

REGULAR MEETING

April 1, 1958

THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, met in the Council Chambers in City Hall, on Tuesday, April 1, 1958, at the hour of seven-thirty o'clock (7:30 P.M. C.S.T.) in regular session with Mayor Thos. L. Lemon presiding.

Members present: Graves, Chitwood, Griffith, Milier, Simpson, and Van Meter.

Members absent: Sikes.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by Rev. Nelson Bunnage of the Methodist Church.

Councilman Simpson moved, seconded by Councilman Van Meter that the minutes be approved as submitted to each councilman; motion unanimously carried.

The following requests for voluntary annexation were received and read by the Clerk-Treasurer:

March 31, 1958

Bloomington City Council
City Hall
Bloomington, Indiana

Dear Councilmen:

Please consider this our petition for the annexation of Beechwood Manors Addition, a part of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section Ten, Township Eight North, Range 1 West: - Beginning at a point that is 20 feet South and 20 feet West of the Northeast corner of the said Quarter Quarter; thence running South 88 degrees - 30 minutes West for 454 feet; thence running South 89 degrees - 6 minutes West for 336 feet; thence running South 2 degrees East for 850 feet; thence running North 88 degrees East for 138 feet; thence running North 87 degrees - 55 minutes East for 60 feet; thence running South 89 degrees - 56 minutes East for 296 feet; thence running North 88 degrees East for 296 feet; thence running North 2 degrees West for 586 feet and to the place of beginning containing in all 10.54 acres more or less, Monroe County, Indiana.

The above described sub-division was recorded in the County Courthouse the 21st day of October, 1957. It currently has all city utilities except sewers and all of the City Planning Commission's requirements were met prior to recording said addition.

S/ E. Burritt Bryan
E. Burritt Bryan-Owner

S/ Nancy W. Bryan
Nancy W. Bryan,- Owner

S/ James E. Owens
James E. Owens - Owner

S/ Nancy Owens
Nancy Owens - Owner

April 1, 1958

To the Common Council of the City of Bloomington

Gentlemen:

I respectfully request that Rob-Ben-Mar Second Addition which I am platting and which adjoins the City of Bloomington, Indiana, and is contiguous to its present corporate limits be annexed by the City of Bloomington, Indiana.

Respectfully submitted,
S/ RubyL. Siebenthal
Ruby Siebenthal

HAAGI

Councilman Griffith moved, seconded by Councilman Chitwood that the City Attorney be instructed to prepare an ordinance annexing Beechwood Manor and Rob-Ben-Mar Second Addition; motion unanimously carried.

The following recommendation from the Traffic Commission was read by the Clerk-Treasurer:

BLOOMINGTON TRAFFIC COMMISSION

To: The Mayor and Common Council of Bloomington, Indiana

At the regular meeting of the Bloomington Traffic Commission, the below listed traffic recommendations were adopted and are herewith submitted to the Mayor and the Common Council for consideration and action.

1. A recommendation was approved that both Driscoll and Wilson between Lincoln and Walnut be maintained as two-way streets. As reported by the traffic survey team, the major problem is not the traffic on Wilson and Driscoll, but that of motorist proceeding south on Walnut and making a left turn. The left turn problem is at its peak from 3:30 to 5:30 P.m. at the aforementioned location. In addition, the same problem exists from First Street to Hillside on South Walnut. In consideration of these facts the Commission recommends that the left turns on South Walnut be made only at First Street between 3:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m.
2. Recommendations were approved for the following traffic controls.
 - a. Mitchell and First: Installation of yield signs on First Street. The principle traffic flow appears to be on Mitchell and the obstruction view at the intersection should be eliminated if possible.
 - b. Rose and First: Installation of yield signs on Rose. There is obstruction of view at the intersection and the principle traffic flow appears to be on First. Rose is not a through street in this area. Under the above recommendations, traffic on First will have been forced to yield on Mitchell and should be permitted to proceed here.

Respectfully submitted,

S/ B. I. Loft
Dr. Bernard I. Loft
Chairman

Councilman Simpson moved, seconded by Councilman Chitwood that the recommendation of the Traffic Commission be accepted and the Traffic Schedule of the Traffic Ordinance be amended accordingly; motion unanimously carried.

Monthly reports for April were received from the Plumbing Inspector and Sanitation Department and placed on file.

Mayor Lemon presented the following message which was read by the Clerk-Treasurer:

During the past few weeks, it has become increasingly apparent that many people living and owning property in the proposed annexation area still are not fully aware of the many benefits and savings of urban residence. The city has been discussing and explaining annexation and the benefits of city services for nearly two years. We were surprised by the doubts and confusion that still seemed to persist in some areas at the time of the passing of the annexation ordinance.

It was our hope that a clear understanding about annexation could be arrived at during the public hearing on the question. When no one appeared to oppose or discuss the annexation ordinance, it was assumed that there were no major misunderstandings.

However, this does not seem to be the case. The number of phone calls and other inquiries regarding annexation continue to increase. More recently, we have learned that hundreds of property owners signed the anti-annexation petitions before learning that the city was truly interested in their welfare, and that the cost of living within the corporate limits is no more in most cases than living outside the city.

Many of these same people have now called us and would like to have their names taken off the anti-annexation petition. We understand that many more feel the same way, but have not yet made their wishes known.

We certainly appreciate the problems which have come up in all neighborhoods because of undue pressures and veiled threats that have been used by a few who have attempted to turn neighbor against neighbor for their own personal and political reasons. We therefore do not in any way plan to publish or use the names of the petitioners.

We do not plan to adjust any rates or services outside the present city limits until the annexation program is finally settled. Whatever changes or adjustments are made will only be after a thorough study is made of the cost involved in providing services to residents outside the city. We have felt that it was only fair to advise residents outside the city that changes may be necessary in order to remove some of the inequities that now exist.

In developing an annexation program, the final goal has always been to promote a greater and more progressive community. We do not want present city residents to bear an undue burden for providing services to residents outside the city, nor do we want to be unfair to those outside the city. We are seeking to annex only those areas which are urban in character and tendency and where we can be expected to provide further city services within a reasonable time.

From the time the survey of areas around the city was completed and annexation proposals set forth, the City has continued to study the plan and to make extensive revisions. Now after still further study, it has been deemed advisable to consider further reductions in the area proposed for annexation. The area proposed for elimination from the plan is comprised of the great amount of acreage owned by Indiana University and the Griffey Lake property owned by the City of Bloomington. The elimination of this area can be made without depriving any individuals of essential services or altering present administration practices.

I am therefore recommending that the Common Council, by ordinance, repeal Annexation Ordinance No. 4 of 1958 as passed on February 4, 1958, and that a new annexation ordinance be introduced and passed.

During the ensuing weeks prior to passage of the new annexation ordinance, the city will welcome the change to meet with any and all citizens in the proposed annexation area for a better understanding of the change to urban status. Everyone involved is urged to carefully weigh the advantages of annexation. Get the answers to any of your questions from the officials involved. Do not take hearsay or unfounded criticism for facts.

We want a unified community working for the benefit and welfare of all our citizens. We regret that so many misunderstandings have entered into the annexation program. We have the finest and most promising city in the midwest. We must grow accordingly.

Councilman Griffith read the following message to the Common Council:

STATEMENT ON ANNEXATION PROGRAM

Of Middle West cities of its size Bloomington has an unrivaled potential for the future. With good planning for that future, with its citizens, its city administration, its business and industry and the University pulling together as a unified community for the benefit and welfare of all, Bloomington in the near future can become a fine modern city of which we can all be proud to claim as Our Home Town.

This is an age of urbanization. Cities have always been the basis of the great civilizations of the world, and that is just as true today as it was in the days of ancient Greece and Rome. City living gives us more of the comforts, conveniences and culture we think of as modern living largely because of the services and utilities that are supplied by the city governments of the nation. And because these services and conveniences are produced on a mass basis their cost through the city is less than the individual outside the city limits can produce them for himself. The advantages accruing from city services enable insurance companies and most public utilities to give better rates to citizens residing within the city limits.

Today in America we have a phenomenon known as "Suburbia". The suburbs hug the cities in close embrace trying to tap from them as much of their services as possible, yet their inhabitants by staying outside the technical limits of the city are trying to avoid their share of the costs. They demand from the cities such services as water, fire protection, hospital and ambulance services, recreational facilities, sanitary protection, streets to places of employment, markets, school and church, etc., and yet try to avoid as much as possible sharing with the cities the costs of such facilities and services.

The only recourse that the city has to bring about the fair sharing of the costs of the governmental services and utilities by the whole community is the annexation of its adjacent suburban areas. Since from the very nature of things the suburbs will not voluntarily seek annexation the city must be empowered by the State Law to take the initiative, otherwise the suburbs will continue to exist as veritable parasites tapping the very life blood of the urban heart of the community. In developing an annexation program the final goal must always be the promotion of a greater and more progressive community. The present City residents must not bear an undue burden for providing services outside the city; on the otherhand the annexation program must be fair to the suburban residents. The present Indiana law on annexation is not only fair to the city, but by laying down certain fundamental principles of annexation protects the rights of the suburban areas as well.

The idea of a general annexation of Bloomington's suburban areas did not begin with the city's present administration. It was much discussed by the immediately previous administration. In fact, the present plan of annexation, bringing in all of the suburbs at once, was suggested, but because the State annexation law was not then as favorable to the city as at present, such an annexation was not attempted.

After a thorough survey of Bloomington's annexation problem by a firm of professional planners in the fall of 1957 the Common Council of Bloomington prepared an annexation ordinance. The Council studied very thoroughly the area to be annexed and from time to time modified the proposed city boundaries, trying earnestly to conform in all good conscience to the principles laid down in the State annexation law and with the best interests of community as a whole in mind. Finally, due notice was given to all concerned that the ordinance was to be considered in a public hearing on Tuesday, February 4, 1958 and that all interested citizens whose interest might be affected adversely should appear for the purpose of remonstrance. At that meeting of the Common Council not one single citizen appeared to remonstrate and the Council duly adopted the annexation ordinance, Ordinance 1958-4.

Immediately after the passage of the ordinance, even though not a single person had appeared to protest against it, an organized movement was instigated to get signatures to an anti-annexation protest and remonstrance for the purpose of nullifying the annexation. This protest alleged a general violation in the annexation of the principles set forth in the State annexation law. Many of those who signed the petition have stated that they did so under misunderstanding or duress and have asked that their names be removed from the lists of petitioners.

During the past few weeks it has become increasingly apparent that many people living and owning property in the annexation area are still not fully aware of the benefits and savings of urban residence. With the deliberate misrepresentation by some of the opponents of annexation it is not surprising that there is doubt and confusion persisting among the residents of this area as to the true facts in the case. What is needed is a period of reflection and discussion that a clearer understanding of the advantages of annexation may be arrived at by those affected by the annexation ordinance.

The members of the Common Council, the Mayor, and the members of the Board of Public Works are willing to bend over backward to be sure that each area affected be treated fairly. If any group or individual can show that in any particular area the principles set forth in the State annexation law are being violated by the annexation of that area, the Common Council would be glad to eliminate such area from the

annexation program. For the purpose of a reconsideration of the boundaries of the annexation area it is recommended that Ordinance 1958-4 be repealed and that a new annexation ordinance be prepared and adopted.

Councilman Simpson ~~introduced~~ introduced for first reading an ordinance pertinent to the repealing of Ordinance No. 4, 1958. Said ordinance was given first reading by the Clerk-Treasurer.

Councilman Simpson asked City Attorney Baker what progress had been made with the County Attorney, Mr. Snyder, relative to emergency ambulance service between the City and County. City Attorney Baker reported that he had corresponded with the City Attorney of Muncie, Delaware County, on how they had handled a similiar situation and was now*meeting with Mr. Snyder, County Attorney, to see what could be worked out. (*waiting for)

James Kent, Attorney for Sexton Ambulance Service, stated that ambulance service would have to be discontinued after April 10th subject to financial help.

Councilman Chitwood moved, seconded by Councilman Graves that the claims as presented for payment April 2, 1958, be allowed as submitted; motion unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned.

Thos. J. Lemon
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Mary Alice Dunlap
Clerk-Treasurer

HAA061