

---

*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](mailto:moneill@monroe.lib.in.us).*

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on May 10, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. via a virtual (Zoom) meeting due to COVID-19. Members present: Flavia Burrell, Beth Cate, Andrew Cibor, Chris Cockerham, Israel Herrera, Jillian Kinzie, Susan Sandberg, Karin St. John, and Brad Wisler.

**ROLL CALL**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** April 2021

**\*\*Kinzie moved to approve the April 2021 minutes. Cate seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0.**

**REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:** Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, reported the revised ordinance and map are still with the City Council.

**PETITIONS:**

**ZO-03-21 City of Bloomington**

Jackie Scanlan reported the City Council suggested two amendments for Chapter 3 of Zoning Ordinances. The first was adding Sustainable Development incentives and a parking amendment to change the ground floor parking standards from student housing or dormitory parking, changing to match multi-family parking.

**Public Comments:** There were no public comments.

**Adopt as Amended by City Council:**

**\*\*Cate moved to adopt the two amendments that were approved by City Council. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0.**

**SP-15-21 Trinitas Ventures**

3216 E 3<sup>rd</sup> Street

Request: Site Plan approval to allow the construction of a multi-family residential development with 340 dwelling units and 906 bedrooms.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich presented the staff report. The 11.98 acre property is located at 3216 E 3rd Street. The site is bounded by 3rd Street along the north property line, the College Mall to the south, Kingston Drive to the west, and Clarizz Blvd to the east. Surrounding land uses include various commercial uses to the north, business and medical offices to the east, and College Mall to the west and south. There are no known sensitive environmental constraints on this property. The site has been developed with a 110,000 square foot big retail store that formerly contained Kmart and a 10,000 square foot retail store for Bloomingfoods.

The petitioner is proposing to remove the former building and parking areas for Kmart and redevelop

the area for new multifamily residences and student housing. The existing building for Bloomingfoods would not be altered with this petition. There would however be improvements made to the Bloomingfoods site to bring that into compliance with all UDO regulations including removing existing parking, installing new landscaping and islands, and adding bicycle parking.

The proposed site plan features four buildings that will be used for student housing and two buildings that will contain multi-family residences for a possible total of 340 units and 906 bedrooms. Approximately 542 parking spaces will be provided through a mix of on-street spaces, surface parking, and a parking garage with 385 parking spaces. There will be two large open spaces provided for the residents consisting of a north/south park between the student housing buildings (Frieda Park) and another large park (Latimer Park) and playground between the multi-family buildings on the south side of the development. Access to the site will come from Clarizz Blvd and Kingston Drive. The existing access drive on 3rd Street will be removed with this petition.

Staff is continuing to work with the petitioner and has highlighted the following features for further discussion and possible revisions:

- Design of end caps of the Buildings, especially for the ends most visible from a public street.
- Design of the parking garage and incorporation of suggestions from Schmidt Associates for possible improvements.
- Relocation of highlighted utility boxes and dumpsters.
- Modifications to be proposed sidewalk connection to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.
- Vehicle access locations.

The Planning and Transportation Department recommends the Plan Commission forward the petition to the June 14, 2021 hearing.

**Project Representative Comments:**

Ryan Call with ELS summarized the project, noting the design team (Jeff Fanyo, Josh Anderson, Mark Becher, Dan Brueggert) was able to meet the UDO requirements.

**Plan Commission and Planning staff Comments:**

Kinzie asked about the possibility of using Green Building Practices on the project. Ryan Call said they are not seeking LEED Certification. Dan Brueggert, with CSO Architect, said the roof material for the student housing portion of the project would be light in color to help with the heat and well placed windows to let in more daylight in the building which helps in the winter months. Also, they will be recycling the asphalt from the old parking lot to be used as fillers to help level the property so there will be less slope. Kinzie asked about the use of solar, Mark Becher said at this time there are no plans for solar or vegetative roof. Kinzie also asked about using no-mow options and Josh Anderson they have not used no-mow on any other projects but they would be willing to explore that option. Kinzie was concerned about traffic congestion on Kingston Drive, Ryan Call thought Margaret Place to Clarizz and Mall Ring Road should hopefully reduce some of the congestion on Kingston Drive. Kinzie is concerned about the appearance of Bloomingfoods loading dock area, Ryan Call said adding the island with vegetation to the south of the loading dock should screen the view of the loading dock.

Sandberg asked about applying the Affordability Incentives to this project. Mark Becher said this project is not on the qualified census track for the Affordability Incentives, he also said the density bonus was not used because the public was concerned about over population by adding additional floors to meet those qualifications. Sandberg would like to visit more later on the bedroom configurations, of student

---

housing versus multifamily.

St. John asked about the undeveloped space on north west corner of the project and what are the plans for that space in the future, could there possibly be a small retail development in that area. Ron Call this time that space is being used in the 40% green space that is required. St. John asked about improving the appearance of the parking garage, would like to see public art on parking garage, to make the structure more attractive. Mark Becher said they are looking at the parking needs for the future, if the need for cars is reduced they could redevelop the area which the parking garage is currently located. St. John would like to see local art on the side of the parking garage.

Cate agrees with St. John's comments regarding the appearance of the parking garage by adding public art. Cate feels the buildings are monotone in design, can the color or tone be changed to make the buildings more attractive. Ryan Call and Dan Brueggert said they will look at changing the outside of the buildings.

Burrell asked about the parking ratio compared to the number of bedrooms. Ron Call said that parking is optional, tenants would pay extra for parking. There are 442 spaces for residential units and 92 spaces for Bloomingfoods. Mark Becher talked about the ratio vs bedroom, said they used the UDO to meet the parking ratio.

Cibor wanted clarification if open spaces will be open to the public. Ryan Call explained that the student housing courtyards would be for tenants only but the parks would be open to the public. Cibor wanted to know why the project proposal is not being proposed as a subdivision, Jeff Fanyo noted a subdivision would require each lot to have 60/40 green space and they would not be able to meet those requirements as a subdivision without losing parking spaces at Bloomingfoods, which they want to maintain those parking spaces. Cibor asked about the possibility of future subdivision of this property, Jeff Fanyo said he doesn't see the need for future subdivision. Cibor wanted to know how parking was going to be managed. Ryan Call said the design team is still working on ways to handle curb management. The parking garage will require a parking pass which will be purchase by the tenant. Cibor believes the Bloomingfoods parking entries is confusing, there are two for customers and two for deliveries. Jeff Fanyo explained the design was based on traffic flow, so no customer has to turn around to leave the lot, and the delivery dock wouldn't work well without an entry and exit.

Herrera asked if there will be public access to the parks and the flexibility for families and different age groups. Josh Anderson explained Latimer Park is designed for different age groups. And both parks are open to public for use. The only spaces not available to the public would be the courtyards associated with the student housing. Herrera asked about LEED Certification, Ron Call said they were not intending to go through the LEED Certification but can look at this more in the future.

### **Public Comments:**

Steve Akers is from the Park Ridge neighborhood and shocked by what has been presented, seems to be just another glorified student housing. This looks like nothing that was present during the charrette meeting. If possible the use of more sustainable elements in this project, solar, water capturing system, more native plants, water gardens. Also feels this is a lost opportunity for affordable housing. Likes the idea of using local art on the side of the garage. Would like to see the use of energy efficient appliances.

Barbara Moss thinks this is just another very large student housing project, 68% is student housing, needs more middle housing options. Does agree with Commissioner Cate about design at street view,

very monotonous, nothing special about the design, needs more variety, and does reflect good urbanism. Not satisfied with the park size.

Margaret Clemens urged rejection of this plan, competing with the University, faculty/student interaction is important and to farm out this many students into the city is not healthy. Keep it commercial if you can't do single family housing. The scale of the project to large, we do not need more student housing.

Lucy Schaich lives in the Park Ridge neighborhood. Was not informed of the meeting, didn't have time to prepare. Why do we need more student dormitory buildings? Focus on affordable housing, wants more community housing.

Ron Smith said the planning team hasn't responded to constituents, what the public is asking for doesn't include more student housing. Disappointed in what has been presented. Need developers to listen to the people in the neighborhood.

Russ Skiba lives in Hoosier Acres, disappointed in how this has developed. These is an affordability crisis, not a student housing crisis in this town. Would like Plan Commission and developer to take this seriously, regarding the need for affordable housing.

Duane Schau states that big development doesn't include affordable housing, wants less student housing and more affordable housing.

**Final Plan Commission Comments:**

St. John was concerned about notification for the Plan Commission Meetings, there were a few people who felt they were not notified until 5 hours before the meeting, which didn't give them time to prepare. Scanlan said legals ran in the Herald Times 10 days prior to the meeting and the packet is posted on the City's website the Friday before the meeting. Eric pointed out there was a neighborhood meeting 3 weeks prior to the Plan Commission Meeting and the Plan Commission meeting date was announced in the neighborhood meeting.

Kinzie wants the developer and staff to address the need for additional student housing. Mark Call pointed out the charrette meetings started 3 years ago, the world looks different now, changes are based on what is feasible. Retail is more feasible for the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase. Were looking to meeting UDO and zoning requirements, not planning to ask for any variances. Eric mentioned there have been a lot of changes in the past 3 years, which contributes the changes to the project. Developers are meeting all the requirements for the UDO. Kinzie wanted clarification on the student housing demand. Eric said occupancy rate for student housing at this time is 98%, and is the appropriate location for this type of housing. Jackie noted if the developers are meeting all the requirements then this must be approved, we don't have the discretion to reject this project.

Trohn Enright-Randolph commented on the subject to rent versus buying, need more options to purchase housing.

Staff recommendation to continue discussion to June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting.

Cibor asked everyone to think more about the details of the items that have been discussed during this meeting.

Sandberg would prefer to see the plans flip to include more multifamily housing and less student housing.

Burrell developers have a good opportunity for more sustainable housing, would like for them to explore that before the next meeting.

**\*\*St. John motion to forward the petition to the June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021 hearing, including the five bullet points outlined in the staff report and feedback from this evenings meeting. Kinzie seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0:1—Approved.**

Kinzie would like to see a lot more green building practices, solar arrays, and vegetative roofs, for a project this large more attention needs to be given to green practices. Would like to see more affordable housing and less student housing. More student housing closer to campus. Would like to see better looking end caps on the buildings and parking garage. Better access to Bloomingfoods for the residents.

Wisler thanked the petitioner for their hard work on this project, questions the type of housing and the breakdown, student housing versus multifamily housing. There has been a lot assumptions made that the only people who would rent a 3 bedroom apartment are students, we need to get away from that thinking, there are many families in Bloomington who would rent a 3 bedroom apartment because they can't afford to buy a house. We cannot vote down site plan approval because of its lack of affordable housing or its lack of solar panels or green roofs, any more than we don't like the color of the siding or choice of playground equipment. If this is what you expect then you need to amend the UDO to reflect those items as standard, simply not fair to the developer who has met the UDO requirements.

Meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.