
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, 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 April 12, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. via a virtual (Zoom) meeting due to COVID-19. Members present: Flavia Burrell, Beth Cate, Anderw Cibor, Chris Cockerham, Isreal Herrera, Jullian Kinzie, Susan Sandberg, Karin St. John, and Brad Wisler.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None at this time

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS: Kinzie thanked the Planning and Transportation staff and public for their work on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, also thanked commission members for their work on the UDO.

PETITIONS:

PUD-11-21 Cornerstone Medical Construction, LLC

2800 Rex Grossman Boulevard

Final Plan approval to construct a 6,975 sq.ft. addition to expand the current use of the "Medical Clinic"

Case Manager: Ryan Robling

Ryan Robling presented the staff report. The property is located in the Southern Indiana Medical Park at the southwest corner of S. McIntire Dr. and W. Cota Dr., a Planned Unit Development (PUD) 98. The property is currently developed with a "medical clinic" and is the location of the Southern Indiana Surgery Center. The current development was approved in September 1991 (PCD-69-91). The property fronts along W. Cota Dr. and S. McIntire Dr. The property derives entrances from W. Cota Dr., S. McIntire Dr., and S. Rex Grossman Blvd. Surrounding properties to the north, south, and east are also zoned within the existing PUD and have also been developed with "healthcare facilities" uses. The property to the west is owned by the State of Indiana and is undeveloped and runs alongside Interstate 69/State Road 37. The petitioner is requesting Final Plan approval to allow for a 6,975 sq.ft. addition to the current 13,870 sq.ft. facility. The proposed 1-story addition will bring the total square footage of the structure to 20,845 sq.ft. The current medical use of the building will expand into the proposed addition. The site is currently developed with 77 parking spaces. No new parking spaces are being proposed as part of this petition. This project would meet all UDO requirements including all other applicable regulations, compliance with utility, service and improvement standards and in compliance with prior approvals. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve PUD-11-21 with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner will provide location and details for the required bicycle parking spaces on the site plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
2. A landscape plan, for the entire site, that meets all PUD and UDO requirements must be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a grading permit. The landscape plan should also show the required tree protection zone of the existing closed canopy wooded area, and other trees intended to be preserved during development.
3. The petitioner will provide a compliant photometric plan before the issuance of a grading permit.

Project Representative Comments:

Dustin Foster, American Structurepoint, had nothing further to add to the staff report but is available to answer any questions the commission might have.

Plan Commission and Planning staff Comments:

Cate asked about the nature of the business and why they were not required to add additional parking. Robling explained the business was a medical facility and additional parking was not required because when the facility was originally built there was enough parking for two additional expansions, and this is the first expansion.

Kinzie ask for an explanation of what a Photometric plan was. Robling explained it's an outside lighting plan for safety and lighting that won't "over light" onto adjacent properties.

Burrell asked about the preserved area and what steps are necessary to protect this preserved area. Robling said there will be a protective barrier 3' from the drip line of the closet tree.

Cibor questioned the width of the sidewalk. The drawings show 4 feet but according to code 6 feet is required. Robling said that issue will be addressed later in the permitting process. Scanlan further explained that site plans are not 100% complete at this point of the process, but the project will be required to meet UDO requirements for the site as part of the grading permit process.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

****St. John moved to approve PUD-11-21 based on the written findings, including the three conditions outlined in the staff report. Cate seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0— Approved.**

PUD-12-21 Starbucks Coffee Company

S. Liberty Drive (Parcel Number: 53-09-12-101-002.000-16)

PUD Final Plan approval for the construction of a 1,985 sq.ft. "restaurant" in PUD 26 (Park 37)

Case Manager: Ryan Robling

Ryan Robling presented the staff report. The property is located northeast of the intersection of S. Liberty Dr. and W. State Road 45 and is zoned (PUD) Planned Unit Development (PUD 26 – Park 37). The property is currently undeveloped and fronts along S. Liberty Dr. to the northwest and State Road 45 to the southeast. Properties to the north, south, east and west are each within PUD 26 and have been developed with commercial uses. The property to the south is zoned PUD 83 and has been developed with commercial uses. The petitioner proposes to construct a 1,985 (2,200) sq.ft. "restaurant" in the existing PUD. The petition meets the development standards of PUD 26's District Ordinance and the Unified Development Ordinance with the following exceptions: A compliant landscape plan showing the required number of species of permitted vegetation; compliant bicycle parking designs and location have not been shown on the site plan; a complaint lighting and photometric plan has not been provided by the petitioner; the proposed entrances do not meet the distance separation requirement; the amount of vehicle parking spaces shown on the site plan is in excess of the maximum parking allowance for the size and use of the proposed structure; and the required number of landscape bumpout, island, or endcaps has not been provided for on the site plan. Robling explained the petitioner intends to seek variances for both the vehicle parking maximum allowance and the required number of landscape bumpout, island, or endcaps. This project would be

in compliance within a PUD in which the Plan Commission has not delegated Final Plan authority to staff, in compliance with other applicable regulations, compliance with utility, service and improvement standards and in compliance with prior approvals. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve PUD-12-21 with the following conditions:

1. The approval is contingent upon approval of the parking variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals related to maximum vehicle parking allowance. If approval of the variance is denied the final plan may be amended to come into compliance pursuant to 20.06.070(c)(2)(E)(ii)(3)[a].
2. The approval is contingent upon approval of the variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals related to the required number and type of landscape bumpout, island, or endcaps. If approval of the variance is denied the final plan may be amended to come into compliance pursuant to 20.06.070(c)(2)(E)(ii)(3)[a].
3. The petitioner will work with staff and the City Engineer to find a suitable entrance onto the site.
4. The petitioner will provide location and details for the required bicycle parking spaces on the site plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
5. A landscape plan that meets UDO requirements must be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a grading permit. The petitioner shall work with the department's Senior Environmental Planner to identify landscaping that would create a visual buffer from the right-of-way.
6. The petitioner will provide a compliant photometric plan before issuance of a grading permit.

Project Representative Comments:

Mike Timko, Civil Engineer, said they plan to pursue a variance for the additional parking spaces; however, will try to meet landscaping requirements so that particular variance would no longer be necessary. He plans to meet all other UDO requirements.

Plan Commission and Planning staff Comments:

St. John expressed concern about traffic "stacking" and spilling over onto Liberty Drive. She suggested there be designated lanes, one for the drive through and the other for people to get around the building without waiting, therefore alleviating the "stacking" of cars. Timko thought Starbucks would be receptive to striping two lanes for ingress. Mike Rouker, City of Bloomington Legal Dept., suggested this be added as a voluntary condition and not required.

Kinzie also had traffic concerns and asked about adding a pedestrian connection to State Road 45. Robling said that INDOT is not interested in making that connection at this time. Kinzie asked if the City would be interested in making that pedestrian connection. Scanlan said it isn't possible because the City doesn't own the right-of-way, it's owned by the State of Indiana. Kinzie asked about the reusing of coffee grounds on the landscape (ground for gardens) at this location as part of green practices. Timko said he would pass along the request to Starbucks.

Cibor asked if Starbucks looked at other options for the entrance and exit driveways. Timko said they

did but felt this option was best for driver views. Robling also noted Starbucks originally had just one entrance on their drawings and Staff requested there be two entrance/exits.

Burrell asked if there is a center turn lane on Liberty. After some research it was determined by Staff there is in fact a turn lane. Burrell was happy about that since Liberty Drive is a high traffic area.

Cibor asked why Starbucks planned to ask for additional parking. Timko said it's because of the pandemic and the change in how business is done. There are more people who now order online and pickup their order and therefore additional parking space is needed for those customers.

Wisler asked what would happen if Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) rejected the request for additional parking spaces. Timko said those spaces would be turned into green space to meet landscaping requirements.

Kinzie asked if there would be dedicated parking spaces used for online pickup orders. Timko responded that dedicated spaces including clean signage for those spaces would be used for pickup orders.

St. John asked if seating would be provided inside. Timko said they plan to have indoor and outdoor seating.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

****Cate moved to approve PUD-12-21 based on the written findings, including the six conditions outlined in the staff report with an additional condition #7 stating that *"The Plan Commission will accept the voluntary condition to visually separate the entrance driveway into two lanes with pavement markings."* Kinzie seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0—Approved.**

Final Plan Commission Comments:

Cibor appreciates the 7th condition for approval, however he was concerned about the drive through lane versus the travel lane and how those lanes would be labeled. The site plan design may be revisited regarding entrance locations, will work with staff to understand the designs as it relates to traffic issues.

Wisler requested that parking spaces for pickup orders be located within the perimeter spaces so that drivers can get in and out without encountering problems with customers who are in line for the drive-through.

SP-13-21 Gene Goldstein (BDG)
1722 N. Walnut Street
Preliminary site plan approval for an existing hotel to be converted to multi-family residential apartments consisting of 85 dwelling units.
Case Manager: Keegan Gulick

Keegan Gulick presented the staff report. The property is located off of N. Walnut Street near the intersection of Walnut and Old State Road 37. This property is currently zoned Mixed-Use Corridor (MC) and developed with a 3-story hotel. The property to the north is zoned as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and is being developed with multifamily dwellings. The property to the east is zoned Residential High Density (RH) and developed with multifamily dwellings. The property to the south is also zoned Mixed-Use Corridor and is developed with a restaurant. The petitioner is proposing to renovate the existing structure and convert the hotel to apartments. This project will convert the 85 room hotel and

create 85, 1-bedroom dwelling units. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) requires that developments that contain more than 30 dwelling units be reviewed by the Plan Commission. Since the petitioner is using a nonconforming site and structure, the limited compliance regulations of 20.06.090(f)(B) are applicable per 20.06.090(a)(2)(A)(i). The UDO requires that bicycle parking, pedestrian facilities, and landscaping including street trees be updated. Landscaping will be updated to meet current code; new street trees will be installed. Bicycle parking will be provided on-site and connect the internal sidewalk to the adjacent public sidewalk. This project would be in compliance within a PUD in which the Plan Commission has not delegated final plan authority to Staff, in compliance with other applicable regulations, compliance with utility, service and improvement standards and in compliance with prior approvals. Staff recommends the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve SP-13-21 with following conditions:

1. The petitioner will provide the required number of bicycle parking spaces on the site plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
2. A landscape plan that meets all UDO requirements, including required street trees, must be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Plan Commission and Planning staff Comments:

Cate asked about the “market rental” expectation for the property. Goldstein said these would rent towards the lower end of the rental market rate.

Cibor asked about the sidewalk connection to the public sidewalk. Goldstein has no issue with adding the connection to the public sidewalk in order to meet ADA requirements.

Kinzie asked Staff for clarification regarding the current easement on the property. Gulick commented that the easement would remain with no proposed changes. Kinzie asked if any thought had been given to Green Building Practices with regard to this project such as solar power or any other green practices. Goldstein, petitioner, responded it hasn't been discussed at this point. Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, said because of the way the code is currently written Staff could not mandate Green Building Practices.

Burrell asked for clarification of the easement and its access to lot 2, to reach N. Walnut Street. Scanlan said since an easement already exists on the property there could not be changes to the easement. Goldstein added they have no intentions of changing the easement.

Public Comments:

Ann Shedd wanted to make sure the easement would remain. She added that the easement was not for emergency vehicles only.

David Askins asked about the required number of parking spaces; old versus new zoning codes for parking have not been approved by City Council. He asked about an estimated time for project completion.

Plan Commission and Planning Staff Comments:

Kinzie asked Staff to respond to David Askins questions. Scanlan said the parking space requirement has to be under the current code because the new code has not been approved by the City Council yet.

St. John asked for clarification of unit descriptions. Goldstein, petitioner, said these units would be studio apartments. He said they plan to add a kitchenette to each room.

Cate asked if there is a bus route for this address. Scanlan noted that a new bus route had been added after Motel 6 was built. Scanlan noted there are now two routes going by this location.

****Cate moved to approve SP-13-21 based on the written findings, including the two conditions outlined in the staff report. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0—Approved.**

Final Plan Commission Comments:

St. John expressed how much she likes the idea of reusing this space rather than tearing it down and rebuilding.

Kinzie said this is a good use of space and provides a great housing option; however, she would like to see the petitioner use some Green Space Practices as part of this project.

Wisler said great adaptive use but he's concerned about losing hotel rooms. However, since there is such a shortage of rentals in Bloomington this is a great solution.

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.