



October 27, 2013

Scott Gustin, Senior Planner  
Austin Hart, Chairman, Development Review Board  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
149 Church Street  
Burlington, VT 05401

**Re: Grove Street Apartments, Preliminary Plan application**

Dear Scott, Austin and DRB members,

In accordance with the COA Level III Preliminary Plat Application Checklist submission requirements for this project I offer the following information and materials.

- A completed and signed permit application
- Application fee of \$74,110
- 1 full size color, 5 full size black, 1 colored 11x17 and a disc of the following plan set:
  - T1** – Title Sheet
  - L1.0** – Tree Planting Plan
  - L1.1** – Enlarged Planting Plan - Zone 1
  - L1.2** – Enlarged Planting Plan - Zone 2
  - L1.3** – Enlarged Planting Plan - Zone 3
  - L1.4** – Enlarged Planting Plan - Zone 4
  - L1.5** – Enlarged Planting Plan - Zone 5
  - S1** – Existing Conditions Plan
  - S2** – Site Plan
  - S3** – Utility Plan
  - S4** – Grading Plan
  - S5** – Pedestrian Plan 1
  - S6** – Pedestrian Plan 2
  - S7** – Pedestrian Plan 3
  - S8** – Street Sewer Plan & Profile
  - S9** – Sewer Plan & Profile – Upper
  - S10** – Sewer Plan & Profile – Transition
  - S11** – Sewer Plan & Profile – Lower
  - S12** – Colchester Court Water Plan
  - S13** – Sewer Details
  - S14** – Pump Station Details
  - S15** – Parking Details
  - S16** – Water Details
  - S17** – Stormwater and Erosion Control Details
  - EC1** – Erosion Control Pre-Construction Plan

**EC2** – Erosion Control Construction Plan  
**EC3** – Erosion Control Post-Construction Plan  
**EC4** – Erosion Control Culvert Removal  
**A1** – Typical Front Building Elevations A,B,C,D,E,F  
**A2** – Typical Rear Inside Elevations A,B,C,D,E,F  
**A3** – Typical Garage Floor Plan A,B,C,D,E,F  
**A4,A5,A6** – Typical Front, Side, Rear Building Elevations J,K  
**A7,A8,A9** – Typical Front, Side, Rear Building Elevations I  
**A10,A11,A12** – Typical Front, Side, Rear Building Elevations G,H  
**A13,A14,A15** – Typical Front, Side, Rear Building Elevations L  
**A16,A17,A18** – Typical Exterior

I will be sending you the following studies and or documents via e-mail:

- All applicable draft legal documents for the Common Interest Community.
- A Draft Warranty Deed for the conveyance of a small parcel of land to the city. (Said parcel is further defined in the narrative below)
- A traffic study/ analysis prepared by Resource Systems Group Inc.

Following is a brief narrative describing the proposed projects conformance with each of the applicable review criteria per section 10.1.8, Preliminary Plat Review (d) Review Criteria of the CDO.

This proposal is to replace the concrete plant and ancillary uses with 247 one & two bedroom units and a rental office/club house in 12 buildings. Each building will have a “footprint lot” as depicted on sheet S2. The project is proposed to be built on two existing lots and a portion of a third existing lot as depicted on sheet S2.. The two existing lots are currently occupied by S.D. Ireland Brothers Corp and S.D. Ireland Grove Street Properties LLC and are used for the production of concrete, storage of inventory, maintenance of heavy equipment and offices. The third lot is also owned by S.D. Ireland Grove Street Properties, LLC and we are proposing to take 0.8 acres out of that lot (via a boundary line adjustment). Apple Grove Apartments sits on this lot and currently comprises 16 units of housing. We have completed a density analysis on the remaining portion of this lot and concluded that we are still in compliance with the base density requirement of this district.

The project is proposed to be served by municipal water and sewer. We are also proposing off-site improvements that relate to water, sewer, traffic and pedestrian safety. Since the technical review meeting and the DRB sketch plan meeting we have met with the Ward 1 NPA (three times), the Fire Marshall, Parks & Rec, Public Works, CEDO, the Conservation Commission, the Design Advisory Board, many neighbors, UVM,BED, Efficiency Vermont, Vt. Gas, the City of South Burlington, several staff members from The Agency of Natural Resources and The Act 250 district Coordinator all in an attempt to propose a project that has taken everyone’s ideas and concerns into consideration.

## Zoning Information

### Zoning: density, setbacks, lot coverage's:

All dimensional requirements are met. The underlying zoning district is residential and allows a base density of 7 units per acre. The project is subject to Inclusionary Zoning Requirements which bring the base density up to 8.75 units. The project is also eligible for a Residential Conversion Bonus of 8 units per acre, which brings the total potential density to 16.75 units per acre. The maximum allowable density using all applicable density bonuses is 20 units per acre. We are proposing a gross density of 11.8 units an acre and a net density (removal of undevelopable area) of 16.5 units an acre. For a more detailed analysis please refer to table to the right.

ZONING DISTRICT: RESIDENTIAL - LOW DENSITY

### DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
MINIMUM ROAD FRONTAGE	50'	1,250'
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	10,000 SF.	1,376,576 SF
MAXIMUM DENSITY	7 UNITS/AC.	N/A
MAX. LOT COVERAGE	35%	31.2%
MINIMUM FRONT SETBACK	AVG. OF 2 ADJACENT LOTS ON BOTH SIDES	14'
MINIMUM SIDE SETBACK**	10% OF LOT WIDTH	>20'
MINIMUM REAR SETBACK**	25% OF LOT DEPTH	>75'
MINIMUM WATERFRONT SETBACK	75'	>75'

\*NOT TO EXCEED 20'  
 \*\*NOT TO EXCEED 75'

## Buildable Area Calculation

TOTAL LOT SIZE - 20.79 ACRES (905,395 SQ. FT.)

-LESS PORTIONS OF THE PROPERTY COVERED BY STREAMS, PONDS, LAKES, WETLANDS, AND OTHER BODIES OF WATER AND LANDS WITH A SLOPE IN EXCESS OF 30%.

 SLOPES GREATER THAN 30% - 181,984 SQ. FT.

 WETLANDS - 15,945 SQ. FT.

-THE DRB MAY UNDER CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA ALLOW UP TO 50% OF THE MAXIMUM BUILDING DENSITY OR LOT COVERAGE TO BE CALCULATE ON LANDS WITH A SLOPE BETWEEN 15-30%.

 SLOPES BETWEEN 15% AND 30% - 108,647 SQ. FT.

TOTAL UNBUILDABLE AREA - 5.86 ACRES (255,253 SQ. FT.)  
 (181,984 SQ. FT. + 15,945 SQ. FT. + (108,647\*50%) = 255,253 SQ. FT.)

TOTAL BUILDABLE AREA - 14.93 ACRES (650,142 SQ. FT.)  
 (905,395 SQ. FT. - 255,253 SQ. FT. = 650,142 SQ. FT.)

## Density Calculation

BASE DENSITY: 8.75 DU/PER ACRE  
 8.75 DU/ACRE X 14.93 BUILDABLE ACRES = 130.64 UNITS

RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION BONUS: 8 DU/PER ACRE  
 8.00 DU/ACRE X 14.93 BUILDABLE ACRES = 119.44 UNITS

TOTAL ALLOWABLE DENSITY\*\* = 250.08 UNITS  
 138 INCLUSIONARY UNITS + 212 MARKET RENT UNITS

\*PER SECTION 445 IDL TABLE 445-7 THE SECTION ALSO ALLOWS FOR A MAX. LOT COVERAGE OF 50%.

\*\*PER SECTION 919, TABLE 919-1 A TOTAL OF 15% OF ALL UNITS ARE REQUIRED TO BE INCLUSIONARY UNITS. THIS PARCEL WOULD THEN ALLOW FOR 38 INCLUSIONARY UNITS AND 212 MARKET RENT UNITS FOR A TOTAL OF 250 RESIDENTIAL UNITS.

### Height

We are proposing a maximum height of 53 feet for Building A, which is the only 4 story building proposed. The remainder of the buildings average 43 feet and are three stories with the exception of the rental office/ clubhouse which is proposed to be two stories. The plan sets depict the front, rear and side elevation of the buildings. **Section 5.2.6 (b) Exceptions to Height Limits** paragraph 1 allows the height of a new building to be equal to or less than an existing structure if the existing structure was built prior to January 1, 2008. On this sit there is a pre-2008 mixing plant that abuts Grove Street that is 57 feet high. It is important to note, that building A sits in the lowest portion of the site and the elevation of the roof is proposed to be at 244 feet. The elevation of Grove Street in front of this building is 235 feet so the building will actually only be 9 feet taller than the street. We are proposing to gift this structure and the land surrounding it to the City. We feel, and the Parks & Recreation department concurs that this would be a great place for a bicycle and pedestrian rest area. The location of this structure can be seen on sheets S1 –S4. In the event that the City does not want it we would propose to either leave it in place (unused, or remove it). This section of the ordinance does not say that the existing structure needs to be either used or that hit needs to stay.

### Overlay Districts:

The project lands are not impacting any of the Overlay Districts.

### Natural Resources:

We feel this project is a big win for the environment. The developable area of the site is currently 95% impervious, we are reducing that to 31.2%. Currently the stormwater from the site has several points where it drains into either Centennial Brook or the Winooski River, we are proposing a state of the art stormwater system which includes the use of multiple rain gardens and are happy to report that we are not proposing to send any stormwater into Centennial Brook or any untreated Stormwater into the Winooski River. The developable area of the site is basically void of trees and grass, we are proposing to plant 146 trees, 507 shrubs and 780 perennials and approximately 10 acres of grass. The site has several hundred feet along the Winooski River and we are not proposing any improvements along that corridor or its buffer. We have delineated the wetlands and floodplains on the site and are not proposing to impact any of them or their associated buffer zones. We have had several staff members from the Agency of Natural Resources on site to review this proposal and confirm the wetland delineation and to search for the presence of irreplaceable natural areas, endangered plants and animals and potential erosion issues and are happy to report that they had no concerns with this project (with one exception as noted below\*).

You will see on the plans that we are proposing one entry instead of the two entrances that we showed at Sketch plan. This is due to a request that was made first by the Conservation Commission and then by the Agency of Natural Resources\*. Eliminating the second or northern entrance will allow us to remove the existing culvert and associated fill and bring this section of Centennial Brook back to what is referred to as an open channel. This is a very large plus for the brook! In regards to our meeting with the

Conservation Commission, we also added the a split rail fence adjacent to the existing tree line along the majority of the site, as depicted on sheet L1.0.

**Fire Protection:**

We have met with the Fire Marshall and have taken his concerns into consideration. He has seen our proposal to only have one entrance and that is why the one entrance is separated by a curbed island.

**Traffic:**

As mentioned, RSG Inc. was commissioned to analyze the traffic that this project will generate. We concur with all of their conclusions with the exception of #23, which recommends that we pay a “fair share contribution of approximately \$6,000” to the City for the eventual improvements at the Colchester Avenue/Riverside Avenue/Barrett Street intersection Triangle. We request this because we will be paying approximately \$53,600 in Traffic Impact Fees to the City already.

**Lighting**

Our lighting is divided into three categories: Interior, building mounted exterior and pole mounted exterior. All lighting will conform to both the general and specific (where applicable) lighting standards of the CDO. The landscaping sheets (L1-L5) all depict the street light and parking area pole locations and attached to this narrative are cut sheets that depict the pole, fixture and bulb type. We have not yet determined the exact location of the building mounted lights but we have included the cut sheet for the ones we will be using. All bulbs will be LED (if available) and at the Final Application stage a point by point photometric analysis will be completed and provided.

**Site Design & Development Pattern:**

One of the things that has been a constant concern is what type of visual or aesthetic impact will this project have on Grove Street? Because of this, we are proposing buildings along Grove Street that imitate large homes, specifically the Allen House on the Corner of South Prospect and Main Street and the Grasse Mont building on Summit Street. While we are not proposing to construct replicas of these buildings we have taken features (front entry way, trim detail and colors) from each and applied them to the elevations. One item that we have yet to decide on and are looking for the DRB and DAB’s feedback on is if we should provide (or not) a direct connection to the sidewalk from these houses (I&J) to Grove Street. Currently the plans do not depict that connection due to the thought that if installed the sidewalk would be used as a shortcut to get to the interior of the project and for security reasons we may want to encourage pedestrians to use the sidewalk at the main entrance (as depicted) .

Once inside the project the streetscape is designed to give the project more of an open, campus type look and feel. You will notice that most intersection corners have a gentle radius and sidewalks are set back from the curb, both design concepts allow street trees to be closer to the pavement which enhances the visual appearance and increases the amount of shaded pavement. We have also proposed to not fill the interior of the two green areas in the center of each pod with trees, as our market research indicates that open areas in which people can play frisbee, kick a soccer ball or have a picnic score high on the scale for natural amenities. We have also chosen not to cross either of these open

areas with a sidewalk or improved path. We have however proposed to incorporate an improved trail system throughout the project site. The trails are depicted on the landscape plan and will likely be made up of natural mulch or gravel, or perhaps may simply become a dirt path.

**Architectural Design Standards:**

As mentioned previously, we are sensitive to how this project will appeal to the existing neighborhood and to the general public as they travel Grove Street and we believe we have come up with a fantastic way to bring some of Burlington's architectural heritage to Grove Street by utilizing a few of the design features and colors from some of Burlington's most historic and visible buildings (that when built, were residences).

It is however important to note that we are financially unable to use the same materials as those buildings as the materials are simply too expensive to purchase, too expensive to install and too expensive to maintain over time, hence the reason we are proposing to use mostly vinyl products on these buildings. We also completed a building by building analysis of the materials used in the neighborhood and can report that 85% of the houses on Grove Street have either metal or vinyl siding and trim and the majority of them have replacement (vinyl) windows and fiberglass doors.

In regards to the massing, height and scale of this project, we understand that once inside this project, it will not look or feel like Grove Street, we do however, feel that this amount of density and the massing, height and scale of this project is the highest and best use of this land. For all of the right reasons: added green space, less pollution from the diesel trucks, less noise from the trucks and plant, less dust, less truck traffic, less impervious surface, the need for housing, a safer street, etc.

**Signage:**

We are proposing to have a project sign inside the curbed island at the entrance as depicted on sheets L1.0 & L1.2. The sign will likely be large boulder or natural block with the name of the complex engraved within it. It will be lighted by an approved fixture and bulb. Other signs will be directional in nature (ex: Turn right for buildings A, B, & C) and their purpose will only be to enhance the circulation of residents and their visitors. They will be harmonious in color, material and lighting (where necessary) and will conform to Article 7 of the CDO.

**Parking:**

We do not need to request a waiver from the parking standards. The requirement is 2 spots for each unit and we are proposing 204 underground parking places and 296 above ground spaces so we are slightly over the required minimum. We are meeting the required threshold for handicapped spaces.

We met with the Department of Public Works bicycling specialist to confirm the amount and location of both the short and long term parking and are proposing to provide more than the requirement for both. Unfortunately we forgot to show the above grade short term bike racks on the plan but rest assured we will show them once and if we get to the Final plan submission stage. The requirement for long term bike spaces is 1 per 4 units and short term spaces and for short term spaces it is 1 per 10 units.

**Inclusionary Zoning**

Fifteen percent of the units (37) will meet the Inclusionary Zoning Requirements and we are anticipating that all of these units will be in building B. We are currently in discussions with a local non-profit housing provider whom is interested in taking ownership of this building.

**Impact fees, taxes & municipal services:**

According to the Cities Impact Fee calculator the following impact fees will be due: Traffic \$46,000, Fire \$52,570, Police \$10,750, Parks \$176,000, Library \$109,000 and Schools \$227,750 for a total of \$622,250. According to the Cities Property Tax Calculator, the total annual property taxes will be approximately \$886,462. These impact fees and taxes should certainly alleviate any burden that this project places on any of these services offered by the City.

To recap, we feel that this project is a welcome change to what is on the site today. We feel that the character of the area will improve, the natural environment will be enhanced and both vehicle and pedestrian traffic will be safer. We feel that this will improve the quality of air and water and reduce the amount of current noise pollution associated with the site. The project will enhance the Cities, street, sidewalk, water, sewer and power distribution systems and reduce the amount of soil erosion and untreated storm water entering Centennial Brook and the Winooski River. The project will have on site recreational amenities that include a pool, a game room, community room, a gym, paths and sidewalks to walk or run on as well as large areas of open grassed area play on. Due to the amount of Impact fees, property taxes and jobs created this project will have a positive impact on the Cities municipal services and lastly this project will provide a fair amount of drastically needed quality housing at a low to moderate price.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the S.D. Ireland Family,

Patrick O'Brien