

**Log of Amendments to Ordinance 19-24 - To Repeal and Replace Title 20 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled, "Unified Development Ordinance"
Final Council Action: Dec 18, 2019 – 9-0 to adopt Ordinance 19-24 as amended**

This log lists all amendments that were adopted. Amendments that failed, were withdrawn, or were not introduced, are also listed in the shaded rows below.

Council Am #	PC Am#	Sections Affected	Sponsor	Synopsis (which Includes the Required Statement of Reason[s] for the Amendment)	Action	Vote ¹	Date of Action
01	4-A ²	20.03.020 Table 3-1 20.03.030(b)(3)(A) 20.03.040(b)(4)(A)	Sturbaum Rollo	<p>This amendment brings forward a simplified version of PC Am-4A. It prohibits the “plexes” on properties zoned R1, R2 & R3 on the effective date of the UDO by making two changes. First, it amends Table 3-1: Allowed Use Table by removing the “C” (Conditional Use) for duplexes and triplexes in R1, R2, and R3 districts and, second, it strikes two provisions in the Use-Specific Standards for “plexes” that would allow them in those districts via reconfiguring lots. Conforming to the Comprehensive plan, this amendment is intended to preserve the stable and diverse character of these unique core neighborhoods that are a model for appropriate density. Up-zoning to allow duplexes and triplexes in these already dense zones will create many unintended consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * New home buyers will compete against rental investors and the new density will favor the investors; * Property speculation, conversion and possible demolition will likely result in displacement of renters and eventual replacement with market rate rentals; * Neighborhood quality of life will suffer from increased density; * There are enough opportunity areas for at least a decade of this kind of infill outside the core neighborhoods; * The fact that the large lot suburbs are exempt from this up-zoning, focuses the burden of this unasked-for removal of existing single family zoning on core neighborhoods exclusively; * A good option already exists to increase density in the core neighborhoods. Accessory Dwelling Units are basically duplexes with the added requirement that the owner live in one of the structures. They are allowed as a conditional use which is approved 88% of the time and no ADU’s have been turned down to date; and * If we don’t want multi-plexes in the core neighborhoods, banning them is the correct option. <p>That is the intent of this amendment.</p>	Adopted	6-2	Nov 14

¹ Please see the Memoranda and Minutes to learn the votes of Council member on each amendment.

² CCL AM-1 revised and corrected PC AM 4A to reflect the intent of the sponsors and make it consistent with other provisions mentioned a note in the text box of this amendment.

02		20.03.020 Table 3-1	Volan	This amendment allows duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as permitted uses in the residential and mixed-use zoning districts indicated below on Table 3-1: Allowed Use Table. The purpose for allowing duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as permitted uses in these districts is to encourage a variety of housing options, to increase housing density, and to promote compact urban form.	Not introduced	N/A	Nov 14
03		20.03.030(b)(3)(C) 20.03.030(b)(4)(C)	Piedmont-Smith	The purpose of this amendment is to limit the number of bedrooms in duplexes and triplexes in existing residential neighborhoods in response to public concerns about increased density.	Amend Adopt as Amended Failed	9-0 4-5	Nov 13
04		N/A	N/A	N/A	Not released	N/A	N/A
05	PC Am 03	20.03.030(b)(3) 20.03.030(b)(4)	Piedmont-Smith	The goal of this amendment is to assuage concerns of many residents in core neighborhoods that the allowance for duplexes, triplexes, and (in the new R4 district) fourplexes will lead to demolition of existing single-family houses. The amendment is based on Plan Commission Amendment 3, which failed for lack of a motion, but revises and clarifies the language.	Adopted	6-3	Nov 13
06		20.03.020 Table 3-1 20.03.030(g)(5)(C) 20.03.030(g)(5)(G)	Piedmont-Smith	ADUs are called for in multiple paragraphs in the Comprehensive Plan. The City has now allowed ADUs as a conditional use for over 2 years, and there have been no negative impacts of such approved uses as far as I know. I think this is largely due to the owner occupancy requirement. The conditional use process is an unnecessary burden for homeowners who want to add an ADU to their property and are able to do so within the rules of the city. Therefore I seek to remove the conditional use limitation for ADUs in all residential districts.	Adopted	5-3	Nov 14
07		20.03.020 Table 3-1 20.03.030(g)(5)(C) 20.03.030(g)(5)(G) 20.03.030(g)(5)(H)	Volan	This amendment removes the conditional use limitation as well as the owner occupancy requirements from accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The intent is to make this housing option more accessible with fewer burdens on those wanting to utilize ADUs.	Not introduced	N/A	Nov 14
08		20.02.050(b)	Piedmont-Smith	Constructed affordable or workforce housing units are more valuable for our community than a contribution to our Housing Development Fund. Therefore, developers seeking an exception to the underlying zoning through a PUD should contribute to the high community need for affordable/workforce housing by including actual affordable units and not by making a monetary contribution which may or may not result in actual housing units within a reasonable time frame.	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19

09		20.03.030 20.07.010	Volan	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Volan at the request of planning staff. The amendment creates a definition for cooperative housing and adds use-specific standards related to such use.	Withdrawn	8-0	Nov 19
09-R		20.03.030 20.07.010	Volan & staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Volan at the request of planning staff. The amendment creates a definition for cooperative housing and adds use-specific standards related to such use. This is a revised version of Am 09, which was considered by the Council on November 19 but withdrawn before final action.	Adopted	6-0	Dec 10
10		20.01.010(b)	Piedmont-Smith	Like in the Comprehensive Plan and the subsequent Sustainability Action Plan, we should state at the beginning of the UDO that one of the purposes is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Adapting to climate change is a corollary to reducing GHG emissions and should logically be another purposes of the UDO.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
11		20.02.020(a)(2) Table 2-2 20.04.020(c) Table 4-2	Piedmont-Smith	With increased precipitation expected to continue in the future, the Environmental Commission is concerned about the UDO increasing impervious surface maximums. These should be kept at current levels (or decreased) to mitigate the impacts of climate change, including surface flooding and the associated run-off, which negatively impacts water quality.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
12		20.02.020(b)(2) Table 2-3 20.04.020(c) Table 4-2	Piedmont-Smith	With increased precipitation expected to continue in the future, the Environmental Commission is concerned about the UDO increasing impervious surface maximums. These should be kept at current levels (or decreased) to mitigate the impacts of climate change, including surface flooding and the associated run-off, which negatively impacts water quality.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
13		20.02.020(f)(2) Table 2-7 20.02.020(g)(2) Table 2-8	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment changes the default development standards for single-family, duplex, triplex, or fourplex dwellings in residential multifamily and high density districts from R2 standards to the more dense R4 standards. The change will allow more dense development within multifamily and high density districts. It makes sense to apply the dimensional standards from the R4 district to the densest residential zoning districts when considering single-family, duplex, triplex, or fourplex dwellings that could be adjacent to multifamily dwellings.	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19
14		20.02.030(b)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment adds language regarding multi-modal transportation and pedestrian travel into the purpose section for Mixed-Use Neighborhood Scale. The Environmental Commission believes neighborhoods should move away from being automobile-centric in their design and should include multiple transportation options for their residents.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19

15		20.02.050(a)	Piedmont-Smith	<p>The Environmental Commission has a long-standing concern regarding the use of PUDs to avoid environmental rules set by the City. This amendment is a stronger purpose statement that we believe fulfills the original intent of PUDs, while strengthening environmental language.</p> <p>Council Sponsor took some language from the EC's suggested replacement paragraph, but not the whole paragraph.</p>	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
16		20.02.050(b)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment moves two important environmental standards from <i>optional</i> to <i>required</i> for qualifying standards. It also strikes subsection 20.02.050(b)(7)(G), which was blank.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
17		20.03.020 Table 3-1	Piedmont-Smith	<p>My goal is to provide at least one zoning district where a methadone treatment clinic would be allowed by right. The conditional use process opens up this use to neighborhood objections based on stigma, whereas we as a community should be working to eliminate the stigma of addiction and instead recognize addiction treatment as equivalent to any other medical treatment.</p> <p>A note about the use "Opioid rehabilitation facility." I would include this use in the current amendment, but unfortunately these facilities are not regulated sufficiently by the state government to prevent potentially exploitative clinics from setting up shop in Bloomington. Methadone clinics are more highly regulated by the state. Furthermore, we have unfortunately already experienced, as a city, the lack of respect one particular opioid rehabilitation facility has had for local laws and procedures. The city really has no way of knowing when such a clinic opens other than to require the operators of the clinic to go through the conditional use process.</p>	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19
18		20.03.030(c)(5)(C)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment clarifies that soil must be tested only if food grown in that soil is to be sold. The goal is to remove what could be a costly impediment to growing food for one's own family's consumption (tracking prior use of the land or comprehensive soil testing).	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19
19		20.03.030(f)(2)	Piedmont-Smith	The Environmental Commission strongly believes that solar collecting devices should be permitted in side-yards, not limited to behind the primary front wall of the building. This amendment allows solar panels anywhere behind the setback of the lot in question.	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19

20		20.04.030(c)(9)	Piedmont-Smith	The goal of this amendment is to make the section on soil constraints more clear, not to change its meaning.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
21		20.04.030(f)(9)	Piedmont-Smith	From the Environmental Commission: one acre in an urban environment is a large parcel. Therefore, riparian buffers should only be exempt if smaller than one-half acre. This amendment changes this as well. Council sponsor has added a cut and paste of existing text from the end of the section on riparian buffers to the beginning: The section on new single-family development that is exempt from riparian buffer requirements. Additional mitigation techniques are required for these parcels, and moving these requirements to the beginning of this section will hopefully increase compliance and enforcement, which has been lacking under the current (2007) UDO.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
22		20.04.030(f)(7)(D)	Piedmont-Smith	The Environmental Commission strongly feels that “as needed for connectivity” is too low of a bar for putting streets in riparian buffers. This amendment strengthens this language to protect riparian buffers, in order to protect habitats/water quality and mitigate flooding.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
23		20.04.030(f)(9)	Piedmont-Smith	In order to protect water quality, the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides should be prohibited within riparian buffer zones. This amendment adds language prohibiting the use of these applicants within all riparian buffer zones, except as needed to control severe cases of invasive species, as designated by the Director of Planning & Transportation. This amendment also adds the requirement that all added vegetation be kept alive and maintained in perpetuity.	Not introduced	N/A	Nov 19
24		20.04.040(d)	Piedmont-Smith	The goal of this amendment is to clarify that construction of any building in the floodplain is only a conditional use and must go through the conditional use approval process. The floodplain standards are set by the state because DNR issues permits for land-disturbing activities within floodplains, but the city can be more restrictive as far as building in a floodplain. In addition, this amendment removes allowed uses that are not defined in Chapter 7 (these were taken from state code).	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19
24-R		20.04.040(d)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment was a revised version of Am 24, which the sponsor chose not to introduce.	Not introduced	N/A	Nov 19

25		20.04.050(c)(3)(B) 20.04.060(i)(2)	Piedmont-Smith	Wide driveways make walking less appealing as sidewalks and street trees are interrupted to allow access for cars. Furthermore, as the Comprehensive Plan states, we should limit impervious surface in the interest of the environment and stormwater management. A width of 18 feet is sufficient even for a two-car garage and should be the maximum width allowed for new driveways in residential areas.	Adopted	8-0	Nov 19
26		20.04.060(d) Table 4-9	Sturbaum	Parking minimums are too small and are targeted for the R3 zone. The R-3 zone is particularly susceptible to harm to neighborhoods from over-parking. Much of R-3 has on-street parking only and the addition of cars that are beyond the very small minimums will have a negative affect on owners and renters already in the area of such proposed, under-parked developments. This amendment changes multiplex minimums from .5 to 1 space per dwelling unit. For student dormitory, it changes “no requirement” to .5 per bedroom. For 0 to 10 bedrooms, it changes “no requirement” to .5 per bedroom and for over 11 bedrooms, it changes .5 to 1 space per bedroom.	Failed	3-5	Nov 19
27		20.04.060(c), (d), (g), & (n)	Volan	The purpose of this amendment is to remove the minimum vehicle parking requirements contained within 20.04.060(d) and adjustments to those requirements in 20.04.060(g). This change would mean that developments or land use subject to Chapter 20.04 of the UDO would no longer have a minimum amount of parking required as part of the development standards, though maximum vehicle parking allowances would still apply. It also removes 20.04.060(n)(1)(A), which would allow the use of off-street parking by parkers who do not have business with the lot owner or tenant. This amendment is intended to reduce the amount of land dedicated to vehicle parking; to make underutilized off-street parking shareable and more efficient, further reducing the demand to devote more land to parking; and to encourage development centered on the concept of public transportation and pedestrian facilities.	Failed	4-4	Nov 19
28		20.04.060(m)(1)(B)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment ensures that bicycle parking leaves sufficient space for someone using a wheelchair to pass on the sidewalk.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19

29		2.04.070(d)(1)(C) 2.04.070(d)(2)(B)(iv)	Sturbaum	EIFS has never been a primary material allowed in our zoning code. It is not a long lasting material and is accepted as a secondary material due to its flexible use for smaller details. This amendment is intended to forbid large projects that are primarily covered with this material, from being built in Bloomington. Better quality and durability is required to meet higher requirements to blend into the different zones. An expectation for higher quality structures is communicated by the banning of this particular material. In addition, this amendment also distinguishes between primary and secondary exterior finish materials in mixed-use and non-residential districts.	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	8-0 7-1	Nov 19
30		20.04.070(e)	Sturbaum	This amendment adds “contributing” buildings to the list of historic structures that are respected by step-downs in height when new buildings in mixed-use districts are constructed next to historic structures. The majority of historic buildings are rated “contributing”. This respects historic structures that are truly historic and important, but not stand-alone important.	Failed	1-7	Nov 19
31		20.04.080(c)(2)(C)	Piedmont-Smith	It is the belief of the Environmental Commission that increased biodiversity is important for our continued ecosystem health. This amendment changes “species” to “genus” when discussing tree planting biodiversity standards. The intent is to make this requirement more restrictive, thus providing for a higher level of biodiversity. Trees are a long-term investment in the ecological health of our community, and we ought to increase biodiversity in order to combat/prevent blights.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
32		20.04.080(m)	Piedmont-Smith	To fulfill the goal stated in the Comprehensive Plan, and the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in the Sustainability Action Plan, as well as the several commitments to climate change mitigation made by the Mayor on behalf of the city, we must remove any barriers we control toward the installation of solar panels and other local renewable energy options. Screening is an additional cost that property owners should not have to incur to install solar panels.	Adopted	6-0-1	Nov 20
33		20.04.080(n)(1) 20.04.080(n)(3)	Piedmont-Smith	As the City of Bloomington seeks to improve access to and opportunities for urban agriculture, the Environmental Commission believes it is important to allow property owners to protect their investment and work through increased fence heights. The Comprehensive Plan specifically mentions adjusting these heights to allow for better protection against deer and other animal species. This amendment changes fence heights in interior and corner lots from eight feet to twelve feet. Council sponsor added a phrase at the beginning of the section on fences for the same reasons. Council sponsor adds as an additional reason for this amendment that the Deer Task Force recommended allowing taller fence heights in its report several years ago.	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	8-0 8-1	Nov 20

34		20.04.100(l)(3)	Volan	This amendment increases the size allowances for projecting signs within the MD District. The purpose of this ordinance is to allow signs similar to those contained in the pictures attached hereto, which depict downtown signage in Bloomington circa 1963 and the current Buskirk-Chumley Theater signage.	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	5-4 5-4	Nov 20
35		20.04.110(d)(3)	Piedmont-Smith	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Piedmont-Smith at the request of planning staff. The amendment clarifies that single-family, duplex, triplex, and fourplex uses are not eligible for the additional primary structure height bonus when those uses meet the requirements of the sustainable development incentives.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
36		20.05.040(e)(3) 20.05.040(e)(9)	Piedmont-Smith	The Environmental Commission believes that herbicides/pesticides do not belong in conservation easements except in the extreme case of otherwise unmanageable invasive species. This amendment adds in this language. Council sponsor added the language for drainage easements as well.	Not introduced	N/A	Nov 19
37		20.05.050(j)(5)(N)	Piedmont-Smith	In street design, “eyebrows” set residential homes off from the street, which, according to the Comprehensive Plan, should be a vibrant public realm. They are also an unnecessary strip of impermeable surface, adding additional driving lanes. Finally, such “eyebrows” push houses away from the through streets, giving drivers a perception of greater open space which may lead to higher speeds. Higher speeds are not safe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other road users.	Adopted	9-0	Nov 20
38	PC Am 09 - REV	20.06.050(c) 20.06.050(c)(3)(C)(ii) (2)[c]	Sturbaum	Excluding partial demolition of “contributing” historic structures from review by the historic commission allows for staff-approved demolitions of up to 50% of the structure which may lower the rating of a property from “contributing” to “non-contributing”. The directive to staff is the issue here. Currently, staff is to consider whether this property should be individually designated when, by definition, as a “contributing” property, it gains its rating based upon neighborhood context. That is the meaning of the definition of “contributing”. Absent an amendment, a historic resource that is an important piece of a group of other contributing resources could be modified without commission or legitimate staff review and, then, be so altered and degraded, that it would no longer be eligible for preservation as a historic property. This amendment clarifies the standard of review for staff in these circumstances in order to avoid that scenario.	Failed	2-6-1	Nov 20

39		20.07.010	Piedmont-Smith	<p>In order to protect water quality, the Environmental Commission believes it is beneficial and prudent to define the three major stream types, as opposed to just intermittent streams. This amendment adds definitions for perennial and ephemeral streams, and amends the definition of intermittent streams, all of which were designed by City Senior Environmental Planner.</p> <p>Due to the difficulty of identifying ephemeral streams and thus enforcing their protection, staff advised the Council Sponsor to not require ephemeral streams to have riparian buffer zones. Thus the definition of ephemeral stream is not necessary and has been deleted from the EC version of this amendment.</p>	Adopted (via consent agenda)	8-0	Nov 19
40		20.02.020(c) Table 2-4 20.04.020(c) Table 4-2	Sturbaum	This amendment reduces the maximum height of R2 buildings from 40 feet to 35 feet. Virtually all R2 buildings are presently two story houses at most. The proposed 40' max would allow three story (or even short four story buildings, which would radically change the quality and character of R2 neighborhoods. Reducing the max height to 35' would still permit a two story duplex and triplex structure.	Failed	2-6	Dec 3
41		20.02.060(a)(5)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment provides clarification on upper floor facade setbacks and the relationship to a public street and not the side or rear.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
42		20.03.020 Table 3-1	Sturbaum	This amendment 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. The Residential Multifamily (RM) zone still contains many single family homes and single family forms that have become multifamily. The higher density forms that are fine in Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH) could have negative consequences in the RM zones. Conditional use still allows their use but the application will have a chance of being more context sensitive with a public process that the conditional use provides.	Failed	1-7	Dec 3
43		20.03.030(b)(10)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment further reduces the spacing standard for group care homes to reflect a typical block length, which is 300 feet. The existing UDO spacing standard for group care homes is 3,000 feet and the draft UDO is 500 feet. This change is proposed in order to be consistent with the federal Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988 (FHAA).	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
44		20.04.020(f)(1)(B) Figure 50	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment provides a new graphical illustration to better show how building height is measured.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3

45		20.04.060(e) 20.04.060(h)	Volan	This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Volan and adjusts provisions related to maximum parking requirements. The amendment replaces the term “requirement” with the term “allowance” to better reflect that the maximum parking standards contained 20.04.060(e) are the maximum allowed amounts of parking for the listed land uses. It replaces many of the specific maximum parking allowances with a standardized default parking allowance, with different default parking allowances for residential and nonresidential uses. The amendment adds a default parking allowance chart, which reduces the default parking allowances for residential and nonresidential uses by specified amounts each year for 20 years after the effective date of the UDO. The purpose of this amendment is to promote density, reduce the amount of land dedicated to surface parking, and to encourage non-automotive modes of transportation.	Withdrawn	8-0	Dec 3
45-R		20.04.060(e) 20.04.060(h)	Volan	This revised version of Amendment 45 is sponsored by Cm. Volan and adjusts provisions related to maximum parking requirements. The amendment replaces the term “requirement” with the terms “allowance” or “limit” to better reflect that the maximum parking standards contained 20.04.060(e) are the maximum allowed amounts of parking for the listed land uses. It converts many of the maximum allowances to a standard measurement of “[number of spaces] per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA” to allow for easier comparison of spaces allowed for different land uses.	Adopted	9-0	Dec 18
46		20.04.070(c) 20.05.050(j)(10)(D)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment relocates MD District standards for street lighting to better align with the Downtown Vision and Infill Strategy Plan.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
47		20.04.070(d)	Sturbaum	Sometimes the design regulations force architectural outcomes that may have been better if the design were left to the architect. Arbitrary variations are sometimes a positive, but sometimes create outcomes that may be regrettable and avoidable. This amendment would give architects more creative freedom.	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	8-0 6-2	Dec 3
48		20.04.070 20.05.050	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment adds provisions related to the concept of “universal design.”	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	8-0 8-0	Dec 3
49		20.04.080(c)(2)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment provides clarification on plant species identification.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
50		20.04.080(d) 20.04.080(e)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment makes changes to the landscaping lists to identify evergreens, to remove poor quality/invasive species, or to add new species.	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	8-0 8-0	Dec 3

51		20.04.080(n)	Sturbaum	In two recent cases, a fence that was requested along an arterial street was turned down and the rules would have placed the fence ten feet in from the property line. This put the fence in the yard in such a way as to make it impractical or give up a large area of the usable yard. In a second recent case, a fence was to be up against the sidewalk, as is common in the core neighborhoods. The owner wanted six feet to keep his large dog safely inside the yard. These rules prevented both desired outcomes without a clear public good resulting from the decision. This amendment allows fences along the frontage of the secondary front building wall in R3 districts to be built to the property line, except where there is an easement which prohibits the fence and no permission has been granted by the easement holder and except where located in the vision clearance triangle. In addition, the maximum height of these fences is eight feet.	FAILED	4-4	Dec 3
52		20.04.100(i)(4) 20.06.020(c), (d), & (g) 20.06.080(b) 20.07.010	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment removes the reference to the use variance process as the City is attempting to move away from such a process.	Adopted	8-0	Dec 3
53		20.04.120	Sturbaum	Presently there is no mention of noisy machinery, but protecting neighbors from noise is just as important as protecting neighbors from unsightliness, especially because noise is a health issue and not only an aesthetic issue.	Withdrawn	8-0	Dec 3
54		20.05.050(k)(4)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment gives authority to the Fire Chief to locate fire hydrant locations other than every 600 feet.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
55		20.06.030 Table 6-1 20.06.050(b)(3)	Sturbaum	“Conditional Use” could represent an important change to a neighborhood. This amendment requires a neighborhood meeting as part of the process. This will ensure greater transparency and a more predictable procedural outcome.	Not introduced	N/A	Dec 3
56		20.06.090(f)(2)(B)(ii)	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment clarifies the use standards for corner lots and the respective setbacks are based on highest classified street.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
57		20.07.010	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment provides a revised definition for Fraternity or Sorority House.	Adopted	7-0	Dec 3
58		20.07.010	Sandberg and Staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment increases the scope of the definition for “Use, Change In” to include “Any change from a nonresidential use to a multifamily use” and includes language about subheadings.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3

59		20.04.030	Piedmont-Smith	<p>When combining two sinkholes into a compound sinkhole for the purpose of better protecting water quality, connecting from the widest points provides environmental protection for the widest possible area. Not doing so results in the possibility of karst features being infringed upon by development activity. This amendment is intended to install this practice into the UDO.</p>	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 3
60		20.02.020 Table 2-2 Table 2-3 Table 2-7 Table 2-8	Piedmont-Smith	<p>This amendment, brought forward at the request of a Bloomington resident, potentially reduces the length of driveways in some residential zoning districts thus reducing impervious surface coverage and allowing more space for green plantings.</p> <p>Currently the minimum setback for front-loading garages in several districts is calculated as additional setback from the front of the main building. I argue it's best to set the garage setback independently.</p> <p>1) For RE zone – the main building setback is 30 ft. If the main reason for the longer garage setback is to allow parking in the driveway, then the additional 10 ft. is really not necessary. If the main reason for the longer garage setback is building-forward design that's already impossible with a 30-ft setback anyway. If the main reason for the longer garage setback is to make sure the garage is not the most prominent feature of the building, then it seems the equal setback of garage and home would be adequate.</p> <p>2) For R1 zone – the main building setback is 15 ft. However, an existing main building setback may not be in compliance with UDO standards and may actually be longer. Therefore, an additional 10 ft. makes the garage setback longer than necessary. Therefore it makes sense to make the garage setback independent of the front building setback. That way, if someone on a lot with a nonconforming front building setback wanted to add a garage, the garage setback could still be conforming.</p> <p>For this case, I also specify that the setback of the garage may in not case be less than the setback of the main building. We do not want the garage to be the primary visual feature of the home.</p> <p>3) For RM and RH zones – Same reasoning as for R1 zone</p>	Adopted	5-2	Dec 10

61		20.02.020(e)(2) Table 2-6	Piedmont-Smith	<p>This amendment is a version of an amendment request brought forward by the Environmental Commission. The EC requested that the height limit in the new R4 district be increased from 35 feet to 50 feet to allow for 3-story buildings with pitched roofs. After talking with staff, the sponsor decided that 50 feet was too tall. Staff indicated that a 3-story building could be constructed within a 40 foot limit, even with the required pitched roof, so that is what I settled on for this amendment.</p> <p>My reasoning, and that of the EC, is that we should allow denser housing types such as row houses and town houses in the R4 district. Denser living close to employment, shopping, services, and schools mean fewer vehicle miles traveled and therefore a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. We have not mapped the R4 district yet, but I assume these areas will be close to the center of the city. When we do map this district, three-story duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and row houses should be allowed in these areas.</p>	Adopted	6-0	Dec 10
62		20.03.020, 20.03.030	Sandberg & staff	<p>This amendment is proposed by Cm. Sandberg at the request of staff. The amendment adds an asterisk to the "P" for Fraternity or Sorority in Table 3-1: Allowed Use Table. It also includes a new Use-Specific Standard under 20.03.030(b)(10) for Fraternity or Sorority, and renumbers subsequent sections.</p>	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
63		20.04.020(e) Table 4-6	Rollo	<p>This amendment would amend Table 4-6 (Authorized Exceptions to Setback Requirements) to add a row for Front Entry to allow an exception for a maximum of 6 feet for those kinds of streetside additions which do not exceed one third the width of the main portion of the house.</p> <p>Bloomington housing stock (formally RS) contains a large number of simple ranch and split level homes which have little-to-no entry sequence. Theses entries open directly into the living room or onto a small stair landing. Over the years, property owners have inquired with a local architect, hoping to add a covered front porch or front entry addition and it has not been possible since there is no provision for any sort of front addition to houses in existing, built-out neighborhoods. This exception would allow homeowners to add a modest entry or front porch addition, improve the utility and experience of their entry and potentially enhance the neighborhood streetscape.</p>	Amend Adopt as Amended Adopted	6-0 6-0	Dec 10

64		20.04.110(c)(7)(B)	Rollo	As every effort should be made to remove barriers to adoption of incentives for anyone – either a developer or individual citizen – these calculations should be included as a part of the UDO and should be as transparent, accessible and understandable as possible. The added language indicates that a timeline should be set for implementation of payment-in-lieu definitions and procedures, and that these procedures should be included. This will increase transparency and reduce negative public perception of the payment-in-lieu mechanism.	Adopted	5-0-1	Dec 10
65		20.04.110(d)(1)	Rollo	This new language recognizes the need for rehabilitation of existing structures toward improved sustainability.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
66		20.04.110(d)(2)(A)(iv)	Rollo	Section 20.04.80 (Landscaping, Buffering, and Fences) emphasizes the use of native plants helps to provide native habitat, which should also be applied to roofs – and additional ecosystem service beyond water retention, heat island mitigation, and insulation.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
67		20.04.110(d)(2)(A)(v)	Rollo	This amendment makes it clear that on-site solar photovoltaic systems may exceed the minimum requirements for the incentive.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
68		20.04.120(b)(1)	Rollo	This amendment adds plant material on vegetated roofs to the maintenance responsibilities of developers and their successors, and includes vegetated roof infrastructure as an example of applicable landscaping structures.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
69		20.07.010	Rollo	Deletes the entry for ‘Green Building Worksheet’. A Green Building Worksheet is not referred to in Section 20.04.110(d) (Sustainable Development) or anywhere else in the UDO. The term should be removed from the definitions section.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 10
70-R		20.04.020 Table 4-2	Piedmont-Smith & staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Piedmont-Smith at the request of staff. The amendment updates Table 4-2 to reflect changes made by Amendments 60, 61, and 73.	Adopted	9-0	Dec 18
71		20.04.020(e) Table 4-6	Rollo & staff	This amendment is proposed by Cm. Rollo at the request of staff. The amendment updates Table 4-6 to use defined terms rather than the language originally proposed by Amendment 63.	Adopted (via consent agenda)	N/A	Dec 18

72		20.04.070(d)(2)(E)	Piedmont-Smith	<p>This amendment, brought forward at the request of a few Bloomington architects, allows flat roofs in residential zoning districts for primary structures which have a minimum size. The minimum size requirement is to avoid having mobile homes in these zoning districts, as mobile homes should be placed in the RMH district. Flat roofs make it possible to have both innovative design and to install green roof cover. Green roofs decrease stormwater runoff and thus their greater allowance in the city serves to meet policies 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the Comp Plan. Policy 5.2.6 of the Comp Plan indicates that both traditional and contemporary architecture are desirable in residential neighborhoods. Many contemporary architectural designs for residential housing include flat roofs. A building with a flat roof does not necessarily violate the “consistent built character” and “prevailing pattern of development, building distribution, and scale” of a residential neighborhood.</p>	Adopted	9-0	Dec 18
73		20.02.020 Table 2-4	Piedmont-Smith	<p>This is an addendum to Am. 60. Sponsor made a mistake and submitted the wrong version of Am. 60 for approval Dec. 10. The version she meant to submit included changes in the R2 district.</p> <p>This amendment correction, brought forward at the request the same Bloomington resident who proposed Am. 60, potentially reduces the length of driveways in the R2 zoning district thus reducing impervious surface coverage and allowing more space for green plantings.</p> <p>Currently the minimum setback for front-loading garages in several districts is calculated as additional setback from the front of the main building. I argue it’s best to set the garage setback independently. We already did so in the RE, R1, RM, and RH districts via Am. 60 on Dec. 10</p> <p>For the R2 zone, the same argument may be made as for the R1 zone. The main building setback is 15 ft. However, an existing main building setback may not be in compliance with UDO standards and may actually be longer. For example, in at least 1 neighborhood the driveways are 30 ft. long by covenant. An additional 10 ft. added to the driveway length thus makes the garage setback longer than necessary. Therefore it makes sense to allow the driveway setback to be less, as long as the garage is not closer to the street than the main structure. That way, if someone on a lot with a nonconforming front building setback wanted to add a garage, the garage setback could still be conforming.</p>	Adopted	9-0	Dec 18
74		20.02.050(b)	Piedmont-Smith & staff	<p>This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith at the request of staff. It adds a reference to the affordable housing section of the code for clarification.</p> <p>Note – this amendment revises section 20.02.050, which was previously amended by Amendment 08 adopted by the Council on November 19, 2019.</p>	Adopted	9-0	Dec 18