morningside Dr. The orange circle in the lower right is the new entrance on 446. The two yellow circles are already existing entrances on the PUD. The distance between the red circle, going downhill, and the yellow circle is 731 ft. The distance between the orange circle and the furthest most yellow circle is a little less than 400 ft. Traffic is already bad between Smith Rd. and 446. It is really hazardous to Park Ridge. Plus there is Circle K which has 2 driveways, maybe cutting down to Park Ridge, going both ways onto 46. The proposed calls for access via 46 that is going to align with Morningside Dr. Gould asked commission if they really want another Park Ridge intersection that is downhill from the existing Park Ridge Rd. intersection. The issues with the traffic study, there was no real talk of traffic safety hazards or the existing. No one pulled an accident report from the Bloomington Police Department. Gould's recommendation is eliminating all access from SR 446 and run the traffic up Park Ridge and put a light at Park Ridge and 46. Gould suggested consolidating the three entrances on 446 of this property to one that is properly managed.

Carrie Bezotte (?), lives at Parkwood East, says that intersection is a hazard. If the word multi-family remains in the proposal, there is nothing in the new diagram that speaks to families. There is no greenspace, there is no play space, no parks, no playground. It has been designed as student housing. Having lived in Bloomington 25 years, this is the time of year that the most for rent signs have been seen. It goes to the issue of "how much is this needed?". There are still many student rental houses with signs out and local apartments. They are typically gone by this time of year. They are not renting for the next school year. The question is whether there is a need for something this big, given the amount of housing going up elsewhere in this local area.

Hoffmann asked Staff to answer the question from the public regarding traffic lights on 3rd St and whether this is in control of the City.

Scanlan said that 3rd St. and SR 446 are both state highways. Any changes to these would be by the Indiana Department of Transportation.

Hoffmann reiterated that a traffic light is not something that could be brought about even if they wanted to. The best that could be done is request the state look at the question.

Scanlan read the 10th condition as, "The petitioner will make necessary adjustments to any anti-monotony standards as related to architectural design". Staff would like this to be included in the motion.

Wisler moved for approval of PUD-12-18 with 10 conditions of approval as outlined in the packet. Cate seconded.

Kappas thanked petitioner for all the hard work and cooperation with the City. Kappas did not ask any questions tonight, because he has had a lot of time to think about this, has talked with the City, and received a lot of public comment. As part of the Comprehensive Master Plan thought process, while vague, our urban corridors on the fringes are gateways. These gateways are opportunities to show our city as people come in and out. There is focus on the northern part for student development potentially. This does count as urban sprawl from a student housing standpoint. Being 1.85 miles from the eastern edge of campus, which is a dormitory, it is far away unless you are a bike rider. Furthermore, the intention is to have the true mix of commercial and residential. It would be a lot more powerful in this area than student and no other mixed use other than the fitness center. There is a lot of other things, like traffic concerns. Kappas is disappointed to see that no one showed up to the open house and no one was talked to from neighborhood associations. There seemed to be a miscommunication. Kappas said he will vote no on this because he does not believe this is a fit for this area and does not benefit the public.

Wisler said a lot has been said about demand for student housing. There is absolutely no doubt that IU needs to do more to address housing. Wisler wishes the Comprehensive Plan had more specifics in there. The answer to that is not to stop building. That is probably the worst thing they can do. We cannot put a moratorium on enrollment. Prices will keep going up if demand goes up and supply lags. The only way prices come down is if supply catches up to the demand. IU is not ignoring this problem. They are spending 99 million dollars on a new 700 bed complex that was approved this year. IU and the City need to do more and work closely together on this. We need more density, more supply of housing. Typically, Wisler's strong preference is that it would be close to campus, much closer than this. This is not where student housing should be located. It is not walkable to campus, but is a quick bus ride down 3rd St. The 6 line is one of the most utilized bus lines. It runs every 20 minutes. One thing Wisler would like to see is less parking. This should be a truly transit oriented development. Having fewer parking spaces would do this. Deck parking makes it less convenient to jump in your car. That parking should be even more removed from the units. With a few tweaks, it could be truly transit oriented. There is room for improvement on 3rd St. It is not so much a capacity issue as a design issue. Wisler said he will bring this up with MPO staff who work with INDOT about this issue. It is probably another 2500 to 3000 units before there is any downward price pressure on rents in Bloomington. The bad news for developers is that the city will hopefully catch up and they will have to lower rents. Wisler says he will support this tonight in hope to make continuous improvement to it and make it more transit oriented. In addition to the contributions they are making directly will lead to more balance in the housing supply.

Maritano said that like Kappas, she did not ask any questions because she has been thinking about and researching this project since last meeting. In the Comprehensive Plan, we need 556 units per year to meet the demands of housing in this community, 2/3rds of which should be high density multi-family, which equals 185 approximately. This one property exceeds these projections already and this commission has already approved several projects around this issue. The numbers in the Comprehensive Master Plan would not suggest that this is consistent to approve this project. We need living options across the range of need. We are missing the middle housing, the triplexes, the court style, the work-life. We should be embracing innovation and creativity and avoiding monocultures that serve only a small range of incomes and attract a limited segment of the market. We should encourage diverse housing, green space, and consideration of overall wellbeing of the surrounding areas. This project is a monoculture, has no green space, and is a continuation of the trend of the building that we keep doing and we are not meeting the needs. We can do better in this community, we can do better, we can meet the needs. Maritano appreciates the changes that were made to this plan and the offer of $500,000 and 5 acres of land along I-69 on the southwest side of town. Maritano encourages this dedication to our community regardless of approval on specific projects.

Enright-Randolph said that access and easements will be sorted out during plats. Enright-Randolph asked if Staff or the developers talked with INDOT about access from 446.

Scanlan answered no, not with Staff.

Enright-Randolph said he has concerns about calling this mixed use. His main focus is traffic and making streets as free flowing as possible. He likes the innovations and adding connectivity.

Cibor appreciates the petitioner's time invested and work put in with Staff. He also appreciates the public and everyone who came out today. One thing to keep in mind is that it goes to City Council and Plan Commission is a recommending body. The transit component is huge. When this first came up several months ago, Cibor remembers having conversations with Staff, going through the Comp Plan, the Hoffmann amendment, and there is other language in the Comprehensive Plan that provides somewhat conflicting information. Cibor said "What is student housing?". Cibor said he started thinking about what student housing looks like compared to a standard apartment building. A lot of the traffic concerns heard tonight are on 3rd St. A lot of the comments made tonight are right on the mark. Next year, INDOT is planning to resurface this road. Without the center turn lane, it creates a lot of the safety concerns that are out there. It is not a volume issue, it is a design issue. Cibor hopes going forward that the traffic study becomes more refined. Cibor said as an engineer, he wants to see real data to make that case. 50% could be accurate, but would like to see real numbers. Cibor will be voting in favor of the motion.

Cate said this has been a tough case from the beginning and appreciates the concerns raised by the public in this case. Cate appreciates all that the petitioner has done to respond to concerns and address those in many positive ways. Cate echoed the emphasis of university communications with the City on issues of student housing. Cate has somewhat the same take on this regarding what student housing is. It will have an appeal to young professionals, some of who will share 4 bedroom units. At the end of the day, Cate does not feel comfortable with the notion of imposing a moratorium to try to get a good development that appeals to not only the students. It is way too far of a walk. Cate said she is leaning towards supporting this and thanked everyone.

Sandberg said that this will be coming to Council. There will be another opportunity to debate the merits. We clearly need housing; this is indisputable. Like everyone else who mentioned all of the work that has gone in since this was first seen to now, it has gotten better. Sandberg said it is not there yet. Sandberg received information today about the contributions to the Housing Development Fund the City has and emphasized this is not the "Affordable Housing Development Fund". The project at Dunnhill was one of the first seeds for that first housing development fund, which is going to critical in what is done moving forward, to be more creative, to be more proactive in getting the housing needed for that missing middle. The low to moderate incomes that many of us in Bloomington have. Sandberg will not be supporting this.

Hoffmann said this is a very important case and a very important issue. Reasonable minds clearly differ about what should happen on this site and with this proposal. Hoffmann says he starts every case with a presumption that Staff, who are professionals, should get a lot of the credit for Bloomington being the place we love and care about so much. It is a testament to our planning professionals that we live in a place that is as wonderful as it is in terms of land use and development. That's the starting point. Hoffmann says whenever he finds himself having trouble wrapping his mind around what Staff has recommended, it is usually a sign to keep thinking and try to figure it out. Hoffmann says he wished he could choose what goes on particular sites around town. They only get to say yes or no to what the owner puts on a particular property. We do not have any power to tell IU what to do, with respect to their own land or even sitting down at the table with the City. Hoffmann said the Commission does not approve or deny proposals based on whether they are economically wise or needed. Owners and developers have the right to make unwise decisions about their own land. Hoffmann suspects this development will be successful, as these developers have done their research and know what will be economically successful. Hoffmann hopes at this point that everyone can agree there is a pressing need for the City to address the question of where we should be encouraging new student oriented housing projects. Student apartments continue to be one of the strongest drivers of development in our local economy. While we all may think we have enough student housing, local developers and non-local developers continue to think that there is new for new projects to prosper, possibly with older projects that may then gradually transition to serve other renters. Hoffmann continues to believe that we should encourage this because this is one of the best ways to respond to the overall high demand of housing in Bloomington and help to drive down rental costs for everyone.

It doesn't matter what the apartments being built are at the higher end of the price range or lower end of the price end. What matters is more housing, more supply, will have a beneficial effect on rental costs for everyone. The question is where the next wave of student housing projects should go. One of the clearest messages that emerged from the Comprehensive Master Plan process is that many people in Bloomington share the belief that the downtown area have become saturated with undergraduate student apartments. We need to encourage developers to consider building such projects elsewhere. It also reflects the strong sentiment that it is best, all else being equal, for new student apartment complexes to be located close to the IU campus. That helps to minimize the negative side effects for the entire community for clogging crosstown traffic, 3rd St., 10th St., 5th St., Bloomfield Rd. If you put the student housing on the peripherals of town, it clogs central arteries and makes life worse for everyone. That is why the plan specifically recommends that student housing be proximate to the IU campus. The problem is that we don't know yet exactly what that means. Those are just rather empty words at this point. That is the way it has to be. Master Plans do not speak in very specific terms about those kinds of questions. They speak about broad policies. They speak in vague generalities. It is the UDO that gives specific content to those generalities. We need to figure out in the new Development Ordinance and we need to put down on paper how best to define what a student housing project is, what specific features they should have, and where those projects should be approved to be built. If we do not do that, we have failed as a Plan Commission. So where does that leave us now since we do not yet have the new UDO. Hoffmann believes we should be cautious but not completely stifle the development of student housing while we wait for the new UDO to be drafted. Hoffmann agrees with Wisler that it would be a mistake to have a moratorium. The key question on any project that comes before us in the next year or so is whether a project offers a sufficient amount of positives to outweigh any amount of uncertainty that may loom over the future decision about steering student housing in a certain area of town or direction. It is quite possible that we'll decide to constrain student oriented projects to an area much closer to the IU Campus. That ordinance is not yet in place. We have not even yet fully resolved of the best specific locations for these kinds of projects. That is a conversation we have not quite had. Hoffmann cannot presume that his opinion is the same opinion that will come out of that public process. This project offers significant positives, including the enhancement of public transit and also the contribution to more diverse housing stock in Bloomington. Hoffmann says this is the basis on which he plans to vote.

Scanlan said for a Planned Unit Development, you can forward the petition to the Council with either a favorable recommendation, a favorable recommendation with conditions, a negative recommendation, or no recommendation.

Hoffmann clarified the motion on the table right now is to approve on the 10 conditions that are in the Staff report.

Wisler moved for approval of PUD-12-18 with 10 conditions of approval as outlined in the packet. Cate seconded. Roll call vote 4-5. Motion failed.

Wisler moved to forward PUD-12-18 to Council with no recommendation. Kappas seconded.

Wisler commented on the motion and said that the Council offers two more chances for public comment and two more cycles for changes to be made to the final plan. Knowing the Council, there will be many requests for additional changes before it gets passed. Wisler thinks procedurally this is a good thing and the best way to move forward.

Scanlan noted the petition is for the preliminary plan amendment, which is a Council voting petition, but also for the preliminary plat amendment, which ends here. There would need to be a second vote for that.

Wisler moved to forward PUD-12-18 to Council with no recommendation and to continue the preliminary plat amendment to the September meeting. Kappas seconded.

Hoffmann said a case that garners this much public comment should probably be decided at the Council, where people elect who votes.

Wisler moved to forward PUD-12-18 to Council with no recommendation and to continue the preliminary plat amendment to the September meeting. Kappas seconded. Motion passes with 7:0 roll call vote

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

Scanlan presented the report. This property is located at the northwest corner of town. The property is roughly 41 acres. The portion on the west side is currently zoned business park and is actually a part of with a use variance of multi-family. The Comprehensive Plan designation for this site is neighborhood residential. There is no development on the site currently. The petitioner is requesting a preliminary plan amendment to the existing PUD to add the use multifamily residential and to also add the BP parcel from the west planned unit development that is just under 20 acres. The proposal includes 253 units and 855 bedrooms. The project would include 224 duplex units and 29 single family detached dwelling units. This is facing north. Entering off of 17th St. through two easements. The breakdown of bedrooms per unit is 10 one bedroom units, 54 two bedroom units, 54 three bedroom units, 100 four bedroom units, and 35 five bedroom units over three phases. The petitioner is proposing a total of 873 parking spaces, which is equal to a little over 1 parking space per bedroom. The petitioner also submitted this map showing the subject site related to the two mile buffer around the Union and other developments out to the west and east. The property is to be developed in three phases. The unit totals are also split up between the phases. The total number of units in Phase I is 106, with 336 bedrooms and 431 parking spaces. Phase II is 88 total units with 298 bedrooms and 305 parking spaces. Both of those phases are entirely duplex models. Phase III is 59 units with 221 bedrooms and 137 parking spaces, which is where the 29 detached dwelling units would be located. This is Phase I and the alley area is the parking area associated with this portion of the development. A lot of area devoted to parking. No public streets or private streets proposed with this development, only parking areas and drive aisles with 90 degree parking on either side to access Phase II and Phase III. They would leave the option of parking pads or garages behind the detached units to be built in Phase III. The petitioner also included this exhibit to give an idea of the access to the two roads. There are two vehicular accesses that are kind of existing and would be used for the petition site. This site has seen similar proposals in the past under the previous long range plan called the Growth Policies Plan in 2014. The petitioner proposed 505 units with 475 multifamily units and 30 single family units. This petition was withdrawn after one Plan Commission meeting because the Growth Policies Plan designation was employment and Staff felt like it obviously didn't match. The petitioner decided to withdraw and wait for the Comprehensive Plan to see if it was more favorable to the type of development they would like to do. Unfortunately, Staff believes that many of the issues raised at this time are still prevalent on this site. The new Comprehensive Plan is neighborhood residential. The neighborhood residential design is what you would think of as a traditional neighborhood, a single family development with public roads built to complete streets standards, sidewalks on both sides, tree plots with street trees, front yards in front of detached units, on separate lots. While the petitioner has picked a density that falls between the 2 to 15 that is designated for neighborhood residential, the Department does not believe the style of this does not match the neighborhood residential design. On-street parking is not seen to be a dominant site feature and it is a dominant site feature in this proposal. Large developments should develop in a traditional street grid with short blocks. There are no streets proposed in this petition. With no direct access onto 17th St, poor transit access. 17th St. in this area is a 2 lane road, some spaces with no pedestrian bicycle facilities at all. There is a lack of future bike pedestrian infrastructure in the area, lack of walkable commercial services in the area, no amenities of nearby parks or commercial nodes in the walkable area. Most of all, lack of compliance with the Comprehensive Plan designation and lack of preservation of environmental features identified in the Environmental Commission report. Staff has a lot of concerns about this type of development in this location, not that this location should not be developed at all. The Comprehensive Plan is clear in what the community would like to see in this area and this plan is not meeting these goals. Planning & Transportation recommends to the Plan Commission recommends continuing the petition to the September meeting to give the petitioner time to respond to the Commission's comments and bring it closer to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Travis Ventel, the petitioner, introduced his team. Trinitas brought a project for this site a few years ago and wanted to wait until the Comprehensive Plan was updated for more guidance. Ventel said they have looked at bringing this product to Bloomington for some time. It is a duplex, cottage project. It really lives like a traditional neighborhood with front porches, backyards, amenity space. It is built with modern standards. It has sufficient parking, it has bed-bath parity. When built across the country, it applies to not only students, but young professionals who want to live in a neighborhood but cannot afford to buy a home. This gives them the look and feel of living in a home. This site is a very ugly site. In 1972, it was scraped of all dirt, all tree, everything, to build SR 37. It has been sitting undeveloped since. This makes it a very expensive site to develop. It has no trees, topsoil, but is served by all utilities. It has been a homeless camp in the past. After diving into this site in the past, it has no Karst features. It is exposed to limestone, but there are no sinkholes on this property. It is a very suitable property for this type of development. This site being on 17th St. with access across 37 or 69 makes this site less than 10 minutes to Cook and Ivy Tech, less than 10 minute drive to the hospital, 7 minute drive to downtown and to IU, and 7 minute drive to west side shopping or north side Kroger. Not many places in Bloomington do you have that kind of access to all of those places without going through 2nd St, 3rd St, or other major arteries. The road improvements of I-69 have drastically improved traffic and accessibility to this site. The current zoning of a PUD, which allows for parking and storage of semi-trailers, and a BP, which now is not the appropriate place for more employment, does not fit. We need to amend the PUD. There is a commercial node, one that will grow and expand as traffic increases and more people come to live in this area. These offices and small businesses will increase over time and expand the availability in that node. The existing multifamily that exists in the corner of the property as well. Another thing to remember is since the last time Trinitas was here, the overpass over 69 and the improved roundabout at Arlington Road have been added. There are plans for the City to improve the rest of 17th St. within the next calendar year. Right of way acquisition is almost complete and the project will be going to bid later this year. There will be an improved 17th St. from the overpass to the roundabout by this time next year. The City has already improved 17th St. from the roundabout to College and Walnut. Pedestrian and vehicular access is going to be much better in the next year than it is today. It is already much better than it was when this petition first came to the Commission. It is also important to look at the City's planning for the pedestrian bike-ped facilities. Looking at the City's draft Transportation Plan, it calls out for two improvements: MU-2 and MU-3. These are increasing the multi-pass along this same area. The City has planned for this area to be redeveloped, it has planned for road improvements. Most of them have been done. It is continuing to plan for more pedestrian improvements. The land has now been designated as neighborhood residential. This site is bound on two sides by the interstate. A grid street pattern is not going to continue through this property. On the east side, it is single family homes that are existing. On the west side is SR 37. The site is served by bus transportation. Petitioner has had several conversations with Lou May. The site itself sits one block off of 17th St, which has more than adequate service for this property. There have also been discussions with May about a shuttle service that would run directly to the park and ride at 17th St. or the development providing this service itself. The bus service is more than adequate and May agrees. This is a bus route that is maxed out on its time, so deviation into this development or any other development is unlikely. This could change over the next year as they go through their Master Planning process and analyzing all of their routes. PSI took a long time to look at what was there. They state there are no Karst features on this property. The petitioner also looked at what services need to be offered and looked at public areas like parks and schools. Crestmont Park is less than a half mile away. Tri-North middle school and one of the only two public pools is less than three-quarters miles away. The new county park is less than 1.1 mile to the west. The petitioner believes this area is well-served. There are 40 acres, 253 units. The clubhouse is capable of being LEAD certified. It is difficult to certify just a clubhouse, but the petitioner will build it to that standard. There will be playground, walking trails, a basketball court. 52% of the space will still be pervious surface area. Greenspace is over 52%. That is the care that was taken in designing this project to meet the needs of the community. There are access points, two on 17th St. and one on Arlington. Arlington is part of Phase III, so the petitioner thinks it may be used more towards the finishing out of the development, not at the beginning. Construction traffic would probably funnel in off of Arlington Rd. as we back ourselves out of the site as the 3 parcels are developed, with 17th St. being the main entrance initially for the project. As time progresses, residents will figure out that it might be easier to go certain directions by using Arlington Rd as opposed to 17th St, but it will be split. Adrian Reed performed the traffic study and can answer more questions late. The four and five bedrooms are a concern, but they allow us to build one and two bedrooms. One bedrooms are more expensive to build. Offsetting the cost of building them with 4 and 5 bedroom units allows rent to be lower. Trinitas has built this product before. It looks like a traditional subdivision, but there is parking in front of the units and greenspace. They also have the ability

to be sold off as part of the PUD. The PUD would be written so they could sell individual units if they wanted to. Bloomington has a housing crisis. The prices of homes are going up at an astronomical rate, faster than anywhere else in the state. Occupancy on rentals is over 96%. There will be students in this property. The petitioner believes that if something new is built in Bloomington, there will be students that rent there. The petitioner believes the average age will be 26 based on their past projects. This is good in regards to the access of Ivy Tech and Cook. This product would not force someone to go all the way through town. Phase I would not be delivered until 2020. It is important to think about the units needed every year. They will be lucky if they are delivered in 24 months from today. If you miss a cycle in August, then they are a year behind on those units. They do not come online until the next August because it is hard to deliver a product here and not deliver in August. This project is consistent with the Growth Policy Plan with Policy 1.43 and 1.46 talking about encouraging greenspace, existing tree buffer, recreational space, outdoor and indoor, and connecting to the trail system. Policy 1.5, 1.51, 1.53, this site is on an existing bus route that has capacity. There are recent and planned improvement to 17th St. This site is already being served by water and sewer, the infrastructure is there. Goal 3.2., greenspace, storm water best practices, a green clubhouse, public transportation service, small parks, these have all been planned. Housing diversity, it has been a long time in Bloomington since there has been a subdivision that is mostly doubles. Most subdivisions are either singles or apartment buildings. This project is near schools. Arlington Rd., Bloomington North, Tri-North are easily accessed from this site. There are conversations about a contribution to the Housing Development Fund. This is positive for the existing neighborhoods. The existing neighborhoods up there, when they had the neighborhood meeting, their number one concern was whether this would be something different. This is something different. This is built to rent, but could be sold off. This is aimed at all stages of life; it is not aimed at one demographic. It is an in-fill and reuse of land that is otherwise surrounded by single families. This is not going to conform to everything in the plan, but it rarely does. We are at 6.83 units an acre. We are singles and doubles one to two story structures. We have front yards, rear yards, side yards. There is no one living on top of each other. There are nine different building types, so there is a variety of product types. All public utilities and services are available to the site. There is a wide range of bedroom counts. Large tracks of singles should be a single family attached and it specifically calls out duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. We are building singles and doubles, which is exactly what it calls out. There was a neighborhood meeting with 30 members in attendance and lots of good comments and questions. The petitioner says they have addressed the concerns and will continue to work with them and update them on the process. There is a website that is regularly updated and comments can be sent through this site. The Staff report says there is not direct access to 17th St. There are two public streets that we continue on that have access onto 17th St. We do have access to 17th St. and Arlington as well. The report indicates that access onto 17th St. is not served by public transit. The petitioner talked to Lou May today and he confirmed that if it is within 2 blocks of a bus stop, you have access to public transit. Public transit does not have to come onto your site to be considered to have access to public transit. The report says there is a lack of infrastructure on 17th St. The petitioner would argue that yes, today there is, but that is funded, planned for, and going to be built within the next 12 months. This includes bike lanes, pedestrian lanes to 17th St. The report says there is not mixed use in the PUD. The petitioner argues they are amending a PUD that has a mixed use. There is a multifamily pieces, the project's piece, and a commercial piece. The petitioner has stated that changing the zoning of the Growth Policies Plan, saying employment is not appropriate here. You might argue it doesn't have retail, but retail follows the rooftops. This would have been on the end of a dead end 17th St. There won't be retail until there is development here. The petitioner thinks this will come with the business park at the bottom. The report also states there is a lack of parks nearby. The parks nearby have been stated and in combination with the greenspace on the development should satisfy this need. Trinitas has been around and the commission is familiar with the projects they've done. Trinitas is committed to the community, committed to the customer, and committed to a product we can all be happy with. When Trinitas did the Village at Muller Park, they donated 9 acres of preserved land to Twin Lakes Park. When Trinitas did the Dillon, it was a redevelopment of a brown fill site and it has transformed that area of town.

Wisler asked the petitioner to talk through the thought process of why there are so many parking spaces and how many houses will have parking pads.

Ventel answered that they would like to hear from the commission on this. Projects this size are typically designed with more parking than needed. Some will be lost to trees, trash receptacles. They start designing parking heavy and then cut back. This is the most parking they would foresee. On the single family area, those

would all have parking pads or garages. The reason the parking is designed this way is that it preserved greenspace. If you build a street and have a parking lot, that street and the parking lot alleyway is duplicated. The 20 ft. width that is down the center of the parking lot is duplicated on the street. If we were to build parking lots and a traditional street, it would decrease the greenspace. This is a more efficient way to build it. It allows people to park at their front doors and allows for the backdoors to be greenspace. There are either going to be parking islands somewhere or parking behind the units, which the petitioner feels is less desirable.

Wisler asked if the units along the top of the map are all duplexes.

Ventel answered yes, they are all duplexes.

Wisler asked if they would have pads or garages.

Ventel said they will not have pads or garages, just parking in front.

Ventel said they can work on that. There has been talk about improving some of the street in this area. As some parking spots are lost and the true number emerges, something that more resembles complete streets will occur. If the Commission thinks that this site needs parking lots, traditional streets, and lower greenspace, the petitioner can do that if the feedback is given.

Maritano asked what the brown squares are on the unit maps and asked what the units are looking at.

Ventel said this is designed to be a back loaded alley. This was designed so access to these units would come down this alley and all of these could be garages or parking pads. They can be built either way.

Maritano asked where the playground would be.

Ventel said the playground would be back by the single family homes and a sports court. This is to spread out the recreational features.

Maritano asked if they would imagine ever creating more sense of recreation in the greenspaces that exist as opposed to just grass.

Ventel answered yes, walking trails. He asked for examples.

Maritano suggested bocce ball, swing set, a sandbox. It looks like a very flat, green yard, sterile kind of building, looking away from the greenspace. It doesn't create a sense of place and community when talking about integration of people across the lifespan. August to August also says that this is pushing more in the student realm. People have life transitions and it would be great to look at moving people across the calendar.

Ventel replied that it's a reality of where we are in Bloomington. There was a discussion with Cook and Bloomington Economic Development Corporation. They have an issue with employees coming in and not being able to find a place to live. The petitioner says they have talked about putting together a program to save some units that were available for short term employees who moved in. This would be a good location to try to do something like that. The problem is, there is no program for what that is.

Maritano said that we as a community are wanting to think about innovation. New developments present an opportunity to change up some of these habitual processes. We don't have to live on an August to August student calendar. Life is bigger than that.

Ventel said it is hard to say "come back and see me later" when someone wants to sign a lease in September 2018 for August 2019-2020.

Kappas asked what the potential phase build out time frame is.

Ventel said they would build it according to market demand. Phase I would come late 2020, early 2021. Phase II would be 2021. If these are leasing well, they will continue to build.

Kappas asked if Phase I, regardless, would be built, including the pond on the backside.

Vental answered yes.

Kappas said there was a discrepancy between Environmental Commission report and PSI on what Karst features are. Kappas asked Ventel to speak to why there would be confusion between what Bloomington code refers to as Karst and what PSI dubbed as not Karst.

Ventel said there is no discrepancy there. PSI stated the code. There is a difference in interpretation.

Jeff Fanyo, Bynum Fanyo Associates, said this property was stripped for clay and topsoil in 1972 to be used while SR 37 was constructed. As a result, the raw limestone bedding was left in place. That bedding is not level. It has some depressions in it and is irregular. When shooting the topographic survey, we did find slight depressions. These are possible sinkholes to be investigated. This was done in 2013-2014 application. We didn't know if they were sinkholes. Electromagnetic imaging done for surface investigation when this petition was brought forward. This was done for two different studies. Then a boring program was done with over 80 borings across this project. And then they took core samplings to verify there are no Karst features in the bedrock. Based on their report, there were no voids, Karst features. When they stripped this off, it has just been eroding for 40 plus years. This is PSI's report, not Bynum Fanyo's, but this is Bynum Fanyo's interpretation of this.

Enright-Randolph said he read the Environmental Commission's report. They had 16 recommendations of approval, which is a lot of concerns. Phase III should be Phase I. Enright-Randolph likes the cottage idea and there are young professionals that would love a housing opportunity there. If you get a bunch of student housing in there, young professionals will not want to move in. This area already has a lot of low income housing. There are a lot of different modes of transportation. You can really try to change the direction of that whole area and it could potentially be for young professionals, which is needed in the community. As a former young professional, Enright-Randolph would have loved the option to rent a standalone rental. Enright-Randolph said he would love to see transit go through that area and it would be great if transportation could be extended into the property. It is a tricky area with all of the environmental concerns. There is sensitive ground out there and it needs to be taken into consideration. The fact that you are conserving over 50% of the greenspace is a good first step. Enright-Randolph urges the petitioner to not dismiss the recommendations of the Environmental Commission's report just because they had their own studies done.

Ventel said they have no intention of dismissing the Environmental Commission's report. They got the report on Sunday, so they cannot speak to those recommendations tonight. There are not sinkholes on the property, which there were thought to be sinkholes historically.

Cibor asked about how they came up with the average age of the demographic for this project.

Ventel answered that they looked at other properties Trinitas has done in similar communities, similar distance from campus. The average age is older. That demographic is not just students. Many are university related. They find that this is an attractive option, as opposed to an apartment building, with no yard and with people on all sides of you.

Cibor asked which of the units would a 26 year old use.

Ventel said that they go across the board. There are less of them in the 4 bedroom units. There are young professionals living with four other people is common practice and a way of conserving money. It is a way of starting off without all expenses. The petitioner said that they want to hear from Plan Commission about whether the unit mix is right for this development.

Sandberg asked if there could be any discounts or for the 4-5 bedroom units or if you have to charge by the bedroom.

Ventel said that they will not let a unit go vacant. They will lower the rent until the unit is filled. They do rent to family and others. They prefer not to rent by the bedroom. In a market like Bloomington, it is the way things are done and that it is difficult to compete without paying per bedroom as an option.

Sandberg answered that she wants what's compatible with the surrounding areas. Sandberg's concerns with the 4 and 5 bedroom units is that it appeals to undergraduates. Sandberg is interested in this being scaled back as much as possible.

Ventel said if you were to look at the single family homes in the bigger neighborhood, the average would be more than three bedrooms.

Hoffmann asked how the petitioner would characterize the traffic report. It sounds like the report is saying at peak times a couple of the intersections involved will be at level F.

Ventel said the level F would be exiting the property, not people getting into the property, not people using Arlington Rd. or 17th St. If this were a traditional single family owner occupied, the traffic would go up. Single family owner occupied hits the peak hours. When the traffic fails, it is at the peak hours. If it is student and has shuttle service, they are more apt to use public transportation. It spreads the trip routes out and does not put it at those two peak times. It does not mean we can't have recommendations how to improve that. Going to Arlington Rd. will become a default when people start backing up onto 17th St., which is where it fail.

Hoffmann asked for a general sense of the petitioner's interpretation of the report. The report specifically says this is targeted as a student development. If not, the traffic situation is worse. They're talking about 42% the normal expected trips for an apartment because it is a student development. Hoffmann asked if it was a student development or if it is about workforce housing, about Cook. For a traffic report, it can either be a student development or something else. As a student development, it gets a few level Fs and mostly impacts the people in the development. But then there are all the questions about whether this is an appropriate location for student housing, which is the exact same discussion there was an hour ago. Nothing about this site is better than the last one. It is worse in every other way. The bus doesn't go right in the middle of it, it is worse in every other way. If it's a student development, you have to confront all of those questions. If it is not, then traffic study is worthless because it is all on the assumption that it is a student housing development. Even with that, it is barely OK.

Ventel said he has a hard time saying what student is when none of us have defined it.

Hoffmann said that the traffic people think this is student housing.

Ventel said they are forced to do one or the other. The petitioner said they could do an update. We could come out and say it might be 60-40. We believe that most of the residents, more than 51%, will be related to the university. In this particular location, it will not be limited to that. The access to Cook, Ivy Tech, the hospital, will draw people to a product that we don't have that will not be students. Ventel said Hoffmann is right, you could slice the report and say it needs to be some percentage there. The petitioner can come up with this for next time to be more helpful.

Hoffmann said that applying that kind of discount rate, it makes the report less helpful if that's not really what it is.

Ventel said if not student housing, if not multifamily, what could possibly be done on this parcel that would not have a greater impact on 17th St. If you put employment here which was decided to be inappropriate, those numbers at peak time are going to go crazy. If you put any kind of commercial or industrial, there will be trucks and the numbers will go crazy. The best you can hope for for these 42 acres is to have a for rent product and

mostly have students here to have the least impact of 17th St. If that's not the case, then we have to come up with new zoning.

Hoffmann said some sites are just undevelopable because of what they are.

Ventel said everything else in the Comp Plan says inside the urban boundaries, 42 acres, with all public utilities should be developed when there is a housing crunch.

Kappas asked Staff if Bloomington Transit made a recommendation on whether there should be a shuttle or private shuttle.

Scanlan said the last time Staff spoke to Bloomington Transit, they were not in support of it. They have not spoken with them specifically about this site in some time. This site and the previous site tonight came forward at the same time initially at the Development Review Committee. Bloomington Transit would prefer no more site specific shuttles, they cause traffic for the actual Bloomington Transit buses, and they would prefer that these would not be used for new sites. Maybe there is a way to redirect that money and somehow incorporate into their schedules. They have a lot of problems with their private shuttles and the stops.

Kappas asked if because they are two blocks away from a stop, they technically have access to Bloomington Transit.

Scanlan said that they did not have no access, they have poor access. They have two driveways onto 17th that they are planning to use. Scanlan reiterated these are not roads. There is platted right of way which they are planning to vacate on their portion, but build a road on another portion. Arlington Park Rd. is not a City road, its an entrance driveway. This development in front of you is multifamily. A detached dwelling does not make a single family dwelling. A single family dwelling needs to be on its own lot, where it can be purchased and sold separately of the other lots. This is more than 250 units on one piece of property owned by one person. While Staff appreciates the design of them looking at, they have not received any proposals or feedback about doing any subdivisions to create any sellable lots in any portion of the site. The only other use of this PUD right now is this additional multifamily. The only allowed uses are manufacturing. They would be adding uses because this multifamily that exists was approved through a use variance in the 90s as opposed to changing the PUD.

Kappas asked if they are wanting a PUD to potentially be able to sell some of these.

Scanlan said that the petitioner has said that and they are showing potential property lines around some of the in Phase III.

Ventel said a subdivision would not be required. They would do a PUD similar to Pepper Grass or Varsity Villas. The land is commonly owned by all and you buy the footprint of the building. We could do a horizontal property or zero lot line. That would be part of the document inside, so you wouldn't have to sell off lots with frontage on public streets. That would be the process by which these would be designed so this could be done. The petitioner spoke with Lou May today about providing shuttle service. Their concern is that they would not provide during the hours the petitioner would like. During peak hours, Bloomington Transit could provide a shuttle service that could integrate with their buses and then on off-peak hours, a private or other shuttle service could be done.

Wisler moved to forward PUD-13-18 to the September meeting. Kappas seconded

Wisler said stylistically the buildings themselves is different and it would play well. The biggest concern is the parking situation. If the petitioner can figure out how to get more of the parking off street, maybe some garages in the duplexes. It makes it feel like more of a traditional neighborhood. If you have a garage, it makes you feel more like you have a house. It makes the streets more walkable as well. It feels like a parking lot when everything is horizontal like that. It is definitely a challenging site. The mixture is really important, having the detached units is important. Wisler would like to see less striped parking.

Kappas said that an overall concern is that the Commission just approved a new development going in on Crescent, which is just down the street from this site. This is only going to add to the traffic situation currently on that two lane road. Kappas drives this road quite often. At peak hours, it is pretty nasty. Even not at peak hours, it's still busy. Now that it's open, people are more inclined to take it. Kappas agrees with Hoffmann's comments about it like student housing, sounds like student housing, for all intents and purposes, it is one. Kappas takes issue with setting up the scene that it was scraped of its land in the 70s, but there is a lot of tree coverage. The Environmental Commission listed all of the hardwood trees on the site. To do 50% and having all grass is not conversation. It is ripping up trees to put in plain landscaping, which creates a prairie, very desolate grass tundra look. It is not a sense of place. Kappas challenges the petitioner to come back to Plan Commission in September with answers for all of the Environmental Commission's conditions. Kappas asked if this is the best place for the development. It would be a great place for Cook, especially as it expands its business. However, this land with its narrow drive in and its phasing, it is not a viable source for answering student housing concerns and housing concerns in general. Kappas thinks that building Phase III first is a great suggestion. Stylistically, fine, but from an environmental standpoint, Kappas does not agree with the stage being set as barren. The Environmental Commission is very specific about it being a corridor for the environment.

Maritano said that if you really want a mix of people to live in this environment, then you have to make it attractive to them. One little outdoor space does not convey an invitation to a wide range of population.

Enright-Randolph said there are 10 one bedroom, 54 two bedroom, 54 three bedroom, 100 four bedroom, 35 five bedrooms here. If the intent is to empower young professionals, it should show on these numbers. Single dwellings. No young professional wants to live with 3 other roommates. Enright-Randolph would be interested in owner occupants. With that said, young professionals will potentially want to buy.

Cibor said generally the idea shown, the mix of duplexes, is very enticing and has potential. It also needs a lot of work. One of the key differences with this petition from the one before this is what is identified in the Comprehensive Plan. This is very clearly a neighborhood residential area, whereas the one out west was not. Cibor appreciated the map that showed the proximity to IU's campus. It might not feel like it, but it is closer to IU's campus than the previous development. If you are driving to IU's campus, you are probably parking on 17th St. anyway. In some ways, this is a convenient location for students. The potential for this corridor to be transformed and for more commercial development. Doing something neat at this intersection to make it easier for people to get in and out of the development while also serving the public. The development down south on Crescent could benefit from something if it was done at that intersection. The traffic study had a lot of reductions in trips. In some ways, more than the previous petition. In regards to traffic, 17th St does have very high traffic volumes and it will in the future. Right now it is artificially high because people are avoiding 3rd St. It is a tricky time to do a traffic study on this corridor. The mix of units, get rid of the 4 and 5 units. Parking is a challenge. The design does not really feel like a neighborhood. If you have lots, it creates more space. They don't have parking lots in neighborhood zoned residential areas. The Environmental Commission's comments need to be addressed next meeting. Speaking of usage of space and parks, some developments do so much with outdoor space, you can't really play in them. Cibor does like some open greenspace. There needs to be balance.

Cate said she agrees with many of the comments that have been made. Environmental Commission's concerns should be paid attention to. Cate agrees that if it is aiming for the young, urban professional market, the 4 and 5 bedrooms are on the high end of that. The style of it provides diversity of housing.

Sandberg said she has a lot of the same concerns she had for the Gentry project that was passed onto Council. Sandberg does like the look. She appreciates the professionalism and appreciates the photo of the pool does not have palm trees around it. Sandberg is concerned about the mixed compatibility. When working people have to get to bed at a certain hour and it is a shared housing complex with students that would rent the four and five bedrooms, it may not be an attractive mix for either demographics. It has to be compatible with the rest of the neighborhood, environmentally, traffic-wise, and out of respect for the residential neighborhood around it.

Hoffmann said that based on what's before the commission now, it is nothing but a student oriented development. It would be nice to have families and young professionals rent there. Everything about the design now says that it's a student project, which is how it was described to the traffic study people. More than half the

total bedrooms are in the 4 and 5 bedroom units. Hoffmann asked if these are family units, then why is there a 102% parking ration. It is designed to be a place where students live. If other people live there, great, of course. If you wanted to really make sure it wasn't oriented to students, you wouldn't make it annual leases. It is what it is. The limited greenspace, the private shuttle to campus. The question then becomes that this is not walkable to campus, this is not in a location the UDO is going to designate for student housing. Hoffmann asked if there were enough positives to outweigh that. On the last proposal, it was about as close as you could get. On this proposal, it does not have any of those additional positives. It is not on a major arterial, it is not going to enhance the bus service going to the site, and there is no specific commitment to affordable housing involved. It does not share any of the positives that caused us to split down the middle on the last project. Design it as a different project. Hoffmann loves the way it looks, but it's a student housing project in separate buildings.

Wisler moved to forward PUD-13-18 to the September meeting. Kappas seconded. Motion passed with roll call vote 7:0

SP-17-18 **Khan Brothers LLC**
201 S College Ave.
Site plan approval for one 4-story mixed use building
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Wisler moved to suspend the rules to hear the last case on the agenda. Maritano seconded. Motion passes

Scanlan gave the report. This petition is located at 201 S College Ave. They missed their window and have to refile. The site is .15 acres at the southeast corner of 4th and College. It is zoned Commercial Downtown in the Downtown Core Overlay. Both the GPP and the Comprehensive Plan designations are downtown. There is one existing building on the site that will remain and a two story addition is proposed above the existing two story building. The total of that is one four story building. The existing building is to remain in the building that exists now and 10 one bedroom units would be added on the two floors above. No parking is proposed. There will be pedestrian amenities and the right-of-way. There are sidewalks already on both sides and the corner of 4th and College ramps would be improved. Street trees and bike parking would be added where needed. The site is actually listed as contributing. It was built in 1948 and it is not a part of a local historic district, so it has to go through demolition delay. We actually added a new condition today because the demolition delay they received last time has also expired. They will have to go back to the Historic Preservation Commission next week. The same members are on the board as last year, so there is no reason they would not release that next week. The design of the site has not changed much, but our rules have changed. They are fine on density in this location. The height has decreased by 10 ft. in December. They are now over the height maximum of the zoning district. They have a handful of design deviation requests, including building façade modulation, height step back, and windowsills. They are all a result of the building being built in the art modern style. They are requesting those as well. They are stepping back the end portion on the end of the building where the stairwell will be. Staff found that the deviations requested were still keeping with the new comprehensive plan. Adding density and mixed use downtown. Using an existing building. Increasing the use and viability of an existing building and site. The building is now being lodged at 50 ft 4 inches, so now slightly taller than last time. The Historic Preservation Committee was hopeful that the design would be approved without having to step back the fourth floor, which would be uncharacteristic of the design as a whole. The petition meets the Downtown Core Overlay development standards, except the four previously mentioned. It would enhance the existing building. They are planning to install solar panels. The Planning & Transportation Department does recommend approval of SP-17-18 based on findings of fact and subject to the following conditions: The solar will be installed before final occupancy is issued. The required right of way improvements will be shown on the site plan. They will receive an encroachment agreement. They are scheduled to appear before BPW in the next couple of weeks. One that was added at Plan Commission last time. The southern pedestrian entrance to building be well lit. They have to receive a new demolition delay approval before the building permit can be issued.

Matt Ellenwood, Matte Black Architecture, says the only things they've changed is the height slightly. There was a lot to investigate with the existing structure. It's a clear span roof. You have to reinforce the roof to add the two stories. There's been a lot of time spent with engineering with Jeff Fanyo. They've been trying to finalize things with right-of-way and public works. There will be bike parking along the alley along with trash and recycling. This will be the primary entrance because it is the elevator's lobby.

Enright-Randolph asked about the alley in the back and what the recommendation regarding lighting was.

Scanlan said that it was not an alley, but it is an entrance immediately south of the building. It will be used as a tenant entrance. Plan Commission will want to weigh in and although code does not require extra lighting there, but it should be well lit if it is going to serve as the main entrance. That is why this condition was included.

Cibor asked when this project would happen, assuming it gets approved by all of the appropriate boards.

Ellenwood said they are planning to go to Board of Public Works on the 21st. They are hoping to start very soon. The completion would be June 1st of next year.

Cibor asked what space would be impacted in this construction.

Ryan Strausser, Strausser Construction, said they will relocate the sidewalk to a walk around those metered spots on 4th St. They will maintain both traffic lanes during construction. They will try to take most material and equipment onto 4th St to minimize impact onto College. On the College Avenue side, there will also be a walk around to maintain sidewalk access. They will shut down where the canopy is right now.

Cate asked about what the costs of the units will be and potential tenants.

Ellenwood said they are all one bedrooms, 650-700 sq. ft. The idea is to cater to downtown professional workers and graduate students. The cost of this development is a lot with the infrastructure involved. Ellenwood doesn't know what the rent will be, but they will be nicely finished.

Nicki V and Sara Gardner, co-owners of the Backdoor, are concerned. There are three bars to the south, not just one. There is the Atlas, the Backdoor, and the Blockhouse. There are efficiency apartments above the Chinese restaurant. Every year there are new complaints from the tenants about the noise. It is a commercial district. We are allowed to make noise up to 250 ft. of the property line. These new apartments are going to be within 50 ft. of the speakers themselves. This will not be conducive for anyone, especially if these will be pricey apartments, when there is music outside until 3AM. This is the only dedicated queer space in town. They are also concerned about the alley, which is the only way to access the Backdoor. It often gets clogged up with delivery people for the Chinese place. The City owns the alley so you can't do anything when its blocked.

Tariq Khan said that they have a bar of their own, so this noise concern has been considered.

Hoffmann asked Staff if there are any rules about noise and people complaining about noise when people knew what they were getting into when they moved in. Hoffmann also asked about access to the alley during construction.

Scanlan said that last year a notice was sent out for this petition. There are three bars in the building to the south of this building. None of those bar owners own that building. The building owner did not give notice and didn't tell anyone. Now signs have to be posted for petitions. Scanlan communicated about Bloomington Police Department about any concerns. BPD does not regulate crowd noise, but they do have to respond to noise complaints. Staff did give contact information to the bar owners in case they wanted to speak to that particular officer. There is nothing that the Plan Commission can do about it.

Hoffmann asked if it is something that can be put in the lease agreements.

Scanlan said yes, if Khan is agreeable to that.

Khan was agreeable.

Scanlan said that the alley will be addressed at the BPW hearing.

Wisler moved for approval of SP-17-18 with the four conditions of approval. Sandberg seconded.

Enright-Randolph said there are a few establishments that gain access from this alleyway. Enright-Randolph asked if there was anything to condition that one of these entries stay open.

Scanlan said that it is up to BPD respond to questions about that. The Board of Public Works can make it required.

Enright-Randolph suggested a proposed amendment to strongly encourage the BPW to work with surrounding businesses to maintain access to their properties.

Scanlan said the property in question does not have frontage on that alley. There may be work done, like Duke. Scaffolding won't be adjacent.

Enright-Randolph took back his amendment.

Cibor said that BPW will consider this in their decision. Legally people are allowed to sit in an alley for 20-30 minutes. This functionally closes alleys. The City code allows this, you can't tow someone for it, it is what an alley is for. Cibor appreciates this development.

Sandberg likes the historic aesthetic design here and it will be a great addition.

Wisler moved for approval of SP-17-18 with the four conditions of approval. Sandberg seconded. Passed by roll call vote 7:0

Meeting adjourned.