

Written Objections and Written Comments Related to the UDO

**Written Objections filed with City Clerk/County Auditor per Indiana Code 36-7-4-606
between October 30, 2019 and December 18, 2019**

(see [Written Objections/Comments filed before October 30, 2019](#) for previous submittals)

1. Shehira Davezac - I was horrified at the ODO plan. I First rented my house and then bought it in 1965. I taught at IU , brought up a son and retired here because Elm Heights, my neighborhood was such a safe and harmonious place to live. Your plan, to satisfy landlord and other tax beneficiaries will ruin this harmonious and safe community. Remember that many retired faculty chose to remain and spend their money here because the conditions practiced until now. Do you think we will want to stay? Please avoid these terrible plans! There are plenty of empty places to build your multiplexes. Think the new hospital area, for example. Shehira Davezac, a very concerned citizen
2. Rebecca Dilger - We are completely opposed to allowed multi-dwelling housing in the core neighborhoods, specifically Elm Heights. We are NOT in support of allowing them in any way, even on a case by case basis.
3. Reyes Vila-Belda - I strongly opposed the proposed the UDO plan. I don't want "plexes" in Elm Height and have many concerns about them. Among others the enrollment cliff that is coming soon to IU, and other factors.
4. Holly Stocking - After some zoning changes attractive to investors in the late 70s, my late husband and I saw a marked change in our neighborhood on E. Cottage Grove north of campus. We were raising our toddler there, as were multiple young families of then-modest means. The housing was affordable, the neighborhood quite wonderful for our children. But then, the zoning changes. Within two years, we had to move. The investors had moved in. Plexes added. And the noise level from students able to pay the VERY HIGH rents decimated the neighborhood for the families. Within two years, with our daughter unable to sleep through the noise of student parties, we left. So did the other young families we had bonded with. The neighborhood never recovered. An AFFORDABLE family neighborhood gone forever! I'm not inherently opposed to slightly higher densities, OR plexes here and there in older core neighborhoods, especially given climate change, the bus route argument, etc. But I am fairly confident that plexes will NOT offer AFFORDABLE housing, as hoped. How to keep the rents affordable in these neighborhoods? Before moving ahead with this plan, much more thinking needs to go into this! Perhaps monetary incentives for investors to keep the rents affordable over a period of time. OR a form of rent control, with lotteries for potential renters, which would discourage some of the more mercenary investors. OR owner-occupied plexes, which will at least keep the noise down (until, of course, the owners move away, and the plexes become all-student-occupied). OR some combination of these options. To just allow incentives for investors without some disincentives is not going to achieve the objectives sought! I myself live in a part of Elm Heights protected by historic designation. But there are other people in these core neighborhoods who are not so protected. And I fear for them. Do we really want to create the conditions for investors to build plexes that -- without some controls in place -- will almost assuredly be

rented at high rates to students, as happened north of campus, causing home-owners to flee neighborhoods that were once affordable? Because without more forethought, that is what is likely to happen, and beloved neighborhoods will be lost, and once lost, they will be lost forever.

5. Robert Stright - I strongly object to the UDO under consideration. I have lived in my house in Elm Heights for 24 years. The neighborhood has revitalized in my time here. When I first arrived, there were almost no children in the neighborhood, now they are everywhere. Families like mine have moved in and invested a lot of time and love into making their houses and the neighborhood more attractive. Yet still there are many students and retirees mixed in. Encouraging "plexus" and redevelopment would be a terrible change and discourage home owners from this charming and historic neighborhood. I strongly object to the UDO under consideration.
6. Volodymyr Lugovskyy - I strongly oppose the idea to allow for 'plexes' in core neighborhoods. It will benefit city in the short run (due to higher taxes), developers and landlord, but at the expense of the current homeowners. I also agree with the following question/argument, posted by a neighbor of mine: "How and why is it possible for the City of Bloomington to even consider passing a UDO that is fundamentally inconsistent with the Growth Policies Plan (GPP)?"
7. Judy Fulford - I am not sure of the dire need to increase density due the current state of unrented houses and apartments. But what concerns me the most is the disregard of current housing stock that can be easily torn down in order to build a plex or apartment building. It seems like Bloomington is easily giving up its character in order to be dense at the expense of one of the things that has made Bloomington so special, the architecture. It was one thing when apartment buildings took over the corridors to downtown. But that is not enough. Now the core neighborhood's aesthetics are at risk. Unfortunately, I have seen examples of what new dense can look like. It saddens me to watch a city that I have been proud to call home become uglier. I ask that you not throw away what has made Bloomington a special place to live and visit. If increased density is the goal, please find a way to increase density, but not demolish the structurally sound architecture of Bloomington's neighborhoods. Thank you.
8. Mark Wroblewski - There are so many questions in this particular situation. The main one for me is the following one: How and why is it possible for the City of Bloomington to even consider passing a UDO that is fundamentally inconsistent with the Growth Policies Plan (GPP)? This plan explicitly states that "plexes" are not allowed to be built within the core neighborhoods; they can only be constructed on the edges. Councilman Sturbaum, among others, has raised this issue explicitly. Why are we having this debate at all? One can only imagine how many hours went into generating that plan. Why would anyone continue to participate in local government, if such a plan is not then followed? Isn't the GPP supposed to be a governing document? What is wrong with our city council when they are unable to follow the rules?

9. Mark Wroblewski - My wife and I have lived in our home in elm heights for 22 years and raised our children here. The home we purchased was affordable because we worked hard and saved our money. Why do others and I feel as though we are being punished for saving and purchasing a single-family residence in a core neighborhood? My understanding is, Bloomington neighborhoods have been stable for approximately 30 years. So, is this déjà vu all over again? Is the city expecting a different outcome this time around? When hundreds if not thousands of new apartments and renovated rental homes have not brought down rental rates in town, how will this UDO change make it happen? With the proposed udo, the new plexes do not have to be owner occupied, or have architectural reviews, so why would they be anything other than poorly constructed and highly priced? There is nothing affordable being offered with the propose udo changes. Zoning for more multi-unit rentals threaten the core neighborhoods' current balance of owners and rentals. This balance was achieved with a maximum rental occupancy of three. The proposed multi-plexes would allow six to nine occupants. This increase will drive up property values and erode owner occupied housing. Where I live on Sheridan drive, students, retirees, and young families mix well. Nancy and I make an effort to know our neighbors, even as people of all ages walk, jog, bike, and unfortunately, scooter their way past our home to Bryan park, town or campus. We urge you, the city council, to reject the proposed udo and to stop selling our town to outside interests!

Second comment - I attended last night's meeting. The council discussed the additional mother-in-law 875sf 2-bedroom units on even the small lots that can be rented out to students or whoever, and the fact that "conditional use" is in all practicality the same as "by right". The add-on units were seemingly enlarged from the slightly smaller one-bedroom limits originally, although the former seems to me to be a much better fit for the small lots at least, to preserve any green space in them. At any rate they have the capacity to increase density significantly. Another big problem and the "Nanny" homes should be deleted from all codes! Also addressed was the \$43,000 commissioned Bloomington housing study, which will relay vital information about Bloomington's housing needs to the council. But if the admittedly experimental UDO is passed before the facts of the actual housing situation in Bloomington from the housing study are available, how effective can this experiment be expected to be? I think this is an important point to bring up to the council, as delaying the UDO a month or two wouldn't hurt, and the delay could be vitally important for Bloomington if the actual housing information is available beforehand. The council and planning commission are both ignoring this practical sequence and is unsettling!

Third comment - The best way to increase density, reduce driving, and lower the incentives for rentals in core neighborhoods is to just build apartment buildings downtown where they naturally should be. Core neighborhoods should be focused on truly owner-occupied housing, and owners of houses in core neighborhoods should not be further enticed into becoming landlords.

10. Jackie Witmer-Mouton - I already own a home in a mixed use area, but I believe in preserving the core neighborhoods from the type of destruction that this produces. This plan has no protection against exploitative developers and landlords. The idea that this is about affordable housing is a sad delusion of people like Daniel Bingham, who has behaved in such an unhinged way to me and others as to even require himself to publicly apologize. A fundamental lack of understanding of federal property laws and how this would be exploited is beyond the understanding of those promoting it as about equality or social justice. The destruction of any remaining greenspaces in those neighborhoods alone is potentially enormous. There seems no reason at all why this proposal has been adopted or is even being considered. The city council was not elected to perform this radical change to the neighborhoods, or to be the naive victim of exploitative developers, or worse. There has been an overt lack of rational process or public input into this and that will be investigated.
11. Teri Kleine - I would like to add my voice to those opposing the UDO. While I understand the need for affordable housing as Bloomington continues to grow, I don't think tearing down homes in historic core neighborhoods to put multiplexes on every available corner serves the community well. For example, have you walked through Elm Heights? Do you know how many corners there are? You would destroy that neighborhood. And from what I understand, the current development codes in Bloomington saved that neighborhood a number of years ago when houses were being ripped down in favor of dense student housing. I know personally that Elm Heights is a wonderful neighborhood that works. It's multiage with retirees, young families, and college students all living side-by-side and forming a community. People are investing in fixing up wonderful historic houses. Elm Heights is an asset to the community, and other historic neighborhoods like Prospect Hill are as well. They should be preserved and protected. I really don't believe Bloomington needs to harm these neighborhoods and residents in order to solve it's housing issues.
12. Christina Jones - I am adding my voice to the chorus of dissent regarding the UDO. As a homeowner in Elm Heights, I am dismayed at the prospect of developers disrupting the character of my neighborhood, driving down home values, increasing traffic and the presence of cars. As a librarian at IU, I help staff and students use data effectively. It is well documented that universities are facing an impending enrollment cliff. There will be fewer students to fill the hunger of greedy developers that have no interest in our community. Consider how the proposed UDO is inconsistent with the Growth Policies Plan (GPP)? This plan explicitly states that "plexes" are not allowed to be built within the core neighborhoods; they can only be constructed on the edges. How might you justify this? Are you now picking and choosing governing documents to meet a specific need? At the very least, I strongly urge you to delay moving forward with the proposed UDO until the City completes the housing survey, which I am sure will reinforce the fact that such structures are not needed. Please don't let us down. Please stand up to corporate interests in the form of outside developers.

13. Rich 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? Sincerely, Rich Pierce
14. Lori Hoevener - I strongly urge the City Council to AMEND this UDO, so that it is fully consistent with the City of Bloomington's Growth Policies Plan, which, according to the city web site, is supposed to be governing document for the city. "Plexes" should not be allowed within the core neighborhoods even as a conditional use. I implore you not to sell out our core neighborhoods, in which we have trusted and fought for the existence of in the past, to predatory developers. Our core neighborhoods constitute a truly unique aspect in the fabric of our city. How is it that we would not be incredibly thankful for that aspect of Bloomington, one that so many other cities and towns lost decades ago? I remain in shock that city government would actually try to do this now, so that an economic experiment can be conducted, when we don't even know the exact status of the housing stock. And city leadership actually prioritizes jumping on an untested trend, over what we are so lucky to still have? We, core neighborhood residents, know that we already have a diverse and dense mix of residents that is a healthy combination of families (of all types), student rentals, and professionals. Those of us who purchased homes here did so because we TRUSTED that OUR CITY would not sell us out to developers, which is exactly what will happen if this UDO passes in its current form. Conditional use means NOTHING; not one ADU has been denied, as we know from a recent council meeting. It is difficult enough to deal with the national political scene, devoid as it is of integrity in governmental processes. This issue, too, constitutes one of basic integrity in our local government: The UDO should absolutely be consistent with the GPP, which explicitly states that there are to be no "plexes" within the core neighborhoods; only on the edges. Furthermore, my neighbors are already planning to sell their homes, if this passes. They cannot withstand more renters, which, in many cases, already surround them. Do the right thing: Amend this UDO and remove the conditional use status of "plexes" in the core neighborhoods for the sake of our city's integrity.

15. Kate Graber - I am adamantly opposed to the introduction of "plexes" into the core neighborhoods (zoned R3). I have endeavored to learn what I can about it: I read all revisions of the UDO and attended the recent city council meeting with Clarion's representative. I did so initially with an open mind. But I have yet to hear a single cogent argument for why the city needs "plexes" in the R3 neighborhoods. Most of them fall back on a bizarrely reasoned need for diversity of housing stock. I live with my husband and young child on the border between R3 and RM; our backyard backs up onto two large undergraduate-dominated multi-apartment houses. We have a beautiful old bungalow, which was renovated after a brief stint as an abused rental house into a home we take care of and take great pride in. We recently renovated our garage to be park-in (a highly unusual feature on the small lots in this neighborhood) and our neighbor, retired from GE, is currently making a stained glass window for our old broken attic window. We put effort into our home. What I see on my block is a remarkable diversity of residents, balanced between graduate and undergraduate students, retirees, young families, and low-income non-students. We have block parties and meet each other; many of the students pass out Halloween candy to our child. I don't mind taking care of the undergrads--they need to be reminded of when the garbage trucks come and to not shoot fireworks into dry trees, for instance, and that's fine; they are young and many of them are living independently for the first time. It works well to have 20-year-olds intermixed among families and retirees for this reason. But we are always at the tipping point of being pressed out of the neighborhood by noise, inexperienced drivers without adequate parking, and interminable games of drunken cornhole. We have a delicate balance, achieved, as far as I can tell from what the longer-term residents of the neighborhood say, specifically because former city councils STOPPED incentivizing the construction of multi-apartment housing in the R3 zones. Should the UDO in its current form pass, it is clear on our block which houses will be targeted to be demolished by their landlords or new developers and made into plexes. It is also clear who will live in the new structures, whatever the city's ideas for enforcing the "family" definition might be: undergraduate students with more money than the student and non-student renters currently occupying those lots. We will be hemmed in on all sides by student housing without adequate parking. The lots in this neighborhood (ours is 0.13 acres) are too small to include a house footprint for 4 unrelated adults plus parking for their 4 cars plus any yard, so residents (again, they will be students, and they will have cars) will just park on the lots. What little green space is left behind our house and to its sides will be covered over in cars. We will move, not because we don't love our house but because there won't be trees or green space left. Check an aerial view of Bloomington--you can see the dividing lines of the R3 zone southwest of campus by where green meets gray, because where student density is higher the city's limit percentages of impervious surface coverage are circumvented by putting down gravel or wood chips for parking. My point, in sum, is that the neighborhood is already socioeconomically diverse, and it is as densely occupied as it can be while still being livable. If there were more in the UDO to incentivize using public transportation and if IUB were more successful at getting students to come to campus without cars, I'd be more optimistic. As things stand, though, including plexes in the R3 zones just looks like a poor idea.

16. Asa Palley - I am writing to voice my objection to the UDO as currently written. I am concerned that it will allow multiplex housing in our single-family neighborhoods, which will change the character and appeal of these long-established communities. I see no need to add multiplexes to areas that have already been built up with well-taken-of single houses, and do not understand why the proposed UDO would allow this. Certainly this would be a detriment to the quality of life for many Bloomington residents without a clear benefit to anyone other than large-scale developers.
17. Andrew Hanson - This plan is inconsistent with all best-practice municipal policy (e.g., the Bloomington Comprehensive Plan) and with all best-practice economic analyses of how to achieve well-balanced affordable housing in a town like the REAL Bloomington, as opposed to the completely different "comparable" cities used by the (totally unfamiliar with Bloomington as a city or its Comprehensive Plan) consultants the mayor turned up with. In order to achieve some measure of the desired objectives without massively chaotic disorder and likely resultant citizen rebellion, the existing UDO plan needs to be completely rejected, and another process started over from scratch. I propose exactly such a workable plan (consistent with the thoughts of many many of my R1 neighborhood neighbors) at the end of this response (see Executive Summary), and we are not going to charge you a quarter of a million dollars for it. Here is a list of the main bullet points the Council must consider and take as overwhelming evidence that the current UDO must be scrapped and started over.
1. Complete Conflict with the Bloomington Comprehensive Plan, which you know very well says that "plexes" within the core neighborhoods are counter to the stated plan, so permitting plexes literally ANYPLACE, with NO location conditions and NO density conditions and NO restrictions on demolitions is simply insane. There is no way to tweak the current plan to be consistent with these requirements. Many, many thoughtful, ethical people spent thousands of hours on the Comprehensive Plan, and the concept that a single outside consultant with no knowledge of our city and no respect for our citizens should be empowered to override the entire plan in one gigantic, IRREVERSIBLE, INSTANT REBOOT of the entire town is insane.
 2. I spent several hours in City Hall Wednesday afternoon at a meeting with Amy Haase of RDG consultants in the company of a group made up almost entirely real estate developers, both commercial and nonprofits focusing on affordable housing. The vastly outnumbered actual homeowners in the group expressed our horror that each of the two single female homeowner on our ONE BLOCK of Elm Heights had received more than one "will purchase sight-unseen" purchase offer from non-local, obviously predatory speculators; exactly the same has been reported in public meeting testimony by other homeowners, so one would conclude that by SIMPLY PUBLISHING THE POSSIBILITY of the UDO in the newspapers, Bloomington has been marked as a prime target for exploitation and profiteering, and the total number of proffers must be much larger than those reported for a SINGLE BLOCK. The council should be very very aware of the fact that not only is this going on, but the CITY STAFF have undertaken a Fox-news-like campaign to DISCREDIT these reports, which I have heard straight from the mouths of three of those affected, and claim that because they "SPOKE TO A REALTOR", such offers were fake news. WHY are our taxes paying people like this to spread Fox-news disinformation in the public press? Outrageous. THEN the most experienced developers in the group declared with certainty

that the predatory developers' approaches that we reported to them (of which they were apparently previously unaware), were themselves ridiculous, and unlikely to be carried out, however scary they are for the homeowners who have been accosted. Why? Because in their opinion there is no way a developer could purchase a typical homesite in the Bloomington R1 neighborhoods, remodel or tear down, and build a 9 bedroom (3-each triplex) and make a reasonable profit without charging enormous rents. They said everyone knows that that economics is just not going to fly, and they had a very hard time understanding how anyone who knew the economics of Bloomington would believe that UDO triplexes were the answer to affordable housing of any sort. So this, if you believe what we heard, is an unexpected argument diametrically opposed in motivation, but with the same result, that the UDO needs to be completely scrapped, the motivations and objectives compared to the actual results being judged basically impossible to achieve with such a plan. But there is a back-door that makes the UDO still very dangerous: my wife and I are perfect examples -- WE OURSELVES could be highly motivated to become the "invasive speculators" and disrupt the lives of our neighbors when we become too old to keep up a house and must move to an assisted living complex. We already own the land and a fairly large house. We could just rip up one side of the yard to put in 9 diagonal parking places, add two 20-30-foot wide two-story copies of our own 3-bedroom home tacked onto the back (there is just enough space), and at a cost FAR less than a developer would have to pay, we would have the \$80,000-\$100,000/year rent from 9 students to line our pockets for the rest of our lives. Dozens of homes owned by retirees or people who might want to move to a smaller house somewhere else, even in a different state (Florida!), would have very high economic motivation to do this if the UDO becomes law, and we'll all be too old to worry about what the neighbors think of us any more anyway... There are 8 single-family homes on our block, two being families with children, two being single women with offers on their homes, and one undeveloped lot on which the owner has been intending to build his retirement home. There is a clear path-of-least-resistance-and-most-money scenario for four of these lots to go to triplexes within 5 years if the UDO passes. That is ONE SINGLE BLOCK; how many blocks like this are in the R1 zones, even just in Elm Heights? Can you imagine that many student rentals (36 bedrooms) appearing on every single block where there are currently eight families? And it's not even walking distance to any commercial district at all - everyone would need cars. Much much more sensible to build a couple of equivalent-bedroom sized student-centered apartment complexes up near Campus or on Campus property, and release the student rental pressure that currently has transformed the blocks from Atwater to Second, turn those BACK into deliberate plans to incorporate the needs of families, young professionals, and IU staff. (See below for further concepts of plans for incorporating the needs of IU employees and young professionals.) So we see that no matter whether the UDO multiplexes are viable for outside developers or not, there is a very high probability of a slow motion train wreck (THAT CAN BE AVOIDED): residents and/or developers having property in the residential neighborhoods will be economically motivated to convert single-family homes into the fanciest 9 bedroom three-triplex units they can afford, rent them for the HIGHEST rents they can get, and make the unit a student-centered rental environment that will drive DOWN the values of neighboring single family homes, discourage people from raising families in such a neighborhood, and motivate them either to leave the neighborhood, selling to rental

landlords, or even convert their home to their own rental property as they move elsewhere to raise their families. The inexorable pressure will be to slowly eliminate all family housing and turn Atwater to Hillside into a student rental neighborhood for all but the hardiest surviving small families. This is the opposite of our community goals and the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, which exists for a reason -- why has it been ignored? A mystery - some collective insanity and lack of knowledge of history (those who do not know it are bound to repeat...)? 3. Unlike supposedly "comparable" cities like Portland, etc., Bloomington's rental market and repurposing of single-family homes that **SHOULD** be for modest-income families, is **COMPLETELY** dominated by its 50-percent student population. The University has failed to recognize its community obligations, and the City has failed to insist on a significant contribution to resolving these problems by the University itself. Bloomington's thinking is **FAR FAR** behind cities where the University is a prime influence but has figured out **METHODS** that are orders of magnitude more effective, and less disruptive to the residential character of the town, than the UDO plan. For example: a. It has been reported in the media that IUPUI offers its employees **LOANS** to help buy or repair homes near the Indianapolis campus, and the loans are forgiven if the employee lives in the house for five years. The numerous UDO advocates who have spoken have repeatedly mentioned that the reason we need the UDO is that IUB employees who would like to live close to campus cannot afford to. One can see already that this is nonsense because it fails to take into account (i) the fact that the University has itself created the pressure that turned **ENTIRE CITY BLOCKS** of previously affordable family homes for half a mile south of Atwater into near 100% student rentals, where no families now would ever want to raise a family; change the University's policies, and those homes would start to flow back towards Atwater as affordable family homes, instead of **NOW**, where Elm Heights residence have tracked a steady increase in the percentage of homes becoming rentals all the way to Second St and approaching First St. (ii) IUPUI has already recognized that this is something University employees want and has taken action; this is the **SAME UNIVERSITY** we have in Bloomington, so it is very hard to argue that it cannot be done at IUB, as it has already been **DONE** at IUPUI. See IUPUI's staff subsidy policies: <https://news.iu.edu/stories/2019/10/iupui/inside/24-anchor-housing-program-apply-before-end-of-year-help-down-payment-repair.html> b. It has been reported in the media that South Bend has had a similar problem with lack of affordable Notre Dame staff residence opportunities near the Notre Dame campus, but that something remarkable has been done: Notre Dame has taken the Freshman, Sophomore, and Junior classes **BACK TO CAMPUS HOUSING** recently, and the immediate result, reported in the Herald Times, has been a significant increase in availability and affordability of housing for staff and young professionals **NEAR CAMPUS** due to the change in pressure from the student population. See Notre Dame's new student residence policies: <https://ndsmcobserver.com/2019/04/on-campus-incentives/> and their effect on the local rental market near campus: https://www.southbendtribune.com/news/business/changes-in-notre-dame-housing-policy-already-squeezing-the-market/article_763efe2b-d7a0-5433-a82e-0130ebfc4058.html. These cities did not decide that the zoning of the entire city needed to be changed to high density to make affordable housing more available -- **BECAUSE IT IS NOT TRUE**. The methods described in these news stories are available for all to study and contemplate, and make it quite clear that the existing UDO plan is not

only unproductive, but grossly unimaginative as a way to achieve the desired goals. What is going on in Indianapolis and South Bend is far more effective, and a clear and distinct model of routes to follow that might actually WORK in Bloomington, instead of "destroying the core neighborhoods in order to save them" as the misguided UDO philosophy seems to think is required. It is clearly not so. 4. It is very scary to consider a what-if scenario: Suppose that the uncontrolled expansion of student rentals that disrupted all the neighborhoods south of Optometry and Atwater had been allowed to continue in the mid 1980's: there would be no real neighborhoods remaining now, 30 years later. There would have been no particular reason for large student housing complexes to be built, as the "high tide" of flowing transition from family homes to student rentals would have continued unabated all the way to Hillside. The desired affordable single family housing would have simply evaporated, as no one would want to raise a family in these neighborhoods: literally every one of is in the single-family residential neighborhoods of Elm Heights has friends who tried as long as they could stand it to keep on living in the student-encroaching neighborhoods, and just COULD NOT continue, and moved away, either into the non-student-rental areas of the neighborhoods, or abandoned the idea of living near the University entirely and moved out to the northwest, etc. This would have been irreversible, and the original character of Bloomington would have been gone forever. This was inhibited, if not halted completely, by Mayor Tomi Allison and the city at that time, as they recognized what was happening, and the principles of that decision to try to recover the residential character where possible was reflected in the current Bloomington Comprehensive Plan. Now take a good look at the UDO: not ONLY does it essentially undo that entire long-argued and hard-fought battle, but it actually goes WAY BEYOND the zoning policies that had almost killed the city's character to begin with: with NO LOCATION guidelines for high-density development, NO DENSITY guidelines for high-density development, NO policies to join the local neighborhood residents together to work out proposed evolution of density changes (see, e.g. in contrast, some of the affordable and disadvantaged housing methods used in the border areas of Prospect Hill, which included community involvement as opposed to the invasive outside-speculator model of the UDO). This is the bad-old days DOUBLED, with apparently no consciousness whatsoever of the absurdity of this "solution." If this becomes the policy of the City, WHAT WILL IT LOOK LIKE in 20-30 years if in fact it does result in the whole current R1 zones becoming dominated by student rentals? 5. Among the many very poorly thought out consequences of allowing the current UDO to proceed, I will mention just one more: the complete lack of consideration for infrastructure. The water, sewer, and electricity service to our home, easily converted or razed and rebuilt as a triplex, barely handles 2 or 3 adults as it is. Put in 9 adults plus their partners, and do that for three or four lots on a single block, and it really won't work. Don't put in 9 to 12 parking spaces, and there will often be 10 cars per unit on the street. On a ONE BLOCK street in Elm Heights? THIRTY MORE CARS? Are you nuts? THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: 1. Cancel the UDO proposal entirely. 2. Go to work with the University to get a mutually beneficial strategy to get more students into attractive, large format modern residences, and make the current overburdened small house rentals between Atwater and First, for example, less attractive to students and find strategies to return them to modest income families, young professionals, and IU employees. THIS WORKED IN SOUTH BEND.

It can work here. 3. Go to work with the University to help IU employees in particular with housing subsidies, which would work PARTICULARLY well if IU simply purchased a lot of the now-student rentals in south of Atwater region (and others), and created subsidized housing for employees (of course IU could pay their staff more, but this would help serve the purpose). 4. Recognize that the need for affordable housing in Bloomington cannot be met by single giant change-everything legislation that depends on the free market to generate that goal -- no one, residents and developers alike, who have really looked at the situation in terms of economics believes this will do anything except the OPPOSITE. Recognize that the problem is not elitism or racism (the rather annoying fake-news buzzwords repeatedly voiced by our self-styled social advocates), but by the interaction with the University, and that THIS HAS BEEN ADDRESSED both at IUPUI and Notre Dame in South Bend, to name real tangible examples, ways that actually work, as opposed to the disastrously Bloomington-inappropriate UDO plan, which will not work. 5. If these goals are important, go at them one by one, with CAREFUL THOUGHT and PLANNING, not by driving the town off a cliff with a one shot revolutionary "solve everything" attack on the nature of the town itself. It will take time and thought - the idea that the UDO will solve every problem automatically rather than creating incredibly nasty problems of its own is the result of really really lazy thinking.

FOOTNOTES: to my Oct 28 response re: the UDO.

1. It has come to our attention that the conflict between the UDO and the precedent Bloomington Comprehensive Plan could be subject to legal challenges.

2. Last night we were seated at an awards d (sic)

ADDENDUM to FOOTNOTES to Narrative on UDO:

An important point I forgot to mention from dinner last night with IUPUI Chancellor Paydar, re: IUPUI's efforts to establish affordable housing near campus for the staff: He mentioned that not only had the City of Indianapolis been a significant partner, but Eli Lilly was also involved. We have heard in the recent discussions and the meetings at Bloomington City Hall that one of the perceived sources of housing pressure, and perceived causes of deficiency of affordable housing in Bloomington is the (anticipated??) additional expansion and hiring of personnel by local industries, Cook Inc. in particular. Surely if they are part of the problem, local industries should also be partnering, under the guidance of the City, with the City and the University to carefully look at the problem and solutions such as those now being implemented in Indianapolis. They did the real work to actually design a real solution in Indianapolis, instead of believing that some single unsupervised magical rezoning wand waived over the whole city would fix everything without any further effort. Indianapolis and IUPUI and Lilly are doing some serious work to make housing evolution happen, no magical wishful thinking going on up there...

18. Beau Vallance - WHY rush this UDO through, suddenly, now? At least give it a few years more of study and systematic public input. There is much confusion and opposition, the UDO apparently violates the Comprehensive Plan, IU enrollment is dropping, and the lovely established core neighborhoods have been stable for decades: why undo them now? Once these neighborhoods convert to multiplex districts, they're gone. We've all seen college towns where formerly-stable core neighborhoods have become overburdened with cars parked in front of and behind houses converted to plexes, older houses with bedsheets and flags as window curtains and party debris scattered about, and For Rent signs everywhere, as owners who once maintained their property move out and the scene is dominated by lodging for a rolling cast of temporary inhabitants. We'll lose a stable residential core. These areas of good older homes would become districts of converted lodgings and new replacement construction. I know the NIMBY mentality sounds self-serving, but the core neighborhoods near downtown and IU are one huge attraction to living in this town. These stable old neighborhoods - and the "real town" they reflect (I've been escaping the suburbs my whole adult life) -- were a factor in assessing my job offer at IU. And for "civilians" who don't have university ties, this lovely convenient housing, stable from year to year with neighbors who maintain their homes and share a history, may be the best way to be in contact with and benefit from the nearby university, making the town and the campus truly an interwoven community. Students already seem to have a zillion apartment options with all the new construction (and is it fully occupied?) in walking/shuttle distance of campus, and I've seen nothing to suggest that rents in converted core-neighborhood units would be "affordable"; those properties would, however, instantly be an incentive for investors to move in and flip. The UDO will degrade that core and we will never be able to get it back. Please oppose the UDO. There's no rush. Let's think it over more calmly. Take a few years. Maybe there are better solutions - even involving IU housing policies and options for students (and others??) -- that won't damage what's already good about Bloomington.
19. Leslie Rutkowski - After a great deal of reading and reflection, I've come to the conclusion that removing single family dwelling restrictions from core neighborhoods in Bloomington is a bad idea. I offer the following reasons: (a) nothing should be done until the housing study is complete. We have poor, incomplete information. Why make irrevocable changes to these neighborhoods until we fully understand what Bloomington's housing needs are?; (b) as noted by IU, there is an enrollment cliff on the horizon. In conjunction with migration patterns, the demographic of college-bound Americans is getting smaller due to an overall smaller number of people in those age groups. Why build more multi-family housing when we know this demographic shift is coming in the near future?; (c) the character of areas like Elm Heights, Green Acres, and so on are unique in Bloomington. Developments on the outskirts are a dime a dozen; generic apartment complexes are much the same. These core neighborhoods create a rich atmosphere, where many of these homes have historic value (i.e., the two Lustron houses just south of campus, the many "atomic" homes in the same area, the many bungalows along 1st and University, the Kinsey home, and so on) and, taken together, they weave a together a homey, varied area. If these neighborhoods are open to 'plex development, the unique character is put at risk. And once it is gone, it is gone forever.

20. Peter Dorfman - Having listened to the discussion of the UDO before the Plan Commission and now the City Council, I'm more convinced than ever that the proposal to upzone the core neighborhoods is not about housing affordability, or human diversity, or climate change. The arguments that upzoning achieves any of those things fall apart on close examination. The upzoning proposal is really about salvaging the Trades District and Bloomington's myopic attempt to lure "creative class" workers into a city where employers don't pay their creatives enough to live close to where they work, and don't pay their service workers enough to live anywhere. Upzoning the core neighborhoods won't change that equation. It will only drive low-income people (and we still have a lot of them) out of the older rental homes they actually can afford in those neighborhoods today. It's very sad and misguided. We can have plenty more workforce (and student) housing without cramming it into already dense neighborhoods that are our most affordable places to own homes. We have the hospital site, the KMart site, lots of other declining retail space, and large PUDs and other sparsely developed areas within the city limits where we can put new housing, including all the mixed density forms density advocates are touting. True, Indiana state law deprives us of inclusive zoning and other tools to build up our workforce housing inventory. But that doesn't mean we should sell our city off to the investment class. The upzoning proposal is an open invitation to out of town, private equity backed rental apartment developers to redevelop core neighborhoods, driving up housing prices and assessed values rapidly, and draining wealth out of the city, just to provide more market rate apartments to house the middle managers for more exploitative employers -- who may or may not even see this housing as a compelling reason to come to Bloomington at all. Upzoning is a plan for growth at any cost. Bloomington should be ahead of the curve -- we should be on the forefront of the movement to take cities back from private equity, not climbing on board the too-prevalent movement to sell out cities off to investors. Finally, please notice that public sentiment at public hearings and here in the written comments is running decisively against upzoning. At the October 22 City Council hearing, public comments were 35 against upzoning, 19 in favor of upzoning and 7 mixed or ambiguous. Upzoning the core is a momentous change for the city; the administration is FAR from having a mandate for this change.
21. Noretta Koertge - Permission for Multiplexes should be VERY carefully regulated. Two recent articles in local newspapers remind us why. 1) From the Oct. 27th H-T: "Neighbors can affect your happiness, a study suggests" I thought about how much I enjoy walking around my neighborhood -- the variety of trees (including persimmon and walnut), the flowers, the hummingbird feeder in a neighbor's front yard, and the patios, swing sets and tomato plants in the backyards. In B'ton we talk a lot about saving "green spaces" but it's not just parks that are important. Yards are also, and too often the backyard of a multiplex (or even a single-house student rental) gets turned into a parking lot for the tenants. And then there are the friendly people I meet. I may not even know their names but we chat about our dogs or our kids' plans for Trick-or-Treat. And we have a neighborhood list-serve where we exchange info on missing pets or recommended repair services or furniture to give away. 2) From the Oct. 28th IDS: "A quiet goodbye: Friday marked the tenants' last day in the Brickhouse after a shooting" I was curious about what that neighborhood looked like so I drove over to 422 S. Grant St. The site of

the party looked nice enough but the surrounding buildings would certainly not invite one to go there for a casual stroll -- unless you were looking for a homecoming party that might turn raucous.*** Different people appreciate different kinds of neighborhoods. Bloomington now has a variety of neighborhoods. Let's not destroy those that are functioning well.

22. Betty Rose Nagle – Please follow the Comprehensive Plan recommendations about the core neighborhoods. Encourage owner-occupied properties and keep plexes out. Doing otherwise will not improve affordability. It will benefit out-of-town developers.

23. Lori Hoevenner - Please follow the Comprehensive Plan recommendations about the core neighborhoods. Encourage owner-occupied properties and keep plexes out. Doing otherwise will not improve affordability. It will benefit out-of-town developers. My sincere hope is that you will amend this UDO proposal, so that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan/Growth Policies plan. In doing so, I will still be able to believe in our city government as one of integrity. Numerous directives are given in the GPP that serve as legal guidelines for how to treat the core neighborhoods. Do the right thing, as an elected official, and uphold those guidelines. (pg 60) Housing Trends and Issues Some of Bloomington's neighborhoods are relatively diverse, both economically and by housing type, whereas others are comprised almost entirely of single-family homes and limited in development by covenants. Most core neighborhoods are stable but are trending towards a lower percentage of new single-family homes. With greater density in the city comes the challenge to preserve neighborhood character and the opportunity to strengthen neighborhoods by developing small commercial nodes as community gathering places. Existing core neighborhoods should not be the focus of the city's increasing density. (pg 61) Bloomington's older urban, small scale, compact, single-family housing stock located primarily around the city center and university provide some of the city's more affordable housing stock and must be protected. (pg 61) Now that 1,900 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. This can allow more people to have a chance to live in urban neighborhoods, which are often closer to employment, shopping, and other amenities. This may also have the added benefit of reducing automobile traffic and the negative environmental impacts of traffic congestion. (pg 64) Policy 5.3.1: Encourage opportunities for infill and redevelopment across Bloomington with consideration for increased residential densities, complementary design, and underutilized housing types such as accessory dwelling units, duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings, courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, townhouses, row houses, and live/work spaces. Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods. (pg 65) Continue to support and promote affordable home ownership as another method of permanent affordability that can help to raise and keep residents from poverty while they build equity and security in the local community. (pg 84) A few locations may support increases in density and multifamily residential uses when adjacent to higher volume roads, or near major destinations, or located along neighborhood edges that may support small-scale neighborhood mixed uses. It is important to protect the existing single-family housing stock within this district. The

conversion of dwellings to multifamily or commercial uses should be discouraged. (pg 88) Land Use Development Approvals New and redevelopment activity for this district is mostly limited to remodeling existing or constructing new single family residences. These instances require the Maintain development theme for development approvals.

24. Tim Sare – Grew up in B-town wanted to return in my retirement yrs but the town has changed to much towards IU needs. IU bought the land around 14th and 13th st, still vacant. Go ahead and but high rise apartments there closer to campus. Leave the good people's homes of Bloomington alone. West and South should not be invaded any more then it has.
25. Sita Cohen – I've lived in the Near West side for 30 years and strongly object to the addition of plexes, especially when it means an existing home would be torn down. We're an already dense neighborhood and one of the only affordable single family home neighborhoods in the city. People can afford apartments in some of our older homes, who would never be able to afford them in the new plexes. We're an historic neighborhood and adding these plexes would take away the charm of this neighborhood, add needed density, more traffic, less places to park, which are at a minimum as it is. There are plenty of areas in town that could be built on to provide low income housing, which are on bus routes, which is really what we need. Please don't ruin the core neighborhoods!

Second comment - I am writing to ask you to vote YES to the Sturbaum/Rollo amendment to the UDO and NO to the Volan amendment. I understand we need housing, especially low income, but the plexes being proposed in the core neighborhoods will not accomplish that objective. We are already very dense neighborhoods, complete with apartments, single family homes, duplexes and even some quads. Parking is tough as it is and would only get worse, along with noise, congestion and loss of the charm that drew many of us to the core neighborhoods to begin with. We've worked hard to improve our homes and the beauty and charm of this area. Please don't destroy it! Thanks Sita

26. Trudy Litz – Please do NOT destroy Elm Heights area! Please turn this down!!!
27. Abigail Pietsch – It is a mistake to change the current rental system near the IU Campus. There are many houses available and empty. The newer apartments offer more amenities to student life than older homes for rent. Parking will need to access more on street spaces which will increase the already difficult passage for all.
28. Carrie Biddle – I strongly oppose the development of more apartments, specifically in our historic neighborhoods such as Elm Heights and Prospect Hill among others. These neighborhoods make Bloomington what it is and cannot be replaced. They also cannot handle the parking and congestion that these complexes would bring.

29. Paula Stapley – I have been thinking of the Elm Heights neighborhood as a future place to live. I cannot, however, possibly bear the thought of what will happen to this neighborhood should it be lost to the parameters proposed. The preservation of older neighborhoods is part of the charm of Bloomington. With the flurry of apartment buildings recently built in Bloomington, I cannot fathom that destroying neighborhoods is necessary.
30. Michelle Henderson – According to a front page article in the Herald Times on October 21, 2019, the city is paying Nebraska-based RDG Planning and Design forty-one thousand dollars for a housing study. The team has already found a "relatively high vacancy rate" of 9.5% which doesn't indicate a housing shortage or crisis in Bloomington. While it makes sense to increase density in areas where there isn't currently affordable housing to provide for future housing needs, it doesn't make sense to destroy the existing affordable housing and greenspace in the core neighborhoods. Replacing old houses with plexes will damage our local environment by sending tons of debris to our landfills, releasing toxic waste like asbestos dust into our air, increasing impermeable surfaces which leads to flooding, and causing the destruction of old-growth trees and wild life habitat. These are not sustainable or environmentally responsible results. Voting to make plexes conditional will have the same effect as "by right" because the real estate investment firms who will be demolishing small houses to build larger more expensive housing will gladly pay fines due to their profit margin. Replacing small older houses with new, more expensive housing will be devastating to current low-income residents who will be evicted by landlords who want to sell their rental properties to developers. I am requesting an amendment that removes the core neighborhoods from the proposed zoning change from single-family to multi-family in order to protect the low income residents who live in those neighborhoods, as well as to protect the unique greenspace only found in our older neighborhoods. Please do what is in the best interest of the residents who live in our core neighborhoods and vote NO to replacing the zoning ordinance in the core neighborhoods. Please don't vote in the interest of wealthy real estate developers over our local low-income residents. That is not the way to help the most vulnerable citizens you were elected to serve. Please do no harm.
31. Wendy Bricht – I live in Elm Heights. The difference between 3 students in a house on a lot, and 6, 9, 12, or up to 18 students per lot in a triplex with a 5-foot setback is huge. The student rental duplexes and triplexes on Woodlawn near 1st St. are much more disruptive than a regular student rental, and groups of students are more disruptive, especially when they are close to campus. Every new student rental is tough on the residents, but high-density ones are the worst. Parties, fighting, loud music, yelling outside, coming and going all night of pedestrians and cars, profanity, drug and alcohol use and abuse are all endemic where there are groups of students, and we have had to get used to them. Safety for our children, women, and older retirees declines when more students move in, and many homeowners in the vicinity of the multiplexes will be forced to move away. But where will we move? Farther out, and then have to commute back in, creating more traffic and the need for more parking? I was here in Elm Heights in the 70's when the occupancy limit was raised to 5 adults, and the neighborhood went downhill so fast it took your breath away. No one wanted to live around here then. I never wanted to live in

my house again. The three other houses on my intersection are rentals, and another next to them up 1st is a 5-person plus family rental, and up Woodlawn are duplexes. It was a difficult and unsettling time for the residents, and it happened so fast. The only thing that saved any of it was the hard-won reinstatement of the 3-person rental occupancy limit. That stopped the decline, but even after that it took decades for the neighborhood to recover, and for homeowners and families to return and invest in their homes and make the neighborhood pleasant again and thriving, which I can say it now finally is after more than 30 years. It's a really nice neighborhood with lots of families again, something I had given up on. It is the nearness to the University that makes us so vulnerable here. The balance here between students and residents is crucial and precarious. It is holding now, barely, but here is no possible way it will hold with the addition of the student multiplexes that the developers are planning. The only reason my block was spared back in the 80s is that there were half as many students, and the housing east and south of me was too expensive for rental investors. At that time, student rents were very low, dorms were plentiful, and rental investors wouldn't buy the really good houses, that is until their value went down from all the nearby student rentals. Then they bought and converted them. It was a vicious cascade that if allowed again will erode the integrity of the neighborhood until all of it is student rentals, perhaps with some progressive young professionals, but in reality probably not. Once you relax the zoning, you can't simply take it back, and what was lost remains lost, which is why only half of Elm Heights remains as family housing. The truth is that no one wants to live with groups of students, except other students. All you need to do is look at the areas south of Atwater and west of Woodlawn to see what it will become. History will repeat itself if we are unwilling to learn from it, and cling to popular ideology instead of facts. With the student-occupied multiplexes there to stay and as dense as possible for maximum profit, how will families and retirees cope? They won't. This has no chance to improve housing in Bloomington for anyone but rich undergraduate students, and they are the worst. Where is the protection for the core single-family neighborhoods that the Comprehensive Plan clearly provides? It states many times that they should be protected, and that multiplexes should NOT be built there, ever. With no parking spaces, where will they park? on the densely overcrowded streets that are already narrow? There are many places in Bloomington that need duplexes and triplexes; that need more density and more development, and affordable housing. We are very dense and very diverse here, and the balance is holding. Why demolish our homes and lives here for nothing except to benefit developers and procure more tax money? There are surely much better ways that will actually benefit the city and its residents, and actually provide affordable housing. I am convinced this plan will only drive up rents, as has happened in the past with dense high-end rentals. You must try to govern wisely the residents who live here now, not the ones you wish for in the future. Change needs to happen slowly and carefully, so that the character of Bloomington will not be lost. Urbanize if you will, but slowly and carefully and with discretion, and the areas that can tolerate it. Please don't force it on unwilling residents of established family neighborhoods. I don't want Elm Heights to become a sacrifice zone.

I oppose the new UDO, specifically as it changes zoning without consent and supports allowing multiplexes in vulnerable single-family neighborhoods.

This article was published in Citylab in January of this year, and it addresses the outcomes on housing of adding density:

"A new study of zoning changes in Chicago finds that they led to higher, not lower, local home prices, while having no discernible impact on local housing supply."

<https://www.citylab.com/life/2019/01/zoning-reform-house-costs-urban-development-gentrification/581677/>

32. Kayla Richards – STOP DESTROYING BLOOMINGTON! I was born and raised here. This is my home. However, it sure feels less like home thanks to the constant catering given to IU students. The students are NOT the only people who make up our community. Stop being greedy and focusing on the money that students and their families give to Bloomington (which, by the way, I see none of, and neither do a majority of the people who reside here). Stop ruining our town and driving out people who truly do call Bloomington home, and not just for the four years they're in college. I am absolutely sick of IU and what it has done to this town. It truly makes me resent living here, and I should not have to feel that way. It's getting more and more costly to live in Bloomington, thanks to IU. We can hardly afford the homes we have now, but now IU wants to force people out and tear down their homes? That is absolutely appalling.
33. Derek Richey – The younger generation are frustrated and rightly looking for solutions to a problem that they had nothing to do with creating, and that needs to be addressed and solved--and it might have been solvable 10-15 years ago before all the empty lots downtown were sold to developers who wanted to build student housing only. But the folks in the core neighborhoods are not the of the future. They aren't millionaires. They're retired and working-class folks who were lucky enough to buy their homes before the prices went thru the roof. Their concerns are real because many of them have seen the fleecing of Bloomington over the years by developers. No, the real enemy of affordable housing isn't the core neighborhood home-owners; your enemies (this is to all the well-meaning young people) are investors and big developers. And those developers will have no incentive what-so-ever to build "affordable plexes" near downtown in these core neighborhoods. In fact, the only way to assure they would, would be to mandate the prices they could sell or rent for, per plex, or make them guarantee that a portion of the plex was in fact, affordable. But that isn't going to happen. No developer would build a du-plex, or a quad plex without the guarantee of a decent profit. Haven't we already learned that? How more obvious could it be? Do folks think that developers are just going to build affordable plexes out of the goodness of their hearts in these core neighborhoods so that average folks can afford them? If you really believe that, then I have a bridge in Brooklyn I'd like to sell you. I think all of us are for more affordable homes. Unfortunately, my personal experience with big developers over the years has led to just a bit of cynicism on my part. A bit of cynicism is probably a good idea, because this has development exploitation written all over it - and no realistic chance of providing what so many here rightly are asking for: affordable housing. I'm sorry for young people going forward, and I am sorry that this won't be the solution you deserve whether it happens or not. And that's the sad truth.

34. Robin Sullivan – Abuse and outrage and way to many to list. I object this project and pray to GOD it doesn't go through. So tired of the city and county controlling this our own land and city, county with restrictions only to benefit this city or county. And yet the people that live and work here are supposed to continue of letting this happen. Greed power hungry liberals and not for the working people.
35. Beth Penrod – Don't destroy our Bloomington neighborhoods. I object to I.C. 36-7-4-606 plan to build apartments in single family neighborhoods we've kept apart of Bloomington for years. Stop the housing crisis and greedy companies building student high priced apartments.
36. Jane Fivecoate – A large part of the beauty and desirability of Bloomington is its historic neighborhoods. Remove these and we will have nothing left except urban sprawl similar to the ugly buildings now built on the old Rogers property. Please don't allow that.
37. Rosalie Baugh – Please leave some part of Bloomington that is not totally student housing or IU development! The town is barely recognizable as Bloomington.
38. Mary Venstra – Bloomington is developing too quickly. I don't want to lose our neighborhoods. A few rich people are making a lot of money at the detriment of our city's Integrity. I don't want to lose the beauty that is Bloomington In The Name Of Money.
39. Diana Spoolstra – Please do not allow homes in core neighborhoods to be turned in to multi-plexus. Bloomington is already being ruined by developers who put greed above all else! Keep the 3 person limit!
40. [no first name given] Vanslyje - We don't need more rentals and apartments they are everywhere now. Ruining a good community.
41. Amy Pennington – This town is already crowded enough, we don't need any more housing. Leave the family neighborhoods alone
42. Donald Jordan – Anyone who has ever lived and loved Bloomington over the decades has to oppose any regulation that would give developers the right to destroy the neighborhoods that have long made the city a warm welcome place to live. Besides it is time to put the burden of housing IU students back on the backs of IU The university is dropping a population bomb on Bloomington that has the potential to turn it into one large apartment building/bnb and destroy the best parts of what remains.
43. Georgia Flaten Shaw - I have the perspective of someone who has visited Bloomington after having been away for a number of years. Walking through the neighborhoods surrounding the campus, I have, for the most part, felt deep shame and sorrow for the way in which the university and city have allowed once thriving and nurturing communities to become overrun by absent landlords and unchecked rental wrecks. This is particularly noticeable in the area of Elm Heights, but includes all neighborhoods around Third Street and all neighborhoods built between 1820 and 1960. The City should

immediately put the foresight and needs of HISTORIC PRESERVATION into effect. ALL properties (even rentals) should immediately be drawn into HISTORIC DISTRICTS and this should include any and all neighborhoods with any housing built between 1700 and 1980. All housing should be forced to comply with strict guidelines including a strict limit on rentals. In addition, ALL EXTERIORS of these houses should be forced to comply with extremely strict guidelines on upkeep and maintenance and should be forced to pay a SPECIAL TAX for the PRIVILEGE of THE ADVANTAGE OF THE CLOSE GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION TO THE UNIVERSITY. This avoidance of paying this additional tax would be grandfathered to anyone who OWNS and has CONTINUOUSLY INHABITED the property for at least 50 years.

44. Ronald McNeal - Vote no on UDO

45. Molly Faries - I want to register my strong opposition to the proposed Unified Development Ordinance. Bloomington purportedly recognizes the importance of historical districts and neighborhoods with single-family dwellings. Once changes are introduced into current protocol, it will never be possible to retrieve the unique character and cohesiveness these neighborhoods bring to the Bloomington community. No one housing type should dominate in the areas surrounding the university. The voices of long-term residents committed to the livability of their residential spaces should be heard and respected. Bloomington has had enough short-sighted development. The addition of one after another huge apartment block that resembles nothing so much as a penitentiary has changed the look downtown Bloomington - and not for the better. The extension of this type of structure into family neighborhoods should be avoided at any cost. Let the town and university find other, more creative solutions, such as utilizing the new condos and apartments on the west side, which aren't even fully occupied, and linking them with fast transportation, such as a tram, to downtown and university.

46. Diana McGovern - Single family neighborhoods should remain that way! If students rent houses there, as long as they stick to the residency requirements (3 unrelated persons in a house), there is really not a lot we can do, but putting duplexes, multiplexes, whatever they are called in single family zoned areas is not wanted and not a good idea in my opinion. There are plenty of vacant apartments, rental houses, etc. around now. Drive around and look at the signs.

47. James Orr - I currently live in a neighborhood that has three multi-unit apartment buildings within one block walking distance. I've been here for 30 years. The sense of integrity that this is, in fact, a neighborhood is largely due to the handful of single-family dwellings laying to the south and east of me. Furthermore, many of these are already occupied by unrelated college students. To densely pack even more apartments, condos, townhouses, and non-owner occupied units into this environment would be nothing more than urban sprawl at its ugliest. Please consider the quality of lives of long-term residents in this, and other neighborhoods like it. Thank you. Jim Orr

48. Kay Jackson - I think they should be building more housing for incomes of 1200. and less. The lower housing is very much needed. I feel like historic homes should be updated without ruining the original blueprint.
49. Douglas Hofstadter - The proposed Unified Development Ordinance is, it seems to me, nothing but a green light to developers to destroy a classic neighborhood in Bloomington and replace it by ugliness. What possible justification could there be for demolishing beautiful old single-family homes and, in their place, building structures in which large groups of students, often very raucous students, would live? Doing so would turn the neighborhood from a peaceful, cultured haven into a loud, chaotic, dirty area where older people (by which I mean age 30 and above) and young children would not fit at all. Such an action makes no imaginable sense to me, unless the only value driving the developmental pathway of the city of Bloomington is sheer monetary greed. I surely hope that is not the case.
50. Curt Lively - I am in agreement with Doug Hofstadter's comments, which he shared with his neighbors. I am totally against the building of multiplexes in our neighborhoods.
51. Karen Bartlett - Eliminating history for monetary benefits will ultimately eliminate the popularity
52. Marie Bogdanoff - I am a student at IU, and I am opposed to allowing multiplexes in single family neighborhoods in Bloomington. I don't feel safe walking to my family's home through the student housing areas in Elm Heights, which are adjacent to my house. The student rentals are also ugly and noisy, and I can't sleep when they have parties and loud conversations and fights at Night. I think single family neighborhoods are much nicer and safer, and should be protected.
53. Gayle Ebel - I have lived in Bloomington for over 30 years residing at 601 South Grant Street. It was one of the first houses built in the neighborhood over a hundred years ago and its limestone construction has certainly withstood the ravages of time and weather. This location had a community cistern and served as a water source for the neighboring residents. I am proud of this history of residence for our family and for those who came before us. UDO will destroy the historical fabric of our beloved Elm Heights neighborhood and replace it with a strip mall mentality of financial gain disregarding the integrity of the community who currently reside here. Our house sits at the corner of Grant and University streets. I walked one block from our corner in the 4 directions of north, east, south and west and here is the tally of what I found: Owner occupied homes: 14 Houses rented out with an unknown number of residents: 18 1 house with 4 distinct apartments 1 duplex 1 apartment complex with 8 apts 1 apartment complex with 18 apartments 1 apartment complex with 18 plus apartments 2 airbnb's 1 house currently under renovation (uncertain if it will be for sale or rent or both) 4 houses that I am uncertain if they are rentals or owner occupied CLEARLY our immediate neighborhood (1 block in each direction) is already saturated with housing options for renters. We do not need more. Adding more density in this area doesn't make sense. Is the City of Bloomington willing to absorb the cost and stress that additional housing units will

make? More police officers hired to patrol and protect? Given a recent shooting 2 blocks away this is crucial. More sanitation workers to serve the populace of people who don't know how to recycle correctly and all of that just goes to the landfill? More scooters? More noise? More, more, more! I would think Indiana University wants to recruit top notch professors and researchers to set themselves up for the next 200 years of success. What academic doesn't want to live in a neighborhood where they can easily walk or bike to campus? The charm, heritage and convenience of Elm Heights neighborhood is a HUGE draw. UDO will undo this appeal and have very negative repercussions for the University and town. I vehemently disapprove of UDO. Please hear my sentiment along with all the others you receive from very passionate Elm Heights residents against UDO. UNDO UDO!!!

54. Deborah Myerson - ADU's and plexes are largely restricted to conditional uses in the September 2019 UDO. My objection: we need to make these by-right uses. For those concerned about teardowns: with the high property values in many neighborhoods plus high construction costs, it will simply not be financially feasible for large developers to tear down a SF house and replace with a duplex or triplex. By-right construction of ADUs and plexes will make Bloomington more friendly to locally-based developers for opportunities to convert and rehab -- people who live in the community and want to make the neighborhoods where they live even better.
55. Restricting these housing types to conditional uses makes it much harder for a smaller local developer. "Conditional" means that there is more review and uncertainty in the process, so it takes more time and costs more money to develop, and thus creates a process that favors larger developers from out of town that can absorb these costs more readily. A more expensive process also naturally raises housing costs, since these added expenses get passed on to the renter or homebuyer.
56. Kathleen Myers – The proposed Urban Development Ordinance (UDO) has received a lot of attention in the media and in City Council meetings, but one point has not been adequately addressed. The city faces an urgent need to urbanize the vast acreage east of College Mall, on South Walnut, and in the near future the Bloomington Hospital site. These areas would greatly benefit from density planning, including multiplexes and two/three-story buildings with opportunities for retail and socializing either on the ground level or nearby. The city should focus on these areas before tampering with the character of existing neighborhoods that already have a balanced and sustainable mixture of families, retirees, students, and professionals. Many university towns, like Lawrence, Kansas, have worked hard to preserve established neighborhoods. Our city planners have reassured homeowners and residents that we will have control over multiplexes built in our neighborhoods. Yet, it is clear that if the developer follows the brief, simplistic list of conditions in the UDO, it's likely that no public review will be involved. In short, building multiplexes in long-established neighborhoods will radically alter the character of Bloomington and isn't justifiable when urban development is needed immediately in other centralized, well-connected areas of our city. (Published in the HT, Oct. 31, 2019)

57. Laura Chamberlain Dedelow - Hello, I object to the proposal to increase the density of our neighborhoods. We are already surrounded by several multi-rental structures and already the noise is regularly disruptive. This proposal, if put into effect, will lead to a higher percentage of transient residents and cause an increase of absentee landlords particularly in my neighborhood which is in close proximity to Indiana University. I am not at all opposed "renters", having rented with my husband for many years in Bloomington and in other cities before purchasing our home here. Single families and very small groups of students and non-students renting nearby in our current neighborhood and in other neighborhoods in which we've lived are usually responsible, good neighbors. It is the "unofficial frat house two doors down" that concerns me. I have seen it so many times in other cities and other states, nobody is going to convince me that this won't happen if this proposal goes into effect. If nothing else, take more time to evaluate studies done in other cities and make sure this is a positive move for Bloomington. Once it is done you know it will be difficult to reverse, why the haste when so many are opposed? Thanks for your time.
58. Ilana Gershon - This plan seems very poorly thought out and seems to entirely ignore that something between a third and half the population of Bloomington consists of IU students who are necessarily transient and overwhelmingly young. Is there any reason to believe that they won't dominate new construction of plexes close to campus? Is there any reason to believe that larger ADU's won't be used primarily to rent to students? Developers support the plan exactly because they think that students are the market and that they will make a lot of money. I don't object to a denser more urban Bloomington, one has been growing up downtown even before this plan. Somehow there seems to be a belief that if only we can build apartment buildings in the old line neighborhoods, suddenly there will be both affordable housing. Affordable housing is hard to come by and there is no evidence anywhere in the US that reducing regulation leads to more affordable housing. I can't even begin to address how wrong the beliefs around UDO and climate change are. Shortening, or even eliminating, the already relatively short car commutes in Bloomington is not a high impact activity on the scale of global carbon emissions. And building causes carbon emissions, lots of them. Read about the emissions from concrete at some point. So at best the net carbon savings from this plan are probably at least a decade away and relatively small. And might even be negative: I for one live close to campus and walk to work. Fill my neighborhood with student rentals and I'll be forced to move and drive to work. So will many of my neighbors and colleagues. This is a bad plan that damages the community for some combination of developer profit and unrealistic left wing pipe dreams. I hope the Council can demonstrate some reasonable common sense and reject it.
59. David Wilcox - The UDO should build off the previous comprehensive plan not set off in a new direction. As a person who lives with student rental neighbors in Elm Heights I can say without a doubt the UDO as written will convert all the area around me into plexes. Which would be ok if there were sufficient resources to maintain the quality of living (police, code enforcement, HAND staff). The issue is there are not enough resources currently and the amount of effort the citizen has to do to maintain normal living in this community is onerous. This UDO should not pass.

60. Daniel Caner - Dear Common Council, I am writing to urge you to reject the Unified Development Ordinance. My wife and I have lived in Bloomington now for four years. Having been recruited to the IU faculty, we wanted to live near campus, but found it very hard to find any place that was not adjacent to a student rental. Having experienced that in Burlington VT I never wanted to reduplicate the experience again. We finally found something - more expensive than we wanted, but nonetheless safe from student housing encroachment. It is true that I want to protect the value of the property that I've purchased and the life that came with it. But that should not be a reason for dismissing my claim. I do not see evidence that student enrollment is increasing at IU, or that creating more units near campus would lower the rents in the area overall, or that it would diminish sprawl. Please vote against this. Yours, Dan Caner
61. Alan Balkema - Protect core neighborhoods! Vote yes for the Sturbaum/ Rollo Amendment.
62. Janie Ackerman - After reading and weighing out all the pros and cons of the proposed UDO, I strongly urge the Council to use caution and consider the damage that could be done to the core neighborhoods. I cannot agree with the possibility of changing the historic landscape of these neighborhoods and feel that this is what makes Bloomington unique. I am all for affordable housing but cannot understand how the "plexes" are going to make that happen. My son lives on a prep cook budget in a small apartment near the Salvation Army. He doesn't drive and needs to live withing walking distance to work. If this were a brand new triplex, how would he be able to afford the rent? Please consider voting YES to the Sturbaum-Rollo amendment and NO to the Volan amendment. Thank you.
63. Merrie Sloan - I support voting YES to the Sturbaum-Rollo amendment and NO to the Volan amendment.
64. Kris Sullivan - I support voting YES to Sturbaum-Rollo Amendment and NO to Volan's amendment. Thank you for considering this in your vote.
65. Suz Frederickson - Respectfully, please hear us! Please vote "yes" to Sturbaum/Rollo amendment and "no" to Volan amendment. In the Near Westside we are diverse...race, age, class, etc. We are considerate. We take care of and respect one another and love our sweet neighborhood. We are grateful for our homes and make improvements as needed and desired. With our small lots - even several together - multi unit dwellings are not appropriate nor is there room for the people or the parking. And in the neighborhoods where there is plenty of room - ridiculously large lots with very poor use of the land - no mention is made of development due to carefully prepared covenants to protect these exclusive residents. Will we not be happy until the entire landscape of our sweet historic neighborhoods are destroyed? Please protect our core neighborhoods! Thank you!

66. Robert Henderson - I would like to voice my support for ADUs and am in favor of the amendment that makes ADUs by-right since I believe they are largely self-regulating by nature. I am also in favor of the Sturbaum-Rollo amendment that would prohibit duplexes and triplexes in the core neighborhoods and against the Volan amendment that makes these plexes by-right. I think the plexes are much more likely to invite outside speculation which has the potential to lead to the destruction of existing affordable housing stock to be replaced by much less affordable market-rate rentals.
67. Angela Lexmond - I don't mind increased density so long as it really will create affordable housing opportunities for those in the community needing it, particularly families with young children who might like to attend Templeton Elementary and take advantage of Bryan Park. HOWEVER... there is currently no evidence that this will be the likely outcome. Most past evidence points to expensive student rentals in unsightly multiplex structures on neighborhood lots (with a bunch of cars parked in front of them). (See for example Park St. south of Bryan Park... Yikes!) I would also like the assurance that increased density will come with attention to infrastructure improvements in the older neighborhoods that are seeing drainage issues, pipe main breaks, etc. Finally, I would like to mention that I feel like I am a rare exception in the months that I bicycle commute or walk to my IU job. Most people who live close in still drive. Other shifts will have to happen in the habits of our community members... if you hope that living close in will result in environmental benefits. Our neighbors may still drive out to the Westside big box stores to get cheap stuff as well as drive to their close to home grocery store and job. There seem to be enough unanswered questions that more research is in order to make the case for removing the protections on single family dwellings and lots. I am not convinced it is a good idea yet, and I hope my representatives will provide more evidence to make the case... (beyond implying that I am simply not progressive enough). I have learned quite a bit from the spirited debate and arguments presented on both sides, but so far I am not convinced that the proposed UDO will accomplish what its proponents suggest. I would for the time being like to continue to protect single family zoning in the core neighborhoods and urge you to at minimum support amendments to the new UDO that would do so. Thank you!
68. Jane Goodman - I support voting YES on the Sturbaum-Rollo amendment and NO on the Volan amendment. Per the linked article, Bloomington is the 5th most attractive target in the country to real estate investors in cities of its size (and 19th across all markets). Staff admits that plexes will not increase affordability. As for climate issues, a drive through Bloomington shows that single-family owners are the ones who have invested in solar panels and related energy efficiency technologies; investors in rental properties have no incentive to do so because tenants pay utilities. Please do not cast your vote alongside Trey Hollingsworth and Todd Young and open up our city to predatory development. Please preserve the integrity of the core: it already models the diversity and affordability that the City wants. Please also respect the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan and the work that went into it. Thank you for your work.
https://www.homes.com/blog/2018/06/the-us-landlord-index-college-towns-cities/?fbclid=IwAR0VH-MbIhFyRMuE8jXTXsZTGrH0nZr_32soHqsqjz0II6f6r6ZxbJBwfwQ

69. Zach Andersom (sic) - I support voting YES to the Sturbaum-Rollo amendment and NO to the Volan amendment
70. Celeste McGregor - How much student housing do we need??? Please stop selling out to developers! Please vote YES with Sturbaum-Rollo to keep laws where they currently are. Changing the laws would benefit wealthy developers at the expense of families, especially low-income and fixed-income residents. Please work on ways to help this segment of our community. Thank you.
71. Jeffrey Thinnies - We have an historic home in Elm Heights (Anthony Gros Luis) and share the concerns, expressed by so many neighbors, that the contemplated zoning changes will forever alter the very special nature of this diverse, yet safe and (relatively) quiet neighborhood. We strongly oppose the contemplated changes. There must be other alternatives that the university, together with Bloomington, can devise to meet the growing need for housing. Please don't cast this historic neighborhood into the hands of developers. Be creative and consider the full range of possibilities. I am quite certain a solution can be found that respects local history yet meets the anticipated future needs of the city and university. Thank you.
72. Susan Wunder- I have not yet weighed in on the issue of zoning changes as they affect my beloved Elm Heights, in part because I live six blocks from campus on the upper end of East Wylie St. (a very quiet and secluded half block). I have always felt my immediate neighborhood could never be threatened by the kind of fraternity invasion and multiplex development that others, closer to campus, have experienced and fear. I felt I had no right to complain, as I was out of the zone of maximum impact/threat. I can't stay silent any longer as my friends and neighbors are so affected by this, and nothing and nowhere now feels safe from tear-downs and mass rentals any longer, even in our historic districts. I encourage the City to consider what Elm Heights will look like in ten years should everything be opened to moneyed developers. What was the purpose of historic designation if history is to be deeply gouged out, or eventually obliterated? On visits to the home of my friend Cappi Phillips and others immediately south of campus, I've seen the garbage and heard the noise she has documented from the adjacent, illegal fraternity. It's no less than a private home- and life invasion for the folks on Hunter Avenue and potentially well beyond. Making such rental complexes legal will not improve the situation with regard to affordable housing or anything else aside from real estate profits. There is a need for affordable housing in Bloomington. I once rented the upstairs of my home to one or two graduate students at a very affordable price, a win-win arrangement that never involved strife or neighbors' complaints. This is the owner-occupied model to follow, not high-density rentals to a large group of unsupervised undergrads that can only detract from all we enjoy in Elm Heights. We are not snobs, we are homeowners grateful to have been able to live so peacefully, so close to campus, some of us for decades, some of us accommodating responsible renters. I am not permitted under historic home rules to screen in my front patio (I've tried to get permission, it was denied). I can live with that kind of protective oversight. It is far preferable than completely stripping all protections for our way of life in Elm Heights (once called Vinegar Hill because it was an orchard long ago, and the rural scent of

rotting apples permeated the air.) Change happens, yes, but it should not be precipitous and up to a few in power and those with deep pockets. Our voices need to be heard and respected too.

AMEND THE PLEXES OUT

Jim Rosenbarger, 11-4-20

What happened to the Comprehensive Policy Plan?

(The Comp. Plan, completed in 2018, “is the city’s long-range plan for land use and development.”)

Permitting plexes throughout single family zones is a flagrant contradiction to the Comprehensive Plan and to Bloomington’s long history of protecting core neighborhoods. While the Comp Plan includes recommendations that can be conflicting and subject to multiple interpretations, Policy 5.3.1, p. 64, leaves little room for the placement of plexes:

“Encourage opportunities for infill and redevelopment across Bloomington with consideration for increased residential densities, complementary design, and underutilized housing types such as accessory dwelling units, duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings, courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, townhouses, row houses and live/work spaces. Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods.” (my underline)

The Comp Plan has many additional statements to protect or expand owner occupied housing. See pages 84,85,86,88,91.

Buying a house is one of the largest financial and psychological investments people make. That long term decision is based on reasonable expectations of the neighborhood’s future.

Core neighborhoods don’t have deed restrictions or subdivision covenants. Owners rely on zoning and the local three-max-unrelated occupancy rule. That rule has been in effect for decades, and was upheld by the Indiana Supreme court in the 1990’s. It has been crucial in creating a balance between home owners and rentals in the core neighborhoods. The Plex zoning throws out that rule, and tips the scale heavily to the rental companies.

Why protect core neighborhoods?

They are sustainable, diverse (except for student enclaves), dense, walkable, drivable, and popular. House price differentials are wide. Instead of ‘trading up’ they often remodel and build additions. That labor-intensive work improves the city’s core and builds its skilled work force.

When residents Owners tend to stay put they get to know their neighbors. These relationships are widened and maintained during walks to nearby destinations when residents meet on the street. City issues are common topics. The sense of community is enhanced. This quality is hard to measure, but precious, and will be increasingly valuable to help cope with climate change

The core neighborhoods’ density also reduces the city’s cost to provide infrastructure and services. Narrow lots and streets equal less paving, shorter pipes, and shorter travel distances

for sanitation and other services. Core neighborhoods' property taxes pay more than their share, and tend to subsidize less dense areas. ('Strong Town' studies)

Core neighborhoods are living examples of urban patterns that should be reproduced, not threatened. Like all living things they are vulnerable and it's up to us to care for them.

The unjustified burden and risk placed on core neighborhoods

These neighborhoods are already dense and diverse, but they need protection, not assault. The fact that core neighborhoods were built with some multi-family dwellings has been given as a reason to add more. That kind of superficial logic pervades the rationalization of Plex zoning, and turns a blind eye to the facts on our streets. The recent planning efforts of Seattle and Minneapolis have somehow become more important than Bloomington's own history.

That history shows that our enormous student population, when unrestricted, takes over blocks of core neighborhood houses. The evidence is clear and persists. When a street's tipping point of student occupancy is reached, owner occupancy disappears. In areas with a current mix of rentals and owner-occupied dwellings a delicate balance exists. Rentals are sometimes sold to owner occupiers and vice versa. But if the market is opened to duplexes and triplexes our history shows us that the balance will shift rapidly toward irreversible student enclaves.

Though the plexes are intended for all 'single family' zoning in Bloomington most of the impact will fall on core neighborhoods. Their close proximity to campus and downtown is an obvious factor, but it should be noted that many subdivisions outside the core have covenants and restrictions still in effect that ban uses such as plexes.

A Plex Scenario

A neighbor sells her house before the For Sale sign goes up. (Rental companies work with realtors to quickly respond to new sales.) The house becomes a duplex with six students, their cars, and lots of coming and going. Parking gets to be a search. Walking is riskier. It's noisier later. Keeping up with six new names each year seems futile. Landscaping, including trees, starts to disappear. The Plex's landlady isn't available, it's an agency. If another house goes plex, owners will be outnumbered. Selling prices remain high. Students attract other students. An agent calls asking if you'd like to sell.

A small number of plexes could transform mixed rental and owner-occupied areas to student only enclaves. Plex zoning code, with its 'by right' to double occupancy, will also double rental income. This rental market leverage will increase the cost of buying a house, and if thousands of new student rentals built in the last few years haven't lowered rents why will a handful of plexes do it.?

The damage from plexes may be irreversible. As noted, the grandfathered rentals from before the 'three max rule' still exist. Once purchases are made with the intention of plexing, can that right be withdrawn? Once a plex, always a plex. Look again at Bloomington's history.

Our History

Blocks of existing streets in core neighborhoods are student rental dominated and have been for decades. The houses in these enclaves have been sold and resold over the years but almost exclusively to other rental companies. Their ongoing attraction as rentals reflects the lack of appeal to owner occupiers, and the value generated by the grandfathering of more than three adults occupancy per property.

Examples (from 'Elevate'):

E. Hunter, three blocks between Woodlawn and Henderson, 24 houses,
owner occupied: 0

E. 2nd, four blocks between Park and Grant, south side, 27 houses,
owner occupied: possibly 2.

Students

Students, approximately 50% of Bloomington's population, dominate our rental market. 66% of our housing units is rental (Comp. Plan). It seems likely that we have one of the highest percentages of student rentals in the country.

Many students are fine people, but most are highly transient.

Both of my next-door neighbors have been student rentals for the last 15 to 25 years. The students rarely stay for more than a year.

They aren't at a stage in their lives when they put down roots, and understandably don't tend to contribute much to a neighborhood. When I was a student I moved frequently and had a challenging class schedule. I liked being around other students and lived in a dorm for three years. Later, when I lived in a shared rental house, I wasn't interested in planting a tree, or fixing a house, or attempting to get to know a neighbor.

It's not that renters can't develop a sense of caring for their dwelling and their neighborhood. This kind of 'ownership' takes time and commitment.

Student Luxury Apartments

I thought the term 'student luxury apartments' was oxymoronic when I saw it in an ad 10 or 15 years ago. It's not. Houses are being bought from owner occupants and then rented. It's a business model, and rental companies obviously want to maximize their profits.

Here's a website for 'Bloomington's Best Student Rentals':

<https://www.chickeringrentals.com/>

Newspaper article about the company linked on the same website:

https://www.hoosiertimes.com/herald_times_online/life/at_home/bringing-rentals-back-to-life/article_803abc69-5f70-5d5b-9f6b-85857340e117.html?utm_medium=social&utm_source=email&utm_campaign=user-share

According to the HT article the company has 50 houses. Most are in Elm Heights. At \$250,000 (rough estimate) per house it's a \$12.5 million inventory. Rents per bedroom

are in the \$600 to \$750 range. The houses appear to be historic and well maintained, an attraction to students and their parents. Many are grandfathered for more than three occupants.

The town planner, Chuck Marohn of 'Strong Towns, visited Bloomington a couple of years ago. He asked his mostly mature audience in the Buskirk Chumley Theatre, "Where was the worst place you ever lived?" Several voices responded with "At college, when I was a student." Chuck expected that answer. He responded, not smiling, saying "Today's college students may be living in the best place they'll ever live."

Heard from a friend: A downtown student housing developer said that it takes six working adults to pay for a three-bedroom student apartment.

A friend on S. Park just south of 1st St. sold her house in 2017 for \$318,000 to an LLC.

My wife, enquiring for her sister, recently called about a house for rent on 1st St. The monthly rent is \$2400. The agent, maybe unaware of the three-max rule said that it has four bedrooms. It was sold in 2014 for \$373,500 to the current owners. (Per Elevate)

Rough financial analysis of duplex with 3 renters in each unit:

6 occupants x \$700 monthly rent = \$4200/month, \$50,400/ gross income

With a \$500,000 house purchase and remodeling budget and taxes at \$5,000/year the gross return on investment for the first year = $\$50,400 / \$505,000 = 10\%$.

Additional benefit: rents and property tend to go up over time.

Conclusion: What is Plex Success?

Given the numbers of student renters and the amount of money in play, it's hard to imagine that plexes in core neighborhoods will reduce rents or house prices. Instead, this poorly planned handout to rental companies, if 'successful,' will severely damage core neighborhoods.

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 December 18, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.**

(see [Written Objections/Comments filed before October 30, 2019](#) for previous submittals)

1. Amanda Mejia - Dear Isabella, I am a first time homeowner in the Bryan park neighborhood. Having moved to Bloomington recently, I feel that the type of neighborhood we have is quite unique. I feel very lucky to have moved to such a great community with a wonderful group of diverse neighbors who care about each other. It is truly something special. I am concerned about the proposed changes to BPN in the UDO, specifically the changing of BPN from single family home zoning to allow duplexes and triplexes. Most of my neighbors seem to feel similarly. It seems from an outside perspective that the wishes and concerns of the residents of Bryan Park are not being taken into account by the council. Please represent your constituents and help preserve this beautiful and authentic community.

2. Marcia Baron - Dear Council Members,

I listened to the report last week and in light of it realize that we do not even know that there is a housing shortage. The lack of information on what the housing situation actually is was simply amazing. I had assumed there WAS a problem and that it was well documented, but it now appears that it is by no means clear.

I would also like to ask whatever happened to the Comprehensive Plan? Has it simply been discarded? I refer in particular to these parts, with some bits highlighted:

(pg 60)

Housing Trends and Issues

Some of Bloomington's neighborhoods are relatively diverse, both economically and by housing type, whereas others are comprised almost entirely of single-family homes and limited in development by covenants. Most core neighborhoods are stable but are trending towards a lower percentage of new single-family homes. With greater density in the city comes the challenge to preserve neighborhood character and the opportunity to strengthen neighborhoods by developing small commercial nodes as community gathering places. Existing core neighborhoods should not be the focus of the city's increasing density.

(pg 61)

Bloomington's older urban, small scale, compact, single-family housing stock located primarily around the city center and university provide some of the city's more affordable housing stock and must be protected.

(pg 61)

Now that 1,900 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. This can allow more people to have a chance to live in urban neighborhoods, which are often closer to employment, shopping, and other amenities. This may also have the added benefit of reducing automobile traffic and the negative environmental impacts of traffic congestion.

(pg 64)

Policy 5.3.1: Encourage opportunities for infill and redevelopment across Bloomington with consideration for increased residential densities, complementary design, and underutilized housing types such as accessory dwelling units, duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings, courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, townhouses, row houses, and live/work spaces. Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods.

(pg 65)

Continue to support and promote affordable home ownership as another method of permanent affordability that can help to raise and keep residents from poverty while they build equity and security in the local community.

(pg 84)

A few locations may support increases in density and multifamily residential uses when adjacent to higher volume roads, or near major destinations, or located along neighborhood edges that may support small-scale neighborhood mixed uses. It is important to protect the existing single-family housing stock within this district. The conversion of dwellings to multifamily or commercial uses should be discouraged.

(pg 88)

Land Use Development Approvals

New and redevelopment activity for this district is mostly limited to remodeling existing or constructing new singlefamily residences. These instances require the Maintain development theme for development approvals.

At the meeting last week, I listened to many speakers, including those whose view is different from mine. While I sympathize about the growing inequalities in our nation—and certainly support leaders such as Sanders and Warren who are very concerned to address them—and sympathize at the local level about housing being somewhat expensive in some areas, I do not understand why it is thought that changing the zoning to allow multiplexes would help the people looking for affordable housing in this part of town. It will line the pockets of those wishing to rent out such places, to be sure, and it will perhaps reduce the property values, over time, of some of the houses near where the multiplexes are; but I'm sure the goal isn't to make the houses affordable by reducing

their value. In addition, it might be worth noting that many of us lived our younger years in less choice areas and only at the age of 55 or so could afford a house in the area we most wanted. I'm not sure that we should feel too terrible about 30 years olds having to live, say, 2 miles from campus rather than walking distance, and I think that providing more housing in the areas around downtown and along the B-line also is a huge help, and helps beautify our city, too, and provides housing in an area that enables people who wish to to walk or bike everywhere.

Surely the creative people in city govt. can come up with something better than rezoning to allow more rentals in areas that are already both densely populated and diverse. Adding housing in other areas—if it IS needed—is one thing. Something I never hear suggested is RENT CONTROL. (Could it be because those with rental property aren't enthusiastic about it?) Another thing I never hear mentioned is GRANTS TO ENABLE some people to buy up a house now on the market—there certainly are some that have been on the market for a long time in Elm Hts.!—and who would not otherwise be able to afford it.

The reasons against the change are so compelling that I will not repeat them again; perhaps the most important one is that elaborated by Jenny Southern, to the effect that this was tried before, and had the predictable undesirable results: rents went up, and there were fewer owner-occupied homes.

I wish to add that the hostility expressed at the meeting by one member of the council towards Sturbaum was deeply disturbing.

Best,
Marcia Baron

3. Mike Biggs - Hi, As for the question of duplex/triplexes, I am struck by the reports that homeowners are getting frequent & very high offers for their properties despite not being on the market for the first time ever. This leads me to believe that just the speculation on the possibility of allowing duplex/triplexes is enough to already make housing unaffordable in Bloomington. The effect is equivalent to if the ordinance had passed already- that is how certain this apparently will end individual homeownership for most people in Bloomington. It already has. Mike Biggs

4. David Keppel - Dear Members of the Council,

Thank you for the many hours you are devoting to the Unified Development Ordinance and for the patience and care with which you are approaching public controversy about it.

As you know, I favor efforts to increase housing density. In the long term (which you are shaping by this vote), greater density will make Bloomington more sustainable and affordable. While it is true that the Comprehensive Plan says core neighborhoods should not be "the focus" for housing density, that does not mean they should be exempt from careful efforts in this direction.

At the same time, I think it is quite right for you to hear -- and incorporate -- the concerns of current residents.

We have heard much about "conditional use" and whether that category is significant. My feeling is that it could be, especially if you added conditions that would tend to guard against the bad outcomes people fear.

Here are some potential ways you might do that, without a total ban on duplexes and triplexes in core neighborhoods:

Make remodels a permitted use; tear-downs would be conditional, requiring the existing structure to be in certifiably poor condition or to have environmental contamination (such as asbestos) making it an unsafe dwelling without expensive remediation;

Cap the total number of plexes, at least for the first five years, with the issue coming back to the Council at that time for renewal;

Require owner occupancy of one of the units. Is that just another term for an ADU, which is already permitted? I don't know. I think it would allow for more than the current model for the ADU -- namely, the remodeling of a building to have up to three approximately equal units, of which the owner was required to make one unit their primary residence.

I believe these amendments would greatly reduce any risk that residents have raised. An outside speculator is more likely to be the one to tear down a good house and build a cookie cutter structure. If you strongly prefer remodels, that will preserve existing buildings and the character of the neighborhood, and the work will more likely go to local contractors who know the specifics of the building and the area. Moreover, since it is generally cheaper to remodel than to tear down and rebuild, it is more likely the units will be affordable.

Secondly, owner occupancy of one of the units (if it is legally possible for you to require this) would make the scenario of irresponsible, disruptive tenants much less likely.

If your legal advisors say the owner occupancy requirement is not possible, then could you approach the goal from the other end by expanding the specifications for an ADU?

If you go forward along these lines, the difference will be incremental, not dramatic. So would be the gains to environmental, social, and economic justice. But that fits the paradigm of addressing climate change: there is no single massive solution; we have to do many modest things.

I have one final thought, though it is not strictly part of the UDO. Opponents have repeatedly said there are many other places in Bloomington where greater density is appropriate. I thus hope that as we go forward, we will commit ourselves to that effort. Developing less desirable areas must be done vigorously, yet carefully to avoid gentrification. Unlike duplexes in core neighborhoods, mere permission will not be enough, because it can't be done incrementally. Who wants a duplex in an otherwise undesirable location? So there will have to be a public-private effort that includes convenient public transportation, safe bike paths to downtown, green space, and other amenities. I hope we can unite to meet this need. With thanks and best wishes, David

Second email - Dear Members of the Council,

I would like to add one idea to my message of yesterday. There are ways apart from the UDO of addressing residents' fear of loud tenants of duplexes and triplexes. The City could expand its use of mediation (reachable through a 311 number). We could also toughen the noise ordinance, including potential penalties.

One advantage of this approach is that it would apply equally to those living in housing of all types and to those of any age. Thanks and peace,

5. Johannes Türk - Dear Council Members,

I am writing to you because I am greatly concerned – and frankly outraged given the new zoning regulations the city was considering recently – to receive news about the new Unified Development Ordinance in planning. To allow in the Elm Heights and Prospect Hill neighborhoods the construction of duplexes and triplexes with 6-9 bedrooms each all through the neighborhoods that can house three unrelated adults and their relatives would mean the destruction of grown an mostly intact neighborhoods in favor of business development. These neighborhoods are protected for a good reason: it is central to the character of Bloomington as a good place to live that central neighborhoods offer families and individuals quiet and residential neighborhoods with a high quality of life. This is under attack with the proposal. And it would hit neighborhoods that have over the last 20 years through individual investment regained their character and attractively. I have lived for years on Fess Avenue ion the hearth of the Elm Hights neighborhoods and know from experience that already now in streets with many houses that host larger

groups of students there are serious and regular problems for neighbors (which does not mean all of the houses or students are the cause of this of course). That no parking spaces will be required for the multiplexes, is so to speak the dot on the of this thoughtless proposal. I am not sure if those introducing this measure are lobbyists of construction businesses, but frankly I am astonished by the bland and unabashed willingness to serve specific business interests with such a clearly destructive impact on the community in the city council. Thank you, Johannes Türk

6. Steven Layman - Bloomington City Council

I am writing regarding the Proposed UDO and the changes to residential zoning in Bloomington. I have been in Bloomington as a homeowner and taxpayer for over 20 years. I am active with many organizations in Bloomington and plan to stay forever even though I am retired and can live anywhere I want. Bloomington is important to me and my family. However this recent push for zoning changes is of enormous concern to myself and others. While I understand the need to change with the times this change is way over the top.

The stated reason for these zoning changes "improve the affordable housing stock in Bloomington through density" sounds good if you say it really fast. Unfortunately it will not work without guarantees in writing with the landlords and developers. This has been attempted, sometimes in good faith and sometimes not, and has failed in cities across the country for many years now. Some cities (Denver for example) are now trying to roll these changes back but it is difficult to do when you have big money involved.

There is plenty of property across the city that can be developed without attacking single family neighborhoods. We don't need more apartments for our residents whether they are families or singles. People need home ownership to build financial stability. The effort should go into finding ways for people to get into home ownership so they can build for the future.

As far as student housing goes I believe IU needs to take the lead on that.. While the city and local developers can assist, the students are ultimately the universities responsibility.

My last point is this, when I moved to Bloomington in 1998 I bought a home that was zoned single family residential. If I had wanted a neighborhood with duplexes or apartment buildings I would have bought in that type of neighborhood. When I bought my home I bought the zoning as well. That should not be changed without a really good reason and the preference of someone else is not a good reason. If the city changes our zoning against our will that could only be described as theft. I understand the need to rezone abandoned commercial and industrial areas but that is not the case here. Thanks, Steven Layman

7. Ann Edmonds - Dear Bloomington City Council Members:

Since 2011, student enrollment at IU has declined by nearly 5% and it is projected to continue declining. While renovating several dorms, IU has been able to place 3000 students in private apartments. A student housing PUD on North Walnut which will provide housing for hundreds more students has been approved. Clearly there is currently no need for more student housing. Furthermore, with declining enrollment, IU will experience declining tuition revenue and may need to cut back on staffing levels. The projected population growth for Bloomington which forms the justification for multiplexes may well be a mirage.

While well-intentioned, the currently proposed multiplexes will cause landlords to buy single family houses to divide them for additional student rentals. In fact, some residents along Henderson Street report having already been approached by such landlords wanting to buy their homes. While allowing multiplexes is intended to provide additional affordable housing, dividing existing single family homes into additional student rentals will have the effect of taking affordable houses off the market and making family home ownership less affordable.

I urge you to deny even conditional use of multiplexes in current single family residential areas. Conditional use merely means that the Board of Zoning Appeals will approve the multiplexes before they are built. It is at best a delaying tactic. Thanks, Ann Edmonds
Treasurer, Arden Place Neighborhood Association

8. Susan Clendening - Dear Council Members,

I have several concerns about the new UDO for Bryan Park Neighborhood. I have read all the posted pros and cons in our neighborhood list, which have been numerous, but helpful.

The idea of comparing a large urban area to a small city with a large university does not make sense to me. I purchased a home in the Bryan Park area, hoping to live there through my retirement. I bought a 1932 bungalow and restored it. I love being able to walk downtown and to the park; however, the prospect of having a student rental, with 6 bedrooms, next door (and, I will add that my neighbor across the street on the corner lot has recently received a most substantial offer for his lot...clearly not meant for affordable housing or single family) transforms my retirement home into an entirely different situation. I never would have purchased this house, if I had thought a triplex would be directly across the street or next door. I have lived within walking distance of downtown since coming to Bloomington in the late 60's and can't imagine living elsewhere.

Finally, it seems to me that the UDO places the burden of "hosting" student housing on homes in the more affordable parts of our community. Sincerely, Susan Clendening

9. Kathleen Myers - Dear City Council Members:

I write with deep concern about the UDO Multiplex plan and uphold comments made by a neighbor:

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.

Second email - Dear City Council Members:

I write to forward to you a letter that I sent to Isabel Piedmont Smith. It discusses points that I have made in comments at your meeting last month, in a letter to the editor published with the HT two weeks ago, and in my neighborhood list serve.

Please think carefully about your votes tomorrow on this issue that would forever change our neighborhoods and the character of Bloomington and that will not achieve the goal of more affordable housing (please see Jim Rosenbarger's good math in his letter to your council and recall that the first person to speak at the council meeting several weeks ago was a realtor who doesn't live in the neighborhood).

Thank you for taking so much time and care on this key issue for our future as a city. We all appreciate your efforts on our behalf.

All my best,
Kathleen Myers

Dear Isabel,

I am writing in response to your position that you sent out to the Bryan Park list serve about the UDO allowing multiplexes in core neighborhoods. I have long admired your work and dedication to my former neighborhood and current neighbors across the park. Your decision to support multiplexes in core neighborhoods, even with your proposed revisions, however, to many of us appears to undermine your record of dedication to maintaining a strong community and to supporting the community that elected you.

Undermining the Comprehensive Policy

Your position directly contradicts the recent Comprehensive Policy Plan (2018), the “city’s long-range plan for land use and development,” and 5.3.1, p. 64, in particular, which states there should be “encouragement for increased residential densities ... duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings ... Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods.” Why would City Council members like yourself go against the community that elected you as well as a Comprehensive City plan that was just instituted only a year ago?

Undermining Zoning Rules that have supported diversity and core neighborhoods

After 33 years of living within a couple blocks of Bryan Park and knowing about 300 neighbors, I can tell you that the best thing that has happened to these core neighborhoods was the zoning rule of a maximum of 3 unrelated people put in place several decades ago. This simple, but powerful zoning rule, helped to protect core neighborhoods that aren’t protected by subdivision covenants and that are close to campus and fall easy prey to IU expansion. This zoning rule was upheld by the state Supreme Court. The rule has allowed student rentals while not overwhelming or forcing out families, professionals, and retirees. Indeed, the rule balances the latter group of citizens, who ensure the health, maintenance, and strong community of the core neighborhood, while students benefit from the neighborhood even as they typically rent for one at the most two years.

The multiplex proposal for core neighborhoods, which you support in your email, will reverse the trend of the last 20 plus years, the trend that brought diversity back into these neighborhoods. If passed, there is no doubt that families, retirees and professionals will look to covenanted neighborhoods so that they can ensure a certain level of stability in their community. It will encourage new urban sprawl by families and produce more commuters to the center of town.

Acknowledge that we are a university town

Planners and others keep comparing us to Portland and other non-university towns/cities that aren’t in the Midwest. But let’s acknowledge that Bloomington is not a large, urban city with a highly diverse work force. It is a Mid-west university town in which about half of the population is students; percentage-wise it is a highly transient city. The proximity of the core neighborhoods to the university makes them targets for realtors to develop larger student housing. Take a look at the number of realtors that own and operate rentals along Hunter Ave., and South Grant St. Let’s respect Bloomington’s

unique history and situation, which has produced a wonderful, unique Bloomington, and let's also acknowledge that this also creates challenges that Portland does not share. We need to support and ensure the health of core neighborhoods close to IU, not help tear them down.

Address areas in need of Urbanization, vacancies, and new IU trends

Instead of undermining core neighborhoods and decades of work to maintain them, let's first focus on developing the many areas that are in urgent need of urbanization (College Mall, South College, and soon, the hospital site, etc.), following the Policy 5.3.1 cited above for higher density and thus also respecting the other part of Policy 5.3.1, which is to avoid these changes in single family neighborhoods. In addition, no long-term studies have been done on the current and future situation of Bloomington rentals, which projects about a current approximate 10% vacancy rate and a sharp decline in IU enrollments within the decade (see recent HT articles). As it is, Bloomington, unlike other university towns has very few core family neighborhoods. Let's keep them.

I wonder if you have had a chance to walk around Allen St., Dodds St., Palmer St., etc., as we discussed last spring at the polls, to see what the blocks look like and to talk with the diverse people who currently own/rent in that neighborhood. If asked if they want a multiplex built next to them, the answer will be "no" from a large majority of families, retirees, professional who have invested in the neighborhood, and even the students who are renting there precisely because they enjoy the diversity of a non-student neighborhood. Please leave your constituents' core neighborhood to continue to develop organically in a way that will continue to ensure diversity and community.

I urge you to follow the amendment that will be introduced at the next City Council meeting, the amendment to remove the multi-plexes in core neighborhoods from the UDO. The future of what is attractive and diverse about Bloomington's already small core neighborhood area is at stake and you are in a position to help it rather than hurt it.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. I'd be happy to talk in person with you further, if you'd like. I will be at the City Council meeting too.

Sincerely,
Kate Myers

10. Michelle Henderson - Dear Council Members,

Thank you all for the many hours you've spent reading articles and messages about residents' concerns, as well as the late nights spent listening to public comment about the proposed UDO. I truly appreciate your service to our community and I admire your willingness to take on such difficult work when there are controversial decisions to be made.

I'm sure you are aware that there are different sources of information that make the case for increasing density throughout the city, as well as for protecting the low-income core neighborhoods from displacement, real-estate speculation, and exploitation by developers. No one can know what will happen in the future, and much of the research supporting both sides of the issue is theoretical in nature or is applied to major cities rather than to small college towns. While there is value in considering the opinions of experts in the fields of urban planning and economics, that theoretical information is not a substitute for facts about the reality of Bloomington, Indiana in 2019. I hope that you are willing to look at facts based on our own unique community at this moment in history, rather than some theoretical future, as you weigh your decisions about the UDO amendments which will be proposed:

Fact: The core neighborhoods contain the least expensive rentals in the city, mostly because they are the oldest and smallest rentals but also because they are in areas that have been considered undesirable in the past. For example, Fairview Elementary School is 90% free-and-reduced lunch, which is an indication of high poverty.

Fact: The core neighborhoods are the most densely developed lots in the city, with average lot sizes of .15/acre and many subdivided to less than .10/acre according to Monroe County GIS Elevate.

Fact: Under a rental code allowing five unrelated adults to live in single-family housing in Bloomington's core neighborhoods in the 1970's-1980's, most single-family homes near campus were bought and converted to rentals until the rental code was changed to limit occupancy to three unrelated adults. Under the current rental code there is already a diverse mix of grandfathered duplexes, triplexes, and small apartments surrounding single-family homes, all on small lots, in the core neighborhoods.

Fact: Bloomington has been ranked #5 on the 2018 U.S. Landlord Index on Homes.com as a small college town bringing the best returns for an investor to get the best yield. Residents have been contacted with requests to buy their properties from non-local real estate investment companies in the past six months.

Fact: More than 90 percent of demolition delay cases are released for demolition by the Historic Commission. In September a notable house on the Near West Side was demolished after being given protected status by the HPC.

Based on these facts, when you review the amendments for the UDO and decide which way you will vote, I ask you to consider one important factor:

What choice will best protect our existing low-income residents who need affordable housing right now?

While adding new plexes to the core neighborhoods may theoretically result in "trickle-down" affordable housing in 20+ years, new construction will NOT be affordable and

will displace the low-income residents who are currently living there and who will have no place less expensive to go if they are evicted so that a landlord can sell to a developer. Those residents need to be protected.

While adding plexes to the core neighborhoods may provide “missing middle” housing for young professionals, those relatively expensive plexes will replace older, smaller housing that is crucial for residents who work at minimum-wage jobs downtown or on campus, and who are currently walking or biking to work because they can’t afford a car. If those renters lose their housing and have to move out of the core neighborhoods, they are likely to lose their jobs. Those workers need to be protected.

While adding plexes to the core neighborhoods may increase housing options, the core neighborhoods compose less than 5% of the city’s area. There are many other spaces which are still close to campus and downtown where density can be added without taking away the already limited affordable housing that currently exists. That limited affordable housing needs to be protected.

While adding plexes to the core neighborhoods will theoretically create environmentally-friendly housing, there is no meaningful increase in environmental or sustainability goals by the focus on such a small area (~5%) of the city, which already meets the sustainability criteria of being built with natural materials on small lots with irreplaceable biodiversity and green space. That existing sustainable housing needs to be protected.

The core neighborhoods are exactly what the pro-plex public speakers have said they want: environmentally sustainable housing on small lots in “walkable” neighborhoods with a diversity of class and culture, a strong sense of community, and a resident population that includes students, minimum wage workers, IU staff, families, retirees, homeowners, and renters. Our irreplaceable core neighborhoods need to be protected. Please vote YES on the Sturbaum/Rollo Amendment 1 to protect the core neighborhoods by prohibiting duplexes and triplexes in the core neighborhoods. Please vote NO on the Volan amendment to allow plexes by-right in the core neighborhoods.

Please do no harm to our vulnerable affordable housing and our vulnerable low-income citizens. Sincerely, Michelle Henderson

11. Kevin Atkins - I think the simple way to make this urban infill duplex/triplex idea work without destroying core neighborhood character is to require owner occupancy, with a legal restriction on all future sales to continue that requirement.

That would mean no (or very few) out of town investor-developers, it would likely curb undesirable party houses, it would mean the rent and taxes would all remain mostly-local, it would mean that a potential ‘plex builder will think twice, or thrice, about the development risks and benefits (not being able to sell it without finding a buyer with the same ethics/motives/aesthetics as the original owner).

We might further protect the idea by connecting resale to a community foundation (county, Habitat, BRI), especially if the ‘plex is being sold after the death of the owner, to

facilitate making sure an appropriate, vetted buyer is found, and to reduce the burden on heirs, especially non-local heirs.

I don't know how difficult it is to make such a restriction binding, toothful, and perpetual, but... that's a version of this idea I would accept with very few qualms (along with all the other pretty sensible workaday restrictions on lot size, footprint, height, setbacks, parking, impervious surface, etc. etc. which are already in the UDO or proposed).

I'm not the only one who has said this, but I just wanted to reiterate in without the jumble of a hundred other thoughts or issues.

12. John Kruschke - Dear Members of the City Council:

Sincere thanks to you all for your efforts with these important matters.

I have been a Bloomington resident for more than 30 years. I've completed the Bloomington Citizen's Academy. I vote. I am a progressive liberal and I resonate with appeals to social justice. I have been a renter, and my children are millennials so I understand and feel the challenges of housing for millennials. I am a professional scientist so I understand the enormous threat of climate change. Indeed, when my wife and I built our all-electric house with no fireplace, we installed, at great expense, geothermal heating/cooling, the best insulation, and many solar panels, so we have a light carbon footprint and green-generate nearly as much energy as we consume.

Given my background, you would think that if pro- "plex-in-the-core" arguments could convince anyone, they would convince me.

But they have not. The pro plex arguments simply do not address my concerns, based on my lived experience. I am a homeowner in a core neighborhood. Rentals in my neighborhood are largely student rentals with absentee landlords. My lived experience shows that a noticeable proportion of these rentals give minimal attention to neighborly appearance and maintenance, with trash cans in the yards, numerous cars spilling into the street, and noise at all hours.

New plexes in my neighborhood will also be largely student rentals with absentee landlords. The proposed UDO allows next door to my home, a triplex that is 40 feet tall, with three loud air conditioning units, six garbage bins sitting out front, and nine more cars parked on the street in front of my house, with car doors slamming and engines running at all hours.

The pro-plex-ers say that a 40 foot tall triplex with its triple A/C units and six garbage cans and nine cars is only a quote "modest" change. It's not modest. It's an enormous destruction of core neighborhoods that the painstakingly conceived Comprehensive Plan says should be preserved for the benefit of all Bloomington.

Thank you again.

13. Teal Bingham - Dear City Council Member,

I'm writing as one of your constituents to ask you to please vote in favor of the density increases in the UDO. I can't make it to the meeting tonight but I fully support the zoning changes that would allow plexes in our neighborhoods.

As a Bloomington native who has moved back here to settle down and start my family, I am thinking a lot of the Bloomington that I want to raise my kids in. I can see the growth and change happening already. We can't know exactly what climate change will bring, but as we see more extreme and dangerous weather on the coasts it looks certain that we will have some (if not en masse) migration into the center of the country, and Bloomington being a progressive town with an institution such as IU will undoubtedly be an attractive choice. This doesn't have to be a difficult and painful growth. We can start shifting our systems now to prepare Bloomington to be a welcoming place that has the flexibility to be home for all manner of people in all manner of economic situations. And the best part is that if I'm wrong, if no migration happens or if growth slows, the changes proposed here will make for happier and healthier communities anyway. Many studies have found that the more diversity (of race, class, background and experience) a child grows up around the more empathetic and compassionate they will be. The more types of housing we have in our neighborhoods will increase the health and diversity of our communities. I want all people in Bloomington to benefit from the opportunity to live close to town and access the resources that my family can. Having more people live walking and biking distance to their city core, grocery stores, work and community does wonders for community health and individual health. Not everyone can give up their car, but a lot of people want to walk and bike more and they currently can't because they don't live in a place that has safe routes to their daily needs. Others have to walk and bike due to lack of resources and endure unsafe conditions on a daily basis to get to where they need to go. We can change that by increasing density in our neighborhoods close to the core and creating a variety of housing and more affordable housing there too.

I appreciate your time and attention and thank you for supporting positive change in Bloomington for our future residents as well as those who've already found a great home here. Thanks, Teal Bingham

14. John Tilson - City Council Members,

While researching places to retire I found this quote by AreaVibes, a livability website. "With a population density of 3,574 people per square mile, Bloomington is well above the nation's average density level." <https://www.areavibes.com/bloomington-in/livability/>

Passing the UDO all but guarantees a collapse of societal norms...

"Behavioral sink" is a term invented by ethologist John B. Calhoun to describe a collapse in behavior which can result from overcrowding. / No small part of this ugly barbarization has been due to sheer physical congestion: a diagnosis now partly confirmed with scientific experiments with rats – for when they are placed in equally congested quarters, they exhibit the same symptoms of stress, alienation, hostility, sexual perversion, parental incompetence, and rabid violence that we now find in the Megalopolis. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behavioral_sink

Maybe housing isn't too expensive but income/wages are too low.

Note: I moved back to Bloomington after a 43 year absence. I am shocked and disappointed at the damage the city leaders have done in that time. They have taken a charming college town and turned Bloomington into high rises and student apartment buildings that look like we're in New York City! What were they thinking?

Bloomington already gets an "F" in crime when compared to the state of Indiana and the nation.

Do not pass UDO...Don't create a Behavioral Sink!

15. Jim Krause - Dear Bloomington City Council

While I can't attend tonight's meeting, I want to provide my support of the amendment by Dave Rollo and Christ Sturbaum. I urge you to adopt their amendment to not allow duplexes and triplexes in single-family neighborhoods.

I'm aware that there are many multifaceted aspects of this debate, but ultimately my hope is that the city council supports the wishes of their constituency- and this voting member does not want to see duplexes and triplexes in single-family-zoned neighborhoods.

Thank you for your service! Jim Krause

16. Kim Vint - Dear City Council Members:

Please vote no in allowing "Plexes" in core neighborhoods. My husband and I used to live in the area of E 14th and N Indiana. At the time it was a nice quiet neighborhood. Then a developer was allowed to build what is essentially 'Plexes in the BACK YARD of single family homes. It created a hostile atmosphere as an off campus greek group used one of these "Plexes as their off campus party house. The neighborhood was destroyed. I would strongly suggest a stroll through the side streets of campus to view more "Plexes built right in the back yard of homes. The developer shall remain un-named but I am quite sure we all are familiar with the style. I can guarantee this will only increase the density of students in older core neighborhoods. The infrastructure will simply not support further density. 'Plexes built with today's dollars will not be "more affordable" just "more attractive" due to luxuries that attract students. To Sturbaum and Rollo save our neighborhoods. My Husband and I eventually moved to East Dodds. We could hardly afford the mortgage as is the norm for most couples just starting out. But we made it, we have actually paid for our home three times. Remodeling to make it a little bigger the first time, then redoing the kitchen and the ONE BATH to upgrade from the 50's. So we are "invested" in our home and love the quite beauty. Please prevent the destruction. City of Bloomington Resident for 50 years

Second email - First for your courage to protect our core neighborhoods. I appalled you. I have lived with my husband in neighborhoods that were completely destroyed by uncaring developers.

My second point I would like for your consideration, is parking. Sometimes I cannot turn left onto E ALLEN on the corner of S Grant. For some reason we have several tenants parking on the street, on both sides, and a home owner with a huge F250 (or larger) with a demolition car on a trailer and the combination almost blocks the whole intersection. Perhaps parking on ONE SIDE of the street would help. I have seen the sanitation trucks and the snow removal trucks having a hard time when the side narrow streets are clogged with cars.

Second. DO NOT forget as most of you are young and mobile there will come a day when you have trouble walking. It could happen much earlier than one might think. Not everyone in Btwn can walk as easily as each one of you can now. It is a growing elderly population that each of you fail to recognize. WE NEED parking. Each Apartment MUST HAVE at least one space for each Tenant do you really get that the environment benefits when one circles and circles a Hood to find a parking space? More damage is done to the environment by LOOKING for a space than having one that will easily be eventually swallowed by nature. the same amount of time that nature would take to take down a plex is infinitely longer. Perhaps your short term thinking needs to be challenged by going into Chicago and the burbs and TRY to find a parking place, wish you could also take a person with a walker and manage that day to day You are only

looking in the future which I get but we still have 20 years of US that may need more than "Parking on the Street," which is plentiful??? STOP thinking of yourself and your current youth. With all due respect

17. Karen Knight - Hello everyone,

Thank you for the wonderful work you are doing on balancing the citizens' needs on this difficult topic.

We have learned as a city that building more apartments doesn't bring down rent rates. Building duplexes and triplexes in core neighborhoods is not going to bring down rent rates either. What it might do is negatively impact the feeling of the neighborhood. It feels like Bloomington now is a series of high end student housing complexes catering to people who are going to live here for a few years and then move out. The city has lost sight of the people who live here, work here, celebrate here, raise children here, pay taxes here and die here. We are the backbone of the city and we create its character. Let's not destroy the character of our neighborhoods!

I support Chris Sturbaum's views and I hope you will support his plan with your vote. Thank you for your time, Karen Knight

18. Sue Wanzer - Dear Council Members.

I have signed on with Housing4Hoosiers as a supporter of plexes by right throughout the city. I have come to this conclusion as a Trustee on the Board of MCCSC.

Housing diversity is critical to helping us balance SES within our elementary schools. Not everything can be balanced by drawing attendance districts since so much of our city center and just north and west and south has similar demographics.

Therefore, I urge you to listen to the experts in housing, workforce development, those who work with affordable housing and those in need of housing, as well as others.

Those opposing the plexes while well meaning are advocating for themselves and not for others as those I previously mentioned.

In summary, below is my statement with Housing4Hoosiers: Sue Wanzer, Trustee, MCCSC School Board: "Allowing greater housing diversity in Bloomington is good for our schools. If more families of all backgrounds have a better shot at finding affordable homes to buy or rent, that will reduce the amount of racial and economic segregation currently present in our elementary schools. This won't happen overnight, but making it easier to add more homes throughout our community will make it easier for MCCSC to fulfill its educational mission." Best wishes in your deliberations. Sue Wanzer

19. Darrell Boggess - Might a compromise be possible to have plexes allowed in some neighborhoods as a pilot program for two or three years to learn what happens?

We don't need to overlay local controversy onto what is seen in state and national politics. The plex question has evolved to a level of religion where either you believe the message or you don't. As an alternative to defuse their differences of opinion, some churches offer communion with a choice of wine or grape juice.

We value diversity, so maybe one size fits all is not the only remedy. In this case, medicare "for all who want it" may be preferable to medicare for all.

If some neighborhoods want to try an experiment with allowing plexes, they can be the model for others to watch and see if the change is good, bad or just different. Darrell Boggess

Second email - The concern of homeowners is with what, why and where. The what is not a concern if the reasons and locations are reasonable.

Imposing a perceived loss of property rights on residents of older neighborhoods near IU campus is not acceptable. Those residences were in place decades before St. Charles Catholic church at the corner of East Third and High streets was criticized for locating itself remotely from the population center.

An alternate solution is to confine the experiment without local precedent to places outside the vulnerable neighborhoods and with limits of how many projects are allowed within a defined time period.

20. Nick Blandford – Dear Councilmembers,

Thank you for your public service. I am writing to urge you to allow duplexes, triplexes, and quads as part of the UDO. In order to solve our current housing crisis, and prevent future crises, we should avoid restrictions which limit housing options for residents.

In my almost 20 years as a Bloomington resident, I have always enjoyed living in blended neighborhoods. While I personally own a single-detached dwelling, not all of our city's residents have the financial means or the desire to do the same. I have always lived amidst a mix of owner occupied and rental units, whether it be in my current home in McDoel Gardens, or previous stops on the near south and near west sides. These neighborhoods have included homes of all shapes and sizes, whether they be single-detached, duplexes, other multi-unit buildings, or single-detached homes with backyard cottages. I feel this diversity accentuates the character of neighborhoods and helps prevent segregation based on economic means and class.

Though I write you as a private citizen, I will share an observation from my professional experience. I am the Managing Director for Secretly Group, a music company which includes 3 record labels, a music publisher. We, along with our sister company Secretly Distribution, employ over 60 people in our Bloomington headquarters. The majority of our staff are between the ages of 25-40. Many of them, myself included, have at some point lived in the type of dwellings I'm advocating for. Having diverse and affordable housing choices is an essential component of answering the quality of life question we face as an employer seeking to retain young developing talent. Placing restrictions on housing choices seems fundamentally opposed to the notion of attracting and retaining young professionals in this town. Housing and cost of living, relative to employment opportunities, is already a major hurdle. Please do not support restrictions which will make this a greater challenge for us and other employers. respectfully, Nick Blandford

21. Antonia Matthew – Dear Council Members,

I have already written to you once before, see below, but because I cannot be at tonight's meeting, I am writing to you again. I hope that you have read Bess Lee's editorial in the HT today. She says it better than anyone else can. I do believe that Ideology is being put ahead of people and that is very frightening. If you live in an neighborhood with covenants, your life will not be change. But for those of us living in modest houses in a core neighborhood our lives will be if plexes are allowed. The doors will be opened to developers and landlords, who will be catering to the student renters who can pay much more rent than a single person, couple or small family. Please vote against these plexes. I think that "improving our carbon foot print" is a misleading buzz phrase. Students renters will all have cars. I see it in my block. They will drive to school. Particularly if the new bus routes go through because it will be much more difficult to catch the bus. The new route no longer runs along E. Grimes which was a great pick-up place for those of us living north of Hillside, or a few blocks north of Grimes.

sincerely,
Antonia Matthew
Dear City Council.

One of the things that concerns me about this push for multiplexes in core neighborhoods is that a philosophical blue print 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 o 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 Sincerely, Antonia Matthew

22. Sharlee Dave - Isabel,

Please vote no tonight on the udo. The climate change issue does not hold up. Don't throw our wonderful historic core neighborhood to the development wolves. There has to be other answers to this issue. Thank you for your consideration. Sharlee Davis

Second email - Isabel,

in your most recent post on BPNA list serve you stated that "the level of animosity on this list and elsewhere is uncalled for". I would like to thank you for clearing something up for me. I have been wondering what the feeling is that I have been having when there is a pit in my stomach and my head feels like it is going to explode when I think about a handful of elected officials about to make a decision that would change the character of my neighborhood for generations to come. I have been trying to put my finger on what it is I have been feeling when I feel a decision is being crammed down my throat that does not take into account my sense of place and my quality of life. I feel like it is so unwise to make changes in zoning when all the other options have not been completely explored. What is this feeling I have when I think about the possibility of up to 12 more cars sitting in front of a new quad-plex...oh, wait a minute...all those cars could not possibly fit into spaces in front of the new quad or tri-plex so they would be scattered all up and down our already crowded small streets making it almost impossible for someone like me...blind...to navigate around my sidewalk free neighborhood. Thanks to you I can now put a word to my feelings...animosity! Please consider the folks who have lived in

these core neighborhoods and our sense of place and quality of life before you make decisions that could change Bloomington forever. Sincerely, Sharlee Davis

Third email - Isabel,

Thank you to you and everyone else who voted to protect our core neighborhoods. Thank you for listening. Sincerely, Sharlee Davis

23. Claire Gillen - Dear Council Members,

The decision to prohibit plexes in single family neighborhoods in the core city was the right one...thank you

24. Andrew Strawn - Dear Mr. Sturbaum:

We live in Cascades Addition, an area already seeing a sizeable increase in the number of rental houses. A particular problem that would be exacerbated by the construction of duplexes/triplexes/quadrplexes is parking. One house in our neighborhood recently was occupied by at least 5 people, each of whom had a car. Despite the availability of adequate parking in the rear of the house, residents parked on the street, on both sides. This included two cars parked directly opposite each other, narrowing the space through which traffic could pass to less than one lane width. On multiple occasions, a school bus, on its way to pick up a special needs student, could not pass and had to back up, seeking an alternate route. Snow plows had to back up the entire length of Clover Terrace, a feat accomplished by amazingly skilled drivers but entirely unnecessary.

Please consider that issue as you think about modifying the UDO to permit the siting of high-density housing in neighborhoods such as ours. This is an issue of safety, not "NIMBY." The housing issues in Bloomington are serious. But people moving into high-density housing are all going to bring their cars with them and take the path of least resistance in parking them--often on the street. Thank you! Andrew Strawn

25. Alex Jorck -

Solar considerations are basically new to Bloomington's UDO, and while we appreciate being included in regulations, it seems like many of the places that solar is being included is with the intent to limit or hide solar systems.

For example, 20.03.30 Utilities & Communications section (f) (2) Solar Collection, Ground- or Building Mounted specifies where a solar system can be placed, but these restrictions will keep some people from being able to get solar. We are right now working through the details of installing a solar system in a customer's front yard in a core neighborhood hear in town. The customer's roof, back yard, and side yards are all inappropriate locations for solar, so the front yard is the only option. Both paragraphs (A) and (B) should be removed entirely.

In 20.04.80 Landscaping, Buffering, and Fences (m) Screening, paragraph (2) (B) (iii) specifies that screening will "not be required when it can clearly be demonstrated that required screening would reduce the efficiency or effectiveness of solar energy equipment." This will likely always be the case, so this is a rule that should be removed as we will need to demonstrate an exception for something every single time. This also applies to screening (m) (1) (C).

These requirements seem like they are aimed at hiding solar, which leads me to ask, why are we hiding solar? I understand that there was a time that solar was primarily solar water, and that this was large, stuck up from roofs considerably, and was more unsightly. However, modern solar panels are overwhelmingly flush mounted onto roofs and are designed with a much more sleek look. Is the City getting complaints from neighbors that solar panels are ugly?

Bloomington as a community has repeatedly voiced commitments to clean energy, sustainability, environmental stewardship, and climate action. Restrictions such as these are not consistent with these values. Also, if someone believes that strongly that they do not want to see solar panels or want to minimize the amount of solar that they see, then that is precisely what an HOA is for.

26. Deborah Myerson - To Council Members:

Bloomington has a dire shortage of housing. We should be making it easier to build more homes in the city, not a more expensive headache.

I am deeply concerned that Amendment 42 proposed for the UDO would create obstacles to increasing the housing stock in Bloomington.

Multifamily uses in a multifamily residential zone should be permitted by-right rather than require additional review with a conditional use.

Yet, Amendment 42 would change the approval of fourplexes, multifamily dwellings and live/work dwellings in a Residential Multifamily (RM) district from a permitted to a conditional use.

Please reject Amendment 42 and let the UDO do what it is intended to do: create RM zones where multifamily properties can be constructed by-right.

Thank you for your consideration. Deborah Myerson

27. CONA - City Council Representatives

In October, the Council of Neighborhood Associations (CONA) sent an educational postcard to residents of Bloomington regarding quality of life issues that will be voted on in the upcoming Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). This was a time sensitive issue. CONA believes that an informed public is one of the basic pillars of democracy. In light of the Herald-Times lack of coverage of the UDO, CONA felt it is especially important to inform citizens about this important and timely issue. Some have questioned the veracity of the statements in the educational postcard. People will disagree. We stand by our message. Attached is a document clarifying our principles and provides supportive research expressed in the educational postcard. We hope you find this helpful and informative.

Regards,
Executive Committee
Council of Neighborhood Associations

See attachment

28. Leo Pilachowski - A Zoning Code is a balance among many competing interests and goals. Many of these conflict to some extent and the balancing takes more than a little thought. A goal of nearly all Zoning Codes is that parked cars do not block the sidewalk. In the case of front-loading garages, there must be sufficient room between the garage door or entrance such that a car parked in front of the door or entrance (tandem parking) does not block the sidewalk. The usual solution is not require the front loading garage to be set back 20'-25'. The latter 25' distance is chosen for modern Zoning Codes because vehicle lengths have increased in recent years. The goal of not blocking the sidewalk normally overrides all others.

Other goals are to minimize impermeable area, allow for more efficient land use, and allow for less expensive construction and maintenance. A few municipalities also use the Zoning Code to provide visual and design standards although this is not normally a Zoning Code function. The UDO update provides such standards for views from the pedestrian streetscape. The UDO update favors this visual design goal of setting back front loading garages from the front of the primary structure above all the other goals, including that of not blocking the sidewalk. However, it must be noted that the visual impact to the pedestrian street view is affected by much more than the garage setback. Front landscaping especially in yards with setbacks more than the minimum, building design features, and front walls and fences are just a few things that affect the view from the street.

The UDO update and the changes made by Amendment 60 nearly all increase the driveway length from that required in the current UDO. In fact, the current UDO front setbacks for detached garages are being applied to attached garages in the update. And, the UDO update, can in some cases decrease the driveway length enough to cause tandem parking to block the sidewalk. The UDO update (and amendment) thus results in more impermeable area, reduces design flexibility by mandating location relative to the front wall of the residential structure and increases the building cost by requiring more driveway surface and additional exterior walls for the same structure interior area. The goal of providing better pedestrian views can be met in much better ways than moving garages further back from the street than the primary building front wall.

In the zoning districts with a 15' front setback or front building line, structures with residential front wall built to the minimum setback will have the desired garage setback with a 25' and a varied front appearance. I suspect that most new construction in the R2, R3, and R4 districts will be built to the minimum front setback (R3 districts must have exactly a 15' setback in most cases) unless deed restriction require a greater front setback. In the RE district, the 30' setback (usually more in such large lots) will already provide a visual distance buffer for pedestrians so there is no reason to move garages further back. The same goes for the other districts where a builder is adversely burdened for having a residential structure front setback greater than 15' by then having to have a longer driveway. I think that most would say that there is a improved visual impact from a greater primary residential building setback than from just only having the front loading garage further back. There are other problems with the UDO update as amended with respect to front loading garages but I think the above show many of the issues.

I suggest that the UDO update, as amended, makes the visual impact on pedestrians no better and often worse compared to the current UDO. And, the UDO update, as amended, without doubt, increases the impermeable area, increases building cost, reduces design flexibility, and makes for less efficient use of the new often smaller lots in the residential districts. I suggest the UDO update be amended as follows:

RE Table 2-2, Section D, deleted (or "30 feet" if Section D to be left)

R1 Table 2-3, Section D, "25 feet"

R2 Table 2-4, Section D, "25 feet"

R3 Table 2-5, Section C 2nd line, "25 feet"

R4 Table 2-6, Section C 2nd line, "25 feet"

RM Table 2-7, Section C 2nd line, "25 feet"

RH Table 2-8, Section C 2nd line, "25 feet"

Table 4-2 be amended to have the above attached front loading garage setbacks (30' for RE district and 25' for R1, R2, R3, R4, RM, and RH districts.

Clarification on CONA Informational Mailing to Core Neighborhood Residents

November 10, 2019

The Council of Neighborhood Associations (CONA) supports the formation of neighborhood associations, provides advocacy for neighborhood issues and concerns, and aspires to make neighborhoods in Monroe County safe, welcoming and desirable places in which to live. Based on this mission statement, CONA supports the stated goals of the 2018 Bloomington Comprehensive Plan:

- (p. 60): “With greater density in the city comes the challenge to preserve neighborhood character and the opportunity to strengthen neighborhoods by developing small commercial nodes as community gathering places. Existing core neighborhoods should not be the focus of the city’s increasing density.”
- (p. 61) “Bloomington’s older urban, small scale, compact, single-family housing stock located primarily around the city center and university provide some of the city’s more affordable housing stock and must be protected. Building a growing stock of affordable housing requires assuring sustainability so unaffordable stock is not the only option for future generations.”
- (p. 64) Goal 5.2 Housing Planning and Design: “Guide growth, change, and preservation of residential and business areas through planning policies that create and sustain neighborhood character and green space, and that build a sense of community, civic involvement, and neighborhood pride.”

CONA supports increased housing density, Accessory Dwelling Units, and growth in parts of the city that can benefit from new housing options. CONA also supports incremental growth and respectfully considers the proposed changes to zoning to be a significant alteration to current zoning, and one worthy of public notice to encourage opportunities for discourse and collaboration in our vision for the future.

CONA is concerned that the Unified Development Ordinance was presented to the Plan Commission and sent to City Council for a vote within a few short months. This was in contrast to the Visioning Statement and Comprehensive Plan Process which took years to develop with the input of many stakeholders and hours of community input. This is not a way to build a sense of community, civic involvement and neighborhood pride (Goal 5.2). CONA supports the Goal and Policies in the *2018 Comprehensive Plan*, p. 30, Policy 1.6.2: “Develop and operate government services that maximize transparency and public engagement.”

The proposed Bloomington Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) will profoundly impact Bloomington residents in the core neighborhoods. But many of goals and policies in the UDO conflict with those of the Comprehensive Plan. In October 2019, CONA mailed an educational postcard to the residents who will be most affected by the proposed zoning changes. CONA felt this was critical because citizens have received little information from the Herald Times or other sources about the proposed UDO.

The mailing was based on sources of information which may be different from, but are no less authoritative than, the sources of information cited by advocates for changing the zoning across the city. The following sections provide clarification and sources for the content of the postcard. CONA invites you to read through the articles listed on the CONA website which provide an extensive foundation supporting the information included on the postcard.

Single-Family Zoning Could be Eliminated in Bloomington...

Duplexes and triplexes are proposed for all single-family zones except Residential Estate, effectively eliminating single-family zoning as it currently exists in Bloomington.

The proposed UDO lays out new residential single-family zones (RE, R1, R2, R3, & R4), each containing multi-family uses. The R4 zone even references multi-family buildings larger than 4-plexes. Although the new R4 zone will not be mapped until the spring, the city planning department will not make any

commitment that R4 will not be placed within established neighborhoods. The UDO codifies the uses for these zones, as well as all other zones, regardless of when and where these zones are placed on the new map.

Single-family zones have been limited to three unrelated people per single-family lot since the time of Mayor Tomilea Allison. The current UDO draft proposes to allow increasing the occupancy load from three to nine in R1-R3 and twelve in R4 single-family zones. Again, this would effectively eliminate single-family zoning as it is currently understood and enforced in Bloomington.

Covenants may protect many newer subdivisions for now, but covenants expire. It will be up to the neighborhoods to challenge violations which this up-zone encourages, costing time and money for residents. If the violations are not challenged, the covenants can be ruled in court to be invalid, which would eliminate covenant protection in that neighborhood.

Reference:

- <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/DisplacementReport.pdf> Preserve existing affordable housing. Normally market forces increase housing supply to meet demand from demographic changes, and rents of older units decrease with time and obsolescence in a process known as filtering down. Since the turn of the century, however, the supply of affordable rental units has shrunk despite rapid growth in the number of very low-income renters.
- <https://jacobinmag.com/2017/08/new-urban-crisis-review-richard-florida> Geographer David Harvey has argued that the biggest shift in urban economies over the last forty years has been the move from [managerialism to entrepreneurialism](#). City governments that once provided services for their residents in the form of welfare and infrastructure now market themselves to global pools of capital, tourists, and educated workforces.

National developers have their eyes on this zoning change and have already contacted local real estate companies.

In public comment at Plan Commission and City Council hearings on the UDO, residents provided numerous examples in which they personally received multiple offers to buy their homes from out-of-state callers or by mail. One local realty company drove an outside investment company representative around looking for neighborhoods to invest in. The owners of the house at the SW corner of Henderson and Grimes have received numerous letters asking to purchase their house. Now their daughter, who lives there, is being hounded on her cell phone by people wanting to buy the house. She has no idea how they got her cell phone number.

Reference:

- City of Bloomington Comprehensive Plan: (p.62) “These older homes are generally well built and have distinctive architectural features. They also often have smaller footprints compared to more modern homes. As seen in communities across the nation, this can lead to the phenomenon of people purchasing these homes purely for their desirable urban locations and tearing down the existing structure to make way for a brand-new home, which often features an excessively large footprint and a contemporary architectural style. Such homes may not fit into the context of their surroundings and can negatively impact the fabric of the entire neighborhood. This can lead to the large-scale loss of a community’s historic integrity and also the loss of affordable housing stock.”
- <https://shelterforce.org/2019/09/06/the-role-student-housing-plays-in-communities/> For landlords, student rentals are an incredibly lucrative real estate opportunity as students pay by the room, allowing landlords to charge more per square foot as there are several roommates paying a monthly rent. As a website for real estate investors recently noted, “a home that might rent for \$1,000 a month to a single family could be rented by the room for nearly twice that.” In addition, students sign one-year leases so rents can be raised each year if the market allows. For

neighbors, student housing can be disruptive as students keep different hours and enjoy different activities than their neighbors, such as late-night parties. And for real estate markets near college campuses, student housing can be transformative as investor capital competes with homeowners, making it so sale prices and rents increase. Local governments in college towns across the country are adopting proactive strategies to gain a measure of control over the spread of student housing and limit negative impact on real estate markets and affordable housing stock supply near college and university campuses.

If you are a renter, the proposed changes may well cause your rent to rise. OR your landlord may decide to sell to developers, and you will be displaced

Displacement is a direct result of up-zoning. Historically, houses around the university have been valued by occupancy load. When the occupancy load increases, it is likely that the amount of rent will increase on the next lease cycle. When five unrelated people per house was the limit, the rent was based on five, regardless of bedroom count. If a developer buys a rental property as a speculator, the house may be converted to a multiplex or demolished and a market-rate multiplex built in its place. This eliminates the naturally occurring affordability of an aging single-family rental.

Reference:

- Comprehensive Plan (p. 65) “Evaluate new development and redevelopment proposals with the goal of minimizing displacement of lower income residents from Bloomington neighborhoods and from the city as a whole.”
- <https://shelterforce.org/2018/11/05/heres-what-we-actually-know-about-market-rate-housing-development-and-displacement/> Studies show that market-rate housing development is linked to the mass displacement of neighboring low-income residents (Davidson and Lees [2005](#), [2010](#); Pearsall [2010](#)). Numerous studies show that market-rate housing development has price ripple effects on surrounding neighborhoods, driving up rents and increasing the burden on lower-income households.
- <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/06/the-zone-defense> When luxury development is encouraged in low-income neighborhoods, the value of surrounding properties rises too, and along with it the rents. Long-term tenants as well as low-income migrants then suffer from either higher rent burdens — the percentage of incomes paid to rent — or displacement to another neighborhood, another city, or another region entirely.

If you are an owner, your property taxes will increase as your property will be valued more and your quality of life may well go down.

Bloomington has already experienced an abrupt change from single-family to multi-family housing in the 1970’s under Mayor Frank McCloskey. Allowing five unrelated people to live together in a single-family house created a massive conversion of single-family homes into student rentals, which resulted in a loss of community in the core neighborhoods close to Indiana University due to displacement of low-income (non-student) renters and multi-generational homeowners.

The occupancy rates were lowered in 1985 under Mayor Tomilea Allison. Those changes supported single-family zoning and resulted in stable neighborhoods that are dense and diverse in both housing types and income levels of owners and renters. Many of these neighborhoods already have a high percentage of rental property that is affordable and desirable for renters and are the city’s source of less expensive starter homes. Up-zoning is how neighborhoods transition into predominantly rental neighborhoods.

“Neighborhood factor” is a variable used by the county to calculate the assessed value of the property on which the property taxes are based when an upward or downward trend is perceived in a neighborhood. If a property is modified to be a duplex, these modifications will indicate an uptick in the trend of the neighborhood. Adjacent properties will “benefit” from these changes by having their taxes adjusted upwards.

Reference:

- <https://www.architecturaldigest.com/story/property-taxes-what-makes-them-go-up> “We find that property tax bills jump higher when there have been a number of sales in the neighborhood,” says Jeff Miller, cofounder of [AE Home Group](#). More sales mean an increase in the assessed value of properties in the area because, well, it’s proof positive that the neighborhood is more desirable—so the properties are too. Ergo, Jeff says, your property tax bill will go up. For the same reason, nearby construction can increase your home’s value too, including the addition of such amenities as parks, golf courses, or lakes, for example.
- <https://beltmag.com/richard-florida-cant-let-go/> Quote from Richard Florida: “In little more than a decade, the revitalization of our cities and our urban areas that I had predicted was giving rise to rampant gentrification and unaffordability, driving deep wedges between affluent newcomers and struggling longtime residents.”

If you are thinking of buying a starter home, you will be competing with developers with deep pockets looking to convert the house into multiple rental units.

It is already difficult to find an affordable starter home in Bloomington. But the predictable market driven demand for up-zoned rental property will create more demand for these previously single family zoned houses. When rents are approximately \$800 per bedroom and now 6 to 9 bedrooms are conditionally allowed on a property, the property values will increase.

A house can be purchased by a homeowner or an investor. Zoning limiting occupants to 3 unrelated adults keeps costs down for both the owner and renter. An up-zone essentially prices out the owner/buyer and drives these neighborhoods toward rental-dominated areas. Starter homes will have to be found in the aging suburbs or Ellettsville and surrounding areas which will increase use of cars and carbon footprint for home owners.

Reference:

- <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/06/the-zone-defense> The rezonings many mayors are pushing, though vast in scale, cannot be mistaken for comprehensive plans; they are, in fact, more often abdications of planning to the market... In most iterations, inclusionary zoning is triggered by an up-zoning — or an increase in development capacity — in areas already at risk of gentrification. This creates a windfall profit for affected landowners, who are then allowed to build something big and glitzy with far more rent-producing units than whatever stands on their lots today. Without doing anything, they can sell the land for a great deal more than it was worth prior to the rezoning, thus speculating off the value the city has gifted them. Ultimately, inclusionary zoning is a real estate strategy, not a social program. It is part of a larger turn away from public housing or even public subsidy and toward market-based planning strategies. It neither decomodifies housing nor limits landlord power.
- <https://jacobinmag.com/2017/08/new-urban-crisis-review-richard-florida> When the rich, the young, and the (mostly) white rediscovered the city, they created rampant property speculation, soaring home prices, and mass displacement. The “creative class” were just the rich all along, or at least the college-educated children of the rich.

CONA respectfully requests that Council Members follow the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and “Continue to support and promote affordable home ownership as another method of permanent affordability that can help to raise and keep residents from poverty while they build equity and security in the local community.”

CONA requests and supports amendments to eliminate zoning that permit multiplexes to be built in the core neighborhoods, BOTH by-right and conditional use in order to meet the following policy statements in the Housing and Neighborhood section of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan:

- P. 63, Policy 5.2.1: “Evaluate all new developments and redevelopments in light of their potential to positively or adversely impact the overall health and well-being of the people who live in the surrounding neighborhood.”
- P. 63, Policy 5.2.3: “In historic neighborhoods and districts, preserve or enhance authentic design characteristics, such as building form, by encouraging new or remodeled structures to be historically compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures.”
- P. 64, Policy 5.3.1: “Encourage opportunities for infill and redevelopment across Bloomington with consideration for increased residential densities, complementary design, and underutilized housing types such as accessory dwelling units, duplex, triplex, and fourplex buildings, courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, townhouses, row houses, and live/work spaces. Avoid placing these high density forms in single family neighborhoods.”
- P. 61, Housing Trends and Issues: “Bloomington’s older urban, small scale, compact, single-family housing stock located primarily around the city center and university provide some of the city’s more affordable housing stock and must be protected.”
- P. 84, Land Use Development Approvals: “A few locations may support increases in density and multifamily residential uses when adjacent to higher volume roads, or near major destinations, or located along neighborhood edges that may support small-scale neighborhood mixed uses. It is important to protect the existing single-family housing stock within this district. The conversion of dwellings to multifamily or commercial uses should be discouraged.”

Erin Cooperman
512 E. University Street
Bloomington, IN 47401
419-356-4849/erincooperman@gmail.com

November 13, 2019

Bloomington Common Council
Attn: Steve Volan
401 N. Morton Street
Bloomington, IN 47404

RE: Objection to Ordinance 19-24 specifically “plexes” and unconditional use of ADUs

Dear Mr. Volan and Council:

I write to share my experience as a resident of a formerly RC neighborhood, soon-to-be R3, on the outskirts of Elm Heights. It is my belief that our neighborhood has some unique characteristics that have not yet been taken into consideration. In our neighborhood, I would estimate that there is about a 50/50 split between owner-occupied, single-family residences and rental properties generally occupied by IU students. We live in older bungalows with shared driveways, few garages, and big backyards. Most of the neighbors I know walk and use public transportation to get where they need to go. It's a short walk from our neighborhood to campus where many of us work or go to school.

When my partner and I found this house, we couldn't believe our luck: a house that we could afford; with a yard; just big enough to add a child or two to our family; close enough to everything we need that we wouldn't need to buy a second car. We almost didn't look at it, though, because when we drove by, the neighbors were playing beer-pong in the front yard and that wasn't the environment we had in mind. I'm glad we took the chance. Our permanent neighbors are amazing and, even after we did have a child, I was able to maintain my commitment to less driving. We convinced a friend to buy the beer-pong house and celebrated a win for the permanent residents.

We have learned to live amongst the IU students. We walk around their garbage cans because they can't seem to figure out how trash collection works. When they spray-painted penises on the sidewalk, another neighbor turned them into flowers. I get up in the middle of the night to ask them to turn the music down; my partner calls the Quiet Nights program. He reports the landlords when they don't mow the lawn. Our daughter wears shoes in the front yard so she doesn't cut her feet on the glass they leave behind. We invite them to the block party to try to get to know them for their short stay in our neighborhood and in the hope that knowing us will motivate them to figure out the trash system. When an elderly homeowner sells to a rental company that paves the lawn and adds a few more students to our neighborhood, we sigh and say “if I ever win the lottery...”

This works, but it's a delicate balance. The changes in the UDO that will make it easier to convert single-family residences into multiplexes and to build ADUs as rentals will create the conditions to tip this balance. We love our neighborhood and our home, but how many more students will it take before the burdens are no longer worth the benefits? Two more student rentals? Five? If we do decide to leave, who will buy our house? If I don't want to live here with my family, will anyone else? I think I know who will want my house. A developer could turn my home into a duplex in a weekend; cut down the trees; put gravel in the backyard for parking; and probably rent each side for \$2000 a month because students can and will pay that for the convenience of walking to class or the bars in fifteen minutes. They might even be able to add another rental in the back.

Why do I think that multiplexes and ADUs in our neighborhood will be rented to students and not low-income community members and families? Because they already are. I've heard a lot about how these changes have benefited other communities, communities that I don't think are comparable to Bloomington. Council members who want to see what happens when you turn single family homes into multiplexes are welcome to come tour our neighborhood. We have multiplexes and ADUs in our neighborhood. When these properties were converted to multiplexes, landlords cut

down trees, paved over the yards, and added gravel to avoid exceeding impervious surface limits. This is done, of course, to add parking because the residents they hope to attract will each drive their own car. If you rent a three-bedroom duplex to a family, you don't need to anticipate three or more drivers, but if you rent to students, you do.

Amendments that prohibit teardowns or building past the existing footprint won't change this as has been suggested. The multiplexes in our neighborhood aren't new construction. They are Frankenstein versions of the original homes.

I want a more economically and racially diverse neighborhood. When my daughter starts school in the fall, we are considering transferring her to a school where the student body is more diverse. It would be great if she could have this environment outside her front door. If more families could afford homes here, my children would have more playmates. I believe that turning single family homes into multiplexes here will create just the opposite. I called around and looked at websites to determine rent for some of those closest to me. The multiplex across the street charges \$633 per person per month for up to 6 people or \$725/month for the one- bedroom unit in the basement. There was a long-term, non-student resident living in the basement unit for a few years, but he was recently evicted; rumor has it he couldn't afford the rent. There is a duplex one house over from us that rents on Airbnb for \$125 per night for the downstairs, three-bedroom unit. Students have been renting the upstairs unit all semester; based on the website, I would estimate they pay somewhere around \$3,772 per month. A one-bedroom ADU was recently built over a nearby backyard and costs \$1,050 per month. Are these affordable prices for low-income Bloomington residents? If we want more diversity and families in our neighborhood, we have to make homes here less attractive to developers, not more, so that Bloomington residents can compete.

In a recent discussion with a neighbor who supports these changes to the UDO, it was suggested that I actually want to live in the "suburbs" because I like trees and yards. I considered this and translated "suburbs" to the equivalent I assume he meant in Bloomington (neighborhoods further from the city core?). That's actually not what I want. Manicured lawns; houses both bigger and more expensive than I need; less economic and racial diversity; and more driving, actually do not appeal to me. I want to live here, but if this neighborhood becomes a concrete jungle filled with entitled college students, we will leave. If the permanent neighbors who share our interest in trees sell their homes, we will, too.

I've seen it suggested that these will be "gentle" changes. That may be true. In our neighborhood, it will only take a slight change to shift the balance from a neighborhood for individuals and families willing to put up with the burdens of some students to one that has ceded control to students and rental companies. Personally, I cannot see how loss of our neighborhood in this way will help low-income people in Bloomington or address the housing crisis.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Erin Cooperman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping tail that extends to the right.

Erin Cooperman

**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!!!!!!