

Plan Commission minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) 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 August 12, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in the City of Bloomington Council Chambers. Members present: Kappas, Enright-Randolph, Kinzie, St. John, Sandberg

ROLL CALL

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED: None at this time.

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS: Eric Greulich introduced Desiree King, the new Planning and Transportation administrative assistant, who will be assisting with all Plan Commission meetings. Terri Porter, Planning and Transportation director, announced the Unified Development Ordinance adoption draft is available for viewing at the Monroe County Public Library and the Planning and Transportation office. The website details the progress of the draft, has forms for public comment, and lists the upcoming scheduled Plan Commission special hearings on August 26th, 29th, and September 5th.

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: September 9, 2019

SP-23-19 **City of Bloomington**
105 & 111 W. 4th St., and 222 S. Walnut St.
Request: Site plan approval for a new parking garage with waivers in the Commercial Downtown (CD) zoning district.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

CONSENT AGENDA:

UV-29-19 **Jason Hobson**
901 W. 1st St.
Request: Use variance recommendation to the BZA to allow a business/professional office in the Medical (MD) zoning district.
Case Manager: Ryan Robling

SP-28-19 **David Hays**
300 W. 6th St.
Request: Site plan approval to allow the construction of 16 multi-family dwelling units.
Case Manager: Ryan Robling

****Kinzie moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Sandberg seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0—Approved.**

PETITIONS:

PUD-26-19 **First Capital Management**
3201 E. Moores Pike
Request: A PUD amendment to the list of permitted uses to allow multi-family apartments. Also being requested is a waiver of the required 2nd hearing.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich presented the staff report. This 2.2 acre property is located on the north side of Moores Pike just east of the intersection with College Mall Road. The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD). The property is currently undeveloped and has several mature trees and emerging canopy species scattered throughout the property. The property had previously been used by a single family residence, but the residence was removed in 2000 when the property was rezoned. Surrounding properties are a retirement home, the AMC

movie theater, several apartment complexes, and undeveloped land. The area contains no slopes or karst formations.

This site was rezoned in 2000 (PUD-03-00) from RS3.5/PRO6 to a Planned Unit Development to allow for a mixture of medical and office uses. A district ordinance and a specific list of uses, as well as prohibited uses, was approved with that petition. In 2003, an amendment (PUD-15-03) was approved to the PUD adding “climate-controlled storage” to the list of permitted uses as well as a final plan for an office building and separate climate controlled warehouse, however that project was never constructed. A site plan was later approved in 2013 (PUD-40-13) for a multi-tenant building, however that was also not constructed and the property has remained undeveloped.

The petitioner is requesting to amend the list of uses within the PUD district ordinance to allow for “multi-family dwelling units”. The petitioner is proposing to adopt a density of 17.48 units per acre and maximum building height of 60’ for this property, the remaining development standards would be those of the current RH zoning district standards for site plan review. No site plan approval is being requested or given at this time and a site plan must come back to the Plan Commission for approval if this amendment is approved. The petitioner has submitted a potential building elevation and site plan. The proposed site plan shows a four-story building with 48 two-bedroom units, 28 one-bedroom units, and four studio units for a total of 80 units with 128 bedrooms. Parking is being provided in a parking area with 62 parking spaces. There would be one drivecut on Moores Pike to provide access for the site. Street trees and eight-foot asphalt is already installed.

Staff are looking for comments from the Plan Commission concerning whether the proposed structure works well on Moores Pike. Site design criteria will require Comprehensive Plan examination. Previous discussion took place about pedestrian movement through the property. The petitioner is asking to utilize Residential high-density multifamily (RH) district standards, including density. The proposed PUD would meet all requirements except density. The Comprehensive Plan proposes three-story buildings for this type of structure and this petition is proposing four stories. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) guides the Plan Commission concerning PUDs. The Plan Commission should examine what the Comprehensive Plan says about this type of zoning and consider that the property is currently zoned as office, has no retail allowances, and is surrounded by single-family and multi-family dwellings. Staff recommends that the waiver from the required second hearing not be approved and forward this to the required September 9, 2019 hearing.

Petitioner:

Mark Figg, Figg Investment, withdrew his request to waive the second hearing. He said he is willing to make adjustments to please the public. He argued against public belief that the proposed PUD is geared toward students because each unit has one to two bedrooms. At this time he has not been able to meet and discuss housing diversity and affordability. He acknowledged the resounding traffic problem but still believes the land needs to be developed. He will work with Staff and the Plan Commission on ways to improve the area for the PUD.

Plan Commission Discussion:

Cate asked staff about recent traffic studies for this project. Greulich replied that no recent studies have been done, but potential traffic issues have been examined and doesn’t foresee any issues or need to widen the road with the proposed structure. Coyne said he would like to see more information on pedestrian connectivity around the area, reaching as far as State Road 446. Greulich responded that the City is looking into making improvements along that corridor anyway and could examine pedestrian connectivity. Kinzie asked for clarification on setback requirements for a PUD and how it differs from the RH district. Greulich explained requirements and that the major differences area height and density with a higher height and greater density being allowed with a PUD. St. John asked if multi-family units are appropriate for the area and Greulich responded that the area has several multi-family, high-density buildings in the area like the proposed PUD, just not on Moores Pike and it’s up to the Plan Commission to decide if the proposed PUD is the best use of the space. Sandberg said she wished to see diverse and affordable housing addressed in the petition, Burrell asked why the PUD needs to be 60 feet in height, and Cate asked if the Environmental Commission had weighed in on the petition. Figg responded that the height is due to the nicer looking and more easily maintained pitch roof over a flat roof and that the Environmental Commission had weighed in. Figg concluded by saying he believes,

contrary to public opinion, the proposed building will be a great public benefit, and better use of space than a business office, and he's unconcerned with vacancies due to a demand for housing in Bloomington.

Public Comment:

Members of the public that spoke: Gene Coyle, 2nd speaker's name unclear, Cynthia Rex, Scott Sherrs, Andy Long, Babette Ballinger, Tom Duffy, Jan Coyle, Carol Rimers, first name unclear Shahban, Barbara Hatton, Henry Luck, Kelly Allenwood, Elaine Lucas

All members of the public that spoke did so in remonstrance of the petition. Concerns expressed were that the units are aimed toward students in a family and retiree neighborhood, and traffic will drastically increase at all hours due to lack of walkable amenities and that a business (Bloomingfoods was suggested) at the location would limit peak traffic hours. The public also objected to the unaesthetic height and density of the building, fearing future buildings like it in the area, potential runoff problems because of property elevation, and a predicted university enrollment drop nullifying the demand for more housing. Traffic problems, emergency vehicle access, and pedestrian safety because of increased traffic were the largest topics of concern.

Petitioner:

Figg responded that based on neighbor input, Moore's Pike definitely has a traffic problem and he is present tonight to hear concerns. He offered his card for anyone that wishes to discuss the petition further and will answer questions and listen to concerns at the second hearing.

Plan Commission Comments:

Plan Commission members expressed that affordable housing needs to be a part of this petition due to the great need, but sympathizes with neighbors, condos might be a better affordable rental or ownership option, and the traffic issue needs to be addressed before the petition is approved. Kappas said that the City Council Sidewalk Committee has an upcoming project that will install sidewalks in the area. Members would also like to see potential runoff problems and vacancy discrepancies from surrounding apartments examined.

****Kinzie motioned to continue PUD-26-19 to a second hearing. Kappas seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0—Approved.**

PUD-27-19 **Hilltop Meadow, LLC**
1201 W. Allen St.
Request: An amendment to the PUD district ordinance and preliminary plan to allow a multi-family development.
Case Manager: Ryan Robling

Ryan Robling presented the staff report. The 5.32 acre property is located south of W Allen St. between S Strong Dr. and S Adams St. The property is currently developed with a vacant mobile home park. The surrounding properties to the south and east are zoned within a PUD (MG/PCD-991) and have been developed with light manufacturing. The property to the west has been zoned Residential Multifamily (RM) and has been developed with multifamily dwelling units. The property to the north has been zoned Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH) and has been developed with multifamily dwelling units. This property fronts on W Allen St via a shared private drive.

The petitioner proposes to amend the PUD to allow multi-family residences on this parcel rather than the original approved mobile home park use. With this amendment mobile homes will no longer be allowed in the PUD. The petitioner proposes to construct 48 efficiency units, 24 one-bedroom units, 32 two-bedroom units, and 10 three-bedroom townhouses. This will create a total of 114 units and 166 bedrooms. The overall density is proposed at 8.78 DUEs per acre. An allowed maximum of 15 units per acre is being proposed for the PUD. There will be a proposed 11 two-story residential buildings, and 2 one-story accessory buildings. The two buildings containing the 10 townhouses will be platted for individual sale. A community gardens/open space will be in the middle of the site directly adjacent to two of the buildings. The 10 three-bedroom townhouses will have a garage in the rear of the unit. There are a proposed 172 surface parking spaces for 166 bedrooms. This equals approximately

1.03 parking spaces per bedroom. No PUD final plan approval is requested at this time, though the PUD final plan must go back to the Plan Commission for approval. Staff have expressed concerns that the petition won't meet Comprehensive Plan guidelines and seeks Plan Commission input. The Planning and Transportation Department recommends that the Plan Commission forward this petition to the required second hearing.

Petitioner:

Mark Lauchli presented his recently completed development Park South to show similarities to the proposed structure. Park South has underground rain barrels surrounding the landscaping, a green roof on the maintenance building, and a roof similar to Templeton Elementary School that powers the common area. The efficiencies are a low-cost option and the complex will be marketed toward non-students and aims to lower the carbon footprint and practice sustainability. The efficiencies are \$200 under market value for Bloomington and the multi-bedroom units are \$100 under.

Plan Commission Questions:

The Plan Commission asked how the parking space number was decided, if there would be ample parking for all tenants and would it cost tenants extra, how many bedrooms the townhomes would have, if the complex would be on or near a bus route, if the property had pedestrian connectivity to adjacent properties, and how did the former mobile home lot become vacant.

Lauchli responded that several parking lot outlines were examined and the Park South layout was the most efficient, will be the outline for the new lot, and will not be an extra cost to tenants. Lauchli said he only services non-student units and knows how many cars per unit are typical. Concerning the vacant lot, when Lauchli and his family decided to no longer manage the lot due to frequent criminal activity, they helped tenants find new housing and recycled the mobile homes. He is aware of the struggle for many residents to afford housing which is why he made 42% of the proposed complex efficiencies. The property currently does not have pedestrian connectivity but that component can be examined knowing that connectivity to the adjacent Catalent could be beneficial for workforce tenants.

Kappas left during Plan Commission questions.

Public Comments: None.

Plan Commission Discussion:

The Plan Commission was pleased with what seems to be a very promising development making strides for sustainable, affordable, and diverse housing. Kopper and Kinzie would like to see less impervious surfaces and a move away from ample parking, encouraging alternative transportation instead, and several Plan Commission members would like pedestrian connectivity to adjacent properties, bicycle accommodations, and a more transit-oriented development.

****Cate motioned to continue PUD-27-19 to a second hearing. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0—Approved.**

Meeting adjourned.