

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes  
Virtual Web Conference Meeting**

**February 7, 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 February 7, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. via a virtual (Zoom) meeting due to COVID-19. Members present: Tim Ballard, Flavia Burrell, Andrew Cibor, Chris Cockerham, Trohn Enright-Randolph, Israel Herrera, Jillian Kinzie, Ron Smith, Karin St. John and Brad Wisler.

**ROLL CALL**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ron Smith has been appointed to the Plan Commission, representing the Common Council, replacing Susan Sandberg and Tim Ballard has been appointed by the mayor, replacing Beth Cate.

Jacqueline Scanlan, Development Services Manager, announced that Plan Commission elections need to take place that evening.

**OFFICER ELECTIONS:**

\*\*Burrell nominated Wisler for president. Kinzie seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved.

\*\*Smith nominated Kinzie for vice president. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved

\*\*Kinzie nominated Burrell for Board of Zoning Appeals representative. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved

\*\*Kinzie nominated Wisler as alternate for the Board of Zoning Appeals representative. Smith seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved

\*\*St. John motioned for approval of Kinzie for Plat Committee representative, Smith as alternate and Brian Blake with CPU and Peden as CPU alternate, Roy Aten with Engineering and Dierkes as Engineering alternate. Burrell seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved.

\*\*There were no volunteers for County PC Ex-Officio, so there was no vote.

\*\*Kinzie nominated Beth Rosenberger for Hearing Officer. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved

\*\*Kinzie nominated Emily Herr for alternate Hearing Officer. St. John seconded. Motion carried by roll call vote 9:0 – Approved

Brad Wisler is a member of the MPO committee and is looking for a proxy to attend in his absence. Has asked the committee members to give it some thought and will discuss again next month.

Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, reported on Ordinance 21-23, when approved last spring by Council one of the stipulations for approval was a semi-annual report of request and approvals for plexes. This information is for the first six months, the department has spoken to 9 property owners and there were four discussions started with property owners before the legislation was finished, so a total of 13, two of those were stopped by the interview provision that states you can't have a notice of violation on file with the Planning and Transportation Department for the last three years. Have not had any conditional use filings for duplexes in the R1, R2 or R3 zones or triplexes in R4 in the six months since the ordinance was passed. There have been 3 plexes approved

in the residential multifamily or mixed use zoning districts since those came into ordinance in 2020 and there are currently three in discussion, expecting for some of those to be built in 2022. Wanted to give context about development for the second half of 2021 which is roughly the life span of Ordinance 20-23. In years past we saw 246 applications, for what are called certificates and zoning, which is our portion of the Monroe County Building Department building permit. The previous years in 2020 there were 348, of those 135 were for the Trinitas project at 17<sup>th</sup> and Arlington. And then oddly enough we saw exactly 211 requests for the second half for each of 2019, 2018 and 2017. Not seeing a slowdown in overall permits. When speaking with members of the public about potential plexes we have identified a potential issue with current regulations, separate utilities for each unit in the R1 – R3 districts, that was included to ensure that each unit functions entirely separately. Which seemed like it could be beneficial for sale of those units, we have heard anecdotally there are owner occupied duplexes that share utilities. Not currently proposing any changes but we just want to bring that to the attention of this body and to the Council as something may be functioning as an unintended deterrent.

Kinzie commented that she is happy to see the monitoring and reporting of the new plexes ordinance, but is concerned it has not stimulated more development. Scanlan noted that it has only been six months and it is during the winter months and it is a new ordinance. It may be too early to determine if the ordinance is a deterrent.

Wisler stated that he would like to see comparisons from year to year on this topic.

Smith asked if the sale of existing properties have ever been tracked. Scanlan said they have not tracked that information and Smith asked if anyone was tracking the information. Scanlan suggested he check with the County's Auditor or Assessor's Office.

**PETITIONS CONTINUED TO:** March 14, 2022

**PUD/DP-24-21 Robert V Shaw**

N Prow Road: 3500 block of N Hackberry Street  
Request: Petitioner requests Final Plan and Preliminary Plat amendment for Ridgefield PUD and Subdivision Section V.  
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

**PUD-03-22 Trinitas Ventures**

1550 N Arlington Park Drive  
Request: An amendment to the district ordinance and preliminary plan for an approval Planned Unit Development.  
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

**PETITIONS:**

**DP-01-22 Redevelopment Commission – City of Bloomington**

Property located at the area bounded by South of W 2<sup>nd</sup> Street / West of S. Rogers Street / North of W. 1<sup>st</sup> Street / East of S Morton Street except 413 W 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and 314 and 302 W 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
Request: The petitioner request Primary Plat approval to plat 7 lots and Right-of-Way.

---

Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

Commissioner St. John has recused herself from this case, will rejoin Commission after a vote has been taken.

Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, presented petition DP-01-22 which is a request for a primary plat from the Bloomington Redevelopment Commission, this property is known as Phase One East, it is southwest of downtown located directly east of the old Bloomington hospital location. The site is roughly 8.65 acres with the large majority of the site zoned Mixed-Use Medium Scale (MM) with some Mixed-Use Neighborhood (MN) on the southern portion along First Street. The comprehensive plan designation is mixed urban residential and it is located in the West Second Street from Bloomington Hospital focus area. Currently has buildings and surface parking lots on the site. The proposal is a primary plat request, the site location is east of the old hospital and is bounded by West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to the north, South Rogers Street to the west, West First Street on the southern end and South Morton Street on the east side. The request is to subdivide the property to create 16 parcels and to adjust some existing right of ways located on the eastern side of the alleys, reconfigure into two roadways that bisect this square north/south and east/west. Parcels two and six would be set aside for open green space, this is part of the old hospital site redevelopment plan that was released in January of 2021. Lots three and four on the southwest portion of the site would be retained for use by Centerstone. All buildings will be demolished, except for the large Centerstone buildings in lots three and four. The remaining 12 parcels would be redeveloped separately or combined. The street that will be added adjacent to the open space parcels would be call West University Street and the north/south street would be a continuation of Madison Street. The petitioner is going to be asking the Common Council to vacate the north/south alley that runs from 1<sup>st</sup> Street to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and the alley that is running east/west on the eastern third of the site. This proposed primary plan meets the requirement of the UDO and is in line with the Bloomington hospital site redevelopment master plan. The intention is to set up Phase One East with improved public ways and new amenities, creating parcels that can be developed separately, or combined in the future, to help this area develop.

The Planning and Transportation Department recommends the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve the primary plat of DP-01-22 with the following conditions:

1. A pedestrian facilities plan for West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and South Rogers Street that meets Transportation Plan requirements shall be shown.
2. A pedestrian facilities plan for West 1<sup>st</sup> Street and South Morton Street that meets Transportation Plan requirements shall be shown.
3. Right-of-way vacation for the existing alleys on the petition site must be approved by Common Council.
4. Secondary plat approval is delegated to staff.
5. Right-of-way dedication of South Rogers Street must either meet the minimum widths from the Transportation Plan with future subdivision on the west side of Rogers Street, or receive waiver approval from the reviewing body.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:**

Mr. Matthew Wallace with Shrewsberry & Associates LLC is lead designer for this project and he summarized this project for the Plan Commissioners. He was also joined by Cecil Penland with REA and Jeff Fanyo with Bynum Fanyo & Associates, Inc.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Smith asked for someone from the design group to speak about the lighting for pedestrians and vehicles safety. Mr. Wallace said they are working with the Parks Department to ensure they are meeting goals and requirements for public safety. Cecil Penland said there will be a combination of lighting types along University Street, there will be poles with luminaries with some focused on the pedestrian walks, some focused on the roadway and some focused more inwardly towards the greenway amenities. There will also be accent lighting on some of the site features.

Kinzie asked if the greenway part of the master plan will run the length of the entire project, or is it just for the East entry way. Mr. Wallace said the greenway will run the entire length of the project, east and west of Rogers Street. Kinzie then asked about the lot on the northwest corner, which is shown as a blank space. Mr. Wallace said that space has not been acquired by the City and therefore is privately owned. Scanlan said the northwest corner and southeast corners are privately owned with no immediate plans of turning those area over to the City. Kinzie asked if the City has any plans to continue to pursue those to make it more integrated. Patrick Dierkes, City of Bloomington Engineering Department, says the City is in discussions with the private owner for the lot at Rogers and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, but the owners of the southeast corner lot has no interest in selling to the City.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Eoban Binder, lives nearby in Prospect Hill, hopes the Commission will give this proposal a lot of scrutiny because this has long term implications. Little details can have far reaching implications. Asked if the Commission would consider reverse angle parking on the south side of University Street. Since the point of the greenway is to make pedestrians and cyclists a priority, or better yet he asked to get rid of the street parking along University Street. Asked about the why the greenway space wasn't more like City owned right-of-way rather than lots if it is supposed to be part of the street. His last comment was regarding lot sizes, would like to encourage narrower lot sizes to keep building narrower. If there is a developer who would like to build larger buildings, Mr. Binder would hope that the Commission would review the development carefully before approval.

**ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Cockerham wanted to follow up with Mr. Binder's comments. Asked if anyone has spoken to anyone at Centerstone or any of the neighbors about parking needs they may currently have or think they might have in the future. Dierkes says they have been working with Centerstone extensively on this project and their parking needs. He also noted that Engineering changed to reverse angle parking along the greenway to improve pedestrian safety. Mary Krupinski, with Kirkwood Design Studio, gave background information on the selection of the angle parking on the greenway. Said it was really about getting to the numbers that Centerstone would need for their clientele coming to the facility.

Kinzie wanted to answer the other two questions from Mr. Binder. She wanted to clarify the lots for the park and what the decision making was regarding those lots. Dierkes said all City parks are their own parcels, even one adjacent to city right-of-ways. A great example is Bryant Park, the pedestrian pathways are not in city right-of-way. It is also about defining ownership and responsibilities and the public right-of-way would be Public Works maintenance responsibility and the park would be the responsibility of Parks and Recreation. All storm water collection of the parcels for this entire site, except Centerstone, is going to be included in this greenway amenity. There is underground retention

tanks and the wetland feature will also store storm water so each development lot will not need to create their own storm water system. To be able to keep the detention system the way it is designed they needed to define the separate parcels. Mr. Binder mentioned this and Dierkes wanted to explain that the interconnections between the green space and the street. On the ground you won't see a defined line, Dierkes said a line that works well with some of the amenities, the south face of the wetland garden is basically the right-of-way line and they just continued that straight. Kinzie asked if Dierkes could address the comments from Mr. Binder regarding the lot sizes. Dierkes said the main thought was providing options for different size developers. So in the southeast corner these is minimum size lots allowable, 5,000 square feet, and there are seven lots with the minimum square feet, which is what needs to be communicated to small developers, that there are options.

Burrell asked about zoning, and are the southeast corner all single family homes. Scanlan said it is all mixed-use medium (MM) scale. The northeast corner of Madison and 1<sup>st</sup> Street would be mixed-use neighborhood (MN) scale and the rest of the lots would be mixed-use medium scale. They were intended to be mixed-use or commercial, not intended for single family use in this area.

Kinzie is excited to see this come forward.

**\*\*Kinzie motioned to approve petition DP-01-22, including the five conditions outlined in the staff report. Cockerham seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0:1—approved, St. John abstained.**

**SP-02-22      424 Walnut LLC**

424 ½ S Walnut Street

Request: The petitioner request site plan approval for a new 34-unit multifamily development located in the Mixed-Use Downtown zoning district within the Downtown Core (MD-DC).

Case Manager: Karina Pazos

Karina Pazos presented the case SP-02-22 which is a 0.27 acre and currently zoned as Mixed-Use Downtown (MD-DC), with a downtown core overlay district it is designated downtown in the compressive plan and its existing land use is vacant because the recent building was demolished in March 2021. The proposed land use is for multifamily and it is surrounding uses include multifamily and personal service to the north, south is office space, east is personal service and west is medical clinic. The petitioner is requesting major site plan approval for a four story building with three floors of residential units, for a total of 34 dwelling units. The units consist of studios and 14 one bedroom units over a ground floor parking garage that will contain 18 parking spaces, bike storage, a fitness room and a leasing office. A major site plan approval is required because this development goes over the 15,000 square footage of gross floor area. This proposal consists of four stories for a total of 35,632 square feet of gross floor area. The first floor plan shows the parking spaces with 24 feet of front setback for the parking behind the primary front wall. That space also contains the leasing office, fitness room, a lobby and access to the upper floors. There is a drainage easement on the northern portion of the lot and an alley along the south side where the parking garage entrance is located, the main entrance for pedestrian is on the east side right-of-way, which was previously improved so it offers a wide sidewalk and space for landscape options. The front elevation shows the use of materials being proposed, a mix of brick and stone, it also shows the five foot recessed main entrance. The non-residential ground floor meets the 12 foot minimum height and there are balconies that overhang the northern portion of the lot which has the drainage easement. Also shows that the lot has an average surface grade of four foot six inches, so the spot height of the building is 54 feet six inches, so the proposed building is right up to the 50 foot maximum for the zoning district. The north

---

elevations shows the 15 foot required step back over the third floor for a patio space for the tenants above the third floor. Shows the pattern of alternating balconies that allow for enough vertical space to access the drainage easement as the surface grade slopes upward. The south elevation shows the parking garage entrance and relationship to the west bound alley that slopes upward. As you access the back of the lot the west elevation shows the use of similar materials as the other sides of the building. Site Plan shows the proposal demonstrates compliance with the setbacks and impervious surface coverage for the environmental portion. The petitioner is proposing to build south of the drainage easement. For bike parking nine spaces are required and this proposal includes 16 bike parking spaces. For landscaping a minimum of one canopy tree per 40 feet of property that abuts a public right-of-way is required and the proposal includes two street trees on South Walnut Street, the City's Urban Forester will need to be consulted about the species of the street trees which can be utilized with this development, and a landscape plan that includes the downtown core overlay district landscape plaza requirements. For the garage access the proposal derives access from the one-way westbound alley which is accessed from South Walnut Street, the City Engineer will need to be consulted about any necessary signage for the one-way alley. The proposal consists of 18 vehicle parking spaces and the minimum vehicle parking requirements do not apply to development in the Courthouse Square Character Area or the Downtown Core Character Area south of 4<sup>th</sup> Street. This site is in the Downtown Core Character Area south of 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The site plan meets parking space total requirements. The structure will be finished with a mix of masonry (brick and stone), metal panel and wood composite on the façade, which are permitted materials in this district. The exterior facades of the building incorporate wall elevation projections, a regular pattern of glass, and changes in façade color and texture to comply with patterns requirements of the UDO. The flat roof features parapets on the supporting walls to meet the roof design requirements. A 15-foot building step back above the third floor is incorporated to comply with the upper floor façade step backs requirement in the UDO.

So in conclusion this petition meets all the requirements of the UDO and will add 34 new dwelling units near other high-density uses and amenities. The development will provide housing in an area where housing is common and can connect the courthouse square with Indiana University. The scale of this development is appropriate for the neighborhood and given other recent developments and proximity to the courthouse square and Indiana University, this is an ideal location for this type of land use. So the Planning and Transportation Department recommends the Plan Commission adopt the proposed findings and approve SP-02-22 with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner must receive a grading permit before any earth moving on the site.
2. The petitioner must consult the City's Urban Forester about the species of UDO-approved street trees which can be utilized with this development.
3. The petitioner must consult the City Engineer about any necessary signage indicating that the alley is westbound only.
4. The approval does not approve any signage on the site.
5. The petitioner must sign an encroachment agreement for the balconies that overhand the drainage easement and any seating or planters that are installed in the drainage easement.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:**

Matt Ellenwood with Matt Black Architecture and Tim Hanson with WS Property Group were present. Mr. Hanson felt that Karina Pazos did a good job of covering the proposal.

---

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Kinzie asked about the entrance/exit of the parking garage, the one-way access from Walnut and the westbound alley as exit. Mr. Hanson said with the access from Walnut Street and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street just to the south gives them use of the lights at 2<sup>nd</sup> and College Avenue, and 2<sup>nd</sup> and Walnut Street to circulate traffic around the entry off Walnut Street to the alley to enter the garage. That way we don't have a garage accessing through a pedestrian way directly onto Walnut and that can exit out through College west and southbound traffic can continue either west or south at the College and 2<sup>nd</sup> light, or they can utilize the light for a left turn onto 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and then go either east on 2<sup>nd</sup> or continue and use the left turn lane on Walnut Street to go north. Cibor, Engineering Department, said he would likely see this alley with on one-way sign or two just indicating that it is a one-way. One across from the garage exit to remind people as they pull out to exit to correct way. He thinks from a traffic flow perspective the biggest benefit here is actually for the sidewalk users that will be walking along Walnut Street. Knowing that the building goes right up to the corner of where the sidewalk is and where the accessible route is really poses a visibility challenge for people, so the one-way flow really works to our benefit here to address a safety concern.

Kinzie asked if someone could explain to her the need for condition five, it's not clear to her what CBU is trying to resolve or address. Mr. Hanson said he has had a couple of conversations with CBU because the drainage easement that exists is 18 feet, on the north part of the property, is an old culvert that is 12 to 15 ft. wide and approximately three to four feet deep. Through previous City drainage projects, they have downsized to a three foot diameter pipe that runs through the middle of this large box culvert and that's all the drainage that goes through there now, they filled the box with lightweight concrete. There is still an easement there with pipe that CBU must maintain and since the proposed five foot balconies encroaches by two feet in the physical area. The balconies are 13 feet above the ground and they asked CBU if there was any concern about heights in that area, if they felt this was adequate for them to maintain their facilities. Mr. Hanson has not heard back until this meeting, he believes CBU is saying should they continue to want these five foot balconies then they should sign an encroachment agreement which might read something to the effect, that if CBU would need to get in there and if the balcony is in their way the owner would have to have it removed and put back at their expense.

Cibor asked about the driveway cut to the north of this property that serves the property to the north, from the aerials it looks like their driveway encroaches on to this parcel slightly. Mr. Hansen affirmed that the driveway does encroach on their parcel but since it is encumbered by the easement they have no concern with the encroachment.

Smith asked about the life span of the proposed building. Mr. Hanson said the general lifespan of new construction is probably 50 years.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Eoban Binder had a comment about the drainage easement. He didn't understand why there could not be something else in that easement area, like a bike rack or benches

**ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

Kinzie wanted to address Mr. Binder's comment. Mr. Hanson said they envision the removal of the concrete that currently covers the easement which they want to remove and cover with dirt and grass

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes  
Virtual Web Conference Meeting**

---

**February 7, 2021 - 5:30 pm**

the area, giving the tenants green space. Their uses are limited by CBU and what they will allow. There will not be a lot of sun on the north side of the building, and there is not a lot of depth that can be used for plantings.

**\*\*St. John motioned to approve petition SP-02-22, including the five conditions outlined in the staff report. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0:1—approved, Cockerham had to leave before the vote.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.