

UDO Adoption Draft Amendment 4A and 4B (Responses)

Timestamp	I have read Amendment 4A and 4B: Remove duplex, triplex, and fourplex from R1, R2, and R3 zones or allow duplex, triplex, and fourplex in R1, R2, and R3 zones	General comments on Amendment 4A or 4B:
9/5/2019 7:26:46	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I have listened with an open mind to arguments on both sides of this issue, and I think plexes would do absolutely nothing for affordability and extremely little for eco-sustainability but permanently damage the core neighborhoods. (If plexes are to be allowed, there must be more stringent requirements.)
9/5/2019 7:52:32	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Our city needs to evolve without government bans preventing higher density dwellings. Higher density residences are more energy-efficient and allow greater access to core Bloomington amenities for a wider socioeconomic range of residents. Single family zoning ordinances lead to greater socioeconomic segregation and suburban sprawl.
9/5/2019 8:20:22	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Dear Committee, I would like to state once again my extreme displeasure that the city is considering changing zoning that will take from current SFH neighborhoods the very essence that makes them an enjoyable place to live. Our density is already challenged by student rentals. Parking is already stretched to the limits. I do not believe "affordable housing" will be cured by this proposal. One has to wonder if that is really the issue here. I hope you all read the solutions offered in The Herald Times today, Wed Sept 4, titled "Sky-high aspirations." Has Bloomington looked at any other options such as these that do not infringe in those of us who worked hard, saved up to buy our SFH, and are now being threatened by the new zoning as though it matters to no one that we don't want to live more crammed in than we already are? Please do not allow "plexes" in our neighborhoods. Please vote no! Sincerely, Jill Crawford
9/5/2019 8:28:02	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	To the Planning Commission: I hope that the vision the Comprehensive Plan provides can serve as a reminder of what a thriving Bloomington can be for the future: "Existing core neighborhoods should not be the focus of the city's increasing density." (p.60) "Bloomington's older urban, small scale compact, single-family housing stock located primarily around the city center and university provides some of the city's more affordable housing stock and must be protected." (p.61) "Now that 1900 new housing units have been constructed Downtown within the past decade (almost all of them apartments), the market dynamic is shifting. More market opportunities may exist to convert single-family homes from student-rental to owner occupied." (p.61) "Policy 5.3.1.--Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods." (p.64) "Continue to support and promote affordable home ownership." (p.65) "The conversion of dwellings to multifamily or commercial uses should be discouraged." (p.84) My question is why are we abandoning these standards? It makes no sense that a document meant to codify the ordinances necessary to promote the goals of the Comprehensive Plan are, instead, violating it. And tonight I received my 11th call from another developer looking to buy my house for cash. It's neither fantasy nor paranoia to suggest that the consideration of up-zoning has already unleashed interest and intent among non-local developers to take full advantage of a market they believe is ripe for profit. When you chum the water, the sharks will come. As Brody said in Jaws, "You're going to need a bigger boat." Don't throw away the only tool we have to protect our neighborhoods: single family zoning.
9/5/2019 8:29:24	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I support allowing these more-equitable, more-affordable, and lower-emissions housing forms by-right in residential zoned districts. Exclusionary zoning is rooted in a long history of exclusion — it is quite literally why it was created. And even today, regardless of intent, the effect and outcome of exclusionary zoning is to exclude and segregate: by class, by race, by age, by income. This isn't a hypothetical problem in some other, bigger city. It is happening here, in Bloomington, right now. All of the higher values we espouse regularly as a community are about social and racial equity and about meeting the challenge of the climate crisis. There is a substantial body of research and evidence showing how eliminating exclusionary zoning does both. Moreover, allowing these housing types throughout the city, near schools and in places that are nice to live, is encouraged throughout the Comprehensive Plan (see, e.g., Goal 5.1.2, Goal 5.1.3, Goal 5.3, Goal 5.3.1, and Goal 5.4.1. Regarding Policy 5.3.1 specifically, which includes a clause "avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods": As I mentioned last week, this requires defining single family neighborhoods. Many neighborhoods — for example, Bryan Park, Elm Heights, Park Ridge East, Maple Heights, McDoel Gardens, Prospect Hill, the Near West Side, Broadview, and more — are objectively not single family neighborhoods. They have duplexes, triplexes, town homes, and small-scale apartment complexes. These neighborhoods are currently exclusionary zoned, but that does not make them single-family neighborhoods. They are manifestly not, nor have they been in their entire history. Finally, our decision on allowing more equitable development that includes duplexes and triplexes will have a substantial impact on Bloomington's climate pollution and GHG emissions. This effect is well-established in the literature and among policy experts on this topic. Denser development supports transit and higher mode share of walking and biking. It also leads to shorter commutes. When exclusionary zoning prices people out of Bloomington — which is happening right now, and will keep happening, increasingly, under our current exclusionary housing regime — this particularly harms low-income individuals. It also increases vehicle emissions and congestion, and it reinforces cycles of poverty by forcing lower-income individuals to spend a large portion of their income on vehicle ownership, maintenance, and fuel. Again, this is all well studied and well established. No one's preference for their "neighborhood character" or aesthetics is more important than another person's need for a place to live. How much evidence will it take before we're willing to pay attention and act for the greater good of the community — especially for those who are struggling most?
9/5/2019 9:03:07	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	In full disclosure, this information was not released to our neighborhood until today, but ultimately, I am in full opposition of allowing duplex, triplex, or fourplexes in any form in Elm Heights or the other surrounding core neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 9:29:27	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Single family home neighborhoods have a unique character. That should not be changed for existing neighborhoods
9/5/2019 9:30:19	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 10:34:49	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	We need to increase population density for climate change adaption and mitigation purposes.
9/5/2019 10:36:21	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	The infrastructure of the core neighborhoods is already overburdonden, and adding more residents will make it function even more poorly than it does now.
9/5/2019 11:22:42	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 11:51:39	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	

UDO Adoption Draft Amendment 4A and 4B (Responses)

Timestamp	I have read Amendment 4A and 4B: Remove duplex, triplex, and fourplex from R1, R2, and R3 zones or allow duplex, triplex, and fourplex in R1, R2, and R3 zones	General comments on Amendment 4A or 4B:
9/5/2019 12:07:03	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 12:17:40	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I am totally against allowing new development of "plexes" in existing core neighborhoods. The language in these amendments is confusing since our zoning is set to change. The language does not refer to "new" vs "existing" R2, R3, R4 neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 12:24:16	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Delete the part of UDO allowing the 2,3,4 plexes to replace single family homes in current R1,2,3 zones. This would allow developers to demolish entire neighborhoods for their own profit, and almost certainly would increase, not decrease, the cost of rent and the cost of purchasing a single family home. The availability of affordable homes would go DOWN, not up, defeating the entire purpose of this action. Gradual change starting in existing student apartment neighborhoods, combined with decreasing the attractiveness of rental home to students, along the lines of the successful program in South Bend, is what is needed instead. This plan is poorly thought out, and the obvious consequences benefitting mostly developers, and resulting in more students, not more middle income families will be the only predictable result in the long term. Wrong plan, wrong execution.
9/5/2019 12:31:34	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 12:35:13	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I oppose all new multiplex housing in core neighborhoods that are currently zoned single family residential.
9/5/2019 12:42:10	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 12:44:47	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	The driver of rental costs in Bloomington is IU students. The core neighborhoods around IU are heavily impacted by student rentals – this is obvious if you just drive around Elm Heights, particularly North of First and west of Woodlawn. All of us who have lived in Elm Heights have experienced noise and nuisance from student rentals, and it is clear that the occupancy of these rentals often far exceeds the legal limit. For every legal student occupant, there is often a "visiting friend", doubling the number of occupants and of cars on the streets. And, there is little sign that anyone in the city government cares to monitor, much less enforce, the occupant-density limits. The proposed allowance of multifamily housing in the residential neighborhoods will dramatically exacerbate this situation. How can anyone not see that this will simply open up more opportunities for student rentals, further impacting the core neighborhoods. And it will open the door to predatory developers which will not only degrade the neighborhoods but will also drive up housing costs since families will have to compete with developers. The consequences will be exactly the opposite of what is intended. A relevant experiment is currently happening in South Bend. As reported by the HT on Aug 25th, Notre Dame is now requiring incoming students to live on campus for six semesters. As a result, rental properties around the campus are standing vacant. As one property manager said, if they can't rent to students, they will convert the houses back to single-family rentals. VOILA: affordable housing for families and young professionals! The solution to affordable housing in Bloomington not to degrade the core neighborhoods even further. It is first, to encourage student housing away from these neighborhoods. This may already be happening with at least two new mega-student developments. And, second, to encourage multifamily housing in new developments (eg. the hospital site), and in current multifamily zones. Along with this, public transportation has to be improved. The Elm Heights, Bryan Park, and Near West Side neighborhoods are already dense. As Chris Sturbaum said last week, these neighborhoods work, they are diverse, people walk to where they are going. Please leave them as is.
9/5/2019 12:49:36	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I do not support the new development of du-, tri-, and fourplexes in existing SFH neighborhoods
9/5/2019 12:53:26	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I oppose any new plex units in current SFH neighborhoods
9/5/2019 12:54:29	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I oppose any new plex units in current SFH neighborhoods
9/5/2019 12:57:59	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Please don't even consider adding these structures in existing neighborhoods. These type dwellings will provide nothing more than investment opportunities by landlords who do not reside in the neighborhood. With a student population willing to pay top dollar for housing, investors will just continue to add more rental units to the neighborhoods, not owner-occupied homes.
9/5/2019 12:58:52	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	These types of housing will only encourage investment developers and will not be used for affordable housing
9/5/2019 13:00:26	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I support removing duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings from R1, R2, & R3 zones.
9/5/2019 13:18:10	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 13:32:58	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Hello, I wanted to drop a quick note before the meeting tonight as I will not have the opportunity to attend. I am one of the representatives from Sherwood Oaks, and a couple of years ago we created a housing/planning survey that was sent around to all the neighbors in Sherwood Oaks, Sherwood Oaks II, and Woods Edge. The survey showed very strongly that the homeowners do not want to see zoning allow for more duplexes and triplexes in these neighborhoods. Additionally, the neighbors feel strongly that they'd like to see more single family homes on our side of town as opposed to high-density or low-income housing. We shared a summary of the survey responses with our elected officials, hoping they would be shared with our mayor, but it doesn't seem that anything ever came of it. We do not feel we have a voice in this matter, and so would greatly appreciate it if our representatives could please vote against allowing for plexes in our core neighborhoods. Thank you so much for your time.
9/5/2019 13:33:12	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Maintaining the Residential Core and Residential Single family neighborhoods are absolutely necessary for a vibrant sustainable city character. These other uses will additionally put great stress on neighborhoods that do not have the Bloomington Utilities to support the additional needs in these RS areas without costly upgrades.
9/5/2019 13:33:56	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	

UDO Adoption Draft Amendment 4A and 4B (Responses)

Timestamp	I have read Amendment 4A and 4B: Remove duplex, triplex, and fourplex from R1, R2, and R3 zones or allow duplex, triplex, and fourplex in R1, R2, and R3 zones	General comments on Amendment 4A or 4B:
9/5/2019 13:35:25	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 13:51:45	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I am totally opposed to any new development of any new development of any multi-plex housing in SF (single family) core neighborhoods. Period.
9/5/2019 14:02:10	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I am totally opposed to any new development of any multi-plex housing in any SF (single family) core neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 14:02:12	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	UDO requirements mandate Owner-Occupancy. If plexes ARE allowed, Owner-Occupancy should be mandated to reduce the likelihood of rental clusters.
9/5/2019 14:09:28	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I am totally opposed to any new development of any new multi-plex housing in SF (single family) core neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 14:19:49	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I hesitate to rec a vote on which amendment because the language of the draft is so thick. I have a concern about the issue of rezoning previously R1-2-3 zones and how that would relate to these amendments. If R4 is restricted to areas developed subsequent to the adoption of the UDO, I support higher density, multifamily structures. But under no circumstances should current R1-2-3 zones be up-zoned to R4.
9/5/2019 15:02:11	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Greetings, please note that I am writing to inform you of my total and complete opposition of any and all new multi-plex housing in single-family core neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 15:02:57	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	I have recently become aware of the proposed plan to begin developing predominantly single family home neighborhoods. I am opposed to and disagree with this proposal to integrate the development of these multi-plex homes in these neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 15:03:39	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Hello, I am completely opposed to any new development of any new multi-plex housing in SF (single family) core neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 15:34:22	I generally support Amendment 4A (removing duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Some duplexes in zones R1, R2, and R3 can be okay. But not an unlimited number, with far-off developers replacing beautiful homes with generic plexes that are just for rent. Duplex units should be geared for sale, they should be mostly owned by Bloomington residents, and they should appear gradually, thoughtfully, and with a care for Bloomington's character. I fear the UDO does not have enough restrictions in place to make sure the plexes are not a disaster. Take plexes out of zones R1, R2, and R3. They can be added back in carefully in coming years as we see how the changes around Bloomington are unfolding. If the plexes remain conditional, please add stronger restrictions on building these plexes to ensure the best outcome.
9/5/2019 15:40:57		The wording is not clear. What is the actual amendment? But I am against the building of duplexes or triplexes in Elm Heights under any condition.
9/5/2019 15:55:27		I am against duplexes triplexes and four Plexes in any corn neighborhood in Bloomington.
9/5/2019 15:56:23		This amendment is too difficult for the late person to understand. I am against all duplexes triplexes and four Plexes in the corner neighborhoods.
9/5/2019 16:06:42	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	
9/5/2019 16:20:41	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Now that we see the data and know that SF zoning is exclusionary and perpetuates racism and classism, it is time to change our historically exclusionary policies to allow people from all backgrounds and income levels to live in our neighborhoods. We are taking a first, small step in this process by allowing by right duplexes and triplexes in our neighborhoods. This is not only the right move for social and economic equity, but for environmental equity as well. Towns across the country do allow and are starting to allow this, and we need to be a part of that. Sightline Institute offers many great articles on this, and Richard Rothstein's The Color of Law (How our Government Segregated America) are must-reads.
9/5/2019 16:21:19	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Our community grapples with a chronic housing shortage. The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce urges the Plan Commission and Council to use the new zoning code to provide more options for increasing Bloomington's housing stock, not fewer. As part of that, we strongly support allowing duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes as a permitted use in R1, R2 and R3 zoning districts. Adding these structures would not destroy our neighborhoods, as some have suggested. Our neighborhoods are not simply the houses or condos or apartment buildings in this community. Our neighborhoods are the people who live in that housing – families, students, young professionals, retirees, police officers, factory workers and others – all the people who add to the fabric of our community. Many of these people can't afford a single-family residence or prefer not to live in that type of housing. If they can't find a place where they want to live and can afford to live, we'll lose them. That means employers will lose the ability to sustain and grow their businesses, because they won't be able to recruit and retain the workers they need. This affects the health of our local economy, which is the underpinning for our government services, our nonprofits, our schools and the overall vibrancy of this community. Again, we need more housing, not less, and we need it with urgency. We need to find ways to encourage construction of new housing, not throw up barriers. This community already has a reputation for a development process that's expensive, time-consuming and capricious, a process that often lacks transparency and consistency. That needs to change. We urge the Plan Commission to support UDO Amendment 4B and make duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes a permitted use in the R1, R2 and R3 zoning districts.
9/5/2019 16:46:33	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Amendment 4A would gut the intent of the new UDO. If you pass 4A, you are essentially prioritizing the aesthetic preferences of a small minority or older single-family homeowners over the community's need to grow in more affordable, inclusive, and sustainable ways. Please support Amendment 4B instead, which makes it easier to increase Bloomington's housing supply throughout the entire community.
9/5/2019 16:57:21	I generally support Amendment 4B (allow duplex, triplex, fourplex)	Amendment 4A: We need to allow small-scale multifamily options in our residential neighborhoods. Amendment 4B is antediluvian and inconsistent with the city's Comprehensive Plan. It is time to change restrictive zoning to allow people from all backgrounds and income levels to live in our neighborhoods. As the City of Bloomington's Comprehensive Plan notes: we need to support more housing options in locations with close proximity to schools, employment centers, transit, recreational opportunities, and other community resources to increase access; we need to encourage a wide range of housing types to provide a more diverse mix of housing opportunities and household income levels, preferably within neighborhoods and multifamily housing developments; and help meet housing needs of all economic and demographic groups by increasing Bloomington's housing supply.

UDO Adoption Draft Amendment 4A and 4B (Responses)

Timestamp	I have read Amendment 4A and 4B: Remove duplex, triplex, and fourplex from R1, R2, and R3 zones or allow duplex, triplex, and fourplex in R1, R2, and R3 zones	General comments on Amendment 4A or 4B:
9/10/2019 13:09:57	I generally support Amendment 4A (ren	It is a mistake for the city to allow the established core neighborhoods to be developed with duplex, triplex, and fourplex dwellings. These should not be allowed in R1, R2, and R3 zones.
9/10/2019 13:23:12	I generally support Amendment 4A (ren	Allowing duplex, triplex, and fourplex dwellings in R1, R2, and R3 zones will diminish the quality of life in these zones by increasing traffic and noise, and by eliminating many trees and other plants.