

UDO Module 1-3 comments

Timestamp	Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 3: Procedures and Administration.
11/27/2018 21:38:42	The definition of an ADU in the Definitions (pg 392) is not consistent with the Standards for ADUs on page 91 of Module 2.
12/30/2018 10:09:47	We should require space and contracts for recycling as a condition of approval of any PUDs.
1/1/2019 20:21:20	20.01.020 - Purpose. Item 18 should be at the end of the list, since it says "otherwise accomplish purposes of Indiana Code."
1/1/2019 20:23:31	20.01.060 - Comprehensive Plan. It is not clear to me which subarea plans are incorporated into the CMP. When discussing the CMP at city council, we were not told that the old subarea plans such as the West Kirkwood Plan are included in it. If those plans are included, the CMP should clearly list them and link to them. Some of these are quite old, so I'm not sure if they are all still relevant.
1/1/2019 20:28:07	Page 25, footnote 49 says that Clarion recommends removing the requirement for multi-family residential that there be a 20 ft setback for parking. I disagree and think we should keep this requirement. Parking along the public ROW does not make for a comfortable pedestrian environment.
1/1/2019 20:38:41	Pg. 244, Jurisdiction & Authority of the Plan Commission. I think the Plan Commission should review use variances for single-family residential districts as well as multi-family and non-residential use variances. The PC input would be valuable and another public step before the BZA hearing. Pg. 245, Conflicts under Board of Zoning Appeals. The last sentence of (5)(A) should be struck, since this is covered in (e)(2) below. The staff must file a statement of findings, and of course this is not a conflict. The sentence in (5)(A) is just confusing.
1/1/2019 20:45:48	Table 6-1 doesn't list PUD modifications/revisions and the process those must go through. In 20.06.040 "Common Review Procedures," the notification process for the pre-submittal neighborhood meeting seems insufficient. In addition to neighborhood associations, which are sometimes inactive for months, property owners and residents near the proposed development should be informed directly. Also, the members of the City Council's Land Use Committee should be invited to the neighborhood meeting.
1/1/2019 20:52:49	20.06.050 (a) Site Plan Review, Exemptions (B)(i) - it says a change in use does not need site plan review if no site improvements are required. I think a change in use could have negative (or positive) impacts on neighbors and thus should undergo a public process even if no site improvements are required. Also, I take issue with (B)(iii) - Since the allowance of duplex, triplex, and quad houses is emphasized in the UDO for the first time, we should really have these types of structures go through site plan review - at least the triplex and quad houses. There is a lot of concern among residents in core neighborhoods that such multi-family houses will be built on single lots by developers who will then rent them to students and price families out of the neighborhood. We need to keep a close eye on this type of development.
1/1/2019 21:02:21	In general, this module gives way too much discretion to the Director of Planning & Transportation to make decisions outside of public view. The threshold for Major Site Plan Review should be much lower.
1/4/2019 12:04:31	<p>In regards to the Sustainability Incentives (20.04.0110(b)), we appreciate the expanded sustainability incentives and ask that they be at least held at the level that they are in the current draft proposal. Bloomington strives to be a regional leader in sustainability, and providing clear and significant incentives for developers to incorporate more sustainable practices helps Bloomington achieve this vision. We also feel that an additional incentive for reduced setbacks for sustainable development would be advantageous.</p> <p>Also, we have concern over the formula used to qualify for sustainability incentives. Bloomington is a leader in solar development among Indiana communities, but the commercial market here lags behind the residential market. We ask that alternative criteria that specifically promote local solar adoption be included as a means to qualify for the sustainable incentives. The current incentives are tied to LEED credits, which do a poor job of promoting Renewable Energy generation. Under the draft rules, a building could be net zero energy usage and still not qualify as a sustainable property.</p> <p>Lastly, in regards to the new regulation for "Solar collector, ground- or Building-Mounted" (20.03.030(f)(2)), we feel that the Bloomington community has made it clear that increasing the amount of Renewable Energy generation in the city is a priority. These restrictions do not fit with this priority and should be relaxed or removed entirely.</p> <p>Thank you so much!</p>
1/4/2019 14:04:27	<p>These comments are on behalf of the Bloomington Board of REALTORS Governmental Affairs committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We believe that you are headed in the right direction and that this is a big improvement over the current version. However, we are anxious to see how the entire document will fit together in conjunction with the zoning map and reserve final comment until that time. We hope that the zoning map discussion will happen immediately after the completion of this document as it is an extremely important piece of this ordinance. 2. As advocates for housing, and owner-occupied housing in particular, we need both development friendly policies in order to increase supply as well as incentives specifically designed for affordable workforce single family housing. We know that owner-occupied housing is a stabilizing force for children and will help us attract the kind of workforce our expanding businesses need. 3. We are concerned about the density in core neighborhood. We believe it is important to carefully consider changing RC to R3 or R4. 4. We have concerns about the restrictions placed on student housing. On page 28 (table 2-15), RH district primary structure height maximum shows 55 feet. On page 49/50 (table 2-29) and in other places throughout the document, student housing height maximum is 30 feet. Given the increases in student enrollment and the need to deal with our pressing housing issues, this appears to be counter-intuitive. 5. As we do not have a zoning map, this comment may not be applicable, but we would like to encourage reviewing the ordinance to ensure it does not negatively impact full utilization of the Bloomington Opportunity Zone. 6. We believe that parking continues to be an issue. There is a disconnect between impervious surface and density. Until we reach a time that mass transit works for everyone (working mothers, the elderly, people with mobility issues, employees with non-regular working schedules), we will need to deal with vehicles and parking. We believe that we should increase density with appropriate parking allowances in order to minimize sprawl. 7. Given the complications due to the state's inventory of historic structures, we believe that the demolition delay ordinance should state "on a survey of Historic Sites and Structures as approved by the Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission . . ." 8. If the code will not permit use variances, we need a nimble process to amend the ordinance and/or map to allow for changes in the market. An example would be the redevelopment of the current hospital site and the surrounding medical zoning. Those medical offices will likely relocate near the hospital and the ordinance will need to be able to make timely adjustments.
1/4/2019 14:28:09	We are in a situation where the plan commission (in recent history) has allowed for a great amount of deviation from UDO standards. I would like to see waivers go thru the public process with the limits proposed limits put forth to guide their decision making process.

UDO Module 1-3 comments

Timestamp	Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 3: Procedures and Administration.
1/4/2019 15:20:03	<p>at lower page 103, Solar: Add a preamble statement before A, B and C: "Use of renewable energy is welcomed to reduce energy cost, make our community more desirable for residents, improve health and reduce pollution of air and water." Some positive statement encouraging renewable energy is appropriate for Bloomington, a community with more than ten percent of Indiana's solar owners, mostly residential, churches, government and schools. Proposed restrictions to solar energy are in conflict with priorities and desires of many residents. (A) 1. "... behind the front was of the building" is unclear. At top of page 104: 2 (C) "shall minimize the visibility ... to the maximum extent feasible without prohibiting" is a disincentive for renewable energy by potentially reducing energy production and thereby reducing the return on investment. Page 104 (4) Wind, large: specify if 200 feet height includes the blade.</p>
1/4/2019 15:42:12	<p>Comments on Unified Development Ordinance, including Module 3.</p> <p>With regard to Module 3, Chapter 20.06: Administration and Procedure, the provisions and efforts to simplify the process and make it more understandable are welcome and much needed. Thank you.</p> <p>With regard to Module 2, Chapter 20.05: Subdivision Standards, we would like to encourage lessening the costs of development so that the cost of lots, and therefore, the costs of single-family, owner-occupied housing are lessened. There is abundant evidence that the lack of workforce affordable housing could impair the ability of people to come to Bloomington and obtain good employment. Any barriers to providing such housing should be removed or lessened.</p> <p>With Regard to Module 1, Chapter 20.02.030(d) ME: Mixed Use Employment, do the references in subsection (1) to "business park" and "research park" mean that development must include two or more buildings on one parcel? That could seriously reduce the ability of companies to develop and build their own facilities if they had to rely on a developer to develop a "business" or "research" park.</p> <p>With regard to Module 1, Chapter 20.02.040(a) IN - Industrial: Would it be possible to change the name of the zone to "EM - Employment"? The term "industrial" is an old term that brings to mind smokestacks and related environmentally unfriendly activities. Such activities have essentially been prohibited for decades in the city and county, and would likely not be sought nor approved in the future. The term "employment" more closely reflects what is actually taking place in our employment sector. That is life science companies, information technology companies, and advanced manufacturing. It appears from the Allowed Use Table 3-1, pp. 81 et seq., that there is a negative view of the activities that will take place in this zone. For example, "Sexually oriented business" is permitted only in MN and IN zones. If we look at major large employers in our community, they take pride in their facilities. Life science companies maintain very clean environments in order to comply with good practices and federal regulations. They attract visitors and customers from around the globe. Imagine the impression it would make if there was a sexually oriented business next door. This runs counter to what they are trying to achieve and what we want in our community to help them thrive. The same could be said of most of our employers in all sectors. There are very few existing IG parcels in existence in the city, so it might not appear to be that large a problem. However, what if the city grows? The tone and tenor of the proposed IN - Industrial would not be compatible with what exists outside the city, and what is likely to develop in the future. Could a different zone be created or the ME zone be expanded to include larger facilities that would aid the growth of employment in our most important sectors?</p>

UDO Module 1-3 comments

Timestamp	Please provide any comments or information to consider for Module 3: Procedures and Administration.
1/4/2019 15:48:30	<p>General Observations: It's been difficult to understand what changes have been made from the old UDO to the new. I think the presentations didn't address key changes or how they will impact residents' lives or what they or others can and cannot happen to their property, neighborhood or city. But rather, the presentation focused on the rearrangement of the materials into tables and charts.</p> <p>Additionally, the presentation didn't link changes to the goals of the Comp Plan. After the first presentation I saw a huge drop in meeting attendance and heard confusion among residents. Many folks simply thought they weren't technically adapted to participate. Personally, I kept waiting for a big summary of what the global changes were. I thought this might come at the end as it did not come at the beginning. When several questions were asked the presenter said that a later modular/map would clarify specific issues. Now, after all these months it is difficult to remember what these issues were and thus hard to add to this list of concerns.</p> <p>Modular 1 Zoning Districts: Largest lots don't allow uses other than residential. We should be encouraging more density on these large lots, this is very non-green. We should discourage lots that are 2 acres. We should be encouraging and allowing higher density in areas that are less dense now. •All new development should include multi-uses and options for higher density such as ADUs, quads, triplex and duplex along the edges. •Smallest most dense lots (naturally occurring affordable housing) should be protected from tear-downs and/or conversions to multifamily. However, this is where the greatest variety of uses are being encouraged.</p> <p>Drawing are Misleading: Residential estate: Drawing for placement shows house NOT lining up with adjacent building-- very misleading. Drawing shows attached garage closer to street than the house. Drawing does not address side street, is this what we want?</p> <p>Residential Large lot: Drawing pictures attached garage closer to street than house. Drawing does not address side street.</p> <p>Residential small lot: Drawing doesn't match the table. Table gives specifications for attached front-loading garage/carport and drawing doesn't represent this.</p> <p>Residential Urban: Drawing doesn't match the table. Table gives specifications for attached front-loading garage/carport and drawing doesn't represent this.</p> <p>Residential Multifamily: Drawing pictures building ignoring street, very un-pedestrian friendly. Other drawings show parking lots without any screening and open to the street frontage. Don't we want parking hidden? Do we want vast oceans of parking along the streetscape? Drawing shows, NO door openings onto the street and zero public-private zone.</p> <p>Residential High Density: Drawings picture one long building with zero relationship to the street. No doors, stoops, porches or public/private space. Another drawing shows zero consideration for the side street.</p> <p>Residential Manufactured Home: Again, the drawings show backdoors/back porches facing the street side. Not pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>Mixed-use: Drawings show one large industrial strip-mall looking building with zero relationship to neighborhood context, streetscape or residential elements—very misleading. Drawing shows parking lots on the side of the building from the street rather than behind or featuring on-street parking. This is creating an unfriendly and jagged streetscape.</p> <p>Mixed-use corridor: Drawings feature huge parking lots in front of buildings. This is not business or pedestrian attractive. Envision this along south Walnut Street. Drawings feature the side of the building facing the street without any windows or doors.</p> <p>Modular 3 •The tables are difficult to understand, and the chapter is very confusing. For example, it is difficult to understand how a public right-of-way is vacated. Regulations refer to other regulations. •It's hard to believe every land situation can be put in to a chart/table and thus not require public process. •Too many waivers and variance decisions are being given through staff review, these should go through a public process. •Variance can be granted for too great of a percentage from the legal standard.</p>
1/4/2019 16:33:45	<p>page 216 (b)(4) add: "On-site renewable energy is encouraged to reduce energy cost, make our community more desirable for residents, improve health and reduce pollution of air and water. Solar projects can provide a major contribution toward LEED certification. The primary LEED category pertaining to solar is the "Energy & Atmosphere" category, specifically EA Credit 2, the "On-Site Renewable Energy" credit. This credit can provide up to 7 possible LEED points. This could represent over 17% of the points required for certification, depending on which level of certification developers are seeking."</p>