

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Timestamp           | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).   |
| 09/11/2018 11:30:00 | <p>20.04.080 20.04.080(c) General landscaping (1)<br/>         (A) "It shall be the responsibility of the property owner to install and maintain landscape materials ( Purpose states that fences and walls are essential components) in right-of-way and easements.This is somewhat contradictory to Standards (20.05.040 Easements) which states that fences and retaining walls shall not be located within the easements. 20.04.080 (n) (2)</p> <p>(B) No fence or wall shall be located within a public or private easement unless written permission from the easement holder has been granted.Also 20.05.040 (e) (4) (B) Prohibits the placement of any unauthorized obstruction within the easement area.Who is the easement holder of a general "utility easement"? Who can authorize placement of obstruction?This space is reserved for future utilities as well. Do all utilities need to sign off? How will they anticipate future needs for the easement space?</p> <p>20.05.040<br/>         (b) General standards (4) signs shall not be located within sanitary sewer easementsWhy sanitary and not water easements also?</p> <p>20.05.040 (e)<br/>         (7, 8, 9, 10) These environmental easements (Karst, Tree Preservation, Tree Conservation, Conservancy) require public signs to be posted. Who is responsible for the sign placement?</p> <p>20.05.050Monuments and Markers.Who is responsible to see that the subdivision monuments are set per the Indiana Code: setting of the individual lot monuments may be delayed until no later than:</p> <p>(1) after construction is complete (including buildings); or</p> <p>(2) two (2) years after recordation of the subdivision plat or, if the subdivision is platted by sections, after recordation of each section; whichever occurs first. In new subdivisions, if monuments are to be set before recording, then the placement of monuments shall be shown on the subdivision plat. If monuments are to be set after construction is complete, the surveyor shall record an affidavit, cross-referenced to the recorded plat, showing which monuments were set and which were found, the dates the monuments were set or found, together with a certification that states to the best of the surveyor's knowledge and belief the information contained in the affidavit is true and correct.</p> |
| 9/12/2018 8:43:57   | <p>Noise control / acoustic buffering: In all zones, but especially in mixed-use areas, noise from structure-related machinery can be obnoxious and affect the well being of neighboring businesses and residences. As an example, consider the block of W 9th St between Morton St and College Ave, which is so noisy that pedestrians can't carry on a conversation and will avoid using that street. Why is it so noisy? Because of machinery permanently installed in the building -- I think enormous ventilation fans for the parking garage in Smallwood Plaza. The UDO should put constraints on where noisy equipment can be placed and require acoustic buffers/deflectors/absorbers. If appropriate for a UDO, there should also be required post-construction inspections to test loudness.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>   |
| 9/12/2018 14:59:40  | <p>I support allowing multifamily units (duplexes and quadplexes) in traditionally single-family neighborhoods around the downtown core. I believe this will increase affordability and reduce sprawl. If more people are able to live near downtown, it may provide incentive to advocate for less automobile dependency. I would support ending single-family exclusive zoning entirely. Also we should get rid of height limits beyond what is needed for safety standards. People need to understand that if we can't increase density, our traffic problems that everyone is upset about will only get worse due to the sprawl of the city.</p>   |
| 9/12/2018 15:05:57  | <p>Methadone Treatment Facilities should be changed to read Addiction Treatment Centers.<br/>         Properties zoned Residential Estate should be re-zoned to more dense occupancy status.</p>   |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Timestamp          | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>  |
| 9/12/2018 18:33:10 | <p>Hello, I am a member of the Bloomington Commission on Sustainability, a local sustainable developer in Bloomington, and I also teach sustainable business classes at IU. I appreciate the work you've done on updating the standards and incentives for developers both in affordable housing and sustainability.</p> <p>Specifically regarding the sustainability incentives, I believe that aligning the incentives with LEED has the unintended consequence of hurting developers who choose a higher standard of certification, such as Living Building Challenge. LBC is gaining popularity, especially among the more forward-thinking building community who see ecological restoration, or improving the environment, as the goal rather than being "less harmful" to our surroundings than traditional building standards. Another big difference between those two types of standards is that LBC is performance-based, whereas LEED is design-based. This means that it is harder to achieve LBC, and LBC buildings which are measured by their performance for a consecutive 12 months are more likely to actually achieve their stated claims than LEED buildings that merely have their designs approved.</p> <p>If I may make a suggestion, it would be to provide something of a translation from the LEED language of your sustainability incentive levels to LBC language to allow for developers to use this higher standard without risking losing the benefits that you offer to developers who use LEED. For example, perhaps achieving Petal Certification in LBC could equate to LEED gold or platinum. You could also consider LBC's standalone net-zero certification as warranting incentives on its own. A full LBC building should have its own category of incentive in my opinion.</p> <p>For more information on comparing LEED and LBC, please see the following sources:<br/> <a href="https://prezi.com/frq3vhwbp7w7/leed-vs-lbc/">https://prezi.com/frq3vhwbp7w7/leed-vs-lbc/</a><br/> <a href="https://sites.williams.edu/kellogg/articles/leed-vs-lbc/">https://sites.williams.edu/kellogg/articles/leed-vs-lbc/</a></p> <p>Thank you for your time and sincere best wishes on your work!</p>   |
| 9/12/2018 18:57:53 | <p>I attended the Citizens forum at 11:30 on Sept 12. I wanted to say that I agree generally with the comments about building height affecting the walkability, and the quality and feeling of the downtown area. I have been extremely disappointed to watch so many old homes and other buildings disappear in favor of these box- like structures. To me, it looks like gentrification aimed at marketing to east and west coast parents. There is also the valid issue of heat islands and increased air conditioning use. That said, I do understand the problem of finding an affordable incentive for developers. These buildings have irrevocably changed the character of downtown Bloomington, however, and not for the better.</p> <p>On a separate note, I sometimes feel there may be too much emphasis on reducing parking for apartments downtown. People forget that if you have a health condition, especially as you age, driving may be the healthiest and safest option. Even though I work in the sustainability field, I worry about the assumptions about health and what is best for all, as well as forcing a lifestyle choice, that is implicit in the idea that everyone needs to use public transport.</p>   |
| 9/20/2018 11:06:44 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•For the Sustainable Development Incentives, I am on board with making the review process a straight-forward process that removes a lot of negotiation. LEED v4 is fine but isn't really pushing the bar or encouraging innovation. Limiting the incentive to only LEED isn't reflective of forward-thinking programs like the Living Building Challenge. We were using LEED 2009 which was updated to v4 in 2013, and then updated with addenda in 2018, so it's likely that LEED v4 will have additional updates in the coming years. If this UDO is only updated every 10 years or so, that can lead to a long gap in promoting practices that are no longer the most effective. Is it possible to advocate for LEED and the Living Building Challenge or petal certification? I recommend (at the very least) having Level 3 incentives apply for LEED Gold or Platinum certification AND Petal certification. I also recommend for looking at what "green building" features should be part of code for building (like reflective roofs that address the fact that IN is getting warmer with climate change and we are likely to see increased cooling loads in the summer).</li> <li>•We've heard repeatedly that multi-family units with more than 4 units don't have space to add in recycling bins. Can we make that a requirement – i.e. we require that multi-family units with more than 4 units must allocate space for both trash and recycling in developing a project? It's up to them if they contract out a service for recycling, but we should eliminate the space argument.</li> <li>•I think we need to include language to really encourage solar installations in our community. I know you have some language about mounting for solar in 20.03.030, but we should be setting a higher bar as a SolSmart community and including language here that actively encourages solar: see <a href="https://www.solsmart.org/">https://www.solsmart.org/</a> for more information and recommendations.</li> <li>•How is the UDO working to reduce barriers for urban farmers? Specifically, if urban ag's definition doesn't include allowing chickens, is there another place to address that? What about allowing small farm stands on private property? We've heard that's a desire from the farming/ag community.</li> <li>•Does this revision place any limitations on personal gardens in yards or patios in any zoning group? Ideally, it would not.</li> </ul> |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Timestamp           | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>   |
| 09/20/2018 12:18:00 | <p>From [REDACTED]:<br/>Page 114, (G)(4)-I would suggest 100' setback instead of 25'.Based on "standard" language I've seen in natural resource management plans (NRMP). Not saying they are correct, but just what I've seen in multiple state NRMPs.</p> <p>From [REDACTED]:<br/>20.04.040 b.3.(A): add 'proposed grading and water quality BMPs'20.04.040 b.4 (B): question: Is 'property' any property? That would be best, but could also say 'adjacent'.20.04.050 (c) - Drivewaysadd: drainage- Driveways shall be constructed in way that will not impede the flow of drainage. Driveway culverts will likely be necessary for streets with roadside swales and no curb. Utilities Engineers need to approve the pipe size for the driveway culverts to insure they have proper capacity and will not cause flooding.From Jane Fleig:20.04.040 (b)(2): I don't disagree with the listed exceptions but a big problem we encounter is that the builders don't always follow the fully engineered drainage infrastructure plans that have been approved. They often re-grade the individual lot to meet their needs but this changes the approved storm water design and often results in problems for adjacent neighbors. Can this be addressed in some fashion?</p> <p>20.04.040 (b)(3):<br/>Can finish floor elevations be included in these requirements? Again, we often get flooding complaints from residents and, after completing our research, find that a builder has changed the grading on the site to suit the home, sometimes adding a walk-out basement below the planned finish floor elevation.</p> <p>20.05.050 (h)(2): Same comment as above re:finish floor elevations.</p> <p>20.05.050 (i)(5)(K): I believe the Planning and Transportation Dept and CBU have agreed that rolled curb is not desirable for many reasons and have been requiring straight curb in all new developments.20.07.020 Definitions: Easement, Drainage. This definition does not match the definition given in 20.05.040. Please modify to match and remove language about city utilities exclusive access, etc.Please let me know if you have any questions.Thanks,</p> |
| 9/25/2018 8:36:42   | <p>Hello Planning Department and Clarion,<br/>My name is [REDACTED] and I am a nearly-licensed architect working in Bloomington. I run a small, satellite office, of a mid-size firm, [REDACTED], based out of Indy. I spend much of my working days navigating codes and ordinances with our clients. Overall, I am very pleased with the suggestions being presented by the consultants of this process. One area I believe needs more work, though, is the incentives for sustainable development.<br/>Tying the incentive to only a single third-party standard is not a sound approach. This discourages and fails to reward all the projects that may wish to pursue different (in some cases, more rigorous) standards than LEED. That said, I do see an advantage of tying Bloomington's incentives to third-party standards: this is the verification role that these standards provide. If a project meets a standard, then the Authorities Having Jurisdiction can be assured that they are not being taken advantage of by overstated claims from project teams.<br/>I believe that there could be a way of tying the sustainable development goals that the City has to multiple third-party standards, which should include: Living Building Challenge, WELL Building Standard, Certified Passive House, RELi Building Standard, Green Globes, and of course, LEED. Each of these standards has a particular focus, and they all in certain ways help reinforce the sustainable goals of the City.<br/>I am happy to help work on a matrix that could align goals with the various requirements from each of the third-party standards. Feel free to email me or call me: [REDACTED]</p>  |
| 10/9/2018 10:40:43  | test  |
| 11/26/2018 11:04:31 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 192 - A (5) Location - This is a good goal, but would benefit from simpler language, at least up front. Typical language: "Affordable units shall be indistinguishable from market-rate units". It's also misleading to have it under the header of "Location," when the section also is pertinent to design, appearance, construction, and quality of materials.</li> <li>2. Page 192: A (6) D Are there also incentives that would apply to projects between 5 and 9 units? This seems to be a problematic gap. There are these standards for minimum of 10 units, and standards above from SF to fourplexes, but nothing in between.</li> <li>3. Page 194 - B(4) LEED certification: While worthy for some projects, LEED certification can be expensive and time-consuming to achieve, and may well be at odds with containing costs for affordable housing development. It would be helpful to offer alternative options for meeting sustainability incentives. For example, see options for green building initiatives in the Affordable Housing Program with the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis. Projects can can earn points in this category by receiving a qualifying Green Certification OR by incorporating at least six of the Green Standards provided in the application. I can share an example with more information.</li> <li>4. Review: Has this section of the UDO been circulated at all to other prospective affordable housing developers? Someone such as [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] has lots of experience and would be an excellent resource. (Partnered on Crawford 1 and 2, recently awarded 9% tax credits for for Southern Knoll, on W Third St near Rose Cemetery.)</li> </ol>  |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Timestamp           | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).   |
| 11/26/2018 20:16:22 | In Table 4-1 on page 99, there are 2 columns for RMH. I assume the one on the left is for the entire development, and the one on the right is per dwelling site. The impervious surface coverage maximum only applies, it seems, per dwelling site, but I think there should be an impervious surface max. for the whole development.  |
| 11/26/2018 20:30:17 | Table 4-2 on pg. 100 says the front parking setback for various mixed-use districts is 20 ft. behind the primary structure's front building wall. This is contradicted by the image used for Mixed Use Corridor on pg. 30 (pg. 36 of the pdf), where the parking is not behind the structure. I want to make sure it's very clear that the parking must be behind the front building wall.   |
| 11/26/2018 21:05:11 | On pg. 101, Table 4-2, footnote #2 mentions pavers. Are permeable pavers meant here? That should be more clear.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:12:00 | On page 102, Table 4-3, I have a few concerns about building setbacks. 1) There should be some guidance to go along with the range of build-to distances. If these are somewhere else in the plan, I did not see them. Should be cross-referenced. 2) It seems like 60% front building facade at the built-to line is insufficient. It should be at least 70%. 3) It seems like there should be some setback along the B-Line trail, perhaps depending on the height of the building.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:15:19 | On page 110, (3)(A) seems really vague. "Redundant erosion control measures such as..." leaves the door open for developers to use less than best practices.   |
| 11/26/2018 21:17:44 | On page 116, under Lake Watershed Areas, item (6) "Recordable Commitment" should have a different heading. The heading should be "Redundant stormwater runoff quality mitigation measures." That's what is being addressed by the recordable commitment and thus makes more sense as the heading for this section.   |
| 11/26/2018 21:21:35 | A few questions about permitted and conditional uses in a floodway (pg. 119): 1) I am concerned about allowing new and replacement utility pipelines in a floodway, unless they are now built to withstand infiltration. Otherwise, it seems like allowing water and wastewater pipes could certainly lead to sanitary sewer overflows. 2) Why would water and wastewater treatment plants ever be allowed in a floodway? It seems these would have in-ground tanks that would be vulnerable to floodwaters that would in turn compromise the plant operations.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:29:59 | On pg. 120, (E) says "the city planning and transportation department shall determine if the site is located within an identified floodway, floodway fringe, or within the floodplain." This doesn't make sense to me, since the floodplain = the floodway + the floodway fringe. So the department should determine if the site is in the floodway or the floodway fringe.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:32:56 | On pg. 124, under (3) Driveway and Access Design, section (B)(i)(2) talks about RC zoning district. This has been replaced in the new UDO by R3. So what are the requirements for driveways in the R4 district?  |
| 11/26/2018 21:36:47 | On pg. 128, where it talks about Bike Lanes, (E)(iii) allows for the substitution of a bike lane with an 8-ft sidepath. Why 8 ft. when the minimum width of a sidepath is 10 ft (see top of same page)?  |
| 11/26/2018 21:41:30 | Table 4-8 on page 132 indicates the minimum parking required for multifamily dwellings adjacent to R3 zoning or in the downtown. The minima seem reasonable until you get to 4+ bedrooms, where it requires 1 space per bedroom. This is too much parking and not in line with the requirements for 1, 2, and 3-BR units.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:46:03 | In the section on landscaping standards, pg. 155, (E) Shrubs, I am concerned about a maintenance plan for the shrubs, and for the perennials which may be substituted. There are plenty of examples in Bloomington of landscaping that is neglected and ugly.  |
| 11/26/2018 21:48:37 | Vacant lot landscaping, page 171, (2) Timing, (B). It seems like 180 days after site plan expiration is too long to wait for vacant lot landscaping, both for erosion control and aesthetic reasons.   |
| 11/26/2018 21:55:02 | In Subdivision Standards, pg. 211, (3)(D) says "all new residential lots shall have frontage on a public street." How will cottage development or pocket neighborhoods fit into this requirement? I would like to allow cottage developments and pocket neighborhoods, and they often have some structures w/o street frontage.  |
| 11/27/2018 10:11:22 | <p>From: [REDACTED]<br/> Date: Mon, Nov 26, 2018 at 10:48 AM<br/> Subject: Re: Thoughts on UDO draft of Affordability Incentives -- DELIBERATIVE MATERIAL<br/> To: [REDACTED]<br/> Cc: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Hello [REDACTED],</p> <p>I apologize for my delayed reply to your query. Below are my comments on the current draft of the UDO, also in the attached annotated file.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 192 - A (5) Location - This is a good goal, but would benefit from simpler language, at least up front. Typical language: "Affordable units shall be indistinguishable from market-rate units". It's also misleading to have it under the header of "Location," when the section also is pertinent to design, appearance, construction, and quality of materials.</li> <li>2. Page 192: A (6) D Are there also incentives that would apply to projects between 5 and 9 units? This seems to be a problematic gap. There are these standards for minimum of 10 units, and standards above from SF to fourplexes, but nothing in between.</li> <li>3. Page 194 - B(4) LEED certification: While worthy for some projects, LEED certification can be expensive and time-consuming to achieve, and may well be at odds with containing costs for affordable housing development. It would be helpful to offer alternative options for meeting sustainability incentives. For example, see options for green building initiatives in the Affordable Housing Program with the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis. Projects can earn points in this category by receiving a qualifying Green Certification OR by incorporating at least six of the Green Standards provided in the application. Please see attached for more information.</li> <li>4. Review: Has this section of the UDO been circulated at all to other prospective affordable housing developers? Someone such as [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] has lots of experience and would be an excellent resource. (Partnered on Crawford 1 and 2, recently awarded 9% tax credits for for Southern Knoll, on W Third St near Rose Cemetery.)</li> </ol> <p>I am happy to discuss more in person or by phone.</p> <p>Thank you<br/> [REDACTED]</p> |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Timestamp           | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>   |
| 11/28/2018 7:20:34  | <p>I would like to comment on Section 20.04.110</p> <p>(a)(1) Affordable Housing - I would recommend defining low- to moderate-income households as below 80% of the Monroe County Area Median Income ("AMI". The Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program and the Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program both allow the funding to be used for households up to 80% AMI.</p> <p>(a)(5) You may want to include size to this requirement for the Affordable Housing units.</p> <p>(a)(6)(B) I would change 60% to 80%. Also, I cannot determine if projects greater than 4 units qualify for any parking requirement reductions.</p> <p>(a)(6)(D)(1) What about projects that have 5-9 units of affordable housing?</p> <p>(a)(6)(D)(2) I would change 60% to 80%</p> <p>(b)(4) I would recommend allowing incentives when developments use other rating systems as well. For the Southern Knoll project we will be using NGBS in lieu of LEED because it is cheaper to achieve the certification as compared to LEED.</p>  |
| 12/27/2018 11:05:56 | <p>20:04 Development Standards: Table 4:20 Overlay application granting by-right height for all currently listed zones is careless and will have unintended consequences as a by- right height incentive. This added height is simply not appropriate in all zones that are listed. Including the RM zone can put height right next to core neighborhoods , MD-UV can have negative affect on Restaurant Row and the surrounding area, MD-DE can again give by-right height and density directly adjacent to single family neighborhoods.While this incentive is a benefit to new construction in appropriate areas, a more careful application of this incentive is needed with more public input and context sensitivity.</p> <p>20:03 Use Regulations Table 3-1As R3 is to R4 with all the multifamily incentives moved to R4, so should RM be to RH. Adding the conditional use options to RM (which is 5 unrelated) opens the doors to Duplex, Triplex, fourplex, multifamily, lifework which is all much higher than existing allowances. This will incentivize investment, demolition and density adjacent to core neighborhoods. This all belongs in RH. Changing the zoning map is a better way than this broad brush allowance that changes existing zoning. Context sensitive zoning changes with public input is a better way for adding both the the R4 and RH denser uses and avoiding unintended consequences.</p> <p>20:03 Use Regulations Table : 3-1Continued: Opiod Rehabilitation Home should also be in R4 and RH but not in R3 and RM. Again these decisions can be discussed and mapped after the adoption of the UDO along with the other new use allowances. The same argument stands for these uses being on RH but not RM: Residential Rooming House, Student Housing or Dormitory, Opiod Rehabilitation Home Both Small and Large, Nursing Home. RM zones often are integrated with R3 Core Zones. This zoning will result in tear-downs and density that will have large impacts on adjacent properties. Even as conditional use options, this sets the residents at odds with a city approved changes that will happen without large efforts by residents to speak against large opiod recovery homes and student dormitories and more where the underlying zoning is 5 unrelated. This is a huge change and all these added uses should be moved to RH and not included in RM. Again mapping changes can carefully select the areas that are now RM but could be changed to RH without controversy or harm to surrounding residents.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS: 1) There should be more emphasis on the design guidance in the Downtown Vision and Infill Strategy. 2) There should be a design review committee that interprets the guidelines for the downtown. Plan commission and planners interpreting instructions is not the best forum for design discussions.3) Regarding 20:03.10 f ) Requiring only 50% of the ground floor street frontage to be commercial is inadequate. 4)There is no mention of addressing Air B &amp; Bs at all.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted: [REDACTED] / Bloomington City Council</p> |

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Timestamp | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>   |
|           | <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In areas where trash receptacles are mentioned, add "recycling receptacle as well"</li> <li>-In addition to any parking space requirements for the various zones, there should be requirements for bike racks</li> <li>-The Drainage/Floodplain section should more frequently refer to protection of tree canopy and wildlife habitat.</li> <li>-Eliminate environmental exemptions for "single-family, duplex, triplex, fourplex, mobile home, and manufactured home dwellings"</li> <li>-Rethink materials listed for use (there is a list of replacement materials in in .05.015)</li> <li>-Add an average parking lot vacancy reporting and/or a certain percentage of parking spaces that should be permeable</li> <li>-Anytime "permeable pavers" or "permeable pavement" is listed as acceptable for the purposes of stormwater management, the UDO needs to include a maintenance requirement. Without proper maintenance, this type of pavement clogs within a short period of time, and functions as an impervious surface</li> <li>-Replace the regulations developed referencing 100-year flood plain rating with 500-year flood plain area ratings, at a minimum.</li> <li>-The UDO should only allow asphalt when it is applied with a cool coating, or is a permeable asphalt (in which case a maintenance plan should be required), except in the case of roadways, where a widely adopted cool coating material is not yet on the market</li> <li>-The UDO should require the consideration of at least three reasonable parcels of infill or building reuse before a developer is permitted to build on a greenspace; the developer should submit a report outlining why those three sites would not work, which is then reviewed by the Plan Commission.</li> <li>-Need more mentions of wildlife, habitats, and biodiversity</li> <li>-Need to mention the required use of native plants with regards to groundcover</li> <li>-Buffer yards cannot overlap</li> <li>- No pesticides should be used in any conservation easements.</li> </ul> <p>02.020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Page 8, 10, 17 of UDO: Front Building Setbacks should include a maximum of 25 feet from the front property line. - Rationale: Sustainability best practices for a compact and complete development for single-family residential blocks use a max 25 feet front setback from the property line (See STAR Communities Credit BE-3). Proposed UDO standards set a minimum, and do not specify a maximum. They should specify a maximum.</li> </ul> <p>02.030</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Page 28, 31, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45: Mixed use development sustainability best practices, for compact and complete communities, include having a front setback that is not more than 10 feet from the property line. (See STAR Communities Credit BE-3). Proposed UDO setbacks are listed as a minimum instead of a maximum, and are too deep as written.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>03.020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Table 3-1: Commercial Uses-Agricultural and Animal Uses: Produce sales to be added to as a line item and permitted within RM and RMH zones.</li> </ul> <p>04.110</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-(b)(2) Remove student housing and dormitories as exemptions to the incentives list. - Rationale: By exempting student housing dormitories, we exempt student housing and dormitory projects from positive exemptions which we want to be more sustainable.</li> </ul> <p>04.030</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The chapter should be titled "Environment," - Rationale: a noun, rather than "Environmental"</li> <li>-c (5): add (E) Presence of substantial tree cover on the slope, which would help to reduce erosion.</li> <li>-c (9): Too vague - work with Planning &amp; Transportation for more detailed language</li> <li>- d (3) (A): Environmental constraints should specify erosion control measures</li> <li>-d (3) (B): "Toxic materials or hazardous materials shall be properly disposed of" should specify disposal requirements</li> <li>-d (3) (E): "Sediment shall be controlled and contained on-site and control measures shall prevent damage to existing vegetation or pavement" should specify control measures</li> <li>-d (3) (M): There is no scale</li> <li>-e (1): This should include ephemeral streams, but with smaller buffers. Ephemeral streams can be significant conveyors of polluted runoff and heavy flows contributing to stream erosion; suggest a minimum lot size of half an acre, not a full acre</li> <li>-e (5) (B), e (6) (B), and e (7) (B): Widen riparian buffer zones beyond what is stated in Module 2 text.</li> <li>-e (5) (D): Would like more mitigation efforts for these four exceptions</li> <li>-e (5)(c) Add text to be able to remove invasive plants or nonnatives in this area</li> <li>-e (8): This section should include requirements for minimum survival of number of trees or area of plantings; minimum diversity of surviving species; and type and extent of volunteer plants allowed.</li> <li>-g: Should have stronger requirements and stronger language</li> <li>-h: Require a "2 for 1 tree replacement by planting trees within ½ mile of site development. Tree plantings must be at least 2 caliper trees or at least add requirement for trees planted near impervious surfaces.</li> <li>-h (4): We should consider reducing this threshold to 1 acre.</li> <li>-(7)(D)(ii): "Streets, as needed to achieve connectivity" is too low a bar to pass to put more impermeable pavement in floodplains. Please add "where no other alternatives outside floodplains can be found and where need for new streets has been established"</li> </ul> <p>04.040</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a: Add (3) to require planting or replanting undergrowth.</li> <li>-b (2): Exemption may only occur if full drainage infrastructure is provided to Planning &amp; Transportation or Plan Commission prior at time of review of development. If not provided then exemption is not acceptable.</li> <li>-b (4): This call for 100% on-site water management; Stormwater Mitigation Requirements "to a location adequate to receive such runoff" should be defined; What are the "city utility department standards" and do those standards account for the increasing number of heavy downpours we are experiencing?</li> <li>-b (5): Development should not be permitted on "poorly drained sites." -Rationale:Flooding is only going to increase in these areas.</li> <li>-c (1): Add "reduce the threat of downstream flooding" and "conserve important wildlife habitat".</li> <li>-c (4): The designation FIRM should be defined.</li> <li>-c (9) (H) (ii): Add second sentence "This includes minimizing tree removal and impacts to wildlife habitat."</li> </ul> <p>04.050</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-d (8): Do we have to plant grass in a tree plot? What about native groundcover and trees?</li> </ul> <p>04.060</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-d: Minimum Vehicle Parking Requirements are too high</li> <li>o"Fraternity or sorority house" and "student housing or dormitory" parking maximums are too high should be reduced.</li> <li>oAll Maximum Parking lines - The UDO should never say "no requirement" for marking maximums.</li> <li>oRetail Sales – the proposed parking maximums are too high, and some of them are increasing since last time. We strongly disagree with this increase, and we advocate for a decrease.</li> </ul> |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Timestamp         | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>  |
| 1/2/2019 15:10:45 | <p>One aspect I find troublesome is zoning ordinances' continuing obsession with setbacks, which are the distances between a wall of a building and the edge of the property parcel. In the case of Bloomington's UDO, it specifies setbacks of 15 feet across most (all?) residential zones.</p> <p>Don't get me wrong; sometimes setbacks make sense. For example, to ensure there's space behind a building so that waste bins and utility boxes don't have to encroach on an alley. Or, to ensure enough light reaches windows on the sides of buildings. Or, to ensure a building doesn't obstruct sight lines at an intersection.</p> <p>In this case, however, they serve little purpose other than trying to impose an arbitrary suburban-style aesthetic. In all the older residential areas surrounding downtown, there are countless examples of houses with either a very small setback (like 3 or 4 feet), or none at all.</p> <p>There are many houses in my neighborhood (Prospect Hill) with setbacks between zero and about five feet. Yet, the new UDO specifies a minimum front setback of 15 feet for all residential zones, even in the R4 'urban residential' zone. My own house is set back 12 feet from the sidewalk—if it were to burn down and be rebuilt, according to the new UDO it would have to be rebuilt further away from street.</p> <p>Even aside from obvious faults like wasting land, it's a ridiculous requirement; a porch near the sidewalk allows it to function as an instrument of social interaction. The further you push a building away from the street, the less the porch serves any purpose except as an outdoor covered space, in which case it might as well be in back.</p> <p>There are likely two possible reasons for the 15-foot setback. One is purely aesthetic, a way of maintaining a kind of exurban, faux-pastoral character. Front yards and the spare resources to grow turf grass are a symbol of American prosperity. But this is not a justifiable goal in the context of a city, which is supposed to be walkable and use land efficiently.</p> <p>The other possible justification is privacy and/or separation from traffic noise, but of course privacy is not the point of a front porch, and moving buildings further apart (thereby encouraging driving) is perhaps the most ironic possible 'solution' to traffic noise.</p> <p>I would suggest a larger standard setback for the lowest-density residential zone (say, 25 ft), and something like a 0-5 ft setback for the denser residential zones. Alternatively, don't specify setbacks for each zone at all, but instead consider the type of street the house is on. For example, a building on a 4-lane road like South Walnut could be able to be set back 30 ft or more, while a building on a 1-lane side street like West Smith Ave could be set back 0 ft.</p> |
| 1/3/2019 10:14:23 | <p>The only comment I have is about parking issues in the downtown area. I hope the parking situation is being looked at very carefully. There are a lot of people living downtown now which keeps any downtown alive. I cannot tell you how many people I speak to that would like to spend more time downtown but totally avoid it because they don't want to deal with trying to find a place to park. There are many businesses struggling to stay afloat in the downtown area. This may or may not be a well-known fact. Ask any commercial realtor in Bloomington about businesses that would love to locate in the downtown area but are very hesitant to do so because of parking. If the plan for Bloomington is to keep a vibrant downtown and have people living there and businesses locating there, then additional parking garages would be the answer.</p>  |
| 1/4/2019 9:47:00  | <p>If I may, since it seems from this email that the earlier comments I provided via a developer site will otherwise go unrecorded, my real concern is about the height of the proposed hotel at the former Kmart site by College Mall right next to where I live in Hoosier Acres, and by what seems to be an ill-conceived plan to dump a large volume of student housing there, and just generally the haphazardness of the plan. I've been trying to follow along but the materials that have been published online and shared at meetings are almost impossible to comprehend. As a reader, one cannot tell what the impact in real terms is going to be, how it compares to how things are now; only that various projects may or may not be happening and may or may not have a lasting impact on the lives of existing homeowners and tenants. It feels as if profit is being put before the interests of the entire town. I understand you may have a different perspective since you are in the midst of this; i'm just telling you what it looks like from the outside. It makes me want to leave town. i'll be honest that the scooter insanity has contributed to this feeling still further. I shudder to think how it will be if hundreds of students move in next door and I am confronted with the same terror I face downtown as I try to navigate the sidewalk while people zoom around randomly on scooters. We need more public transport, not dangerous modes of individual transport. We already have extensive student housing around that site, and if we add still more, it will stop feeling like a town, where I live at least. I don't know anyone in my neighborhood who is happy about the proposed plan.</p> <p>Last year, when we met with the developer, (on the sidewalk, in the heat, outside Kmart) they claimed the only way to tell whether the proposed hotel would puncture the neighboring skyline in Hoosier Acres would be "if we put up scaffolding" which is obvious nonsense. He also said the impact on traffic (we were all worried about the traffic light at College Mall and the bypass, which already is often in gridlock) was irrelevant because there was a traffic light beside the location, as if that constituted a plan for traffic. This has made me highly mistrustful of the entire project.</p> <p>I am not against development. I'm absolutely for it. I'm just against development that hasn't been carefully thought through and for all the above reasons, I don't think this has.</p>  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Timestamp        | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>   |
| 1/4/2019 9:48:20 | <p>The Commission has endorsed, and the Comprehensive Plan calls for an expansion of efforts to make our community work for all ages and abilities – what we refer to as a 'Lifetime Community'. This document employs the Clarion framework into our consultant's recommendations [REDACTED] for more specific actions around the module entitled Development Standards. Paragraphs in blue type are drawn from the Clarion template, with our recommendations in black type.</p> <p>Chapter 20.04: Development Standards and Incentives</p> <p>This chapter will include all of the UDO regulations that address site design and development (rather than permitted uses or procedures for development review and approval). It will cover a wide range of topics from site design to landscaping, parking, and lighting. This proposed organization will group standards by topic and will incorporate regulations from both the zoning development standards and the subdivision development standards while clarifying where they apply.</p> <p>The comprehensive plan calls for the use of "the lifetime community" concept as a key framework for the redevelopment of the to-be-cleared hospital site (West Second) and the Switchyard Park area. In these two focus areas, redevelopment will "...leverage opportunities for city and private planning and investment to achieve a lifetime community, defined as a place that promotes social, physical, mental, and emotional well-being for persons of all abilities, across the of the international effort to make cities more livable by emphasizing quality of life for people of all ages, abilities, and socio-economic backgrounds" (96).</p> <p>The Commission on Aging has endorsed the concept of the Lifetime Community, to include such essential key elements as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Universal design</li> <li>2. Walkability</li> <li>3. Complete streets</li> <li>4. Connectivity of residential to commercial and public spaces</li> <li>5. Meaningful intergenerational contact</li> <li>6. High level of civic participation</li> <li>7. Multiple affordable housing options</li> <li>8. Multiple affordable mobility options</li> <li>9. Access to fresh food, parks and exercise options</li> <li>10. Sociable public spaces and Third Places</li> <li>11. High level of social capital</li> <li>12. Affordable health and supportive services to enable aging in place</li> <li>13. Sense of place</li> </ol> <p>The Commission argues that these goals can be achieved in the UDO through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• deep public participation (6, 11)</li> <li>• sustaining core residential and character features of the existing core neighborhoods (13)</li> <li>• developing mixed commercial assets accessible by pedestrian and alternative transportation routes (4, 9, 12, 2)</li> <li>• expanding the range of housing types and mobility options for families with children, persons with disabilities and older adults (5, 7, 8)</li> <li>• implementing design and architectural standards for new construction of private and public spaces (1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13)</li> <li>• encouraging use of universal design standards in modification of existing construction (2, 7)</li> <li>• orienting higher densities towards the B-line Trail and improving trail access by all persons living or working in the district (2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13)</li> </ul> <p>Many of the recommendations below will be seen as too restrictive in certain zones of the city. For that reason, we continue to argue for the use of an overlay concept in the redevelopment of the Hospital Re-use and Switchyard districts. We propose the overlay be entitled "Lifetime Community District." We feel that creating the opportunity for the two neighborhoods to pilot these new standards will pave the way for their use in other interested neighborhoods and serve as a national model for the implementation of lifetime concepts into the planning literature and practice. We draw elements of our thinking from the "Lifelong Community" approach taken in Atlanta, Georgia, as influenced by the work of Duany Plater Zyberk and the new urbanism, with special appreciation to M. Scott Ball, formerly of [REDACTED] and now the principal of [REDACTED]. Mr. Ball recognizes the influence of IU Nobel Prize winning economist, the late, Elinor Ostrom. He has spoken in Bloomington several times and knows well the district permeated by the B-line Trail. We also have learned from architect Zach Benedict, partner in [REDACTED] in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Mr. Benedict has visited Bloomington many times and is also very familiar with the B-line Trail and the national significance of its designation and development as a lifetime community district.</p> <p>Recommendations regarding building setbacks, facades and plazas/commons are drawn from Suzanne Lennard's work and those regarding housing rely upon the experience of Alan De La Torre, both of whom have visited and spoken to Bloomington audiences.</p> |



|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Timestamp | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>   |
|           | <p><b>Dimensional Standards</b></p> <p>This section will collect all of the standards for the size, shape, height, and size of lots and buildings in each of the City's zoning districts. It will address both site and building standards including minimum lot sizes, lot widths, building setbacks and build-tos, building height, as well as building form where those standards exist. It will also list all exemptions to these rules for height and setback encroachments and the rules for measurement of dimensional standards.</p> <p>Some important elements of a lifetime community, relative to dimensional standards, should include:</p> <p>For buildings surrounding public plazas and squares:</p> <p>One of the most important features of any public space in the commons is its ability to attract social interactions and support a vibrant local community. Architectural historians and planning scholars have identified many of the key elements of vibrant common spaces in urban environments. This set of recommendations draws upon the work of Suzanne Lennard, who has accumulated a vast knowledge about squares and plazas drawn from her own research and that of other scholars. She cites Jan Gehl in noting that a good plaza "has more to do with designing a theater than with architecture per se."</p> <p>Human physiology and, specifically, angle of vision is an important starting point in plaza design, and should define the relationship between building height and the size of the open square or plaza. Our normal angle of vision is 50-55 degrees above the horizontal and we should be able to have a sky-view as we sit, stand, or interact with people in the space. This represents the "sky-view island." This determines the minimum standard of design for socially purposed open spaces. She distinguishes socially purposed open spaces from "pocket parks" that might serve other open-space needs, such as seating areas for lunchtime workers. The ideal extent of the sky-view island determines the allowable building height according to the following formula:</p> <p>"Our angle of vision is 50° - 55° above the horizontal[5]. Thus, when we stand at the edge of the "sky-view island" in a 100' x 100' square, we feel more comfortable when the surrounding buildings are no higher than 50° above the horizontal, i.e. 48'. This can be mathematically figured using the following formula: distance from the "sky-view island" x tangent of 50 degrees, i.e. 40' x tan 50 degrees = 48'.</p> <p>In a rectangular square of 100' x 200', with an "sky-view island" of 20' x 50', buildings at the narrower ends can be up to 89' without causing claustrophobia, i.e. 90 x tan 50 degrees = 89'."</p> <p>She draws an important exception to the rule by noting the role of slender towers that signify important local institutions (churches, clocks, civic icons) and identity, and provide hallmarks both for local inhabitants of the space as well as those coming from afar, searching for the essential center.</p> <p>See her overview at : <a href="http://www.livablecities.org/blog/designing-successful-neighborhood-squares-part-6-surrounding-building-heightsproportions">http://www.livablecities.org/blog/designing-successful-neighborhood-squares-part-6-surrounding-building-heightsproportions</a></p> <p>As for horizontal dimensions, research has determined that human emotion can be perceived at distances up to 115 feet, which Gehl has noted is the stage to top balcony footage in an opera hall. On the vertical plane, individuals can maintain a social connection to the plaza from buildings up to 4-5 stories, maintain hailing distance. Openings in the buildings, windows and balconies, provide eyes on the square and it is important to note the value of older residents of those spaces as eyeing the outside is a valued activity throughout the day.</p> <p>Employing these design principles provides a human scale in the environment that facilitates participation, sociality, identity and belongingness. This is critically important in helping us prevent the social isolation that is enabled by residence in faceless, nameless, cookie cutter buildings and public spaces.</p> <p><b>Set-backs and step-backs</b></p> <p>For public buildings facing open social spaces, the façade of the building should be close enough to enable social interaction between those within and those without. For food establishments and other socially attractive businesses, activity should be permitted to extend into public space, without becoming a barrier to everyday activity. First floor setbacks can also accommodate this interaction but should avoid cantilevered spaces as they are felt to be uncomfortable and even dangerous to occupy. Even if cantilevered, however, the use of columns under the upper levels can promote a feeling of comfort and help distinguish seating spaces from spaces available for pedestrian movement.</p> <p>Step-backs should be required for any building over 5 stories as this provides for an expanded angle of vision and sunlight to the open space. For the developer, this provides an additional opportunity to include rooftop terraces and gardens in penthouse units.</p> <p><b>Access and Connectivity</b></p> <p>This section will combine the various sections related to access and connectivity that are currently located in both the zoning developments standards and the subdivision design standards. It will address topics such as entrance and drive standards, street types, street design, cross-access easements, alternative transportation (including electric vehicle and autonomous vehicle standards), access and transit easements, pedestrian and trail network standards, and driveways and access regulations.</p> <p>In a Lifetime Community, access goes beyond the minimum requirements of concrete infrastructure and has as much to do with creating environments that are inviting, legible. Environments that are inviting are created through the provision of opportunities for social interaction (formal and informal programming) and the creation of beauty and interest. Environments that are legible rely not on signage and vision alone but on the multi-sensory presence of light, breeze, sound and smell, as well as the use of a hierarchy of building types that differentiate civic, sacred, commercial and residential uses. The quality of the pedestrian experience does more to create access than the minimalist removal of access barriers and the use of harsh sensory cues. This is to argue for the use of a universal design approach to access and connectivity that is broad in scope and perhaps difficult to "regulate."</p> <p>Integrate pedestrian access early in all public and private development planning in order to reduce the need for ramps and stairs and to ensure strong visual ties between building program and pathways. This will involve attention to the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly consider vista and terminus relationships from the pedestrian perspective. This is the most significant factor in navigability.</li> <li>• Provide parallel parking whenever possible. This provides both convenience for the driver and the parked cars protect pathways from vehicular traffic.</li> <li>• Continuity of pedestrian pathways should be prioritized. Target investment towards areas where pathway network can be made complete across both public and private property.</li> <li>• A path is only as wide as its narrowest section. All plans for development should ensure sufficient space is provided for all sidewalks and paths to be a minimum of 5 ft throughout the route.</li> <li>• Parking lots need pedestrian paths, separated and protected from vehicular traffic whenever possible, that run from parking to destination and from the public sidewalk to destinations.</li> <li>• Problem areas along the pathway network, such as areas of significant grade or spatial constraints should be identified early in the development process and given extra attention. If utilities, landscaping, and roadways are not sufficiently coordinated in these areas from the outset, then the final result will not be accessible.</li> <li>• The use of contrasting-colored pavers as edging for a concrete walk is both attractive and provides sufficient texture to signal the edge.</li> </ul> |

Timestamp Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).

**Landscaping, Buffering, and Fences**  
 This section will bring together all UDO regulations related to landscaping, buffering, and fencing, including the general landscape standards, buffering requirements, street tree standards, parking area requirements, tree protection standards, walls, fences, and screening methods, and installation requirements.  
 See other sections. Add language that incentivizes the use of water features that achieve aesthetic and social goals for all ages and abilities, such as fountains, splash pads, ponds, streamlets, and misters.

**Site and Building Design**  
 This section will contain the site and building design standards for all of the zoning districts in the City and will update those standards to ensure that the base standards reflect the high quality of development that Bloomington expects citywide, and to reduce the length of building design regulations in the downtown overlay zoning districts.

Lennard has written that "The building façade is the 'face' of the building. Like the face of a person, it may be friendly or hostile, open or closed, facilitating contact through windows that open, balconies and doors, or preventing interaction with sealed windows and blank walls. Facades around a neighborhood square should create a welcoming atmosphere in the public domain, emphasizing human scale, enhancing the experience of the space, and facilitating communication. Colors, tones and quality of light communicate on an emotional level. Lines and shapes communicate on the intellectual-cognitive level. Textures, materials and fine detailing communicate on a sensory level, inviting touch. The appropriateness of relationships between the details of a building, the design of the building as a whole, and the building's larger context (neighborhood or city) conveys an intuitive sense of 'rightness'."  
<http://www.livablecities.org/blog/designing-successful-neighborhood-squares-part-7-facades-setbacks-and-stepbacks>

Buildings should exhibit an articulated façade that invites observation, even a desire to touch. Buildings around public spaces should be designed at human scale, through the lens of the pedestrian. Beyond five floors, buildings lose their ability to be experienced directly from the ground. Design should emphasize vertical elements that hold the viewer in place, not horizontal elements that draw the eye to the distance. First floor details are especially important to children. Facades should not be blank, featureless. First floor facades should reinforce interaction with the street: from the inside, windows should enable outside viewing for customers and waitstaff. From the outside, pedestrians should be able to view people within, both during the day and the night.

Windows should be designed with attention to their ability to frame visually appealing elements in the environment, both inside and without. Bay windows projecting onto public spaces enable residents to "belong" to the social space below. Balconies provide direct participation between the residents and those on the street below. External balconies are preferred modes that allow interaction with the street. Internal balconies provide some privacy. Hence, a combination of both might be ideal. Street level arcades provide the same solution, enabling both semi-private and public goals as well as protection from the elements when needed. Ledges and sills provide opportunities to naturalize the public space for cats and potted plants. Below 4-5 stories, windows should be operable.

In less urbanized realms, a lifetime community district provides a diversity of housing options beyond traditional single-family residences alone. While abiding by local architectural character, alternative senior dwellings can provide essential "aging in place" functions. Permitted housing forms should include small lot elder cottages, pocket neighborhoods and small cooperative housing, "Golden Girls" residences, accessory dwelling units, and neighborhood scaled assisted living and geriatric care residences such as Green Houses  <https://www.thegreenhouseproject.org> and Abbeyfield Housing: <https://www.abbeyfield.ca> .

Visitability will be required in new construction of public and private buildings, facilities and surroundings. Minimum standards of access as defined by the ADA for public spaces shall be maintained. In addition, visitability will be required in all new residential construction and be defined by following the Indiana Visitability Rule: ARTICLE 27. INDIANA VISITABILITY RULE FOR ONE AND TWO FAMILY DWELLINGS AND TOWNHOUSES

Rule 1. Indiana Visitability Rule  
 675 IAC 27-1-1 Scope and enforcement  
 Authority: IC 22-13-2-2; IC 22-13-2-13; IC 22-13-4-7 Affected: IC 22-12; IC 22-13; IC 22-14; IC 22-15; IC 36-7

A.at least one (1) building entrance is on an accessible route;B.  
 B. all doors on the accessible route shall be thirty-six (36) inches (ninety-one and forty-four hundredths centimeters) in width; and  
 C.all dwelling units shall contain the features of adaptable design, such as:

- (i) an accessible route into and through the dwelling unit;
- (ii) light switches, electrical receptacle outlets, thermostats, and other environmental controls in accessible locations;
- (iii) reinforcements in bathroom walls to allow installation of grab bars around the toilet, tub, shower stall, and shower seat, where such facilities are provided;
- (iv) kitchens and bathrooms such that an individual in a wheelchair can maneuver about the space; and
- (v) all habitable rooms shall have a minimum size of seven (7) feet by ten (10) feet.

In addition, visitability will be encouraged or incentivized in the modification or remodeling of existing residential homes in the district, with provisions for waivers due to cost or topography.

Ramps to residential structures will be a permitted use, regulated by current ADA standards and encouraged or incentivized to comply with extant architectural neighborhood character. Where feasible, permanent grading will be preferred to the installation of structures.

**Elevators:**  
 In the Lifetime Community District, housing becomes accessible to all ages and abilities when options are available above the ground floor. For that purpose, all multi-family housing shall include residential elevators beyond the first floor. Multi-family walk-ups shall be prohibited.

**Acoustics and other Sensory Issues in service environments:**  
 More than one-third of the population over the age of 65 has moderate to severe hearing impairments. This, combined with limitations in vision, makes many if not most commercial food, beverage and even health care establishments uncomfortable if not impossible for older adults to frequent. Best practices for age-friendly businesses have been developed and should be encouraged, incentivized or required in lifetime community districts.

**Drainage and Floodplain**  
 This section will contain the regulations pertaining to drainage, storm water design and management, floodplains, and erosion control related to both subdivision and zoning regulations. These standards will be reviewed and updated as discussed in Part 1 of this document, including updating the City's floodplain regulations to reflect the State's new requirements to the maximum extent practicable.

In the hospital re-use district, current water flows due to topography and other environmental features shall be fully realized as assets rather than detriments, and potentiated for reasons of beauty and sustainability through the creation of streamlets, rain gardens and other mechanisms.

**Sustainability Standards**  
 This section will combine the City's environmental and sustainability standards that are currently located throughout the UDO. This will include regulations pertaining to steep slopes, wetlands, riparian buffers, and other environmental standards in addition to sustainability policies related to green development. Standards will be revised as discussed in Part 1 of this document.  
 See drainage and floodplain recommendation above.

**Lighting**  
 This section will contain the standards related to outdoor lighting including applicability and exemptions, parking area lighting, building lighting, and street lighting standards. The lighting standards will be updated and modernized to align with more traditional measurement metrics, as discussed in Part 1.  
 Outdoor lighting for older adults, like indoor lighting, should be task oriented. This suggests that lighting shall be adapted to the needs

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Timestamp         | Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).   |
| 1/4/2019 9:51:10  | <p>Incentives<br/>This section will include a more objective list of development standards or processing requirements that can be adjusted in return for specific community benefits. The current framework of incentives for design, sustainability, and affordable housing will be revisited and revised to ensure that the incentives are clear and objective, that they reflect the goals established in the Comprehensive Plan, and that they are reasonable in light of the developer's costs to earn the incentive. Incentives in this section may include additional height allowances, increased density, reduced parking, or other similar regulations.<br/>The attached Policy checklist outlines the many incentives available to leverage resources and encourage the development of a Lifetime Community District. In short, they include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Tax abatements</li> <li>•BUEA credits and benefits</li> <li>•Housing Development Fund</li> <li>•Fee waivers</li> <li>•Parking waivers</li> <li>•Density bonuses</li> <li>•Lot size waivers</li> <li>•Low interest loans, grants and location efficient mortgages</li> <li>•Design standards and assistance</li> <li>•Efficient development review</li> <li>•Tax increment retention (TIF and BID)</li> <li>•Municipal bonds</li> <li>•Real Estate transfer taxes</li> <li>•Alternative currencies and time banking</li> </ul> <p>Maintenance and Operation<br/>This new section will include all regulations related to the maintenance of landscaping, parking lots, signs, and building features, as well as regulations addressing operations to prevent nuisances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Stormwater inlet positioning and design determines not only where water will accumulate, but also debris. Inlet planning is a critical factor in pathway accessibility that must be considered from the beginning of civil engineering if pooling and debris accumulation is to be avoided at the crossing area. This consideration emerges from a series of insightful observations offered by adults with disabilities in two participation events/walkabouts conducted in 2014 and documented at:</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KheDU869Tk8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KheDU869Tk8</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FoqPN2tERqo">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FoqPN2tERqo</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil compaction is a critical access consideration Standards for soil compaction around subsurface utilities must be adopted and enforced consistently. Non-compacted soil around water meters, utility trenches, and storm water fixtures result in sidewalk settling and cracking and will create barriers to wheeled vehicles and trip hazards for pedestrians.</li> </ul> |
| 1/4/2019 12:55:22 | Given that Bloomington has the worst housing affordability in Indiana, I'm particularly supportive of the affordable housing incentives. I'd like to see the height and density bonuses and streamlined process all remain in the final code. I'm also very supportive of the expansion in the code which allows multi-family housing. I believe it's very important to expand our options to allow for more housing opportunities in the City.  |
| 1/4/2019 13:41:47 | I would like to see a way for houses to have front additions in built-out neighborhoods. People are want to reinvest in small, ranch style houses which are close to downtown by adding entries. Typically these house have entries that go directly into a living room. There is no way to do this with our current code and I don't see that this has been addressed in Table 4-5.   |
| 1/4/2019 13:57:39 | Maintain our current parking requirements as maximums. It might be unusual but our community does not want to require that people building parking they don't want or need. Having no maximum on single-family dwellings will allow existing 5-unit student rental houses to build out lot of parking.   |
| 1/4/2019 14:03:52 | <p>Page NumberLanguageComment</p> <p>100Small Retail definitionLike the increase to 5000sf</p> <p>103HeightAgree with height increases. Would prefer to see stories instead of height with a min/max on height for each story so builders create better 1st floor retail space. Historic structures in our community with tall ceilings have proved to be valuable and allow for new uses and renovation.</p> <p>106Building HeightSuggest height is instead measured by the average of the lowest to highest distance on a parcel.</p> <p>63Design GuidelinesDowntown Vision and Infill Strategy - you can't reference it because it was never codified so it's not an ordinance. If they want to reflect those then it needs to get codified in the UDO. It was adopted by resolution so it has no binding properties.</p> <p>79Group Care HomeNot allowing group homes near each other - why? Helps with shared services</p>  |
| 1/4/2019 15:35:26 | <p>The MC: Mixed Use Corridor district description is appalling . The drawing, which seems to conform to the 'Dimensional Standards' listed, is maybe from the 'cars only 1960's.</p> <p>The short end of a building somehow is allowed to be the front. Note the abysmal pedestrian experience. The building setback is a minimum and should be a maximum.... I could go on but this district simply has no place in the code and should be removed. It's drastically in conflict with our policy.</p>  |

UDO Module 1-3 comments

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Timestamp         | <p>Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 2: Dimensional standards (height, size, setbacks, and location of primary and accessory structures) and the development layout and quality standards (access/ connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping/buffering, signage, and maintenance standards).</p>  |
| 1/4/2019 16:33:16 | <p>20.02.(10) -- ensure UDO accounts for and reflects the Trades District Covenants (see attached here for reference)<br/>                 20.03.010(2)(c) -- why is childcare an excluded use?<br/>                 20.03.010(2)(d) -- Multifamily shouldn't be excluded use in Trades District<br/>                 20.03.030(5)(c) -- Why limit commercial footprint to 50%<br/>                 20.03.030(6)(A) -- Why not allow subdivision for home ownership opportunities? Wouldn't this be effectively forcing rental in perpetuity?<br/>                 20.03.030(d)(7) -- Rooming houses may have been gamed to circumvent student housing restrictions and affordability requirements. Need to tighten this down as much as possible.<br/>                 20.03.030(d)(9) -- Why not allow commerce of artist work from studios? And why not allow them to display the work? It seems to be limited their commercial viability unnecessarily.<br/>                 20.03.030(f)(3)(A).i. -- Typo?<br/>                 20.03.030(g)(8)N -- Extend time frames to allow for earlier drop off and later pickup, especially for early childhood education uses<br/>                 20.03.030(h)(4)(B) -- Why limit the ability to sell produce? Don't we want to encourage that?<br/>                 20.04.060(d) -- Why have parking minimums at all?<br/>                 20.04.060(d) -- EV charging should be included explicitly in the UDO. Perhaps not mandate a % of use yet, because the market is still shaking out, but should either incentivize or require that core infrastructure to support EV in the future be built into the structure<br/>                 20.04.0100(f)9 -- Can we consider allowing signage that hangs off a pole as long as it's not overbearing?<br/>                 20.04.0110(a)(6)C&amp;D -- I know we've already provided this input, but 30 years should be extended, probably to at least 50 years; and the % AMI number should be 120% to incorporate workforce housing<br/>                 20.04.0110(b)(4) -- Should expand beyond LEED both because there are other measurements that are just as good/better, and LEED v4 is already obsolete. Perhaps use "LEED or equivalent" to broaden.</p> |
| 1/4/2019 16:35:36 | <p>20.04.0110 -- some broad comments, for which I am seeking Clarion's opinion and ability to find programs from other communities we should consider in ours:</p> <p>Can we consider an incentive program for business sustainability investments -- i.e, we are offering developers incentives for sustainability/green investments, can we do the same for businesses investing similarly?</p> <p>One goal for Bloomington moving forward is to increase employment and office capacity. Land values are pushing people toward student housing and/or multi-family. What incentives can we put in the UDO to drive more office development?</p> <p>Another issue we have in Bloomington is that early childhood education facilities are too cost prohibitive to build. What incentives can we provide to developers either to build some or to include them in their office/multi-family developments?</p>   |