

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)
www.burlingtonvt.gov/planning

Yves Bradley, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Lee Buffinton
Emily Lee
Andy Montroll
Harris Roen
Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur
Vacant, Youth Member



Burlington Planning Commission

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, July 9, 2013 - 6:30 P.M.

Conference Room #12, Ground Floor, City Hall, 149 Church Street

AGENDA

Note: times given are approximate unless otherwise noted.

I. Agenda

II. Public Forum - Time Certain: 6:35 pm

The Public Forum is an opportunity for any member of the public to address the Commission on any relevant issue.

III. Report of the Chair (5 min) – Yves Bradley, Chair

IV. Report of the Director (5 min) – David E. White, Director

V. Annual Organizational Meeting

- Election of Officers: Chair & Vice-Chair
- Election of Executive Committee At-Large Member
- Appointment of Commission Clerk
- Appointment of Committees

VI. Zoning Amendments ZA-13-05, ZA-13-08 & ZA-13-09

The Commission will review changes made to the following zoning amendments by the City Council and provide comments.

VII. Proposed Amendments

The Commission will consider a proposed amendment to increase lot coverage within the RCO-Recreation/Greenspace zoning district.

VIII. Committee Reports (5 min)

This agenda is available in alternative media forms for people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in programs and activities of the Dept. of Planning & Zoning are encouraged to contact the Dept. at least 72 hours in advance so that proper accommodations can be arranged. For information, call 865-7188 (865-7144 TTY). Written comments may be directed to the Planning Commission at 149 Church Street, Burlington, VT 05401.

IX. Commissioner Items (5 min)

X. Minutes/Communications

The Commission will review minutes from the June 11 and 25, 2013 meetings.

XI. Adjourn (8:00 p.m.)

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE—
Nonconforming Structures Demolition
ZA 13-05

That Appendix A, Comprehensive Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington be and hereby is amended by amending Sections 5.3.5, Nonconforming Structures, thereof to read as follows:

Sec. 5.3.5 Nonconforming Structures

(a) As written.

(b) Demolition:

A nonconforming structure may be replaced by a new structure retaining the same degree of nonconformity as the original structure. This provision is limited to the existing dimensional nonconformity (i.e. setback, lot coverage, or height), and shall not expand the degree of nonconformity except as provided for in (a) above. The new structure shall be subject to conformance with all other dimensional requirements (i.e. setback, lot coverage, and height). Zoning permit application for the replacement structure shall be completed within 1 year of demolition of the nonconforming structure; failure to do so shall result in the loss of the ability to retain the nonconformity.

In all other cases, a ~~A~~ nonconforming structure that has been demolished or moved shall not be re-built or relocated in any way other than in full conformance with the provisions of this ordinance. Structures or any portion thereof that are structurally unsound, and are required to be removed by order of the building inspector, may be replaced within the original footprint provided both the requirement to demolish the building is not the result of demolition by neglect and the replacement ~~does~~ shall not expand the degree of nonconformity.

* Material ~~stricken out~~ to be deleted.

* Material underlined added.

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE—
Residential Side/Rear Yard Setback Encroachments
ZA 13-08

That Appendix A, Comprehensive Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington be and hereby is amended by amending Sections 5.3.5, Nonconforming Structures, 4.4.5, Residential Districts and 5.2.5, Setbacks, thereof to read as follows:

Sec. 5.3.5 Nonconforming Structures

(a) Changes and Modifications:

Nothing in this Part shall be deemed to prevent normal maintenance and repair or structural repair, or moving of a non-complying structure pursuant to any applicable provisions of this Ordinance.

Any change or modification to a nonconforming structure, other than to full conformity under this Ordinance, shall only be allowed subject to the following:

1. Such a change or modification ~~should seek to~~ may reduce the degree of nonconformity and shall ~~not increase~~ expand the degree of nonconformity ~~except as provided below;~~

Within the residential districts, and subject to Development Review Board approval, existing nonconforming single family homes and community centers (existing enclosed spaces only) that project into side and/or rear yard setbacks may be vertically expanded so long as the expansion does not encroach further into the setback than the existing structure. Such expansion shall be of the existing nonconformity (i.e. setback) and shall:

- i) Be subject to conformance with all other dimensional requirements (i.e. height, lot coverage, density and intensity of development);
- ii) Not have an undue adverse impact on adjoining properties or any public interest that would be protected by maintaining the existing setbacks; and,
- iii) Be compatible with the character and scale of surrounding structures.

Existing accessory buildings of 15 feet in height or less shall not exceed 15 feet tall as expanded.

Balance of 5.3.5 as written.

Sec. 4.4.5 Residential Districts

(a) As written.

Map 4.4.5-1 As written.

(b) Dimensional Standards and Density

The density and intensity of development, dimensions of building lots, the heights of buildings and their setbacks from property boundary lines, and the limits on lot coverage shall be governed by the following standards:

Table 4.4.5-1 As written.

Table 4.4.5-2 As written.

Table 4.4.5-3: Residential District Dimensional Standards

Zoning District	Max. Lot Coverage ¹	Setbacks ^{1, 3, 4, 5, 6}				Max. Height ¹
		Front ²	Side ³	Rear	Waterfront	
RL; WRL	35%	Min/Max: Ave. of 2 adjacent lots on both sides +/- 5-feet	Min: 10% of lot width, but in no event less than 5 feet Or ave. of side yard setback of 2 adjacent lots on both sides Max required: 20-feet	Min: 25% of lot depth but in no event less than 20' Max required: 75-feet	Min: 75' feet from the ordinary high water mark of Lake Champlain and the Winooski River	35-feet
RM	40%	Min/Max: Ave of 2 adjacent lots on both sides +/- 5-feet	Min: 10% of lot width, but in no event less than 5 feet Or ave. of side yard setback of 2 adjacent lots on both sides Max required: 20-feet	Min: 25% of lot depth but in no event less than 20' Max required: 75-feet	NA	35-feet
WRM	60%	Min/Max: Ave of 2 adjacent lots on both sides +/- 5-feet	Min: 10% of lot width, but in no event less than 5 feet Or ave. of side yard setback of 2 adjacent lots on both sides Max required: 20-feet	Min: 25% of lot depth but in no event less than 20' Max required: 75-feet	Min: 75' feet from the ordinary high water mark of Lake Champlain and the Winooski River	35-feet (60-feet under Sec. 4.4.5(d)2A)

Table 4.4.5-3: Residential District Dimensional Standards

Zoning District	Max. Lot Coverage ¹	Setbacks ^{1, 3, 4, 5, 6}				Max. Height ¹
		Front ²	Side ³	Rear	Waterfront	
			Max required: 20-feet			
RH	80%	Min/Max: Ave of 2 adjacent lots on both sides +/- 5-feet	Min: 10% of lot width, but in no event less than 5-feet <u>Or ave. of side yard setback of 2 adjacent lots on both sides</u> Max required: 20-feet	Min: 25% of lot depth but in no event less than 20' Max required: 75-feet	NA	35-feet

1. An additional ten per-cent (10%) lot coverage may be permitted for accessory residential features per (d)3A below. Measurement of and exceptions to coverage, setback, and height standards are found in Art 5.

2. Average front yard setback of the principal structures on the 2 adjacent lots on both sides within the same block having the same street frontage. See Sec. 5.2.4.

3. In no event shall the side yard setback be required to exceed 20-feet, or the rear-yard setback be required to exceed 75-feet.

4. Additional setbacks from the lakeshore and other water features may be applicable per the requirements of the Sec 4.5.4 Riparian and Littoral Conservation Overlay Zone.

5. The side yard setback shall be calculated based on the 4 adjacent properties (2 on each side of the subject property). The right side yard setback is the average of the right side yard setback of the principal structures on these 4 properties. The left yard setback is the average of the left side yard setback of the principal structures on these 4 properties. The adjacent properties shall be within the same block having the same street frontage as the subject property. See Sec. 5.2.5.

6. Where there are fewer than 2 adjacent lots on both sides within the same block having the same street frontage, the average side yard setback shall be calculated from the fewer number of lots. Where there are no adjacent lots, the setback shall be 10% of the lot width.

(c) and (d) As written.

Sec. 5.2.5 Setbacks

Setbacks between buildings and property lines where required are intended to provide access to light and air, provide fire separation and access, and maintain the existing neighborhood pattern of buildings and open spaces between them and to the street.

(a) Setbacks Required:

Unless otherwise authorized or specified under the district-specific provisions of Article 4, which shall be controlling over these provisions, a setback shall be provided between any proposed structures and/or site features, and the front, side and rear yard property lines as follows: (See Art. 13 for definitions of “setback” and “yard.”)

1. As written.

2. Side yard. The minimum side yard setback for any principal structure shall be as required under the provisions of Article 4. Where the side yard setback is expressed as a percent of the lot width, such width shall be measured parallel to the lot frontage. Alternatively, where provided for under Article 4, the minimum side yard setback may be the average of the correlating side yard setbacks (i.e. left or right) of principal structures in lawful existence as of the adoption of this ordinance on the four (4) neighboring lots (2 on either side) and within the same block having the same street frontage.

3. As written.

(b) Exceptions to Yard Setback Requirements:

The following projections into required yard setbacks may be permitted subject to the standards of Article 6 to ensure compatibility with neighboring properties:

1. – 6. As written.

7. Additional exceptions for nonconforming structures under Sec. 5.3.5.

* Material ~~stricken out~~ to be deleted.

* Material underlined added.

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE—
Community House
ZA 13-09

That Appendix A, Comprehensive Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington be and hereby is amended by amending Appendix A-Use Table-All Zoning Districts, thereof to read as follows:

Appendix A-Use Table

Change Community Center Use from a Conditional Use (CU), allowed only on the ground floor level of structures in the district, to Permitted (Y) in RH Zoning District subject to permitted hours of operation of 5:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

See attached Use Table excerpt for changes.

Balance of Appendix A-Use Table – All Zoning Districts As written.

Burlington Comprehensive Development Ordinance

PROPOSED ZA-13-XX – RCO-Recreation/Greenspace

As proposed by staff

Changes shown (underline to be added, ~~strike-out~~ to be deleted) are proposed changes to the *Burlington Comprehensive Development Ordinance*.

Purpose: This proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Development Ordinance is to provide more flexibility for management and activities of urbanized greenspaces including City Parks by exempting certain activities from requiring zoning permits and allowing for greater lot coverage to recognize actual and future improvements.

Sec. 4.4.6 Recreation, Conservation and Open Space Districts

(a) Purpose – *unchanged*

(b) Dimensional Standards and Density

The density and intensity of development, dimensions of building lots, the heights of buildings and their setbacks from property boundary lines, and the limits on lot coverage shall be governed by the following standards:

Table 4.4.6 -1 Dimensional Standards and Density

District	Lot Coverage ¹	Setbacks ¹			Height ¹
		Front	Side ²	Rear ²	
RCO-A	5%	15'	10%	25%	35'
RCO-RG	<u>25%</u> ³	15'	10%	25%	35'
RCO-C	5%	15'	10%	25%	25'

1. See also exceptions to lot coverage, setbacks and maximum height in Article 5.

2. Percentages figure refers to either a percentage of lot width, 10% in the case of side yard setbacks, or lot depth of 25% in the case of rear yard setbacks.

3. Or as may otherwise be prescribed by the Parks and Recreation Commission for any City Park. Maximum lot coverage for City Hall Park, Battery Park and Perkins Pier shall be 35%.

(c) Permitted and Conditional Uses- *unchanged*

(d) District Specific Regulations

The following regulations are district-specific exemptions, bonuses, and standards unique to the RCO districts. They are in addition to, or may modify, city-wide standards as provided in Article 5 of this ordinance and district standards as provided above in Tables 4.4.6-1.

1. Lot Coverage Exemption for Agricultural Structures.

The maximum allowable coverage may be increased to ten percent (10%) in the RCO-Agricultural District for agricultural structures subject to approval by the DRB.

2. Exemptions for Tree removal and Turf Maintenance in City Parks.

- i. Regular tree maintenance and removal not otherwise associated with land clearing for new development or site improvements, and regular turf maintenance including re-grading and reseeding shall be exempt from the requirement to obtain a zoning permit.

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)
www.burlingtonvt.gov/planning

*Yves Bradley, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Andrew Saba
Lee Buffinton
Harris Roen
Andy Montroll
Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur
Vacant, Youth Member*



Burlington Planning Commission Minutes

Tuesday, June 11, 2013 - 6:30 pm

PC Present: Y. Bradley, B. Baker, A. Montroll, H. Roen, J. Wallace-Brodeur, L. Buffinton, A. Saba
Absent: S. Thibault (at North Avenue Corridor meeting)
Staff: D. White, E Tillotson

I. Agenda

No changes.

II. Public Forum

The Chair acknowledges and welcomes Emily Lee, new Planning Commissioner, who is observing. He spent time with her yesterday exchanging information. Introductions were made to Commission members.

III. Report of the Chair, Yves Bradley

The Chair provided the following report:

- This is A. Saba's next to last meeting.
- The Chair acknowledges that S. Thibault, Comprehensive Planner, won Planner of the Year from the Vermont Planners Association. And planBTV won Plan of the Year as well.

IV. Report of the Director, David E White

The Director provided the following report:

- The two awards mentioned by the Chair will automatically be nominated for the Northern New England Chapter of the American Planning Association's annual awards.
- PlanBTV was adopted unanimously last night, June 10th, with all City Councilors as sponsors of the resolution. Copies of the Plan will go to the printer within a couple of weeks following which there will be a public event to announce the finalized plan and distribute copies.
Y. Bradley: Suggested perhaps a table at the Farmers Market.
S. Thibault: Noted there are normally a lot of people at the Farmers Market that are not Burlingtonians. It would be best to reserve copies of the plans for Burlingtonians.
- The City Council also approved for warning two zoning amendments: vestigial alleys, and garage proportion facing the street last night.
- The City Council Ordinance committee meets Thursday and they have three amendments which they will be addressing: two relating to setbacks and one for community centers.

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on , 2013.

- The Police Department and Public Works Commission are working on updating the on-street residential parking program. There is still some language to be resolved about the number of permits to be issued to any given property, the whole issue raises questions.

J. Wallace-Brodeur: Suggested inviting them to a Commission meeting to discuss how this proposal works with other ordinance changes under consideration. D. White will follow-up.

- This week is the kickoff of the Parks Master Planning process and the Director would encourage participation of any Planning Commission members in the process which will be in some ways similar to the planBTV process.
- The city was awarded EPA area-wide brownfields grant for \$200000 and will cover the Railyard Area. It dovetails nicely with other projects in that area of city.
- S. Thibault has been in Portland, Oregon at the Eco-District Incubator discussing coordination of planning of all departments in the City.

V. Public Hearing: ZA-13-12 Historic Building Materials

R. Wannamaker, 462 South Willard Street is here to speak. He is not exactly familiar with the proposed ordinance language. Preservation Burlington was invited to the discussion via a letter. Their members are concerned. They feel the existing ordinance has plenty of flexibility in relation to sustainability, use of local materials, labor. Their fear in the proposed change is that it might actually encourage demolition by neglect. One additional concern about language regarding the "average person's" opinion coming to boards. If they aren't experts, they can come to boards with a lack of experience with certain materials. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are guidelines that encourage continued maintenance of a historic district or neighborhoods. It holds true that the Design Advisory Board and Development Review Board do a pretty good job of taking all things into consideration and giving guidance and education to the public. The fear is that we keep dumbing down the quality and integrity of our buildings without education.

H. Roen: The crux of the problem is which structures are being considered, the definition of such.

D. White: The proposed language doesn't change the definition of historic.

H. Roen: We have to go with standards that are not so strict which involves eligible properties.

R. Wanamaker: I agree, but believe that there is a lot of flexibility in the ordinance and the Secretary of the Interior standards. No vagaries in a lot of the housing stock eligibility gives flexibility.

A. Montroll: He has met with Preservation Burlington and discussed several ordinances. He thinks this is the right balance; it separates out historic materials from historic features and maintains Burlington's character. Materials I think are secondary; in the long view over 50 or 100 years materials may change but features will retain the character. The buildings have to look like they were before repair.

E. Lee: Who judges what is visually compatible? She is shocked to see vinyl windows in a beautiful Italianate dwelling. Where is the line?

A. Montroll: One of the examples is the color of paint; some materials are almost the same thing.

R. Wanamaker: My windows are 145 years old and will be there for the next 100 years.

J. Wallace-Brodeur: Has spent a lot of time trying to define visual compatibility, but probably it will always be subjective. Also the definition of appropriate replacement materials was difficult, the policy has to be interpreted by the Design Advisory Board and the Development Review Board, and there are a lot of materials out there. The Planning Commission certainly doesn't want non-durable materials used as replacements.

L. Buffinton: My understanding is that vinyl siding doesn't look like wood, vinyl windows also do not, but other options would work and could be more energy efficient. Materials do evolve. The Planning Commission tried to be flexible.

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on.

Andrew Saba: Wishes to echo A Montroll. He feels there is a good balance which is fair and that features are the most important. Do we need to address building materials re: quality?

A. Montroll: Item 6 states that materials will be durable.

D. White: What is durability and how do we measure it?

B. Baker: A good example is E Lee's reference to windows with storms, and replacement windows. Windows could be different in the interior but with storms, could still look the same outside. The next owner might choose to replace with better quality.

Y. Bradley: In my opinion the job of the Department and staff is to communicate with the Commission. The Planning Commission needs to be an advocate for department. We have been working this aspect for three years. We have heard that people want greater flexibility. Features are never irreplaceable, but he does agree that old windows with brass fixtures are irreplaceable. Some homeowners will invest in appropriate repairs. The Ordinance tries to maintain balance.

L. Buffinton: Vinyl clad doesn't look like wood windows.

Y. Bradley: If there is a product that is vinyl clad of good quality, it should be acceptable.

R. Wanamaker: Our ordinance allows for that already, there are not many changes.

A. Montroll: The old ordinance represented a high hurdle to replace previously; it is now clear what you can do.

B. Baker: Has had a garage with squirrel damage, chewing through garage. Sometimes there is a need for a material that is durable.

R. Wanamaker: Cement board is a durable product.

D. White: It is important to ask for a demonstration that the material has failed. The durability standard should apply, and there is nothing as durable as preexisting slate. It is necessary to know that the existing materials can't be repaired.

Y. Bradley: So what trumps? Durability or appearance?

D. White: If the slate has reached the end of its life, slate, standing seam and some other products would be appropriate replacements.

L. Buffinton: This change would encourage flexibility. Item 8 addresses new additions, exterior alterations only changed the material piece. The differentiation requirement from old to new construction is changed. The primary building should be the focus. This rewrite is opening the door again to allow for historically appropriate additions.

A. Montroll: It is the same as the original policy; there has to be a changing ordinance. The Planning Commission has accomplished what we set out to do.

E. Lee: One comment, by not following the Secretary of Interior standards does this effect eligibility for tax credits, ADA accessibility, and elevators.

D. White: No - if you are taking advantage of the tax incentives, you must maintain the Secretary of Interior Standards.

On a motion by A. Montroll, seconded by A Saba, the Commission unanimously approved ZA-13-12 and forwarded to the City Council for adoption.

VI. Proposed Amendment, ZA-13-03

E. Lee: A question about the area of parking, can't read it clearly. The map in the amendment is different from the map in the ordinance.

D. White: The downtown zone is the least restrictive, residential low density is the most restrictive. The requirements are not isolated from land uses. The proposed change to shared use parking

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on.

requirements will create a system, ie: for a typical home, as bedrooms increase, the parking requirements will increase and vice versa. For larger than four bedrooms, one parking space for each bedroom over five would be required. Ultimately this action will create an incentive for less auto need.

A. Montroll: The draft has changed downtown already.

D. White: The downtown amendment is before the City Council now.

A. Montroll: Shared use, have we seen that the requirements would work?

D. White: They will work if units are created and the developer wants to market differently. It will allow for more flexibility.

A. Montroll: Using the chart, what happens with half of a parking requirement? What happens with a half space?

D. White: The requirement will be to round up.

A. Montroll: Will the requirements work?

D. White: We don't have experience yet. The desire to market small units successfully allows this. There are no actual studies here.

L. Buffinton: Under parking district, strike the third parking district, take out c on first page.

D. White: That portion is actually correct as written with rest of ordinance.

J. Wallace-Brodeur: Is generally in support of the change and feels it is worth trying in order to incentivize small units. Regulation of parking permits by Public Works is a really important part of the planning. There is a need to explore the number of permits issued. She suggests that they should work with D. White.

Y. Bradley: Suggests that they add language to indicate it is a piece of larger process occurring. There is a real need to understand the parts of the process before action occurs.

D. White: It would seem opportune to involve police and public works at the same time that they are proposing?

L. Buffinton: What is the process?

D. White: It goes through the City Council.

Y. Bradley: Tim O'Brien is the owner of fair amount of units in City and reports that the desirability of the larger units has dropped off. The UVM model of housing is influencing the off campus housing.

D. White: There are many zoning applications seeking off-site parking. For the owners of the property which would be leasing, the permit requires maintenance of existing number of parking spaces, so that option is not viable unless there are uncommitted spaces even though some may be not used or needed at a given time.

Y. Bradley: For example, a property on Battery Street is required to have one year lease, Perkins Pier being the most appropriate space. There are no long-term parking leases available from the City, only month to month.

L. Buffinton: This is something that the Planning Commission can address.

Y. Bradley: The present regulatory requirements make parking challenging.

On a motion by J. Wallace-Brodeur, seconded by L. Buffinton, the Commission unanimously warned a public hearing for the proposed residential parking standards.

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on.

VII. Form-Based Code Discussion

D. White, lead the discussion with a power point presentation. He describes the form based code, as it applies to Burlington, as not as proscriptive as in some locations.

Y. Bradley: If FBC (form based code) had been used for the permitting of the new ICV Battery Street building. The surrounding buildings influenced the massing of the new building, much as FBC will do in the future by proscribing a higher level of detail to building proportions.

D. White: The FBC will consist of eight elements:

1. regulating plan (zoning map)
2. private frontage standards
3. building form standards
4. building type standards
5. public space standards
6. architectural standards
7. landscape standards
8. signage standards

The Burlington City zones will be different and specific to our City and contain nuances not included in other City's code.

L Buffinton: Has observed that the first floor of commercial buildings are likely to feel skimpy, an area that needs attention.

D White: That is correct, the most important floor is the first floor.

J Wallace-Brodeur: Is the type of building tied in with the use of the building?

D White: Yes in many cases. A building with a shopfront clearly has a retail-type use and a townhouse is nearly always residential.

H Roen: A question would be for example the alleyways between the Hilton and adjacent buildings, can this be examined in form based code?

D White: Yes. Our beginning texts etc for FBC came from the Yarmouth ME code and after synoptic survey by the consultants with measurements, the FBC was refined to conform to Burlington's needs keeping in mind that only the Downtown and Waterfront areas will be affected by this code.

J Wallace-Brodeur: We need to consider how to educate the City Council about this new portion of the ordinance.

Y Bradley: Some community members are reluctant to be involved in the process and thereby lose their opportunity to have resolution.

A Montroll: So the next step is to bring this to the City Council.

VIII. Committee Reports

None

IX. Commissioner Items

None

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on.

X. Minutes, Communications

On a motion by A. Montroll, seconded by B. Baker, the Commission unanimously approved the April 23 and May 14, 2013 minutes, as amended.

XI. Adjourn

On a motion by H. Roen, seconded by L. Buffinton, the Commission unanimously adjourned the meeting at 8:50 pm.

Yves Bradley, Chair

Date

E Tillotson, recording secretary

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on.

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)
www.burlingtonvt.gov/planning

Yves Bradley, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Andrew Saba
Lee Buffinton
Harris Roen
Andy Montroll
Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur
Vacant, Youth Member



Burlington Planning Commission Minutes

Tuesday, June 25, 2013 - 6:30 pm

Present: H. Roen, A. Saba, A. Montroll, B. Baker
Absent: J. Wallace-Brodeur, L. Buffinton, Y. Bradley
Staff: S. Thibault, D. White, E. Tillotson

I. Agenda

No changes.

II. Public Forum

B. Baker opened the public forum at 6:35pm.

Sharon & Steve Litwhiler would like further information about new amendments; lot line adjustment, garage size and orientation, etc.

D. White: They were approved by the City Council on June 10th. There were many items on the agenda including the airport.

S. Litwhiler: There was not obvious information that there was more to the agenda although the public hearing agenda indicated there were other items.

D. White: He will contact the Litwhiler to make an appointment to come by to discuss the amendments in relation to the property.

B. Baker: Closed the public forum at 6:40pm.

III. Report of the Chair

None

IV. Report of the Director

The Director presented the following report:

- There is a lot going on and a lot of the activity seems to be concentrated in the Pine Street corridor area with many possible aspects being discussed: alternative scenarios, evaluations of traffic safety, urban design perspective, and more.
- Today, tomorrow, and Thursday, Global Green, a technical assistance group for the Environmental Protection Agency, is visiting City, funded by a grant. The Director and the Comprehensive Planner were on site walks this morning with the group. There will be a community workshop tomorrow night involving discussion of LEED standards relating to commercial development, specifically performance of the building, infrastructure elements.

H. Roen: Are there specific goals?

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on March 26, 2013.

D. White: Global Green will provide a report at end of the project with short, medium and long-term items. The City needs to get ahead in this area and this approach to planning. The Group is looking at superfund areas for perimeter development. EPA officials were present. The Superfund area will be a particularly difficult area to facilitate development.

S. Thibault: She has drafted the first draft scope of work for the Urban Preserve and is attending a meeting next week to discuss this further with other city staff. She will go to the LRPC and then to City Council with the updates.

V. planBTV – Open Space Protection plan

D. Cahill spoke to the Commission about four months ago about the Open Space Plan. He has been through the process of visiting all of the NPAs, visiting the Parks Commission, taken all information and synthesized the results into the existing updated Plan. The public outreach results were very good.

All of the new in depth information has resulted in new maps for the Plan.

Fin 1989 the Conservation Board was established and in 2000, the Open Space protection plan. A lot has been accomplished since then especially in relation to delineating natural areas. This present work is an update not a rewrite, following the original standards.

A. Shelton: Reports that part of the municipal plan was reinventoried, existing natural spaces inventoried for characteristics and opportunities to implement improvements, based on the public input.

Sites for urban agriculture, access to waterfront, wildlife corridors have been identified based on information from studies. A lot of feedback was received on improving the management of public lands. The 1999 inventory was done on a coarse scale; the present inventory refined the process.

Use of open spaces is defined by category. Natural community types are associated generally with soils type. City trails are mapped by UVM students. The green infrastructure was examined for potential use.

D. White: Would like to highlight one thing. The large lawn in front of the Follett House doesn't show on the maps.

S. Gustin: It will on the updated map.

For the urban agriculture aspect, soils potential was examined for future use. More than 2000 residences are more than quarter mile from public open space. 8700 residences are more than quarter mile from public access to the waterfront. Wildlife corridors were examined by UVM students who looked at barriers to access; there will be a study report with suggestions.

The new management recommendations will be applied to the following:

- a. Parks Master plan update
- b. Management plans
- c. Conservation Legacy fund

Education for schools and community will foster partnerships supporting green infrastructure.

S. Gustin: The Conservation Legacy program will provide updates to existing plans to implement improved decision making and improved inventory of characteristics.

S. Thibault: She will be updating the Municipal Development Plan Chapters in which the Open Space Plan is discussed and bring that along to the Commission for approval.

H. Roen: There is a lot of good information, the recommendations are good. He has mentioned before, maps that indicate the natural communities, should be reworked? It is quite an involved process to blend forest management plans to join with the soils maps to natural communities information.

A. Shelton: The plan is not purported to be natural communities planning.

H. Roen: The plan doesn't read that way. There are historic natural communities. He suggests areas to investigate for the potential of natural communities. And he has spoken with Jeff Severson, ecologist.

S. Gustin: The Conservation Board will meet and discuss this next Monday.

A. Shelton: She did a similar watershed plan and it does require field work.

H. Roen: The bigger picture: Liz Thompson, Eric Sorenson, categorize Vermont in natural communities. The natural community has a certain ecological profile. If there were no human intervention this is what would exist. Natural state, defining those areas that are common ones, and the ones which are more rare, is more important for habitat. This is a newer way to recognize the natural landscape but it is difficult to properly identify.

D. White: So soil conditions are an indicator?

H. Roen: Yes, and there are other subtle differences.

A. Montroll: What is the importance of this?

H. Roen: The natural communities are ranked statewide, like endangered species, some are found in Burlington.

A. Shelton: She felt these were important to include in the study for raising awareness of natural community types that a member of the public can visit and compare.

H. Roen: The listing needs reworking in reference to the natural community types. It also seems that some goals are a little vague on page 29.

D. Cahill: The community types are identified on the maps.

H. Roen: Are the bike path connections identified?

A. Shelton: They are in chapter two.

D. Cahill: He could identify probably twenty at least.

L. Ravin, UVM: Apologizes for not commenting sooner in the process. She didn't realize that there was access to the plan. She has reviewed the maps and found a couple of errors in maps G and H, which address agricultural open space and urban agriculture. First on the list: open land with potential for agricultural use. Centennial Field is developed land, not undeveloped. Next is Trinity campus with soil types of 6 & 7. The present UVM campus was developed in the 60s. Now with UVM's master plan in place, there is development of housing and sustainable landscape, edible agriculture. UVM wants to work with the City.

Third, the little areas near the jug handle; they are trying to build land banks which are more appropriate for development. There are many opportunities for green areas. Agricultural land potential is has been ignored.

Fourth is University Heights; this area has been developed; athletic fields, FSB, with bedrock outcrops that cover more than 2 percent of the area. It is full of ledge and the athletic fields also have ledge. Working with the campus master plan supports the City plan and UVM wishes that the City work with UVM. Letters on page 59 denote landbanks for development and landbanks that are slated for open space. UVM would like to work with S. Gustin and the Conservation Board.

S. Gustin: Corrections to the map will be done, landbanks are a characterization of existing space and informational only.

D. White: On the map, what is the difference between G and H?

S. Gustin: The map is the whole soils map, map G is more relevant.

L. Ravin: Didn't exactly understand the difference between G and H. UVM has extensive agricultural lands at the horticultural farm and dairy farm. She disperses letters with comments to the Board.

VI. Eco-District – Portland OR

S. Thibault: She attended a three-day Eco-District Incubator workshop in Portland OR with others from the city and wanted to share what she learned with the Commission. She presented the Eco-District framework and showed pictures of what they learned from Portland, OR. There were eight communities from around the country who were invited to attend. While they were there, opportunities to explore some of Portland's innovative planning were included in their activities.

S. Thibault: Some of the other communities present were much further along in the eco-district formation process which was helpful to learn about. Other communities at the conference were: Cambridge, Oakland, Denver, Charleston, SC, Orlando, etc.

H. Roen: Would Eco districts in Burlington relate to wards?

S. Thibault: Probably not. The area that is being look at right now is the Pine Street corridor and enterprise area, where there is a lot of potential for re-development.

K. Merriman: One of Portland, OR participants is here with the Global Green group. Tomorrow night at 7pm, the group will meet with VEIC on 128 Lakeside Avenue, suite 401.

VII. Proposed Amendment

Discussion of the proposed amendment will be re-scheduled to the next meeting.

VIII. Committee Reports

None

IX. Commissioner Items

H. Roen: The Regional Planning Commission planning advisory committee has been alerted of the Park Master plan that is going on. He believes it is essential to go early in process to the Regional Planning Commission to let them know what we are doing.

It has been difficult to get a handle on Act 250 or Act 248 projects. Could he be included in the loop on the larger projects that are proposed?

A. Saba: States his appreciation to the Commission and staff for a good learning experience. Some of it was fun. He is very grateful for the support of the Commission and staff.

X. Minutes/Communications

On a motion by A. Saba, seconded by H. Roen, the Commission unanimously accepted the communications.

XI. Adjourn

On a motion by A. Saba, seconded by H. Roen, the Commission unanimously adjourned the meeting at 8:41pm.

Bruce Baker, Acting Chair

Date

Elsie Tillotson, recording secretary

As approved by the Burlington Planning Commission on , 2013.