

Written Objections filed with City Clerk/County Auditor per Indiana Code 36-7-4-606 as of October 30, 2019 at 12:00 noon

- Comments not related to density
- 1. Kris Floyd - As an Architect/Designer of single family residential projects in Bloomington I am concerned about the prohibition of flat/low sloped roofs with EPDM/TPO roofing on single family new construction in the proposed UDO, Page 5-16. It is my understanding from Eric Greulich that the Planning Department supports changing the proposed UDO to allow for flat/low sloped roofs with EPDM/TPO roofing. I encourage the Council to make this change by amendment before the measure is passed.
- 2. Ann Edmonds - In Chapter 2, in Tables 2-2 through 2-6, the dimensional standards call for an attached front-loading garage or carport to be set back 10 feet behind the primary structure's front building wall. In chapter 4, Table 4-2: Residential District Dimensional Standards has the same requirement. In effect this requires an extra 10 feet of driveway or more. Looking at my neighborhood, there are some houses where the garage is in front of the structure's front building wall; others where it is flush with the front building wall or with a front porch; and some where it is set back some amount, but not necessarily a full 10 feet from the front building wall. I can see no reason for having such a requirement other than to impose a uniform look on a neighborhood, cookie cutter houses. The result would be an extra 10 feet of impervious driveway surface which would cause an additional amount of stormwater runoff. Many of our existing neighborhoods have stormwater drainage issues. It would be nice if we learned from that experience and limited the amount of runoff rather than increasing it unnecessarily. This 10 foot setback requirement seems totally unnecessary and detrimental to drainage objectives and I don't see any justification for it.
- Comments related to density
- 3. Wendy and Ed Bernstein - We wish to preserve our core neighborhood's single family homes. Many of us have expressed our shared appreciation of our neighborhoods' green spaces with oxygen producing trees and varied density housing collecting lots of solar energy. We would very much prefer ADUs and duplexes be conditional use with the planning shared by contiguous neighbors. And we emphatically support not destroying affordable housing and replacing it with unnecessary off campus dorm style housing for IU students whose numbers are trending downward. Thank you.

4. David Warren - Thank you for your service to Bloomington and your work on this issue. I have a few objections to the proposed UDO, listed below:

-Duplexes and triplexes should be allowed by right in areas zoned single-family residential rather than conditional. If single-family homes are allowed by right, we should absolutely allow more affordable and environmental sustainable housing structures like duplexes and triplexes to be allowed by right. To force owners to go through the conditional approval processes if they want to add missing-middle housing when we do not force owners to go through that same process for single-family homes works against the community's desire to develop more affordably, sustainably, and inclusively.

-ADUs should be allowed by right. Similar to the comment above, we should be making it LESS difficult to add housing throughout the community. One reason people give for why they would like an ADU is that they want to be able to care for an older family member or a family member with disabilities. If ADUs are conditional, they may feel compelled to share sensitive information about the health of themselves or their loved ones. We also know from experience that making ADUs conditional has not resulted in much uptake of ADUs (here in Bloomington and elsewhere). We all more or less agree that Bloomington has a major affordability challenge that is exacerbated by a tight housing supply. Responding to that challenge requires making the development of missing-middle housing easier, not requiring owners to go through a time-consuming process for something that will be built in their own backyard.

-If possible, it would be nice to reduce or eliminate parking minimums. Yes, people complain about parking, but that will always be true if we don't continually induce non-car modes of transportation. We should not be discouraging the development of needed housing because of parking minimums that require developers to allocate scarce land for automobiles. We'd be better off allowing housing to be built and then allowing would-be owners or renters to decide for themselves whether they really need a car.

The new UDO is a chance to stimulate much needed housing development in Bloomington. But it will be a wasted opportunity if we place aesthetic concerns ahead of the more important goals of building a more affordable, inclusive, and sustainable community. Many Bloomington leaders have talked about an affordable housing crisis and the need to address climate change and the levels of inequality in the city (particularly in our schools). This UDO is a chance to actually address these problems in a comprehensive, structural way.

5. Patricia Foster - Dear City Council Members,
RE: UDO

It is perfectly obvious that 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 that 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 is 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 Councilman Sturbaum said at a Planning Commission meeting, these neighborhoods work, they are diverse, people walk to where they are going. Please leave them as they are. The 2018 Comprehensive Policy Plan demands this on page 60: "Existing core neighborhoods should not be the focus of the city's increasing density"

6. Jackie Witmer-Mouton - This legislation profits developers and predatory landlords and is destructive to core neighborhoods for no good reason whatsoever.
7. Gail Weaver - I will keep this short, focusing on an old axiom, "If it isn't broke, don't fix it."

Our current single-family zoning has kept core neighborhoods intact for many years. Many, if not most, of the owners and residents of these houses have lived in them for a long time. Due to their ownership of the property and concern to maintain its market value, they have kept up the properties with needed repairs and improvements, including replacing aging trees as they decline.

If the City Council passes the proposal for plexes in this area, either contingent on Council review of building plans or by right, things will change radically in the core neighborhoods. It is unlikely that the plex units will be affordable due to high value of the land alone in this neighborhood as well as ever-increasing construction costs. And, of course, the investors/builders will want to maximize their profits from these rentals. The ideal that they will rent only to families would be very hard (or impossible) to enforce on any on-going basis. In the process of making this change, landscaping and trees will necessarily be removed, having an adverse environmental impact on the city. Another ideal that the renters would utilize alternative transportation such as walking, biking, and taking public transportation would be monitored by no one. Parking problems in the area will increase exponentially as density increases, causing friction between the owners of single-family housing and the renters living in the plexes. Noise levels in the neighborhood are also likely to increase.

For all of the stated reasons, I go back to my original statement, "If it isn't broke, don't fix it." Please, please, City Council members do not change the single-family zoning of the core neighborhoods. There are many other areas where plex housing could be developed and welcomed in Bloomington such as the old K-Mart location on the east side of town or in the old Bloomington Hospital property near downtown. Let's keep the core neighborhoods the way they are!

8. Sara Frommer - I cannot attend the council meeting Tuesday, and so am writing to object to the proposed UDO. I have lived in Bloomington since 1964. My husband and I first rented a duplex (built as a duplex) on First Street. There was no lease (we learned only later that it was for sale, and we could have been evicted with no notice), and so we were free to look for a house in that walkable neighborhood, especially good for me as a nondriver.

I remember vividly that when we looked at our house on Fess, south of First, the realtor told us that it ought to be "safe" for a few years. Safe from turning into a student rental neighborhood, he explained, with raucous parties. We took a chance and moved in January 1965 to the house I still occupy. Our side of the block already shared an alley with a modest apartment building on Henderson, and another one on Stull shared the alley between Fess and Stull. There was a rental trailer on our block of Fess, which has since been replaced by a small house. The houses on First Street between Henderson and Fess were then still owner occupied.

Since then, the First St. houses between Henderson and Fess have become mostly rentals, but not the overcrowded kind. Several houses on our block of South Fess have been enlarged by their owners. Two families added second stories when they had more children. Two families added accommodations for disabled older members. One family turned a garage into a small apartment for a single person and sold half of a double lot to another family, which built an accessible house to grow old in. All these changes increased the density of our neighborhood without crowding us or making it less livable.

All these desirable changes were possible with the current single family zoning. All of them made it easier and more affordable for people of different ages and families of different sizes to live with easy access to bus routes and downtown, as well as IU and a great park.

When our first next door neighbor died, a man who remembered as an adult the opening of the Oklahoma Territory, his spacious corner lot with its small house wasn't grabbed by some enterprising realtor to turn into something that would have dwarfed ours. Instead, it sold to the single mother of a small girl, who grew up a block from Bryan Park. That house has changed families several times, as have others on the block. I'm the only person left from 1965. But it's still a neighborhood.

Students, retirees, and young families mix well in our neighborhood. We make an effort to know each other, even as people of all ages walk and bike and drive and scoot by on their way to campus or the park or the library.

The present zoning gives the city and the neighbors a voice when someone proposes a change. It doesn't keep good changes from happening! I urge you to reject the proposed UDO.

9. Homer Hogle - When did increased density become so desirable? For decades I have provided very low-cost rental housing to Bloomington tenants. I really understand and appreciate the need for affordable housing. But I cannot see how increased density in our core, single-family neighborhoods is going to provide more affordable housing. Increased density simply provides increased income for landlords like myself, rather than help low income tenants.
10. Wendy Calman - I moved into my home in 1983 and remember similar issues to the ones now being proposed by the UDO. The local government then had an ear for their constituents and an appreciation for the historical values and safety of these neighborhoods, which had at that time been slowly deteriorating. Over 30 years later, houses in our core neighborhoods, such as Elm Heights, the north side of campus, and the near west side have been rehabilitated, and owner-occupied homes are proudly cared for and maintained. Most people who buy houses in designated historic neighborhoods do so to enjoy and enhance the beauty of their surroundings. They often invest in home improvements and community well-being. They are often single families with a desire to live comfortably in reasonable peace and quiet. Multiplexes run contrary to the very reason people move there in the first place. This type of housing will not be affordable, as is proven already by the student rentals in and/or bordering core neighborhoods. They are often illegally over-occupied, rents are high, and definitely not "affordable" for most low-income tenants. On the heels of approving "granny flats" in these neighborhoods to provide affordable options, I am absolutely opposed to the addition of multiplexes in single-family neighborhoods.

11. Charles Trzcinka - Kill it. Take it out and shoot it. It undermines single family homes which are the basis of our community. It is especially risky to allow multi-household structures in a University town. People will stop investing in their homes and the developers will take over.
12. Wendy Bricht - I object strongly to the proposed UDO, especially regarding allowing multiplexes in single-family housing neighborhoods. When our Elm Heights neighborhood was rapidly turning into multi-unit student housing decades ago, we fought hard to reinstate the 3-adult limit to homes not already rented to more than 3 unrelated adults. This saved some of our neighborhoods at least. There are many rentals here, and investors are always on the lookout for more, but the limit keeps owner-occupied homes here too. If the proposed UDO goes forward as written and the protections are removed and multiplexes allowed, my Elm Heights neighborhood, which is already very dense, diverse, friendly, thriving and improving, will erode once more and very quickly into extended IU student rental housing, as will all other remaining neighborhoods in the vicinity of IU. The balance is already precarious, but holding. To think this won't happen is not remotely realistic, as the financial motivation is extreme. Without the protections that saved us before, living within walking distance of IU will rapidly become unbearable for most of us. The character and quality of life that has defined living here in these vibrant neighborhoods in central Bloomington will vanish, and the many families, professionals and retirees who poured resources and time into improving these beautiful old houses and being part of our community will be forced to migrate further out to the suburbs and commute into Bloomington, and there will be even more traffic and less diversity. Why must this UDO now endanger something that is working so well, and that we have fought so hard to improve and protect? Many other University towns and cities have implemented the same protections we now have and more in order to save older neighborhoods close in and maintain their integrity. Without them, we don't stand a chance. Investors are already contacting all of us now with offers to buy up our homes and turn them into rentals. Please do not allow this UDO to go forward.
13. Rachel Fleishman - I object to the change made to the original Plan Commission document making duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexed conditional upon a landowner passing the proposal through the Plan Commission. The plexes and the alternative dwelling units (ADUs) should be by-right as the Plan Commission originally proposed. Making them conditional reduces the effectiveness of the UDO and makes the case-by-case decisions subject to political will. It also reduces the property rights of owners by making the right to develop conditional even if they have met the basic requirements of the zone.
14. Jenny Southern - The downtown neighborhoods are healthy and thriving but that has not always been the case. In the 70s and 80s most older neighborhoods were in desperate need of renovation. Our downtown was suffering, shopping had moved to the Mall area and families had moved to the suburbs. It was an echo of what was going on all over America. Old houses and buildings were going down all over downtown, some through neglect and others to build more parking.

Several things happened to reverse this trend. When the Courthouse was slated to be torn down, residents protested and a battle flag was raised to try to save historic buildings and to keep some of Bloomington's history and color. Resident Bill Cook bought and renovated the southside of the square, the derelict Graham Plaza hotel and part of the westside of the square. Money was poured into the downtown from many other directions, parking meters removed, a new library built, roads, sidewalks and aging systems repaired and rebuilt.

This was also seen as a good time to raise the number of residents in the downtown area, subdivide houses, and raise occupancy rates to make it more affordable. Occupancy rates were raised from 3 to 5 unrelated adults and the race was on to invest in rental housing for students near campus.

There had always been rental housing but previous to this it was mixed families, students, single adults, and lower income housing like rooming houses.

Due to the increased occupancy rates entire neighborhoods proximate to campus began to change. The northwest side of Elm Heights went from mixed rentals and home owners to a monoculture of student rentals. The north side of campus suffered even more. Prices for homes and rentals steadily rose and rents did not decline.

Protests and action by neighborhoods, the Mayor, and City Planning eventually rezoned the neighborhoods to approximately the way they are now. It was a hard-fought ugly battle, finally it was decided to draw a line between the blocks that were mostly then rentals and the houses still occupied by their owners. Slowly one side of the line became almost entirely student rentals (5 unrelated adults and up) and the other home owners (3 unrelated adults). They are now our single family and multi-family zones.

Since then it has been fairly stable for the past 30 years. There has been steady pressure to expand student rentals into these areas but love and pure stubbornness has left them for another generation to enjoy.

Now there is a new/old idea. Again, in search of affordability and density occupancy rates are being increased by allowing duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in neighborhoods.

Is the City expecting a different outcome this time? How is it possible that investors won't buy the most affordable houses in desirable areas and remove them to build duplex, triplex and fourplex rentals? When thousands of new apartments in buildings downtown haven't brought down the rental rates in our town how will this change make it happen? The new plexes do not have to be owner occupied, or have architectural review, why would they be anything other than cheaply built and highly priced? Since our neighborhoods are healthy and thriving, why encourage rental investors to buy our scarcest resource downtown, affordable single-family housing?

15. Cordah Pearce - Dear City Council,

I have already lived in (and left) an otherwise very desirable neighborhood that went from single-family housing to rentals with “5” (really more than that) unrelated adults per house. A beautiful, peaceful neighborhood quickly became congested, and cars ruined once well-maintained lawns by parking on grass, often four or more cars, to a single house.

Currently I live in a neighborhood that seems to be increasing its density naturally and sustainably. The neighborhood includes students in rental houses, long-time homeowners who are retired, and younger families - both renters and homeowners - with babies and toddlers, families with older school-age children, couples, families whose elders have joined them until their passing, and single individuals. It is an ethnically, racially, occupationally, and age-inclusive mix of all kinds of people that makes for a vibrant, well-cared for neighborhood. People can still find smaller properties to buy that “don’t break the budget” if they wish or, for those who can afford it, properties that allow some luxury either through size and/or types of materials. The neighborhood is walkable and is served by buses when we don’t need to drive.

Our neighborhood enjoys stability, with gradually increasing property values. We want Bloomington’s core neighborhoods’ owner-occupied properties to be protected. We want to deter the kind of multi-unit development that would destroy opportunities for owner-occupancy of the less expensive properties and would discourage long-term residence in larger owner-occupied properties. The cycle of neighborhood deterioration, as described above, has happened before and is predictable when deep-pocketed developers overtake a neighborhood to buy up properties for multi-occupant rentals.

To keep Bloomington core neighborhoods vibrant and developing at a sustainable pace, I urge you to retain present zoning that gives a voice to neighbors when change is proposed. Vote to reject the proposed UDO.

16. Annamarie Mecca - I am writing in opposition to the UDO allowing multifamily units and ADU's in core neighborhoods. This is a new/old idea. The core neighborhoods were taken over by student housing in the 70's and 80's when the city allowed the break up of houses and many unrelated people living together. It did nothing for affordability. In fact just the opposite happened. Again, this is being done in the name of affordability. The UDO calls for and density occupancy rates are being increased by allowing duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in neighborhoods. We already know what will happened to these old neighborhoods which are currently thriving. They will be taken over by landlords and rentals. Apartment buildings are going up at a rapid rate as it is. As this continues, as long as it is tied to affordable housing, this is a reasonable solution and then let the old neighborhoods exist as they are.

17. Jean Simonian - Last week I talked about the financialization of our housing supply, and I'd like to drill down on that a bit more. The NYT reported that 1 in 5 SF homes in the US is held by private equity. This acquisition began after the housing crash of 2008 left so many homes in foreclosure: a crisis created by the alliance between private equity, the banking industry, and political imperatives. Private equity ownership of SF homes, by definition, separates home values from the local economy. How it does this is homes are securitized - which simply means to convert a home into a marketable security, like a share of stock, for the purpose of raising cash by selling it to other investors.

A securitized home is fundamentally removed from its function as housing, and its value is separated from the micro-economy of where the house is located. The danger is that the asset now can be manipulated for the betterment of the portfolio. The equity investor can trade the asset in high frequency trades occurring thousands of times a day. Every time a trade is triggered, the investor makes a profit. Multiple quick small profits are lucrative. This is why Elizabeth Warren has proposed a 2 cent tax per trade.

If you are renting a securitized home or apartment, it will also mean that the rent you pay will inevitably be the highest market rate and you will be subjected to the highest eviction rates. Both because the investor wants a high rate of return, but also because the investor isn't under the same pressure to keep the apt occupied; thanks to the 20% pass through tax credit that Hollingsworth secured in his amendment to the Tax Bill, the building can be held vacant or traded for profit based on appreciation alone. This securitization of housing process insulates housing from local supply and demand cycles; for the equity investor, it's a win from every direction.

Data has shown that in NYC and Seattle, despite adding tens of thousands of market rate units, low income units continued to vanish, with no affordability benefit*. Is this really what we want for Bloomington? Thank you.

*<https://www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-zoning-density.html>

18. Jean Simonian - I'd like to speak to the relationship between private equity control of property and economic and political dis-empowerment.

Our city is approaching 70% rental - some of which has already been securitized--which makes it more vulnerable to equity control. Our neighborhoods are the provider of less expensive rental and more first time buyer opportunity, and as such, are a driver of economic growth and stability in the City. Density is important in spaces where it will not destroy a current economic asset. High development corridors, greenfield, and brownfield will add both needed housing and economic benefit through up-zoning. Conditional ADUs can add both density and value to the neighborhoods within current zoning.

As you all well know, there is a difference between advocacy and governance: being a firebrand comes with advocacy and it's appropriate; but governance carries a greater responsibility to balance diverse interests and to do no harm. The fact is that the YIMBY movement is new and has arisen from the ashes of the housing crash of 2008, and is fueled largely by the wealth of private corporate equity and abetted by special interests in our government. It has manipulated the idealism - and the understandable frustrations - of a generation.

But the most important aspect of this issue is the fact that the ownership and usage of land is inextricably bound to economic and political empowerment. As a nation, we've seen this power used to disenfranchise people throughout our history from the establishment of land ownership requirements to vote, to the Ideal City movement in urban renewal, to the more recent desecration of native land for the sake of oil pipelines. Private equity control of Bloomington land will result in the economic and political dis-empowerment of city governance and its citizens. Once the door is opened, it cannot simply be closed.

The question before you isn't really whether or not tearing down a 100 yr old home creates a greater or lesser carbon footprint than the building of a new plex; No: the question you must consider is "Do you want to dis-empower this city and its citizens?"

15 million homes in the hands of private equity. Do. No. Harm.

Thank you.

19. Richard Durisen - While I recognize the need for affordable housing in Bloomington, it should not be at the expense of neighborhoods with single family, owner occupied housing. The proposed relaxation of zoning to allow multiplex housing in core neighborhoods is a recipe for loss of family housing to more student housing, which is definitely not what is needed. High density housing that is truly affordable (unlike most of what is built with students in mind) should be provided elsewhere, including affordable single family dwellings. Habitat for Humanity proves this is possible.
20. Cappi Phillips - We are against the idea of 'Plexes whether by conditional use, or by right. This is the 4th year now that my family and my neighbors have been subjected to an IU fraternity illegally occupying two adjacent houses in our neighborhood.

Fraternal organizations should not be permitted in any zone that allows residences, including multi-family, commercial, and mixed use. Institutional zoning is the only place where they belong.

Until you live next door to one of these fraternities, I don't think you can fully understand the detrimental impact a group of unsupervised young men and their friends can have on the neighborhood. In addition to the loud music, parties and alcohol violations, there's trash that leads to a problem with rats, parking problems, increased vandalism, constant traffic and loud car speakers all times of the night.

The amount of city resources used: including police calls, Housing and Neighborhood Development violations, city legal services, and parking enforcement that have been allocated to this problem is outrageous. These groups want to live and party together, unsupervised off campus. In four years the city has been unable to stop the landlord next to me from renting to these type of groups. My fear is that these proposed plexes are another opportunity for landlords marketing to fraternal organizations to move into core neighborhoods. Allowing these type of dwellings in the neighborhoods will give them just another opportunity to do so.

21. Kevin Atkins - The UDO changes proposed are too radical and untested in our environment.

Let's get the results from RDG Planning and Design's work as well, before we finalize the related parts of the UDO. This study should have been done *first*, before Clarion was engaged.

I challenge the next round of consultants/studies to find a truly comparable city (demographically, economically, socially, and geographically), and let us learn from their mistakes.

I believe that allowing du/tri/quadplexes in core neighborhoods close to the university will initiate a feeding frenzy of developers/real estate investors/landlords which will not lower rents at all, but might eventually lower home purchasing costs by damaging the quality of life in the core neighborhoods and depressing property values.

And as important as more sustainable living is, what incremental change in housing density we might create in the 15 square miles of the inhabited part of town is nothing compared to the 3 million square miles of the lower forty-eight, or the 25 million square miles of habitable lands on Earth... the only measurable impacts will be local, and mostly negative.

22. David Fisher - This plan seems insensitive to all local interests. It doesn't allow for variation between neighborhoods and seems designed for some other community with entirely different demographics. Bloomington has a 10% vacancy rate and the housing inequity issues that do exist are largely driven by students driving out locals in the rental markets close to the center of town. The solution proposed seems likely to make the situation more equitable: student rentals will no longer only drive out lower income locals, but middle to high income locals as well. What a fantastic plan!

23. Richard Pierce - I live in Elm Heights, so this is completely NIMBY, but I believe that I have legitimate concerns about core neighborhoods near downtown and campus, as well as mine.

I think that if the UDO is passed as is, developers will be able to buy properties in core neighborhoods, tear down houses, and replace them with 'plexes. It's what happened in my hometown of Hinsdale, IL: The least expensive, most run down houses become "tear downs". Homeowners stop investing in maintaining their house because they know that when they sell, a developer who wants to tear it down will win the competition with families that want to live there.

I doubt if the 'plexes will be built with adding to Bloomington's affordable housing in mind. Another reason I hear for allowing 'plexes isn't necessary in the core neighborhoods - they are already dense and walkable and bike-able.

If it's true that there are parts of Bloomington where building 'plexes would be a good idea, the UDO should be changed to specify where those areas are.

I understand that the city's Comprehensive Plan prohibits 'plexes in core neighborhoods and is still in effect. Does the UDO override it? Why?

24. Paula Girshick - I agree with those who have argued that the UDO plan conflicts with the already established Growth Policies Plan (GPP) which states that "plexes" are not allowed to be built within core neighborhoods but only on their edges. The GPP has worked well and there is no need to override it.

25. Sarah Farmer Manka: Dear City of Bloomington,

My Father, Dr. Richard Farmer, taught at IU for many years. My 3 siblings and I were raised in Bloomington on E. Wylie St. near Woodlawn Ave (near Bryan Park).

I believe this ordinance will hurt the property values and integrity of my former neighborhood. One of the greatest assets of Bloomington is it's charm and integral, owner occupied neighborhoods. This ordinance will make the occupant density very high, much higher than is reasonable. And homeowners will not appreciate the invasion of multiple rental units, perhaps built next door to their single dwelling domiciles.

I strongly urge the City of Bloomington to not pass this UDO Ordinance. Thank you,
Sarah Farmer Manka

**Written Comments submitted directly to the Council Office
as of October 30, 2019 at 12:00 noon**

1. Wendy and Ed Bernstein - Thank you for your hard work to represent us citizens of our cherished, but now perishable city. Right now, I feel our quality of life is endangered by eliminating single family neighborhoods' protections so hard won over many years of zoning improvements. In addition to the over occupation of neighborhood houses by students, we are suddenly threatened by predatory developers whom the new UDO encourages to tear down our homes and build money making quadplexes.

We wish to preserve our core neighborhoods' single family homes. Many of us have expressed our shared appreciation of our neighborhoods' green spaces with oxygen producing trees and varied density housing collecting lots of solar energy. We would very much prefer ADU's and duplexes be conditional use with the planning shared by contiguous neighbors. And we emphatically support not destroying affordable housing and replacing it with unnecessary off campus dorm style housing for IU students whose numbers are trending downward.

2. Abe Morris – (For Councilmember Sturbaum) - I am a property owner and resident in your district, living on the Near West Side near Fairview Elementary. I am writing to express my concern over the current proposed UDO. I do not support the development of my neighborhood into multi-unit dwellings and support the preservation of our neighborhood. The Near West Side, Maple Heights, and Prospect Hill neighborhoods hold a unique quality that is distinctly Bloomington, and one that needs to be preserved. I think the proposed goals of the UDO are foolhardy and will not be the actual outcomes of the changes that are proposed. There are plenty of places for development to take place in Bloomington and I see no shortage of new development in our city. There is no reason to cannibalize our west side neighborhoods to create more development and density within our city.

I hope you agree with this viewpoint and will use your vote to vote against the UDO and for the preservation of Bloomington's beautiful west side neighborhoods.

3. Sita Cohen - All members of the council, I'm very concerned about the potential for upzoning in Bloomington. I've lived in the near west side for 30 years and it is still one of the only affordable single family neighborhoods in the city. It has a rich history and a charm that would be ruined if upzoning is allowed. To think that it would bring about more affordable housing just isn't true. I hope you will take the time to read the article below. This is a complicated issue and not one we should be rushing into without fully understanding all the ramifications.

<https://outsidecityhall.wordpress.com/2019/06/10/two-new-studies-challenge-notion-that-upzoning-leads-to-moreaffordable-housing/>

4. Jeri Lynn Greenfield - I strongly oppose the new proposed zoning code which includes duplexes and triplexes throughout Bloomington's single family zones. Core neighborhoods should be protected! The new proposed zoning code threatens the stability of core neighborhoods.
5. Noretta Koertge - I live in Elm Heights at 419 S. Highland. My nearest neighbors on all sides are now students. That's not ideal at times but we have longtime friends (non-student neighbors) just a block away on both S. Highland and E. Hunter. What IS an enormous problem is the apartment building two doors North of us. If other high density occupancy buildings were permitted, the noise, parking and clutter problems would be unbearable. Don't wreck neighborhoods like ours!
6. Suzann Mitten Owen - I am very much OPPOSED to changes in zoning that would allow construction of multiple unit houses in established core neighborhoods.
7. James Rosenbarger – (Herald Times Letter + Additional Thoughts)

Protect Core Neighborhoods

Bloomington's proposed land use zoning code (UDO) is now in final review with the City Council. It allows duplexes and triplexes throughout Bloomington with a goal of creating denser, more inclusive, and walk-able neighborhoods. Unfortunately, the zoning's scattershot approach unjustifiably threatens the stability of core neighborhoods that already embody those goals. Core neighborhoods (Elm Heights, Near West Side, etc.) now have owner-occupied homes mixed with many multistudent rentals, and are dense, walk-able, and inclusive. Our 2018 Comprehensive Policy Plan calls for protecting the core neighborhoods' owner-occupied dwellings, and discouraging the conversion of existing housing to more intense land uses.

In contradiction to our Policy Plan, zoning for more multi-unit rentals unnecessarily risks the core neighborhoods' current balance of owners and rentals. That balance was achieved with a maximum property occupancy of three unrelated adults. The proposed multi-plexes would allow six to nine occupants. That multiplication would drive up property values, and coupled with the prospect of living in a student dominated environment would erode owner occupied housing. We'd see a return to the days before the three-occupant maximum when blocks of East 2nd St. and East Hunter became student enclaves. These student-rental dominated blocks still exist and serve as history's warning.

Additional Thoughts: Risking the core neighborhoods' current owner-renter balance isn't necessary. The Comp. plan calls for urbanizing the College Mall area and portions of S. Walnut. Hundreds, if not thousands of rentals could be added in these locations. Students and other renters would help create that urbanization by creating demand for restaurants, bars, groceries, retail, etc. The city should build parking structures to develop the critical mass density for these urban centers. Most single-family housing outside the core neighborhoods was built to be homogenous, lack density, and be car dependent. Covenants and deed restrictions continue to enforce those problematic characteristics. Suburban residents can be expected to 'lawyer up' to combat the 'plexes'. We need a surgical approach to densification, not a one size fits all.

8. Antonia Matthew - is being laid over these neighborhoods because it's the trend or it worked for other cities But Bloomington is not "another city" it is a city being swamped by university students wanting rentals and landlords who take advantage of this and charge rents that three students can pay and first time home owners cannot. Any additional housing in core neighborhoods is going to suffer that fate.

Here are some quotes from articles in the HT:

1. 10/3/21019 from the discussion about housing on 10/3 "Tom Morrison , vice president for capital planning and facilities at Indiana University said,"the university only houses 20-25% of its student body. The rest of the students live in the community...affordable housing has been an important topic for long time...construction of a new 700 bed undergraduate residence hall will begin soon...other housing will probably come down and be replaced in the near future but high rises are not planned." Given that the student body doubles the size of Bloomington's population we have an adversarial situation. Housing that people who live in Bloomington want to have available, and the huge need for student housing -- 700 beds is a drop in the bucket.

2. 10/6/2019 HeraldTimes reported "the majority of people in south- central Indiana do not believe the current housing supply adequately meets the needs of people in the area" (Regional Opportunity Initiatives housing study published the previous week) The reporter went on to say that in a recent survey, 2/3rds of area residents said a small or medium single home was their desired housing type. With the exception of Monroe County, which has a high number of student rentals because of Indiana University, between 75% and 84% of all housing in the other regional counties are owner occupied." regionalopportunityinc.org Putting plexes in core neighborhoods is not what non-students want.. The plexes will serve the student.

3. 10/18/2019 In the HT Dave Warren wrote a letter supporting the new UDO, and ended it with, "allowing modest multifamily and accessory structures through out the community (my emphasis) is a necessary step..." But these structures are not going to be built throughout the community because many, if not all houses built outside the core neighborhoods have covenants that do not allow accessory dwellings, so the community as a whole is not sharing this increased housing density. I support the building of the apartments on the site of Motel 6 and wonder why a similar project on the corner of 446 and Est Third was turned down? I read in the HT that the residents in that area said that it would bring increased noises and traffic to the area, but all these outlying complexes have their own buses for transporting residents and that a BT route would go through there (which is considered a plus for the N. Walnut development.) The development area is not closely surrounded by houses. When you increase density in core neighborhoods you are packing people in like sardines. The block of S. Grant between E. Grimes and S. Hillside is narrow, only allowing parking on one side of the street and with no sidewalks, in addition some of houses are built closer together than the code now allows, and there are times when residents of the street have to hunt for parking elsewhere because of a lack of off street parking. The Eastside development would not have experienced these problems.

4. 10/19/2019 Herald Times

This article concerns the gift to IU from a former student, of \$60M. The article says, in part "Luddy's gift will fund the construction of a new building, the creation of six endowed chairs, six endowed professorships and six endowed faculty fellowships. It will also provide graduate and undergraduate scholarships."

In other words IU is continuing to grow while its housing plans are insufficient and students will continue to need housing in Bloomington,

I do not believe that increasing the density of the core neighborhoods is going to solve the problem of students wanting to live near campus and landlords profiting from this. Housing for those who live and work in Bloomington has to be build where students do not want to live.

This is probably completely impossible but could the university be asked to consider donating money to developers who include affordable housing in their complexes -- that, I imagine would disqualify students -- after all the City has taken on their job of housing students.

This is a long email I know but the decisions made about the UDO could very well be the making of the difference between Bloomington as a college town, or Bloomington a town attached to a university

9. Kevin Atkins - Hi all: Another vote against the 'plex ideas in the UDO. I don't believe they will achieve the desired results of creating affordable housing. I don't believe Clarion's comparisons were to places with our demographics and economics, in particular a city of our size with 50,000 transient residents most of whom bring capital from outside sources, and spend it in a concentrated way, here. That guaranteed steady money makes rental investors drool and dance, and they will always be able to outspend any normal, local, living-wage residents in pursuit of more profit.

We're playing checkers, while real-estate investors and landlords/rental companies play 3-dimensional chess. Their expertise, motivations, and resources in gaming systemic changes is nearly guaranteed to outmaneuver the proposed rule changes in ways that benefit them, not our city or future residents. We're already number 19 in the list of most desirable college towns for real-estate rental investment:

<https://www.homes.com/blog/2018/06/the-us-landlord-index-college-towns-cities/>

It may in fact be impossible to create affordable housing in this true college town, our small oasis of modestly liberal culture in the Midwest. (Although it will take a sea-change in our economy, I believe the only way toward affordable housing (in any city) is a large increase in wages for working people. We're tackling the problem from the wrong end.)

Finally, but least important, I believe the sustainability goal is also misguided and should be emotionally decoupled from the UDO goals. Zoom out on a satellite view and it's pretty clear that what we do inside our 24 square miles isn't going to change the larger world in any measurable way. For perspective: Can you spot our town here?. It would be easy and quick to break what we have... and it won't really matter to anyone else except us, if we make near-downtown core neighborhoods more unpleasant. Landlords will buy, students will still rent, rent and housing costs won't go down, retirees will move farther out, but long term residents in core neighborhoods will see their own homes de-valued and their quality of life drop.

The UDO proposed is too radical and untested in our environment. I challenge the next round of consultants/studies to find a truly comparable city to compare, and let us learn from their mistakes. And let's get the results from RDG Planning and Design's work as well, before we finalize the related parts of the UDO. Thanks!

10. Marcia Baron - I want to strongly endorse the excellent letters pasted below, by people who have lived in Bloomington for many years and observed the housing changes. I am utterly appalled by the current proposal. Providing more affordable housing is of course important, but it has to be done wisely. Perhaps the city could provide grants for lower income people who want to buy a fixer upper and because of skills (maybe they are carpenters, for example) show real promise to be able to do so? If the UDO goes through, such houses are likely to be torn down by investors who would then put up a four-plex). I can picture now a house I often walk by that would be a prime candidate for such treatment, when instead it is a small, affordable single-family house. The success of the UDO will mean fewer single-family homes, more cars—rendering the neighborhood less walkable than it now is—and the “wrong” kind of student rentals. We currently have many student rentals but, as Sara Hoskinson Frommer writes, a kind that are not a problem. We have a diverse neighborhood: along with exclusively owner-occupied homes, we have homes with a student living in a basement apt. of an owner-occupied home, homes rented out entirely to students but within the restrictions of our zoning code (a code that was hard fought and hard won, as Jenny Southern explains below). We also have diversity in terms of ethnicity and nationality. As Sara explains, the code allows for an array of valuable additions to the neighborhood of the sort she describes, and happily, does not encourage investors. The new plan will do precisely that, with the result that we will have more housing that is not desirable for families, primarily just for temporary student housing, priced far too high for lower income folks. We do need to provide more of that in Bloomington and there are promising areas to consider, for example, along the B-line. I paste below parts of two excellent emails, from Sara Frommer and Jenny Southern. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the UDO proposal.

Sara: I remember vividly that when we looked at our house on Fess, south of First, the realtor told us that it ought to be "safe" for a few years. Safe from turning into a student rental neighborhood, he explained, with raucous parties. We took a chance and moved in January 1965 to the house I still occupy. Our side of the block already shared an alley with a modest apartment building on Henderson, and another one on Stull shared the alley between Fess and Stull. There was a rental trailer on our block of Fess, which has since been replaced by a small house. The houses on First Street between Henderson and Fess were then still owner occupied. Since then, the First St. houses between Henderson and Fess have become mostly rentals, but not the overcrowded kind. Several houses on our block of South Fess have been enlarged by their owners. Two families added second stories when they had more children. Two families added accommodations for disabled older members. One family turned a garage into a small apartment for a single person and sold half of a double lot to another family, which built an accessible house to grow old in. All these changes increased the density of our neighborhood without crowding us or making it less livable. All these desirable changes were possible with the current single family zoning. All of them made it easier and more affordable for people of different ages and families of different sizes to live with easy access to bus routes and downtown, as well as IU and a great park. When our first next door neighbor died, a man who remembered as an adult the opening of the Oklahoma Territory, his spacious corner lot with its small house wasn't grabbed by some enterprising realtor to turn into something that would have dwarfed ours. Instead, it sold to the single mother of a small girl, who

grew up a block from Bryan Park. That house has changed families several times, as have others on the block. I'm the only person left from 1965. But it's still a neighborhood. Students, retirees, and young families mix well in our neighborhood. We make an effort to know each other, even as people of all ages walk and bike and drive and scoot by on their way to campus or the park or the library. The present zoning gives the city and the neighbors a voice when someone proposes a change. It doesn't keep good changes from happening! I urge you to reject the proposed UDO.

Jenny: The downtown neighborhoods are healthy and thriving but that has not always been the case. In the 70s and 80s most older neighborhoods were in desperate need of renovation. Our downtown was suffering, shopping had moved to the Mall area and families had moved to the suburbs. It was an echo of what was going on all over America. Old houses and buildings were going down all over downtown, some through neglect and others to build more parking. Several things happened to reverse this trend. When the Courthouse was slated to be torn down, residents protested and a battle flag was raised to try to save historic buildings and to keep some of Bloomington's history and color. Resident Bill Cook bought and renovated the southside of the square, the derelict Graham Plaza hotel and part of the westside of the square. Money was poured into the downtown from many other directions, parking meters removed, a new library built, roads, sidewalks and aging systems repaired and rebuilt. This was also seen as a good time to raise the number of residents in the downtown area, subdivide houses, and raise occupancy rates to make it more affordable. Occupancy rates were raised from 3 to 5 unrelated adults and the race was on to invest in rental housing for students near campus. There had always been rental housing but previous to this it was mixed families, students, single adults, and lower income housing like rooming houses. Due to the increased occupancy rates entire neighborhoods proximate to campus began to change. The northwest side of Elm Heights went from mixed rentals and home owners to a monoculture of student rentals. The north side of campus suffered even more. Prices for homes and rentals steadily rose and rents did not decline. Protests and action by neighborhoods, the Mayor, and City Planning eventually rezoned the neighborhoods to approximately the way they are now. It was a hard-fought ugly battle, finally it was decided to draw a line between the blocks that were mostly then rentals and the houses still occupied by their owners. Slowly one side of the line became almost entirely student rentals (5 unrelated adults and up) and the other home owners (3 unrelated adults). They are now our single family and multi-family zones. Since then it has been fairly stable for the past 30 years. There has been steady pressure to expand student rentals into these areas but love and pure stubbornness has left them for another generation to enjoy. Now there is a new/old idea. Again, in search of affordability and density occupancy rates are being increased by allowing duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in neighborhoods. Is the City expecting a different outcome this time? How is it possible that investors won't buy the most affordable houses in desirable areas and remove them to build duplex, triplex and fourplex rentals? When thousands of new apartments in buildings downtown haven't brought down the rental rates in our town how will this change make it happen? The new plexes do not have to be owner occupied, or have architectural review, why would they be anything other than cheaply built and highly

priced? Since our neighborhoods are healthy and thriving, why encourage rental investors to buy our scarcest resource downtown, affordable single-family housing?

I hope to attend tonight, but with offices hours until 6 p.m. and then needing to prepare after that for tomorrow's classes, I am not sure that I'll have time, and so am sending you this note. Sincerely, Marcia Baron

11. Sandi Clothier - Hello Common Council members, I am forwarding an article on the financialization of housing that I listened to several months ago on Alternative Radio, and which, I believe, provides a perspective that we must understand in our discussion of housing issues in Bloomington. Housing prices are going up, people are being displaced, we have been given a "solution" that suggests simply allowing density via "plexes" will solve our housing problem. So, the question is, will it? Will it make a significant difference to our affordability, number of available units, or carbon footprint? What has caused this rapid inflation of housing prices, why are so many priced out? This article was written by a woman who studies housing as a Special Rapporteur On Housing for the UN. She discusses the underlying issue with housing and housing prices. I know it is easy to say we are looking at Bloomington, not the State, not the Country, but the fact is we are on a global adventure, and our status as a "hot market", a place where people want to live, makes us a target for the sort of speculation and privatization that is being discussed in this piece. To pretend we are not part of the larger world is to be an ostrich, and to simply put our faith in the great unknown. I prefer to know what the battles are that we face, even indirectly, when massive changes such as upzoning are proposed. I hope you will read this short article and look at how it fits into the picture of Bloomington. Sincerely, Sandi Clothier
12. Michael O'Connell - Dear City Council, As you consider the UDO and especially the details regarding potential duplexes triplexes etc. in "core" neighborhoods, please consider: The city reportedly has recently fined owners of a possibly historic home that was razed without proper approvals. This shows that the city realizes how wrong it is to destroy something that is valued and worthy of preservation. Yet the plan for plexes in the UDO currently under consideration clearly threatens to effectively raze the nature of well established and historic neighborhoods by employing a policy that is unproven, by any measure (particularly as it relates to specific neighborhoods), and which may cause more harm than good. Do the right thing and preserve the very core elements of the core neighborhoods that led current residents – students and other renters as well as owner-occupants -- to move into these neighborhoods. They warrant preservation. Don't upend the nature of zoning in these established neighborhoods. Sincerely, Michael O'Connell
Bloomington Resident Eastside Neighborhood

13. Jenny Southern - Jenny's history on the topic and opinion below..... The downtown neighborhoods are healthy and thriving but that has not always been the case. In the 70s and 80s most older neighborhoods were in desperate need of renovation. Our downtown was suffering, shopping had moved to the Mall area and families had moved to the suburbs. It was an echo of what was going on all over America. Old houses and buildings were going down all over downtown, some through neglect and others to build more parking. Several things happened to reverse this trend. When the Courthouse was slated to be torn down, residents protested and a battle flag was raised to try to save historic buildings and to keep some of Bloomington's history and color. Resident Bill Cook bought and renovated the southside of the square, the derelict Graham Plaza hotel and part of the westside of the square. Money was poured into the downtown from many other directions, parking meters removed, a new library built, roads, sidewalks and aging systems repaired and rebuilt. This was also seen as a good time to raise the number of residents in the downtown area, subdivide houses, and raise occupancy rates to make it more affordable. Occupancy rates were raised from 3 to 5 unrelated adults and the race was on to invest in rental housing for students near campus. There had always been rental housing but previous to this it was mixed families, students, single adults, and lower income housing like rooming houses. Due to the increased occupancy rates entire neighborhoods proximate to campus began to change. The northwest side of Elm Heights went from mixed rentals and home owners to a monoculture of student rentals. The north side of campus suffered even more. Prices for homes and rentals steadily rose and rents did not decline. Protests and action by neighborhoods, the Mayor, and City Planning eventually rezoned the neighborhoods to approximately the way they are now. It was a hard-fought ugly battle, finally it was decided to draw a line between the blocks that were mostly then rentals and the houses still occupied by their owners. Slowly one side of the line became almost entirely student rentals (5 unrelated adults and up) and the other home owners (3 unrelated adults). They are now our single family and multi-family zones. Since then it has been fairly stable for the past 30 years. There has been steady pressure to expand student rentals into these areas but love and pure stubbornness has left them for another generation to enjoy. Now there is a new/old idea. Again, in search of affordability and density occupancy rates are being increased by allowing duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in neighborhoods.
14. Judy Stubbs - Dear Council Members: The proposed zoning to allow multiplex housing it is taking wealth from families who own houses or who want to own houses and giving wealth to landlords. This especially impacts first time home buyers and low income buyers who will be priced out of the market thus denying them tangible assets that are now afforded to those with more income. We need more starter homes not more high end rental housing. If we don't support single families we will have a city of transients with no interest in the long term health and prosperity of our city and a population of older and more affluent home owners. While I understand the argument about environmental impacts of single family homes vs multiplexes I believe there are better ways to offset energy use (solar panels, on demand water heaters, insulation, better windows) than to turn all our neighborhoods into rental zones. Do we really want to disenfranchise young adults who bring innovation and vibrancy to our community? Rental housing makes money only for landlords. Judy Stubbs

15. Steve Brewer (For Councilmember Sturbaum) - My name is Steve Brewer. My wife and I own the house at the corner of 1200 S. Henderson. We first purchased the house shortly after our first child was born in 1987. We sold it in 1997 but bought it back in 2005, and our daughter currently lives in it. I thought it might interest you to know that shortly after the discussion of rezoning in the core neighborhoods arose last spring, my wife and I received two offers from a company in Beech Grove to purchase the house. Last week, on our recent trip to our oldest son's wedding in Chicago, our daughter off-handedly mentioned that she has been annoyed by phone calls from people offering to buy that house, obviously from buyers who do not realize that her name is not on the deed. I have included with this email a photo I took of one of the offers we to purchase the house. (I still have one hard copy of the offer in hand.) Should you need more examples, I can ask if my daughter has kept any of the messages on her phone. I don't know how serious these offers are. I have not followed up on any of them because we are not interested in selling. I do know, however, that in the 27 years we've owned that home over a 32-year span, we had never previously received unsolicited offers to buy the house. Perhaps the timing of these offers after re-zoning proposals arose is coincidental, but it stretches credulity to believe so. While I agree with the desire of many to address climate change and historic housing segregation, reducing the potential stock of modest single family homes near downtown is not the solution. Other, potentially more immediate mitigations on those two fronts are possible: perhaps, for example, targeting development in already neglected or vacant areas, which abound in the city. Regardless, I hope you oppose the new liberalized zoning changes, which I believe will unwisely open the door for more speculative development in the core neighborhoods at the cost of reducing housing stock for single-home buyers. Thank you for your service to the city. Sincerely, Steve Brewer
PS. I hope you have received the copy of the photos I took of the offer back in April.
16. Johannes Türk - Dear Council Members, I am writing to you because I am greatly concerned about the new zoning regulations the city plans to introduce. I am not worried about the introduction of social or other diversity in my neighborhood and welcome it, but I do not think that the new guidelines will lead to increased diversity in central neighborhoods, rather, if I understand what is being proposed well, it will lead to more students living in residential neighborhoods. The price structures are such that only students from moderately wealthy families will be able to afford housing in many of the central neighborhoods. To claim that diversifying neighborhoods is the goal of such a measure is in my view misguided in the case of Bloomington. I have a friend who works as an architect in Durham, NC, and have discussed the successful diversification that has happened there with him. But the situations are absolutely not comparable. And to think that tearing down historic houses and replace them by duplexes just after the old center has been revived over the past 20 years and the city of Bloomington has become attractive as an urban space again is devastating. I have two young children and am not happy about the situation. It also seems to me that the city is falling for a decision that in the end will be destructive and benefit mostly construction businesses. What a shame that this happens! Thank you, Johannes Türk.

17. Suzanne Eckes - Dear Members of the City Council, I am writing to express some concerns about the plan to rezone. I've listed a few items below. 1. There are three neighborhoods near campus that have character and help make Bloomington the unique place that it is (e.g., Elm Heights, Prospect Hill, and Bryan Park). I worry that this plan will destroy the character of these core neighborhoods. Because they are closer to campus, it is no secret that developers will target these core neighborhoods. This will make Bloomington a less attractive place to live. 2. I tried to find data of a housing shortage in Bloomington and wasn't able to locate this information. Do we really have a shortage of housing, or do we have a shortage of affordable housing? It seems it is the latter. I did see that the HT highlighted that there is 9.5% vacancy rate in Bloomington. Surely we could come up with a better plan that offers housing to those in need without sacrificing the character of the town by destroying core neighborhoods. Rent subsidized or controlled apartments in several neighborhoods (including the 3 core neighborhoods) is one possibility of many. Providing a place to live for our lower income community members is a high priority for me; I don't think this proposal to rezone will fully address this issue. 3. Related to number 2, I am skeptical that this plan will create affordable housing for our lower income community members and will instead allow more student housing in core neighborhoods. The neighborhood behind the union is a case in point. This was a beautiful core neighborhood that defined Bloomington and has been destroyed by short-sighted decision-making. Thanks very much for your time. Suzanne Eckes
18. Diane Reilly - Dear City Council members, Please reconsider the drastic change that is proposed for city zoning in the form of the UDO. I live in Elm Heights, and share my neighborhood with many rental properties, several across the street and one next door that includes an accessory dwelling occupied by an absentee landlord when he comes to manage his local income properties. I walk to work every day alongside many students, both graduate and undergraduate, and others who rent in the neighborhood. I have no problem with these neighbors and welcome the diversity they bring. What alarms me about the UDO is that it has been proposed to solve a problem that has not been documented to exist (a significant population of potential residents who cannot find housing), and that there is no evidence that the UDO would help to solve the supposed problem. Two rental properties on my block are currently empty. This either means that the owners have decided to take advantage of tax benefits for leaving them unrented, or that there are not enough potential tenants. Adding to the number of rental units in our neighborhood in this case will only serve to increase the number of empty units. However, these observations are simply anecdotal, just like those that seem to be fueling the drive for this UDO. Until there has been a comprehensive study of the current housing situation, the future housing situation (given the rapidly approaching 'enrollment cliff'), and the potential impact of the UDO on either, it would be irresponsible to pass it. Diane Reilly

19. Nancy Wroblewski - I saved and saved to buy my home in the Elm heights neighborhood back in 1997. I did this by not going to star bucks everyday, not going out to lunch everyday, not going out for drinks and ordering high end alcohol on the weekends! Buying clothes at goodwill!! The UDO is all about making the RICH RICHER! TAXES HIGHER! It has NOTHING TO DO WITH CLIMATE CHANGE!!!! I MEAN REALLY YOU ALL KNOW THAT!!! OR FOR PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING! MY WORD! WHY WOULD ANYONE IN ELM HEIGHTS RENT FOR CHEAP!!! GET REAL!!! Investors from the east coast do NOT care about our sweet Bloomington. THEY will come here and destroy our quaint and precious neighborhoods!! I cannot understand why anyone on our city council would allow this TO HAPPENEN!! especially if you understand and have a love for this very special placed called Bloomington. If the UDO is passed our Bloomington will become another Ann Arbor Mich. and another Austin Texas! Check out those cities and see how zoning changes will collapse our beauty. THINK HARD ABOUT IT!!!!!!