

****ORDINANCE CERTIFICATION****


In accordance with IC 36-7-4-604 I hereby certify that the attached Ordinance Number 23-10 is a true and complete copy of Plan Commission Case Number ZO-12-23 which was given a recommendation of approval by a vote of 9 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 0 Abstentions by the Bloomington City Plan Commission at a public hearing held on April 10, 2023.



Date: April 18, 2023

Scott Robinson, Secretary
Plan Commission

Received by the Common Council Office this 18th day of April, 2023.



Nicole Bolden, City Clerk

Appropriation Ordinance #	_____	Fiscal Impact Statement Ordinance #	_____	Resolution #	_____
------------------------------	-------	---	-------	--------------	-------

Type of Legislation:

Appropriation	End of Program	Penal Ordinance
Budget Transfer	New Program	Grant Approval
Salary Change	Bonding	Administrative Change
Zoning Change	Investments	Short-Term Borrowing
New Fees	Annexation	Other

If the legislation directly affects City funds, the following must be completed by the City Controller:

Cause of Request:

Planned Expenditure	_____	Emergency	_____
Unforeseen Need	_____	Other	_____

Funds Affected by Request:

Fund(s) Affected	_____	_____
Fund Balance as of January 1	\$ _____	\$ _____
Revenue to Date	\$ _____	\$ _____
Revenue Expected for Rest of year	\$ _____	\$ _____
Appropriations to Date	\$ _____	\$ _____
Unappropriated Balance	\$ _____	\$ _____
Effect of Proposed Legislation (+/-)	\$ _____	\$ _____
Projected Balance	\$ _____	\$ _____

Signature of Controller

Will the legislation have a major impact on existing City appropriations, fiscal liability or revenues?

Yes _____ No XX

If the legislation will not have a major fiscal impact, explain briefly the reason for your conclusion.

Approval of case ZO-12-23 amends the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), with amendments and updates to processes and procedures related to chicken flocks and maximum parking standards, by the Bloomington Plan Commission. This ordinance is in accordance with Indiana Code 36-7-4-600.

If the legislation will have a major fiscal impact, explain briefly what the effect on City costs and revenues will be and include factors which could lead to significant additional expenditures in the future. Be as specific as possible. (Continue on second sheet if necessary.)

Case # ZO-12-23 Memo

To: Bloomington Common Council

From: Jackie Scanlan, AICP Development Services Manager

Date: April 18, 2023

Re: Text Amendments to Unified Development Ordinance: Parking Maximum and Chicken Flock

The Plan Commission heard case ZO-12-23 on April 10, 2023 and voted to send the petition to the Common Council with a positive recommendation with a vote of 9-0.

The Planning and Transportation Department proposes an addendum to its annual update and amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), Title 20 of the Bloomington Municipal Code.

At its March 2023 hearing, the Plan Commission discussed the annual UDO text amendment update. The Department proposed parking maximums for just under 70 uses that currently have no maximum in Table 04-10. A member of the public appeared at the hearing with concerns about adding maximums, and the Plan Commission voted to remove the parking maximum proposal. More information about that proposal is included below. The Common Council is working on an update to regulations related to chicken flocks, and a Title 20 update needed to be done to align with the proposed changes. No changes to proposed uses or zoning districts are included in this update.

That petition is as follows:

1. ZO-12-23 | UDO Chapter 3, Use Regulations; UDO Chapter 4, Development Standards & Incentives

ZO-12-23 UDO Chapter 3, Use Regulations; UDO Chapter 4, Development Standards & Incentives

There is one amendment proposed for Chapter 3 related to the accessory use, ‘chicken flock’ that is a technical amendment to align Title 20 with Title 7 changes that are being brought forward by the Common Council. The Council is proposing to allow more than one flock per parcel, so the Title 20 amendment changes the reference in the Use-Specific standards from ‘one flock’ to ‘flocks.’

The amendments in Chapter 4 are related to Table 04-10, which addresses the Maximum Parking Standards for uses in the UDO. When the UDO was repealed and replaced after the 2019-2020 Update process, a number of uses were left with ‘no limit’ as their parking maximum. The

Department is proposing to add maximums to those uses that do not currently have maximums in order to align the code with the Comprehensive Plan, provide that all uses have maximums for consistency of regulation, and still allow for the uses to be developed with necessary associated parking. The limits in Table 04-10 are for surface parking on a site. If a 'parking garage' use is also allowed in the developing zoning district, structured parking can be built. In the Downtown, the Comprehensive Plan prefers structured parking. The Land Development Policy Guidance for the Downtown says on page 86: "Land dedicated to parking should be minimized by building, preferring multi-story parking garages to surface parking lots, and by encouraging active transportation (bicycling and walking)." Additionally, in the Urban Corridor Site Design portion on page 90, the Comprehensive Plan states that "Strategies for parking will become more important in order to avoid large open areas of asphalt."

The Department used a number of resources to arrive at the maximums presented, including the Report described below, as well as researching similar uses in other locations, and looking internally at similar uses. Since March, the Department has re-visited the proposed maximums and altered a few.

The Department utilized American Planning Association's Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 510-511, Parking Standards, to compare uses to standards being used by other communities across the country. The Report is from 2002, so general guidance and thinking related to surface parking has shifted in the last two decades, but the numbers are a good guide to determine whether or not the proposed numbers are in the ballpark, and was also useful to suggest items to incorporate. For example, a cemetery regulation is often based on the buildings on the property and their size, not the acreage of the property, so we adjusted our recommendation accordingly.

Jail: The Department was able to find information about 3 of the jails that were identified in Monroe County's RFQ for a New Criminal Justice Center. While the Indianapolis facility houses more than the jail, including the majority of the court system and offices, the other facilities are smaller scale. Under the proposed provision, both Allen County and Lawrence County would be able to build the number of desired vehicular parking spaces.

Location	Square footage	Allowed under proposed maximum	Allowed under previous maximum*	Actual number of spaces
Allen County, IN	242,000	484	413 (1100 bed 275 employees)	326 (proposed)
Lawrence County, SD	64,200	128	45 (120 beds 30 employees)	84 (proposed)
Indianapolis-Marion County Community Justice Center	750,000 (Detention Center only)	1500	1,125 (3,000 beds 750 employees)	2067 (entire site)

*assuming "largest shift" meets BJS inmate-to-correctional officer ratio of 4 to 1

Stadium: The Department looked at 4 stadiums in Indiana to determine how many spaces would be allowable for facilities of comparable size under the proposed regulations. The stadiums listed offer shared parking options with nearby structured parking. However, the proposed maximums allow plenty of opportunity for on-site parking. Indiana University facilities built on State-owned land are not subject to the parking maximums in Title 20. For stadium, we confirmed in the PAS Report that one space per four seats is a standard regulation used.

Location	Number of seats	Allowed under proposed maximum	Actual number of spaces on-site
Victory Field - Indianapolis	12,230	3,057	286
Loeb Stadium - Lafayette	7,500	875	0
Kokomo Municipal Stadium - Kokomo	4,000	100	63
Parkview Field - Fort Wayne	8,100	2,025	51

General Uses: For many of the general uses that did not have maximums, we applied our larger typical maximum of 3.3 spaces for every 1,000 square feet of GFA, as the vehicular uses of those sites are similar, such as kennel or pet grooming. This is the maximum that we currently use successfully for office, and our larger retail uses. We propose to utilize the number for some of our manufacturing uses, as they are often larger sites with commuting workers, and the average square footage per employee for manufacturing is very similar to office. For sites that may be

uses that are less commute-heavy, we applied the 2.5 spaces for every 1,000 square feet of GFA maximum, such as for an amenity center that would be accessory to a primary use by definition. We utilized a smaller maximum of 1.25 spaces per either 0.5 acres or 1 acre for uses that primarily take place outside of a supportive building, such as quarry or transportation terminal.

Based on the definition of ‘parking space’, the space for larger vehicles required by some uses, such as semi-trucks are not counted as part of the parking maximum total. So, manufacturing and other uses do not provide for extra space for those vehicles. However, we propose extra allowance for uses that utilize fleets of small vehicles, such as a contractor’s yard or police, fire, or rescue station.

The Department believes that adding maximums to the allowable amount of surface parking for all uses is in line with City goals that work to encourage green space and less automobile dependence, while still allowing room for necessary on-site parking for new and redeveloping uses.