

UDO Module 1-3 comments

| Timestamp | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 1: Zone Districts and Permitted Uses. |
|--------------------|--|
| 7/11/2018 14:00:46 | Can you tell me the purpose and location of the private dorms? |
| 7/19/2018 12:37:10 | <p>I appreciate the new residential zones that distinguish between estate, large, medium, small, and urban lots. I fully support adding density to existing neighborhoods with ADUs, adding a story, or replacing single-family with multi-family housing.</p> <p>I am concerned that neighborhood associations, while sharing valid concerns about the effect of university students living in older neighborhoods, may overrepresent homeowner interests in the comments/feedback. There is a significant shortage of rental housing in the city that is affordable for low-income households.</p> <p>Yet, despite prospective neighborhood association resistance, the updated UDO is a key opportunity to accommodate a mix of housing types suitable for a range of incomes, particularly with higher densities and more infill.</p> <p>With this in mind, Table 3-1 "Allowed Use Table," needs some refinement for consistency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Higher density housing types that are suitable for infill, such as attached single family, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, should be permitted (or at least conditional) in the R2, R3, and R4 residential zones. (I will refer to these housing types collectively as "small multifamily buildings" in comments below.) •"Cottage development" is an option for conditional uses in R1, R2, R3, and R4. Why not make this at least conditional for small multifamily buildings in these zones, too? •Accessory dwelling units are conditional uses permitted in RE, R2, and R3 zones. Why not R1? |
| 7/22/2018 14:55:13 | <p>Here is a summary of the comments either I or others from the Eastside Neighborhood made regarding the neighborhood update of the UDO as presented this evening, July 16, 2018:</p> <p>The Eastside Neighborhood Association supported the ADU ordinance passed by the city council on September 6, 2017, and wants to see it maintained as is in the updated UDO.</p> <p>A chart or some other representation to show how the UDO changes reflect the Comprehensive Master Plan "Neighborhood" and "Land Use" sections would clarify and demonstrate that the UDO actually is being written to reflect the new Comprehensive Master Plan.</p> <p>A table that shows how allowed uses in the new residential and mixed use residential designations compare with those in the present UDO would add clarity.</p> <p>The Eastside Neighborhood would like to be included in a designation of neighborhoods that are "vulnerable" to influx of student renters when multi-family dwellings are permitted in its residential areas. Don Elliot mentioned this in response to [REDACTED] comment about allowing a variety of multi-family units in the Eastside Neighborhood would open us up to even more student renters than we already have. Actually, all neighborhoods ringing IU would benefit from this type of special designation. That would be Elm Heights, Eastside, Green Acres, Old Northeast downtown, and Garden Hill. However, Old Northeast downtown and Garden Hill may already be lost single-family residential neighborhoods!</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to give input during this important rule-making process. Sincerely,</p> <p>[REDACTED], Eastside Neighborhood and CONA Executive Board</p> |
| 7/24/2018 9:40:46 | <p>The City wants a vibrant downtown, which I wholeheartedly support. To do this you need people. Higher density is required and also supports more varied downtown retail stores. The proposed limitations on height stymies growth and development. I support higher heights and more dense development.</p> |

| Timestamp | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 1: Zone Districts and Permitted Uses. |
|--------------------|--|
| 8/5/2018 12:01:50 | <p>As a member of the Bloomington community and Bloomington Food Policy Council, I am excited to see the City of Bloomington is redoing their UDO to accommodate to Bloomington's growth and change, as well as plan for its future. I am especially excited for the opportunities Bloomington has to expand and strengthen their local food systems, which I have included my thoughts and suggestions on.</p> <p>I would love to see chicken flocks become accessories in R3 and R4 zones. Chicken flocks are currently allowed in the Residential Core (R3) and many owners would be forced to give up their chickens if this zoning goes through. Regarding the R4 zone being made up of the smallest lot size, it can be assumed some of these homeowners will also be of lower income as they own a smaller residence. Chickens are one of the cheapest ways for those of lower income to provide nutrient dense foods for themselves. Under Food and Agriculture in the CMP, it states "The City of Bloomington supports and recognizes that residents desire opportunities to produce, process, sell, purchase, and consume local foods of their choosing". Restricting chickens in R3 and R4 would work against the goals set forth by the City of Bloomington in the CMP. When speaking to the City of Bloomington Animal Shelter, they said they only received one to three complaints pertaining to chickens per year. Of those complaints, they said they never had to do with noise, fecal matter, etc. but instead an escaped chicken. If there is concern with chickens on smaller lot sizes causing a disturbance to the neighbors, there have been no cases reported to the Animal Shelter, which leaves little evidence to show this is a problem in Bloomington.</p> <p>Along the same lines, Crops and Pasturage have been reduced from being permitted in RE zones to being a conditional accessory. This no longer allowed residents to keep livestock on lots that they do not reside on. I would be curious to know what had prompted the change and if the community would indeed benefit from it.</p> <p>The Food Processing and Production has been allowed in more mixed-use zones, yet still not in any residential zones. While it might seem like a new idea, many cities have already adapted to allow this and I'm worried Bloomington will be left behind if it does not. This allows residents to grow, process, and sell small batches of items from their gardens, if they follow health codes and business standards. It would be a shame not to allow a gardener to pickle their produce or turn their berries into jam if they so pleased. In the CMP under Food and Agriculture, it states that "...local food processing and marketing should be facilitated and not hindered by local regulations." I believe inhibiting food processing and production in residential areas would be a direct contradiction to the goals set in place by the CMP, as it would hinder residents from food processing.</p> <p>While Orchards/Tree farms are being proposed to be permitted in more non-residential zones and stay permitted in RE, they should be further expanded to other residential and mixed-use areas. The CMP supported orchards in several areas, specifically in the Food and Agriculture section stating, "that urban agriculture should be supported, including farming, community gardens, rooftop and home gardens, orchards, and edible landscaping". Additionally, in the Chapter 7: Land Use, the Parks and Open Space sections states that "Parks/Open Space areas should provide opportunities for both active and passive recreation, as well as opportunities to produce local food through community gardening and the planting of fruit trees". It is important that the City consider how the UDO can help promote orchards in Bloomington, rather than inhibit them. While I'm aware rotting fruit is a concern with fruit trees and orchards, individuals looking to run an orchard that is unattached to their residence are likely looking to do so as a business venture, creating an obligation to look after the grounds.</p> |
| 8/22/2018 13:20:11 | <p>██████████ message to Staff: ██████████,</p> <p>They were very concerned about several items. They really should have requested a Planning Staff member to be there, as it would have been a much more productive meeting for everyone and probably saved Staff some future time and energy. I elaborate on the items below. I would appreciate if you would provide me some ideas for responses to their concerns that I might have used at the meeting, as I'm sure I will be hearing about these concerns from people a lot over the coming months- thanks.</p> <p>Change in RS zones to allow duplexes which would then permit 6 unrelated adults on lots that were previously limited to 3. They were extra-concerned that a property owner could take an existing house and simply turn it into a duplex and double the legal occupancy with almost just a snap of their fingers. The issue was summarized as, "Duplexes and triplexes will be allowed in places in core neighborhoods where they are currently not allowed"</p> <p>They don't like ADU's but they did contrast the ADU still being limited to a total of 3 unrelated adults on the lot, with the doubling or tripling of occupancy by using duplexes and triplexes.</p> <p>Next, they were as concerned or more concerned about "student dorms" to be allowed in some R zones like north of the old Elm Heights BFoods on up to Atwater. They were saying that only students were to be allowed and so all of the existing homes would almost certainly be torn down and new vinyl boxes would be put in their places housing up to 20 students each. It was said by people at the meeting that landlords in these areas are already letting homes fall into disrepair because they know this change is coming and they fully plan to replace them with vinyl box private student dorms.</p> <p>A third smaller issue is that they want a rule that the live-work proposal include a requirement that the "work-business" must be the "live-in resident"</p> <p>ANother issue of great concern was new uses being allowed in CL districts (high-density residential uses being allowed). They asked me how the City can reserve land in these zones for commercial uses if more profitable multi-family residential are permitted?</p> <p>Finally they were concerned that the new zoning districts proposed to be created would be created by moving around the existing zone district lines, which would lead to encroachment on existing zones and pressure to change character and density of districts.</p> |
| 9/3/2018 9:06:39 | <p>Zoning Districts: (1) RM. Why does there need to be a minimum lot size for multi-family developments? It seems like this could preclude a small apartment building with small units, the type of units we want to encourage due to their smaller ecological footprint. (2) MC. The parking should be required to be in the back, behind the buildings. (3) MI. Why does the minimum lot size have to be so large? Seems like this could preclude a small church or neighborhood community center.</p> |
| 9/3/2018 9:27:40 | <p>For the downtown overlay DG, I wonder if we should make the upper floor setback rules a little more flexible, since on the Plan Commission we so often made exceptions. The intention in the current UDO is, I believe, that anything above 3 stories should be stepped back. The draft text says 35 ft., with a footnote that says this provides greater flexibility for the builder. That doesn't make sense - greater flexibility would be given if you had a higher limit. For example, anything over 45 ft. in height has to be stepped back. That's what's in the current UDO.</p> |
| 9/3/2018 9:48:29 | <p>Two questions about building materials downtown: 1) On pg. 49 (pdf pg. 53), the primary pedestrian entrance materials list includes rusticated masonry. 2) On pg. 50 (pdf pg. 54), highly reflective materials are allowed in the DC character area as a secondary material. I question both of these allowances and would like to know if we have any current examples in our downtown where these materials were used.</p> |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

| Timestamp | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 1: Zone Districts and Permitted Uses. |
|---------------------|---|
| 9/3/2018 9:51:20 | In the Allowed Use Table, why are opioids singled out, as in "opioid rehabilitation home"? Wouldn't "drug/alcohol rehabilitation home" be more useful, so we can include homes for individuals who have other substance use disorders? |
| 9/3/2018 9:53:28 | Allowed Uses table: Why would "art gallery, museum, or library" not be allowed as a conditional use in R4 district? |
| 9/3/2018 9:55:34 | In the allowed use table, Sexually-Oriented Business seems more appropriate for the MC than for the MM zoning district. Why was it allowed only in the MM? |
| 9/3/2018 9:57:26 | In the allowable use table, an accessory chicken flock must be allowed in the R3 zoning district, since it is currently allowed in RC. |
| 9/3/2018 9:58:33 | In the allowable uses list, why is an accessory dwelling unit not allowed in the R1 district as a conditional use? |
| 9/3/2018 10:01:24 | It seems like there should be a maximum fence height for kennels, not just a minimum. Page 68 (pdf page 72), item (d)(1)(C). |
| 9/3/2018 10:06:41 | Under "Crops and Pasturage," pg. 76 (pdf page 80), part D refers to chickens (and ducks), which may be kept within the density limits on parcels of two acres or more. This seems to contradict the current allowance of chickens in residential single-family zoning districts. Also, currently I don't think chicken coops are subject to the setback requirements in part (E) on this page. I don't think any restrictions on chicken flocks than are in place currently would serve the purposes of CMP implementation. |
| 9/3/2018 10:09:24 | Definitions: Commercial Rooming House is defined in this section but I don't see it in the allowed uses table. Am I missing something? |
| 9/3/2018 10:11:38 | Definitions: Crops and Pasturage talks about creating livestock products such as honey. I recommend we do not make it more difficult for people to raise honeybees. I'm not sure whether the current definition of Crops and Pasturage, which mentions honey, would do that. Raising honeybees should be allowed as much as it is now in an effort to encourage local food production as stated in the CMP. |
| 9/3/2018 10:13:21 | Definitions: Child Day Care Home has a confusing definition (pg. 89, pdf page 93). It mentions a maximum of 16 children, but in the next sentence it says the maximum is six. |
| 9/3/2018 10:15:45 | Definitions, pg. 92 (pdf pg. 96): Family. The third point under the definition of Family refers to the RE, R2, and R3 zoning districts. What about R1 and R4? Does the "no more than 3 unrelated adults" rule not apply there? It should apply in all single-family districts. |
| 9/3/2018 10:17:14 | Definitions, Farm Produce Sales. Why does this definition include "crafts and art, clothing and other goods"? So people can be selling clothing by the side of the road as a temporary use? That doesn't seem right. Where does this definition come from? |
| 9/3/2018 10:17:54 | Does the definition of Green Space include areas covered by permeable pavers? |
| 9/3/2018 10:20:59 | Some questions about addiction treatment clinics. Does the definition of Medical Clinic (pdf pg. 99) include addiction treatment? For example, Medically-Assisted Treatment other than methadone? In the definition of Methadone Clinic, you must change the term "drug addicts and abusers" to the more humane term "individuals suffering from substance use disorder" or "substance misuse disorder." |
| 9/3/2018 10:23:04 | In the definition of Park, why does it only include parks governed by the city's parks board? What about parks owned by a homeowners association or other privately-owned parks? Maybe we need another definition for those? |
| 9/3/2018 10:27:23 | The definition of "supportive housing" is problematic. It says that the dwelling is "for the exclusive use of persons requiring medical, correctional, or other mandated supervision," but then it then goes on to list domestic violence shelter and homeless shelter as falling under this definition. Those are not individuals who required mandated supervision. Furthermore, item 2 under Supportive Housing ("a shelter for persons experiencing temporary homelessness") makes no sense here, since that use is covered under the definition of "homeless shelter." Also number 4 ("battered women's shelter" - an outdated term) is already covered under number 3 ("domestic violence shelter"). |
| 11/27/2018 8:56:00 | I hope that improved UDO rules will prevent the type of garish signage which now decorates the Graduate building on Kirkwood. Size and type standards are necessary if we are to maintain appropriate facades on our principle streets. |
| 12/19/2018 10:42:38 | <p>Thank you all for your work on this. I'm glad Bloomington is updating its UDO, but I feel the proposed updates still favor wealthier homeowners in largely single-family neighborhoods and will not do much to promote greater housing choice and affordability. Here are two suggestions I think are important:</p> <p>-We should at least be allowing duplexes and triplexes in all residential zones. Doing so would not require anyone to give up their single-family dwelling, but it would provide a mechanism for increasing the housing supply in parts of the city where there is high demand for development. The arguments against doing this all seem to relate to desires by existing homeowners to "protect the character of the neighborhood," but that is often a euphemism used to avoid saying less politically correct things. Maintaining single-family zones as they are is a recipe for continued housing segregation based on socio-economic characteristics like income and race. It also makes it really difficult to increase the supply of different types of housing in a growing, highly desirable city.</p> <p>-The UDO should be even more aggressive in permitting higher densities throughout the city, especially downtown. Current and proposed height restrictions in the downtown core undercut efforts at improving environmental sustainability, inclusion, economic vibrancy, and housing affordability. The less square footage of development we allow in our downtown, the more development is pushed further away. And that means public transit is less efficient, fewer residences are built in the core, fewer businesses are able to take advantage of the benefits of density, walkability is reduced, etc. I know there are a large number of Bloomington residents who don't want Kirkwood and other parts of the city to change, but many of these same residents also demand environmental sustainability, housing affordability, racial and economic inclusion, a vibrant arts and entertainment scene, and other amenities that are inconsistent with tight regulations on development in the downtown core.</p> <p>I love Bloomington and am a big Bloomington booster wherever I go. But I don't think we're fully living up to the "you belong here" slogan painted on the mural at People's Park. The proposed UDO changes are definitely a step in the right direction, but I think we're missing an opportunity to go further and really walk the talk of inclusion, affordability, and sustainability. At a time when other cities are recognizing the problems caused by overly restrictive zoning--particularly single-family zoning--we should be taking this opportunity to put our city on a more welcoming and forward-thinking path rather continuing to allow individual neighborhoods and homeowners to have a disproportionate influence on how we grow.</p> |
| 1/4/2019 12:46:01 | The graphic for the MC district shows a large surface parking lot in front of a building. I would prefer there to be a min and max for the front building setback so that buildings will be located along the street edge with parking behind. |
| 1/4/2019 13:02:05 | Fig. 40 Downtown Residential Ground Floor Reg. I recognize that our commercial space has been over built but I support extending the non-residential ground floor standards along Walnut and College, north and south. |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Timestamp | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 1: Zone Districts and Permitted Uses. |
| 1/4/2019 13:13:53 | Dwelling, Accessory Unit - Currently, there is a provision which limits the number of ADUs in core neighborhoods by not permitting two within 300 ft. This appears to not have been incorporated. I would like to see this incorporated in R3. |
| 1/4/2019 14:03:26 | <p>Page NumberLanguageComment</p> <p>2Merged IG and QY to INNNeed two different industrial districts to separate light industrial uses. Something like 3D printing should be allowed in other places besides industrial general.</p> <p>54Courthouse Square Character AreaProhibits medical clinic. Per the definition, a business like Ossip (eye doctor on the square) would not be allowed. We need dentists, physicians, psychologists, etc. to be located in the downtown. This helps with sustainability and allowing people to live, work, and play within a small radius. If it's an issue, we suggest instead stating a maximum percentage of street frontage (no more than 25%) can be medical uses.</p> <p>54University Village Character AreaProhibits brewpubs. Most likely there isn't enough square footage to allow for brewing but why is it being prohibited?</p> <p>1 & 56Parks Abbreviations 'parks' PO or OS? Inconsistency on different pages.</p> <p>58Educational FacilitiesAllow all education facilities as permitted uses in IN. Provides more opportunities for partnerships between schools and businesses in industrial area.</p> <p>59Urban AgricultureUrban Agriculture allowed as an accessory use in every district except industrial and open space. Lots of setbacks required in industrial and urban agriculture would be a great use.</p> <p>59BrewpubNot allowed in industrial. Allowing can help diversify uses (Upland west side brew pub)</p> <p>60Grocery or supermarketShould also be allowed in mixude use health care or mixed use employment. Not allowing can creat food deserts and increases vehicular travel.</p> <p>60Transportation terminalShould be allowed in Industrial.</p> <p>62Electric vehicle charging facilityWhy not allowed in mixed use healthcare or industrial? They do not need to be required but could at least allow.</p> <p>63Recycling drop-off, self-serveWhy is this not permitted in industrial?</p> <p>47Parapet heightsDo the parapet heights generally count towards overall height?</p> <p>50Historic AdjacencyNeed to define what side means. Should we look at alley separations as not being adjacent? Right now, even if you're separated by an alley and adjacent to the back end of the building, it's been interpreted as a side. We need clarification. Do you physically need to be next to the building?</p> <p>54Courthouse Square Character AreaWhy are we prohibiting multi family in some of the overlays when we already have it in there? Including pedcorps - a low-income multi family development? Where do you want people to live?</p> <p>646A - Cottage DevelopmentClarify 6a - are all cottage lots only for rent and not for sale? If so, why? Would this be counter to our whole idea of affordability? Why shouldn't people be able to own cottages?</p> <p>19RMHF for RMH - shouldn't we allow smaller residential mobile home areas? 87,000+ SF requires significant infrastructure investment. These are an affordable option.</p> |
| | <p>One of the largest and most important suggested changes is that of Urban Agriculture being reduced to an accessory in RS, RC, RH, and RM zones. While expanding it to an accessory in all mixed-use zones is a step in the right direction, Bloomington would greatly benefit from it being permitted in all residential and mixed-use zones. In the CMP, the City of Bloomington set forth many goals pertaining to urban agriculture, one of which has already been mentioned in the paragraph above. Other's include "Urban agriculture reexamines the traditional mindset of agriculture uses and activities within rural settings. It assesses the cultivation, processing, and distribution of food within an urban context," and, "agricultural zoning district and/ or permitted urban agriculture uses within otherexisting zoning districts." The City of Bloomington has made it clear that it wants to encourage urban agriculture, and the UDO offers a great opportunity to represent that. As the current UDO permits urban agriculture in most residential zones, reducing it to an accessory would be a step backwards. Urban agriculture allows for food production to be integrated into the community; neighbors and residents develop a stronger connection with where their food comes from. An organization in Indianapolis that has really pioneered urban agriculture in Indiana is Growing Places. They have wonderful gardens across Indianapolis that promote local food through showing communities not only how the food is grown, but also offering CSA's (community supported agriculture). Their garden in White River State Park exists in harmony with passersby. In Bloomington, Green Acres is a wonderful example of urban agriculture in a neighborhood and sets a great example for how future communities should exist. As much of our food is trucked in, Bloomington is reliant on outside sources for food. If there is a nature disaster or national emergency, and we will be forced to self-sustain on our local food system which is currently unprepared for such an event. The City of Bloomington mentions increasing pollination several times in the CMP yet does not include bees in the UDO. It is important to ensure beekeepers have rights if the City wishes to better local pollination. This could come in the for of classifying bees aspets, or creating a category specifically for them, similar to how chicken flocks. Additionally, while I realize the draft for the chapters pertaining to fence height regulation have yet to come out, it is important to keep in mind that urban agriculture may need exceptions to traditional fence heights to allows for certain crops.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope the City of Bloomington can continue to prioritize and strengthen our local food system!</p> |