

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 5, 2020 12:04 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

LEAVE CORE NEIGHBORHOODS ALONE! I rented apartments in McDoel Gardens in the 70's and fell in love with the West Side. I moved on to live in four much bigger cities, visited hundreds of others, seeking out college towns, and have never felt anything close to the Bloomington vibe. That brought me back. Imagine my delight to return to old neighborhoods that hadn't changed much. Some might call that stagnation, but I think differently. The Near West Side, Prospect Hill, McDoel Gardens and many others have survived because those residents feel comfortable where they are. I think that's an amazing achievement. I think that present and past councilmembers and mayors deserve credit for good stewardship and husbanding of resources, because it is much greener to maintain what we have than to tear down and build new. I agree that Bloomington has to densify. Please recognize too that Bloomington is densifying. Everywhere you look you'll see new mixed-use 3-4 story buildings. So, the densification already underway surely tempers the argument that city government has to do more on this issue. Planning process, approvals, all of it. What they've done is working. Good job.

'Plex' Text Amendment

LEAVE CORE NEIGHBORHOODS ALONE! We are already dense, and allowing plexes will only initiate the destruction of these wonderful, vibrant, dense neighborhoods.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Concerned citizens like me sat through hours and hours of commission and council meetings last year to voice our opposition to the destruction of core neighborhoods. Thankfully, that council listened to our concerns and comments and voted down the changes. BRAVO! Now we

have a new bunch and they want to go in and muck around in already established and GOOD policy. It reminds me of the Trump Administration. Shameful!

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 6, 2020 6:10 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

I am unequivocally opposed to changes in historically single family homes that would allow duplexes and triplexes. There are NO and have NEVER been rental properties in my area, Blue Ridge (BR), and by history such multiple family dwellings will be primarily, if not exclusively rentals. Such a change will qualitatively change forever the nature of a community that is based upon stability of residential population. Given my \$4000+ and ever increasing yearly property taxes, what and how do I benefit? By lowered property values? By increased uncertainty of who lives temporarily in such rental properties by people who have little invested in my neighborhood? By a diminished sense of community that we the people of BR work hard to build, in the face of busy and complicated lives? Income inequality is a real issue in our national society but it will not be solved on the backs of middle class.

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 14, 2020 9:11 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

Arbor Ridge Homeowners' Association requests that the area immediately south of Arbor Ridge be zoned as R4 rather than the proposed RM classification. Also we suggest that the area south of the now proposed RM tract be changed from R4 to RM . If this change were made than there would be a "cluster" of R4 areas. This would seem to agree with the Planning Department's suggested creation of R4 clusters in various parts of the City. Since Arbor Ridge now is next to a large 3 story apartment complex (Millennium Apartments) on two sides, the above suggested change would result in a reasonable separation of the 3 story apartment complexes. We believe this requested change would aid in the flow of vehicular traffic in the area south of the Bloomfield Road and Weimer Road intersection.

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Arbor Ridge Homeowners' Association is very concerned about any construction on the "Sudbury property", which is located east of Weimer Road, near the intersection of Weimer and Bloomfield Road, unless major additions are made to the present streets in this area. At present, public access from Arbor Ridge to other areas of the city is provided only by Weimer Road. Weimer Road is a very narrow winding road, and its intersection with Bloomfield Road is one of the worst intersections in the city. There is only a Stop sign at this intersection for Weimer Road, which makes left turns from Weimer to Bloomfield Road very dangerous during busy traffic periods. Some Arbor Ridge residents gain access to Bloomfield Road by driving

through a private road running through the Millennium Apartments. The manager of Millennium has allowed us access, but is not obligated to do so. We suggest that access streets running from Sudbury Drive to Adams Street, and hopefully farther to South Rogers Street, as well as to Tapp Road be constructed before any construction begins. There have been published reports in the H-T of possible developers asking the City to allow construction on the Sudbury property without any additions to the present street system in the area. If this were done, there would be major traffic difficulties in the area. Arbor Ridge Homeowners' Association may be contacted as follows for any questions about our requests: Arbor Ridge HOA - Donald R. Shelton, president email - dshelton0117@yahoo.com Phone - 812/822-2749

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 14, 2020 9:43 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

We do not need more rental units in existing neighborhoods. We need more affordable home ownership options. If the duplex and triplex will be owned by the residents, I do have have a problem with them. If they are merely rented, I have concerned about not only the care of the home and the lawns but also the level of involvement in the neighborhood. Park Ridge has several ingated subcommunities, usually by the block, of neighbors who get to know each other, help each other, and even socialize. Renters do not seem willing to come out and be known and participate.

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 14, 2020 11:00 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

As a homeowner in Park Ridge neighborhood and resident of Bloomington for 16 years, I am against the plex proposal. I believe this proposal will negatively impact property values and negatively impact daily living of residents in this neighborhood with an increase of traffic and vehicles. This neighborhood currently has many young children living here, including my own young child, and I fear for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in this neighborhood with increased vehicular traffic. While I support and understand housing needs in this community, I feel Bloomington government should put its efforts into true affordable housing and housing for those without housing at all rather than trying to cram additional living spaces into full and established neighborhoods.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 14, 2020 11:13 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

No. These will become student rentals. Owner occupied is preferred. These plexes will ruin the core neighborhood values that are still important to the quality of life that attracts new residents with kids. hello

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 15, 2020 4:15 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

The soon to be former Bloomington Hospital site provides plenty of room for plexes, and has bus service and is very walkable to many areas of Bloomington proper. Changing Blue Ridge (and other neighborhoods) from single family homes to plex lots, without safe walking paths or bus service to town, will drastically increase cars and traffic in the neighborhood. I strongly oppose this ordinance and those that support it.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

The soon to be former Bloomington Hospital site provides plenty of room for plexes, and has bus service and is very walkable to many areas of Bloomington proper. Changing Blue Ridge (and other neighborhoods) from single family homes to plex lots, without safe walking paths or bus service to town, will drastically increase cars and traffic in the neighborhood. I strongly oppose this ordinance and those that support it.

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 15, 2020 7:40 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

Would the mayor please acknowledge that Bloomington is densifying? I came back to Bloomington 6 years ago and I am amazed at the proliferation of dense development. Everywhere I go I see new 3 and 4 story mixed use buildings. Bravo! What we have in place is working! Celebrate! Let the process procede. You will reach your goal with the tools you have.

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 17, 2020 9:40 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

I support well-built multiplexes along the perimeter of the core neighborhoods, but not inside them. I live on South Dunn Street and I'm concerned that multiplexes and possibly triplexes would dramatically change the character of Bryan Park. An area of concern to my specific home is the alley that runs behind. I am deeply concerned that increasing access to this alley would make it difficult to live here. I would appreciate a visual of what you anticipate these new buildings would look like in the context of the existing neighborhoods. The picture that I create in my own mind looks pretty bad, so it would help if you could show me something. I'm okay with duplexes. I do think it is naive to think people won't have cars. Since the university has expanded parking pass usage for students, the number of cars on the roads seems to have increased significantly. One question...is the city working with the university in terms of planning? I have participated in a few of the zoom meetings about this subject. I am unfamiliar with the "inside" real estate jargon, so I walk away feeling confused. Also, It seems the city may have an agenda that it isn't being transparent about.

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I'm concerned that the R4 location on Palmer Street would affect the alley usage behind Dunn Street.

'Plex' Text Amendment

I support well-built multiplexes along the perimeter of the core neighborhoods, but not inside them. I live on South Dunn Street and I'm concerned that multiplexes and possibly triplexes would dramatically change the character of Bryan Park. An area of concern to my specific home is the alley that runs behind. I am deeply concerned that increasing access to this alley would make it difficult to live here. I would appreciate a visual of what you anticipate these new buildings would look like in the context of the existing neighborhoods. The picture that I create in my own mind looks pretty bad, so it would help if you could show me something. I'm okay with duplexes. I do think it is naive to think people won't have cars. Since the university has expanded parking pass usage for students, the number of cars on the roads seems to have increased significantly. One question...is the city working with the university in terms of planning? I have participated in a few of the zoom meetings about this subject. I am unfamiliar

with the “inside” real estate jargon, so I walk away feeling confused. Also, It seems the city may have an agenda that it isn’t being transparent about.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 17, 2020 10:20 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

They are largely fine. Though would also suggest consideration of more areas immediately adjacent to campus. Though some are unfortunately historically designated (Elm Heights), density of such areas within walking distance of a campus that does not house all its stakeholders makes sense. The surrounding area should not be the exclusive realm of the priveleged.

'Plex' Text Amendment

Please let elected officials know they should not be scared off by a minority of NIMBY residents. The arguments floating about are near solely to propogate ongoing economic and social segregation in the particular areas where this most negatively impacts logical and sustainable Bloomington development. Opponents oddly argue that pricing will go both up and down and can't make up their mind. Opponents argue that other neighborhood should look more like current core neighborhoods (ok, that's fine but doesn't mean core neighborhoods shouldn't have the possibility of places). The research is clear. Middle housing makes sense. This is still about detached housing that keeps a neighborhood feel. A duplex is not a skyscrapers. There can be REALLY nice. This is about sharing the pie instead of hoarding it. The plex option is necessary and reasonably located in town. It's where slow, long-term incremental density needs to occur. No one is forced to sell. But this is a university town, and a growing town. Both are great. We're not going to be able to keep the structure of a town built 100 years ago. That town was divided by class and it's time that ends.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 17, 2020 11:36 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

please see below

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

There are cities where plexes might be needed to add workforce housing. In these usually larger cities, the very long commute from affordable housing areas is a concern. In a city the size of Bloomington, with a university, increasing density is counter-productive and completely changes the character of established neighborhoods. "Affordable" housing, anywhere near the campus, will ALWAYS end up becoming student housing. A much better solution would be to limit student rentals to the many apartment complexes that have been developed specifically for them. People wanting to buy single family homes in Bloomington neighborhoods have to compete with investors, who don't live in the houses they purchase, so don't care how it changes a neighborhood. Having 4 or 5 students loudly coming and going at all hours, and parking all over the street, is not where these developers would choose to live with their families. I understand the "good intentions" here, to provide housing to workers and backyard mother in law apartments, but it will all end up, ultimately, filled with students. In neighborhoods like Park Ridge, there are apartment complexes on both sides. These are already providing affordable housing options. Allowing plexes in such neighborhoods, would completely change their character, and it would not accomplish the goal you are trying to achieve. What is ideal in larger cities, and may work well in cities without a college, are not ideal here. This is not the right solution.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 30, 2020 10:49 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I think this makes a lot of sense. The map overall looks good to me. I live in Prospect Hill on Howe Street and think that the proximity to downtown and amenities like grocery stores, pharmacies etc. make this an appropriate change.

'Plex' Text Amendment

I'm having a hard time digesting all of the docs so maybe this is covered, but I'd like to see something in the "Use-specific standards apply" to make it so parking isn't directly attached to a dwelling. That is, people need to interact with neighbors rather than exit their home directly to a car. For example, the new townhomes at Switchyard have parking separated. If the parking was on the bottom floor under each unit and accessible directly from the dwelling, neighbor interaction would be limited. Got this idea from the "Missing Middle Housing" book.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: December 30, 2020 12:32 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

I support the the proposed UDO changes

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

In addition to the metric of using lot size to determine the location of R4 districts, I would like the city to investigate possible inclusion of parcels based on proximity to employment hubs such as Carlisle, Catalent, IU, and the new IU hospital location; K-12 schools; and retail grocery and convenience stores. Perhaps using a "walkability score" as a key metric.

'Plex' Text Amendment

I support the inclusion of plexes within the UDO into ALL residential zones. My support for permitted use in smaller zoned lots declines proportionally as the plex number increases from 2 up to 4 with the thought of placing a 4-plex on a downtown, R4, historic preservation lot resulting in a lower quality of living for the potential resident than should be expected (e.g. NYC "micro-studios"), assuming no waivers for building height, setback, impervious coverage, etc... With that concern in mind, I think it would be more rational if as the zoned minimum lot size increases, the permitted plex also increases in dwelling units. Conversely, as the zoned minimum lot size decreases, the higher number dwelling unit plexes should become conditional. With this approach, over time, the density of the city will homogenize, hopefully.

Other Text Amendments

20.04.060(c)(1)(B): I think parking spaces for "motorcycles, scooters, and other two-wheeled vehicles", to an extent, should be included in the calculation of minimum vehicle parking requirements. This will encourage the use of more efficient transportation and better use of land capital.

Other Thoughts and Concerns

N/A

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 1, 2021 8:24 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

This is more related to outreach: I'm noticing that there seems to be a lot of pushback related to affordable housing. Folks are concerned that upzoning will result in only market-rate housing moving in. I caught that there were really well-researched affordability incentives in the UDO, however. Would it be possible to surface that (and anything similar) on the outreach website? I.e., would it be possible to add another FAQ getting at affordability? Thank you for all you do!

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 3, 2021 11:38 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

none

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I think that McDoel would also be good as R4. Also the entire Broadview neighborhood. I would like to see it just all over the city. I understand that it is supposed to be on small lots but couldn't the suburban neighborhoods be allowed to sub-divide their huge lots and then then the new build could be a plex?

'Plex' Text Amendment

I think that a compromise could be made on not having quadplexes permitted in R4 and make them conditional. Then maybe you can please the nay-sayers and keep duplexes and triplexes permitted.

Other Text Amendments

Can't tell but are ADUs going to be allowed to be bigger? At least two bedrooms? That would be good.

Other Thoughts and Concerns

1) You are going to get continued resistance because the process is moving very quickly. Prospect Hill neighbors (Hopewell) have organized a facilitated conversation for the Nimbys and Yimbys Jan. 6th and there will probably be two more meetings. I think the City should wait to pass on their proposal to the Planning Dept. 'till after January so the feedback collected can be given to you guys. 2) What feedback have you taken into consideration and has the proposal changed? Could you make that available and highlight the changes? 3) You should focus on form and not density, that's what the nimbys are up in arms about. 4) I would like the City to encourage more ADUs and make them bigger. 5) People in Prospect Hill are going to ask to remain R3, heads up. 6) Your yimby supporters should stop calling the boomers racist unless they truly have the historical research for Bloomington to back that up. A smarter approach

would be to look at how many people lived in the core neighborhoods fifty years ago (I'm guessing many many more) and the racial diversity back then. Did that racial diversity and density change in the 50s? the 70s? the 90s? 7) Could we consider sub-areas for the zoning? Then the neighborhoods could really have specific input on where they would like plexes as opposed to everywhere in their neighborhood. That would go over well! 8) Again, you should slow this all down and give some more time for the Hopewell discussions to happen and for some more research to happen. People think it feels shady. I know it isn't but people on both sides have said to me 'why is this happening so fast, seems shady'

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 6, 2021 12:54 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

They're generally bad.

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

These generally look nothing like the pictures you show on your website. These will mostly become undergrad boxes.

'Plex' Text Amendment

Is this meant to help real estate developers serving undergrads?

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 17, 2021 8:56 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I strongly oppose the proposed R4 locations. While housing affordability is an important goal, the location of R4 zones adjacent to the university encourages rapid development of more student housing rather than managed, socially responsible housing options for the community.

'Plex' Text Amendment

I strongly oppose the proposed plex amendment. It is disheartening that the examples of plexes shown in the proposed document do not appear to meet the new requirements and are not obviously built as plexes.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 24, 2021 5:20 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I strongly oppose this. As a 25 year resident of Prospect Hill, I have enjoyed the mix of rental and owner occupied single family dwellings. I know there is "research" that supports this idea that multiplexes will increase affordability and diversity. I question whether that research applies to small college towns. I believe that the R4 designation will achieve two things: increase the holdings and wealth of several property management companies and two increase the number of beer pong tables and outdoor couches. With our historic designation, we haven't been able to install a new window or door without approval and now you are going to allow someone to change their house into 4 separate units with 4 sets of ridiculously ugly garbage and recycle containers and satellite dishes. The streets can't hold the cars now, no one has off street parking and the storm sewers are almost non-existent. Stop this.

'Plex' Text Amendment

I see no explanation for how multiplexes will increase affordability or diversity. Increasing the number of people in a given area--yes, sure. Apparently, there is no consideration for where more people will park, or for the lack of infrastructure--how about putting some storm sewers up the hill? I don't understand all the problems that are needing to be fixed.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 25, 2021 11:05 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

Add more truly affordable housing. This is still not enough to get lower rental prices into our neighborhoods. Force landlords and developers to cap rent at \$450/person. Is it possible to establish and enforce rent control or expand section 8 or other housing help?

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

I am a homeowner on Prospect Hill and I want the city to allow affordable duplexes and multiplexes in my neighborhood and other core neighborhoods. This is true to the character of these neighborhoods because they used to have a lot more multifamily homes.

Other Text Amendments

Add more truly affordable housing. This is still not enough to get lower rental prices into our neighborhoods. Force landlords and developers to cap rent at \$450/person.

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Add more truly affordable housing. This is still not enough to get lower rental prices into our neighborhoods. Force landlords and developers to cap rent at \$450/person.

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 27, 2021 2:07 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

I support this change, but I do not think it goes far enough in reducing the restrictive nature of land use rule in Bloomington. It would be beneficial to the Bloomington community to allow by right construction in all areas of the city with rules and restriction focused only on safety practices.

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

This is a good change, and encourages transit centered housing, which I think it great, but I once again think that we are making this way too technical and could simply allow construction companies to build housing that is in demand in Bloomington.

'Plex' Text Amendment

It's great that we are upzoning the core neighborhoods. It has been too long that the rest of Bloomington has had to deal with the consequences of the protectionist attitude toward the core neighborhoods while the demand to live in Bloomington has continued to grow. The city should not be in the business of protecting the home values of individuals and should instead be focusing on providing affordable housing options for all Bloomington residents. The Plex amendment is a good start to ensuring that happens, but I would prefer by right construction in all areas of Bloomington.

Other Text Amendments

I would like to see minimum setbacks done away with altogether.

Other Thoughts and Concerns

I support anything that will encourage the further construction of affordable and market rate housing in Bloomington. I would like to see the city go further than what is being proposed, but I understand that we have to start somewhere, and I think what is proposed is a very good start to that process.

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: January 31, 2021 7:02 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

I am STRONGLY opposed to the proposed changes to the R4 designation within the older neighborhoods of Bloomington. The lack of affordable SINGLE FAMILY HOMES within walking/cycling distance of downtown is what you should be addressing, not opening up our core neighborhoods to speculators and more rental housing. You claim to want to increase the availability of options so that more people can benefit from living in the core neighborhoods. What you seem to fail to recognize is that doing so will destroy what makes those neighborhoods desirable in the first place. Please withdraw this proposal that will only benefit outside speculators and investors, not the permanent residents of the city. Bill Holladay
Prospect Hill

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: February 5, 2021 9:30 PM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

Years ago my neighborhood (Blue Ridge) was established as a single family housing development. After living in apartments in my younger years when first coming to Bloomington and saving up for a down payment on a house, I chose Blue Ridge because of the type of single family development it was. It is totally unfair and unjustifiable for the city to now change the rules! If other housing is required, new neighborhoods can be established with new rules so that people buying there know what to expect, but do not upset the established neighborhoods after people have bought into those with the guidelines they sought and the guidelines that existed when they bought their homes.

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns

Individual Record Report for General Feedback Form

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: February 11, 2021 11:12 AM

(PUD) Planned Unit Development

I would like to object to our PUD being converted into regular zoning under the new UDO. We spent many years and a considerable amount of money getting our PUD put into place to best represent the needs of the shopping center and the desires of City of Bloomington Planning Department. In my opinion, the new UDO creates too many variables that could have consequences down the road. Please let us leave our PUD in place. Whitney Gates- Whitehall Crossing Shopping Center.

(R4) Residential Urban Lot

'Plex' Text Amendment

Other Text Amendments

Other Thoughts and Concerns