

## Plan Commission Summary Minutes Virtual Web Conference Meeting

October 18, 2021 - 5:30 pm

*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 October 18, 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:** September 13, 2021

**\*\*Cate moved to approve the September 13, 2021 minutes, with no changes. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0- Approved.**

### **REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

Appoint New Plat Member - Jackie Scanlan reported they intended to appoint a new Plat Committee member tonight, but they will instead wait until November. In the meantime there is an alternate available from Utilities that will serve if need be, but the Utilities Department would prefer to wait to fill the position when they have a new staff member.

### **PETITIONS:**

SP-27-21      **Michael Cordaro (Johnson Creamery)**  
335 W 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Request: Major site plan approval to allow for the construction of a 5 story building with 51 dwelling units in the MD zoning district.  
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

The property is located on the north side of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and extends north to 8<sup>th</sup> Street and is within the Downtown Core Downtown Character Overlay of the Mixed-Use Downtown (MD) zoning district. Surrounding land uses include offices to the north, west, and south with the Showers office building and B-Line Trail to the east. The property currently contains a surface parking area that is used by tenants of the Johnson Creamery office building that fronts on 7<sup>th</sup> Street. There is a 12' wide platted alley along the west side of this property that runs north/south and connects 7<sup>th</sup> Street to 8<sup>th</sup> Street. There is an underground culvert and 15' wide easement that runs through the northeast corner of this property that contains a 48" storm water pipe that serves the overall storm water drainage system for the portions of the City upstream of this area.

The Plan Commission recently approved a site plan (SP-11-20) for this site in 2020, however due to difficulties encountered regarding the relocation of the existing box culvert and concerns about the stability of the historic smokestack, the petitioner has had to redesign the proposed project.

The petitioner is requesting major site plan approval to allow for the construction of a new residential building with 60 dwelling units, 74 bedrooms, and an interior parking area with 18 spaces. There will be 44 studio units, 6 one-bedroom units, 6 two-bedroom units, and 4 3-bedroom units. The interior parking garage would be accessed from a drive cut on the alley on the west side and by an entrance on the south side of the building. The petitioner is proposing a 1,000 square foot fitness area along the ground floor of the 8<sup>th</sup> Street frontage and a large outdoor plaza area, two dwelling units, and lobby along the

---

ground floor facing the B-Line.

This petition is proposing to utilize two sections of the UDO. The first is Section 20.04.110 (d)(2)(A) Sustainable Development Incentives that allows for an additional floor of building height, not to exceed 12'. The second is to utilize Section 20.04.060(g) Adjustments to Minimum Parking Requirements to allow for a reduced on-site parking requirement. More information is discussed on those two aspects later in the report.

This petition is considered a Major Site Plan since it contains more than 50 dwelling units and is required to be reviewed by the Plan Commission.

Based on the bedroom and unit count, the site is required to have 45 on-site parking spaces. The site plan shows 26 parking spaces, 18 spaces will be created under this building and there will be 8 surface parking spaces. The petitioner is proposing to utilize Section 20.04.060(g) of the UDO that allows for adjustments to the minimum number of parking spaces required based on five different factors. The petitioner is proposing to utilize Section #2 (Proximity to Transit) and Section #5 (Modification of Minimum Parking Requirement Based on Parking Study) of that provision to allow for a reduction of required on-site parking spaces.

Section #2 allows for a 15% reduction if there is a fixed transit station within ¼ mile. There is a fixed transit stop at 7<sup>th</sup> and Morton which is within a ¼ mile of this site. This 15% reduction allows for a reduction of 7 parking spaces from the 45 required spaces, which would reduce the number of required spaces to 38.

Section #5 allows for a further modification to the minimum number of spaces based on the submittal of a parking demand study. The petitioner has prepared a parking demand study and that is included in the packet. The study discusses the use of shared cars within units as well as an expected decrease in cars for residents of the studio and one-bedroom units, and the use of specific car sharing programs. It should also be noted that the City recently finished construction of a new public parking garage immediately adjacent to this project at the Trades District Garage. The Public Works Department has indicated that there are spaces available for long term lease and the petitioner has initiated communication with the City to secure long term leases for residents. Given the information presented in the Parking Demand Study and the location and availability of on-street parking spaces, and spaces available within a public parking garage immediately adjacent to this property, the Department finds a further reduction of 12 parking spaces appropriate and that the proposed 26 parking spaces should be approved at this location for this project.

Since the petitioner is partially relying on a car sharing program to justify the request for a reduction in the minimum number of on-site parking spaces required, the Department recommends that a minimum number of parking spaces within the on-site garage be set aside for vehicles in the ride sharing program. The petitioner has agreed to set aside 3 spaces within the garage for vehicles in the program and a condition of approval has been proposed to that effect.

**CONCLUSION:** This petition meets all of the UDO requirements for the Downtown Core Downtown Character Overlay. This project provides a high quality building along the B-Line Trail and the placement of the plaza space along the B-Line Trail facade allows for the visitors to the building to actively engage between the Trail and building. The development provides housing immediately adjacent to the developing Trades District employment area. The incorporation of the Sustainable Development Incentives provides several environmentally friendly design features for this project as well.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Department recommends approval of SP-27-21 with the following conditions of approval:

1. A total of 15 bicycle parking spaces are required and will need to be shown on the site plan before issuance of a grading permit.
2. One street light and street trees not more than 40' from center are required along the 8<sup>th</sup> Street frontage and will need to be shown on the site plan before issuance of a grading permit.
3. Verification of the east/west alley vacation must be submitted prior to issuance of a grading permit

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:**

Michael Cordaro, petitioner, is excited about the new design for this project, thinks the architect and design team did a great job. Cordaro hopes this design meets everyone's approval and hopes to get started on this project sometime in late spring next year.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

St. John asked about the three rideshare spaces that were mentioned in staff report. Greulich said that was an accidental carry over from the previous report, no ride share spaces are being set aside. St. John also asked about the interior plants mentioned in the Environmental Commission report. Greulich explained that means plants within the boundaries of the property, not plants inside the building.

Kinzie asked about the parking on the south side of the building, is that parking for the residents or for the commercial tenants to the south in Johnson Creamery. Greulich said that parking could be for the residents or for the commercial space, however the owners want to allocate those spaces. Commercial space is not required to have parking spaces, it is only residential uses that have that requirement. Kinzie wanted to clarify the concerns about the culvert, the original plan was to move the culvert and that became too cost prohibitive and potentially dangerous, she wanted to clarify is the problem that it couldn't be accessed or is there danger in building on top of a culvert. Greulich said the main problem was that you can't build over the culvert, because it hinders the ability to have access for repairs and because they couldn't move the culvert they redesigned the project with the current culvert location in mind.

Kinzie also asked about clarification regarding vacating the alley that runs east/west on the south side of this project. It has been requested there be verification the alley has been vacated, Kinzie just wanted to know where that alley was located. Scanlan explained using a site drawing where a platted alley is, Greulich believes the alley has been vacated, but to make sure that is true a condition was added to verify that the alley no longer exists, if it does exist then they will have to go to Council to get it vacated. This is necessary to get site plan approval.

Kinzie next asked about the use of exterior limestone that was in the original package for this project, wanted to clarify that no limestone would be used on this version of the project. Cordaro said that limestone was featured in the original design around the retail space, with the redesign they didn't see the need to the use of limestone since there will be no retail space.

Cibor asked about the parking, wanted to verify that the commercial office space doesn't have any required off street parking and if correct what plans does the owner/developer have for the tenants of

the commercial building. Cordaro said that code does not require parking for the office or retail space, but they have talked with all of the tenants to let them know parking is not guaranteed. They have secured 13 parking spaces for the tenants during business hours from the church directly west of Johnson Creamery, there are also parking garage options within walking distance. Cibor also asked about the rideshare space mentioned earlier, he noted in a parking study it was recommended that there be a least one rideshare space. Cordaro noted they are still going to attempt to have one rideshare space dedicated and are currently exploring the options for having a rideshare space. Have not been able to get one of the rideshare companies to commit to renting a space, but they are still trying.

Cibor was interested in hearing how the developer planned to construct a 5-story building in an area that has limited access for traffic. Joseph Patrick, Director of Development for the developer, wanted to go back to the rideshare topic and note they are going to be talking to the City of Bloomington about possible renting a space in the Trades District garage. Patrick said they have been reviewing the traffic issues with the pre-construction general contractor about the logistics of getting equipment and material to the jobsite. They will use the space behind Johnson Creamery as their staging area with deliveries coming in via 8<sup>th</sup> Street and the jobsite will be enclosed with a fence to keep the public out of the area. There would probably be temporary closures along 8<sup>th</sup> Street for deliveries and utility connections and temporary alley closures for utility relocations. There will be no closures of the B-Line trail and they would certainly be able to work around any special events, such as Farmers Market, that might be happening in the area.

Herrera asked about potential sidewalk connections to the B-Line trail and landscaping that will screen between the parking lot and the development. Patrick noted there are two connections to the B-Line trail, both would be taken to the property line and they would work with the City to make sure that the connection to the B-Line is made. The landscaping that is currently next to the B-Line belongs to the City and they have no intention of disturbing anything that is not within their property lines. They will do whatever they need to do to protect that landscaping during the construction phase and refurbish anything that is disturbed.

St. John asked about drainage during heavy rains, she noted the parking lot currently floods and was interested in knowing if the flooding will be dealt with during construction. Greulich said there are a few storm water inlets on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, but believes the petitioners will need to have conversations with the City's Utilities Department regarding this as part of their grading permit process.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** No public comments.

**FINAL COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Cate appreciates the attention to the environmental considerations.

Kinzie noted she preferred the original design features, before the re-design, she felt the original design had some nice features. Wanted to acknowledge the use of the sustainability incentives, would like to make sure that we acknowledge that more publicly, wants to draw more attention to sustainability incentives again.

Cockerham sees this as the perfect use of this lot considering it is right next to the trade's district, next to City Hall and the Showers Building, great use of utilizing a really good lot in a great location.

**\*\*Cate motioned to approve petition SP-27-21, including the three conditions outlined in the staff report. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0—Approved.**

DP-29-21      **Sukhvinder Mehta**  
2306 & 2310 W 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Request: Subdivide one lot into two lots.  
Case Manager: Keegan Gulick

The site is located at 2306 & 2310 W. Third Street and is zoned Mixed-use Corridor (MC). The site currently contains an assisted living facility that was constructed in 2014. Surrounding land uses include Mixed-use Corridor (MC) and Residential Multifamily (RM).

The site currently contains 1 lot and has an assisted living facility structure and parking on the eastern portion of the lot. The existing lot maintains frontage on W. Third Street. There is one access point to the property from W. 3rd Street. There is one sinkhole on the eastern portion of this property and one sinkhole immediately to the north of the property, which both required karst preservation easements. There is an existing retention pond on the eastern portion of the lot that was developed with the building in 2014. There is an existing 5-foot sidewalk along the property frontage that was installed by the City with a previous project along the 3rd Street corridor. The petitioner is requesting to subdivide the property into two properties so that the existing building and parking area are on their own lot and a second vacant lot is created, and both lots utilize a shared access driveway from W. Third Street.

**CONCLUSION:** By subdividing the lot into two lots, the granting of this proposal would allow the western lot to be sold and promote development along the W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street corridor. There is no new construction proposed with this petition.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Department recommends adopting the proposed findings and approving DP-29-21 with the following conditions:

- Approval of the secondary plat for this subdivision is delegated to staff.
- In conjunction with the approval of a secondary plat, the petitioner shall install or provide a financial performance guarantee for the required sidewalk improvement.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:**

Tom Nugent for the petitioner, just splitting one lot into two lots and there is already two existing addresses so hopefully this won't be a problem.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Kinzie asked about the verification of the minimum 40% landscape area. Pazos said those requirements applied to existing property. Scanlan confirmed that the lot on the east side has been verified as meeting the 40% landscape requirement, without the lot they are wanting to divide off. The new lot is not developed and is non-conforming.

Cibor asked about the sidewalk frontage, the sidewalk is expanding essentially from the driveway to the western property line, but the driveway to the railroad tracks on the east is a separate property. Pazos noted there is a parcel between the eastern lot and the sidewalk that belongs to the City.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Diana Reynolds asked for clarification of what is being divided into two lots, just the property on the City side, and not the property on the County side? Scanlan verified that the property on the County side is not included in this request.

**\*\*Cate motioned to approve petition DP-29-21, including the two conditions outlined in the staff report. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0—approved.**

Meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.