

*Plan Commission minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) Audio-visual Department of the Monroe County Public Library at 303 E. Kirkwood Avenue. Phone number: 812-349-3111 or via e-mail at the following address: moneill@monroe.lib.in.us.*

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on May 13, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in the City of Bloomington Council Chambers. Members present: Hoffmann, Kinzie, Burrell, St. John, Kappas, Cate, Sandberg, and Wisler.

**ROLL CALL**

**MINUTES TO BE APPROVED:** April 2019

**\*\*Sandberg moved to approve the April 2019 minutes. Kappas seconded. Motion carried by voice vote.**

**REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:** None this time.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

- UV-14-19      **David Howard**  
1301 S. Walnut St. A recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a use variance to allow a ground floor dwelling unit in a new mixed use building.  
*Case Manager: Eric Greulich*
- SP/DP15-19    **City of Bloomington Redevelopment Commission**  
642 N. Madison St.  
Site plan approval and preliminary plat approval to allow a two-lot subdivision.  
*Case Manager: Eric Greulich*

**\*\*Kappas moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by voice vote.**

**PETITIONS:**

- DP-11-19      **Allen Dunn**  
3727 E. Cameron Ave.  
Preliminary plat approval for a two lot subdivision of 1.92 acres.  
*Case Manager: Eric Greulich*

Eric Greulich presented the staff report. The petitioner is requesting preliminary plat approval for a two-lot subdivision of 1.92 acres on E. Cameron Avenue. The property is zoned Single Family Residential (RS) and is adjacent to the Hoosier Acres Neighborhood. The property has been developed with one single-family residence and a driveway. Surrounding land uses are all single-family in nature. The petitioner is proposing to subdivide the property in order to create two lots. One lot will be sold for a future single-family residence on 0.72 acres. The second 1.19 acre lot will consist of the existing residence. Both lots meet the minimum lot size and minimum lot width requirements per the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). As part of this petition, a 5' wide concrete sidewalk and a 5' wide tree plot with street trees is required along Cameron Avenue. No additional right-of-way dedication is required for Cameron Avenue since the current amount of right-of-way exceeds UDO requirements. Greulich noted the petitioner is also requesting a waiver from the required installation of a sidewalk for this site. Staff recommends approval of the two-lot subdivision based on the written findings outlined in the staff report and denial of the requested sidewalk waiver.

Allen Dunn, petitioner, urged the Plan Commission to approve the sidewalk waiver. Having a sidewalk along Cameron Avenue would be detrimental because it would be the only sidewalk in the area and it would look odd.

Residents were intentional when they chose to develop the neighborhood without sidewalks. In 2015 a sidewalk waiver was granted for the next street over. In recent years, preventative measures have been put in place and as a result, have prevented through streets and added to the overall safety of the neighborhood. Some people in the neighborhood are also concerned about potential water runoff, including the potential for property damage.

**Plan Commission Discussion:**

Discussion ensued between the Plan Commission and Staff regarding whether or not there is a mechanism in place that would allow the sidewalk waiver now, but require a sidewalk later when the entire neighborhood could receive sidewalk funding. Greulich said that would be considered a determinant sidewalk variance. A determinant variance temporarily waives the sidewalk requirement and the City can call in that waiver should a network of sidewalks be installed at a later date. However, this variance is not part of the subdivision network. The petitioner could request the variance, but the request is based on the same standards as the waiver and would be still be difficult to have approved. Sandberg asked Staff if anyone knew about the Council Sidewalk Committee's status on retrofitting older neighborhoods with sidewalks. Greulich responded that the Sidewalk Committee looks to fill gaps in sidewalk networks in higher traffic areas first; retrofitting older neighborhoods with sidewalks would probably be a lower priority. St. John asked if the petitioner still intended to plant trees as part of this petition. Greulich said yes. Hoffmann asked Staff if the installation of a short segment of sidewalk would present any safety or environmental issues such as a ditch. Greulich explained that such issues are taken in to account when installing a sidewalk to prevent any hazards from occurring.

No public comments.

Hoffmann noted that there were several members of the neighborhood who previously signed a petition prior to the meeting in favor of the petitioner's request. Wisler noted that the board should be cautious in the future concerning sidewalk waivers. However, this is a unique situation where the area won't be rezoned or undergo a change of use. Also the residents are in favor of no sidewalks. Kappas agreed and thinks the waiver is for a unique situation such as this where having a sidewalk segment on a blind curve would cause safety issues, and force pedestrians to leave the end of the sidewalk at the curve. Burrell said it's important to consider the spirit of the neighborhood evidenced by the history that the petitioner provided. The neighborhood was designed without sidewalks in order to have a small-town feel.

**\*\*Wisler moved to approve DP-11-19 including the waiver for a sidewalk.** Hoffmann suggested that Wisler amend his motion to delete special conditions #1 and #3 from the staff report, keeping condition #2 based on the petitioner's alternate findings relative to tree planting. Sandberg maintained her second. Kinzie said she is in favor of sidewalks but noted that in this case it is important to be reasonable. She disagreed with Staff's findings regarding the necessity of a sidewalk. St. John agreed with Kinzie. Hoffmann restated the motion. **The motion is to approve DP-11-1 for both the subdivision and the sidewalk waiver, based upon the findings offered by the petitioner in pages 11 and 12 of the information packet, including the one condition of approval, which is condition #2 in the staff report. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by voice vote 8:0— Approved.**

PUD-17-19 **CDG Acquisitions, LLC**

1800 N. Walnut St.

Rezone 3.85 acres from Commercial Arterial (CA) to Planned Unit Development (PUD). Also requested is approval of a Preliminary Plan, District Ordinance, and a waiver from the required 5-acre minimum lot size for a PUD.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich presented the staff report. The petitioner is requesting a rezone from Commercial Arterial to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and approval of a Preliminary Plan and District Ordinance. Also requested is a waiver from the required 5-acre minimum for a PUD and delegation of final plan approval to Staff. The property is zoned Commercial General (CG) and is located at the southeast corner of S. Walnut Street and E. Driscoll Drive. It is currently developed with a multi-family residence with a parking area in the rear of the property. The petitioner is requesting a use variance to allow for a dwelling unit to be placed on the ground floor

within a Commercial General (CG) zoning district. This type of request requires Plan Commission review because the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) does not allow residential, multi-family units on the ground floor in this zoning district. The petitioner must receive a use variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) for the ground floor unit. The petitioner is also requesting a waiver from the required 5-acre minimum for a Planned Unit Development since the property is 3.8 acres in size. The petition site is surrounded by commercial and multi-family units and to the north of the site are several high-density student-oriented developments. The site would contain two buildings; one with 6,000 square feet of commercial space and the other with 6,000 square feet of amenity space with a mixture of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and four-bedroom units with a possible total of 270 units and 820 bedrooms. Parking will consist of a minimum of 410 parking spaces in a parking garage and 8 parking spaces provided along the front of the building for the commercial space. The site has been highlighted as an ideal area for high-density student-oriented housing because no single-family units are nearby. The site is near the Indiana University campus, and several goods and services are in the vicinity as well. The proposed use will redevelop an under-developed lot and the scale and massing of the proposal will complement the surrounding area. Greulich noted that several different types of materials would be used for aesthetic reasons. This would result in breaking up the monotony of a tall, multi-unit building oriented for student housing. The petitioner is required to install covered bike parking due to the size of the building, along with long-term storage options within the building. Staff is working on possibly raising the standard requirement for bike parking; however, the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) currently requires one space per six bedrooms. The petitioner is proposing one space per two units. The petitioner has agreed to the landscape according to UDO requirements with the exception of planting trees where a gas line is present. This is problematic and therefore the petitioner would like to plant shrubs instead. Greulich noted that this project meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan in terms of redirecting student-oriented housing away from downtown, adhering to street setbacks, and making the commercial space viable with ample parking. In addition, the area is already paved and no greenspace is being removed so the building would be an improvement over the current lot. Bloomington Transit already has a bus stop, but the petitioner is proposing to have a private shuttle service that would work in conjunction with Bloomington Transit. Greulich stated that Planned Unit Developments are beneficial to the community. Staff is working with the petitioner to diversify the housing mix and this will be discussed at the second hearing. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward this petition to the required second hearing.

Steve Brehob, Smith Brehob & Associates, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Also present was Brant Stiles of the architectural firm Collegiate Development Group, to present their proposal, including what materials would be used for aesthetics and longevity. Their goal is to build high-density, mixed-use structures to replace underutilized spaces. Public safety is always a high priority when developing any of their projects, and this includes external and internal key card access, secured parking, and on-site surveillance and management. Many of their projects contain similar features such as ground-level retail, study rooms, furnished units, and in-unit washers and dryers. He thinks the location of the student-oriented housing being away from downtown, including the commercial buildings that surround it, and the adjacent location next to campus make the proposed building an appropriate fit for the area.

**Plan Commission Discussion:**

Discussion ensued between the Plan Commission, Staff, and the petitioner regarding whether there is ample parking, and if there are external pedestrian paths between this property and the neighboring properties for students to use when walking to the bus stop. Greulich explained that a path is not planned as part of this proposal; however as more properties develop, the need for a path could be examined in the future. Kopper asked if renting a parking space is bundled with the lease. Mr. Stiles responded that parking is optional for an additional fee and is available on a first-come first-serve basis. St. John asked to see green space to pavement ratio. Brehob confirmed the property is mostly paved. Driveway ease of access and traffic congestion were also discussed.

No public comments.

**Plan Commission Comments:**

Burrell recommended a pedestrian path between buildings for student residents to use when walking to the stadium to ride the bus to campus. Burrell awaits further information about ease of access for the fire

department and an effort for affordable housing at this location. Kopper commented that he agrees with separate paid parking and developers should aim for high standards for bike parking and use. St. John agreed with the high bike standards and the environmental report. Kinzie raised concerns over the “towering” presence of the buildings and the materials used, wishing instead to see more natural materials used. Kinzie also emphasized Burrell’s concern over a lack of a pedestrian route and believes a traffic study would be beneficial, as well as the use of environmentally friendly materials. Overall, Kinzie agrees with a PUD rezoning. Wisler agrees with the project but finds the location and lack of connectivity to campus problematic, as well as lack of walkable amenities, believing residents will still drive to grocery stores and restaurants, negating the developer’s vision of less vehicles per unit. Both Wisler and Kinzie wish for the final decision for this petition to come back to the Plan Commission instead of staff for final approval. Wisler’s final remark was to see a blend of demographics in housing units in the future, including this one, instead of building units to cater to only students or only families. Enright-Randolph also wishes to see connectivity of this area to other parts of town and echoed traffic concerns. Sandberg stated she believes this is a good location for student-oriented housing, disagreeing with Wisler that this is not a negative segregation of housing, but rather an effort to implement community feedback by creating housing for people with different lifestyles. Sandberg also believes that giving students targeted housing gives others in the community affordable housing because students are not living in areas with non-students. Kappas agrees that the petition meets most requirements for a PUD rezoning, but not enough emphasis is being placed on affordable housing with this project and projects that continue to come up for petition. The building is being marketed to undergrads and it could be a great opportunity for young, working professionals. Hoffmann had no issues other than the complexity of the project means it should come back to the Plan Commission for final approval. He remarked that there will certainly be more projects like this in the future and the Commission should think about traffic and pedestrian connectivity and area layout when those projects are presented.

**\*\*Wisler moved to forward PUD-17-19 to the June meeting for a second hearing. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by voice vote 8:0. This petition will be heard again by the Plan Commission on June 10, 2019.**

UV-18-19      **Bloomington Cooperative Living**

921 W. 9th St.

A use variance recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow a cooperative housing unit.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Ryan Robling presented the staff report. The petitioners are requesting a use variance to allow a cooperative housing unit at this location. The 8,184 square foot property is located at 921 W 9th St., and zoned Residential Core (RC). The property has been developed with a two-story single-family house. Surrounding properties are zoned Residential Core (RC) and developed with single-family homes. The petitioners are proposing to reuse the existing building for a new cooperative housing unit. They would be modifying the interior of the building to create 12 private bedrooms, and 3 private two-bedroom suites. This would allow space for 19 unrelated adults with the 3 private two-bedroom suites being reserved for families. Tenants would share common kitchen spaces, living areas, and bathrooms. Proposed are 4 parking spaces, including one van accessible space. The petitioners are also proposing to pave the alley to the south of the property, which will then be used to access the newly created parking. The proposed parking will be paved with pervious paving. Additional on-street parking will be available along N. John Street and W. 9th Street. Also proposed is a second story egress stair. This would allow access to the second story from the outside. No other exterior changes are being proposed. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward this petition to the Board of Zoning Appeals with a positive recommendation.

Brady Huberlin, a Bloomington Cooperative Living staff member, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. She touched on the positive reasons for living in a co-op, including low cost of living. She said low cost living is something the City strives for when reviewing petitions for new housing. The requested use variance would allow the co-op to offer larger individual units and encourage more families to apply to live in this type of housing. Huberlin stated that the Neighborhood Association is in support of the requested variance. Architect Lucas Brown also spoke about the current condition of the building. He emphasized the limited time frame to repurpose the

building before it becomes irreparable. He said repairing windows and doors and repurposing the building will make for a safer neighborhood and increase affordable housing. Brown reminded board members that with the exception of paving the unimproved alley, and installing a sidewalk and landscaping, the property will not undergo major changes. Proposed is a large communal kitchen. The façade of the building will be updated, combining the use of current limestone with newer, natural materials.

**Plan Commission Discussion:**

Discussion ensued between the Plan Commission, Staff, and the architect regarding the historical status of the building and if a new definition for co-op living is in the Comprehensive Plan or in the updated Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Brown responded that it was not historical but he would double check with the Historic Preservation Committee. Greulich explained that neither document contains a definition but it is on the table for discussion. Hoffmann asked Staff what the use variance means for this particular petition. Greulich said use variances accompany the property so that the same kind of uses keep occupying the properties. Hoffmann also asked to confirm the number of bedrooms and how many possible adults/families could occupy the space.

**Public Comments:**

The following members of the public spoke: Peter Dorfman, Evelyn Smith, Bill Bouse, Mark Turner, Tim Clower, and David (last name inaudible). Concerns were raised about available parking in the neighborhood, including how many people would be permitted to live in the structure, as well as lack of parking and public transportation options. Others voiced their overall support of the project and for the affordable housing moving into the neighborhood. Huberlin addressed neighborhood concerns pertaining to the potential for high occupancy of adults in one building. They would like for several units to be occupied by families. The architect addressed neighborhood concerns about parking. He talked about the alley and how it would be paved and how it would allow access to parking behind properties, as well as developing a queuing street to open up more parallel parking, which would reduce driving speed in the neighborhood.

Hoffmann asked Staff about plans for parking on John Street.

**\*\*Kinzie moved to forward UV-18-19 to the Board of Zoning Appeals with a positive recommendation, citing the variance does not interfere with the Comprehensive Plan. She said this proposal potentially supports diversified housing, sustainable living, and increases density. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by voice vote 8:0. This petition will be heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals at their June 23rd hearing.**

Meeting adjourned.