Burlington Development Review Board
149 Church Street, City Hall
Burlington, VT 05401
www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz/drb
Phone: (802) 865-7188
Fax (802) 865-7195

Austin Hart
Michael Long
Jonathan Stevens
Brad Rabinowitz
Missa Aloisi
Israel Smith
A. J. LaRosa
Alexandra Zipparo (Alt.)
Jim Drummond (Alt.)

BURLINGTON DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Tuesday, February 17, 2015, 5:00 p.m.
Conference Room 12, City Hall, 149 Church Street, Burlington, VT

Board members present: Austin Hart, Michael Long, Brad Rabinowitz, Jonathan Stevens, Israel Smith, Alexander LaRosa, Missa Aloisi,
Staff members present: Ken Lerner, Scott Gustin, Mary O'Neil.

I. Agenda
No changes.

II. Communications
One distributed via email; hard copy available and offered if board members wish. Board accepts communication relative to 495 Colchester Avenue.

III. Minutes
In packet for board review.

IV. Consent Agenda

1. **15-0734CA/CU: 502 NORTH ST (RL, Ward 1) Kyle & Christine Dodson / Elizabeth Herrmann**
   Rear addition to home, driveway expansion, and creation of accessory apartment (Project Manager: Scott Gustin)
   Applicants are present. No one objects to Consent Agenda item.
   Michael Long – I would move in the matter of 15-0734CA/CU, that we approve the application and adopt staff findings and conditions.
   Brad Rabinowitz – 2nd.
   Vote 7-0-0.

V. Public Hearing

1. **15-0743CA/MA: 234-240 COLLEGE ST (DT, Ward 3) Sisters & Brothers Investment Group**
   Addition and renovations to existing building, addition of 4 net new residential units for total of 23 (Project Manager: Scott Gustin)

   Joe Handy and Steve Guild present. No one else here to speak on this matter.
   Sworn in by Chair.
   Steve Guild goes over 4 points discussed at last hearing.
   Trash – previous plan in a closet. Now we are showing it in the existing location, north west corner of the building. (Shows on plan.)
   Austin Hart – existing location, but you are going to screen it.
   Steve Guild – yes. 3 yard dumpster, with recycling.
   Jonathan Stevens – How will the rubbish be removed? Truck back in?
   Steve Guild – That's the way it has been since Joe bought the building.
   Joe Handy – the garbage truck goes down the alley. Goes in, flip it, goes back.
   Missa Aloisi – goes through the YMCA...
   Steve Guild - #2, side yard setback. We met with Scott about the northeast corner of the building. We pushed it 10'3" to meet that section of the ordinance.

The programs and services of the City of Burlington are accessible to people with disabilities.
Individuals who require special arrangements to participate are encouraged to contact the Department of Planning & Zoning at least 72 hours in advance so that proper accommodations can be arranged. For information call 865-7188
Printed on 100% Recycled Paper

Austin Hart – We just didn't know we had the discretion to waive that. Can put windows in?
Steve Guild – Yes.
Missa Aloisi – What is 8'1" dimension?
Steve Guild – on site plan. Not from the property line. Showing hashed area.
Steve Guild - #3, curbing to prevent mulch from running down. We got rid of the mulch.
Austin Hart – Created order around planting bed.
Steve Guild – Original plan show area for bike storage for 7. Access to elevator to bring bikes down. Don't have to carry them down the stairs. Those are the four items to be addressed.
Michael Long – Concrete versus asphalt?
Steve Guild – Change to concrete.
Austin Hart – anything else? Open to comments and questions.
Steve Guild – the owner informed me, p. 13 for minimum off-street parking…in our last review, we thought five. We need 2 additional spaces. We aren't sure why.
Austin Hart asks Scott Gustin.
Scott Gustin – I don't remember off hand the first time around. I thought the pending parking amendment would have affected this. But it didn't. I corrected it when it came back the second time. Right now, 1 space per unit (23) minus existing deficiency they have, comes out to 7.
Joe Handy – before we had 18 units plus 1 commercial space.
Scott Gustin – commercial didn't require parking.
Austin Hart – difference between 23 and 18 is 5. You are saying seven?
Scott Gustin – reads from staff report.
Austin – 2 spaces being lost…
Scott Gustin – That's it. Two are being lost behind the existing addition in the alley. You can see it in the photos in your packet.
Joe Handy – No one talked about it last time.
Austin Hart – We talked about whether those spaces existed or not.
Scott Gustin – (shows photo) Sign says private parking. I have been calling it two, because it is consistent with aerials and site visit. We are talking about off-site spaces in a garage. I don't think it's a big deal. Hardly burdensome.
Austin Hart – Good marketing opportunities for renting your apartments.
Brad Rabinowitz – I am trying to follow something here on your drawings, Steve. You have a basic level on College Street. The basement is down below the street level. When I look at the lower level plan, you have both front and back. Where is this lower level plan in relation to the basement?
Steve Guild – Below the lower level of College.
Brad Rabinowitz – You have 2 levels below College Street. There is a level missing somewhere. You have the same number of units, same number of bedrooms?
Missa Aloisi – That bedroom unit will be 7' wide. How will anyone walk around? It should be an efficiency,…you can't really get….
Steve Guild – You're right. We will fix that. Owner wants to move immediately; hopefully start next month.
Austin Hart – closes public hearing on this issue. Call Planning and Zoning to check on date of deliberative.

VI. Sketch Plan

1. **15-0747SP: 495-497 COLCHESTER AVE (NMU, Ward 1) Randall Brisson / Jay White**
   Elevate building 9.5 ft. from present grade, retain 4 residential units, add commercial space (Project Manager: Mary O'Neil)
   Randall Brisson (owner and contractor), Jay White AIA present.

   Austin Hart – swears in applicant and members of the public.
   Applicant sets up plans, presents plan.

Jay White – Raising building up to before flood. Currently the grade on that building, 2nd floor, 1st floor. The ground floor is a stone foundation. [Mr. Brisson shares additional plans with DRB Board members.] In the process of rebuilding the bridge, the City decided to change the grade.,
Currently the building has 2 apartments on the 2nd floor. 2 are almost completely buried underground. [Owner shares photos.] Igloo effect. Pretty much unusable. Building is a brick veneer building; 4" of brick attached to sheathing. Water is getting in around the building where the city built a retaining wall on the west. A lot of rising damp; always damp. Apartments are damp, floor below, original ground floor damp. We would like to raise it, to save the building. About 9'7". Mary has commented that may be too high, based historically. Below, we would re-instate windows. You can see from within the cellar. From historic photographs, you can see the windows on this side. As you go around to east side, we know it was on-grade access. We will leave the original ground floor where it is. The owner put a slab in there. This floor rebuilt with 2 x 10's, with joist hangars. These [gestures to upper floors] are timber framed floors. We would like to lift that. Put in re-built first floor. Insert new ground floor. This part of the building would be generally what it was historically. When you measure from the ground, 35' limit allowed by the ordinance. Not blocking any views by raising the building up. We create a better environment for the residents. This allows us to have a handicap accessible entrance that would come into a stone foundation. We would copy the stone foundation, duplicate these windows. The overall effect is to create what was there in 1927. The interior use becomes a 2000 café (limit before we get into parking requirements), let us come into a new ground floor. Leave this corner without a floor into it because we want a visual and light connection. Have historic authenticity. We aren't fooling anyone who comes here. Then we would remodel both floors of the apartments. Ground floor is currently 2 bedroom apartments. Upper floor is 3 bedrooms. We would remodel all to 2 bedroom apartments, higher quality. Once you get out of the ground, better views of the river. It will look far better than it does now. [Shows photograph illustrate window location.] On the west side, we would like to duplicate the historic porch that was taken off when the building was buried. We would like to provide a balcony for the 2nd floor apartment. Pretty convenient access. After the flood this side porch was built on [south]. We would match the railing height, but meet 42" railing height. I reviewed all of this with the Division for the Historic Preservation Department, who checked with the federal level, that it meets the criteria to qualify for tax credits. Sent to Washington DC – yes, good news, it will meet the federal standards. We need to meet those standards to make the project work. We have confirmation from both the state and federal level.
Jay White discusses problems with snow plowing, creation of huge snow banks. Our thought is to leave 3 spaces on the uphill part, 3 taxi spaces, lines up with curb, bridge. Pretty dangerous place to park on the side. Create much more green space. More green space. More attractive site with a nicer landscaped space around the building. We would offset the loss of 3 parking spaces here, and 3 spaces here, with new parking. I talked about the concept of doing this with Larry Williams of Redstone properties. He has not seen the plans, but improvement to tenants, safer. The goal is to improve the landscaping just so that it is improved for the whole neighborhood. Raising the building doesn't necessarily do that. We hired Hamlin Engineering to locate the right-of-way. I used that to line up my plan. The original porch would not have been within the public right-of-way. Mary may have different information on this.
For finishes and materials, Randy has been in contact with a contractor to lift the building. We don't have to get into the excavation of the site. Reduces risk. We can re-use bricks and re-install them. They stop at the top of the stone wall. We would bring in more stone to create the distance between the current area where buried. Put foam insulation in to create a barrier for energy/insulation. Upgrade windows to be energy efficient. Original windows were multi-paned, shaker style. Nothing extra fancy. We want to get it out of the water, make it usable on all levels. Behind this building, is a tight courtyard. Access to basement apartment. Want to fill it in, about 15". Have ground floor handicap access. And we want enough headroom to keep existing original ground floor (which I call cellar

on plans) for an 8' floor to floor height. We think Mary gave detailed comments; I rebutted most of them. Mary did not have the benefit of being on site. She brings valid concerns. Location of windows and doors not conjecture. Secretary Standards for Rehabilitation being followed. A benefit to the neighborhood. The neighbors will like it better when it is not abysmal, basement apartments. Beautiful setting on the river. We hope you will enthusiastically support it.
Austin Hart – Your plan, from Colchester Avenue, bumped up. It would look like what, 1927? I guess I want to understand how each elevation will change. What will be impacted the most will be the view of the river.
Jay White – Explains elevation and floor plans. What is good about the building is that it is all there.
Austin Hart – Where is the river elevation.
Jay White – (points.) Now we are putting this on a real stone foundation. Not fake. Randy does not do fake.
Jay White – Randy has some large stones which he may use. We need to consult with tax credit people to meet those standards.
Austin Hart – clarification of boundary; where it buts up to the right-of-way...
Brad Rabinowitz – I am surprised that you have not come in with a real survey. That is not a survey. It must be clearly labeled, especially if you have to deal with public works.
Austin Hart – A boundary line survey will be critical. Have you talked to public works about this?
Jay White – I called them. The general discussion was, yes, a good thing. But come through you folks first. Road is too wide for standards there. I hope they will be encouraged by that. My initial phone conversation was positive.
Austin Hart – Parking will be a killer.
Jay White – No change. We would still have 4 apartments. Four spaces assigned.
Michael Long – those were street parking spaces?
Mary O'Neil – Two previous permits have identified the use of four spaces on street. Not assigned. Some arrangement at the time of review.
Austin Hart – Oh, on-street spaces.
Brad Rabinowitz – You are presenting a whole package. What you are doing to the right-of-way, the whole thing. You can't say raising the building is separate from these other issues. We are going to look at them all together.
Jay White – My whole career is with historic preservation. Lived in Rome, worked in Burly partnership, moved to Prague, 600 year old buildings. I recently opened my own firm and Randy hired me when I came back from Prague. What's good about our team is that the focus is entirely historic preservation. Trying to improve the quality of the neighborhood, quality of the building. You cannot bury brick. You can bury stone.
Austin Hart – Asks Mary if any new information to change her report.
Mary O'Neil – received email from Caitlin Corkins, not as confident about historic tax credits as Jay is sharing. Email today say they have not heard from John Sandoval as of today.
Jay White – reads email from Caitlin aloud.
Brad Rabinowitz – this is a sad little building. Look at the elevation. Not attractive.
Mary O'Neil – so why does it look that way? The story is part of the significance.
Michael Long – I did not know about the flood until I read this. But not an attractive building.
Austin Hart – I understand Mary's points. We could document what is there, in the context of the area. It would be a better building. It would be restoring.
Jay White – Documenting every detail, where the doors are. All becomes part of the historic record. To prevent an owner from salvaging his building and to keep a buried building...
A.J. Larosa – What we are seeing here is a unique and interesting narrative. Part of a narrative, one that goes beyond the structure. Is there a way to recognize, portions of this building used to be buried, used to be below grade. I have seen a line of demarcation,

"the flood went up to here." There is a unique narrative here. We don't want a building to fall down. There is a need to preserve and improve.
Jay White – there is a way to do that, documentation and photographs. Keep the stone work. The advantage of adding new stone that Randy already has. A new part of the foundation, not the original foundation. I want to leave this corner, so you can stand and see. When you go to Rome, you can see the layers of history. I can see mounted photographs, before the flood, after the flood.
Austin Hart – Preserve both versions. There are at least 2 neighbors who want to speak.
Steve Litwhiler, Sharon Litwhiler. We own 485 Colchester Avenue. My major concern is parking. If he does what he is proposing to do, it will take parking right off Colchester Avenue. When we get all our apartments rented, it will take spaces away. More of a burden on the rest of us in the neighborhood. Mary said they don't need parking for a pub or a restaurant. The reality is, I'm in the restaurant business, if you get 10 or 15 people at the pub, you are needing more spaces, not less. By removing spaces, that hurts us. We can't go anywhere else. We have 9 drivers. We have had 11-12 drivers. Not really when we are busy. It's when we slow down, and the drivers come back. You are taking those additional parking spaces, putting a real burden on us. About 7 spaces.
Brad Rabinowitz – Around the corner there are more.
Steve Litwhiler – We don't go there.
Jay White – taking those parking spaces away would be bad. Right now 10 parallel parking spaces along the river. There will be 20. It will take spaces away from next to the building; give us a sidewalk. Feels more urban. If it is approved, it will be a net gain of 4 parking spaces.
Michael Long – a public works issue.
Steve Litwhiler – to put that curb there, it is taking potential from us.
Michael Long – All your parking on the street?
Steve Litwhiler – it is limited. We have our drivers pull in, park.
Jay White – Right now there is a taxi stand. I have always been able to park right there. No trouble, not on Barrett Street either. In reality, if we don't move the parking out, a huge pile of snow. Randy can park in his truck. I can't park my car. The one right in front of our building, we think it would be better for green.
Austin Hart – although Sketch Plan, we think this is something that will need to be addressed in an application.
Steve Litwhiler – a further concern for a plow. How will he get in and come out? And in 23 years, we have never had a problem with our drivers. We are dealing with it all the time.
Austin Hart asks Sharon Litwhiler if she has any additional comments.
Sharon Litwhiler – it would be premature.
Jonathan Stevens – discusses the purpose of Sketch Plan. Communication.
Jay White – We would like to leave tonight with a message that we are headed in the right direction. Begin survey, architecture work, materials and finishes. We would like to have a nod "yeah."
Austin Hart – I would give a nod "yeah." The project as a whole gets us to a better place. There are obviously some parking issues.
Jay White – the preservation issues can be address at the state and federal levels, as that is where the tax credits will come from.
Israel Smith – Discusses staff comments about demo review standards.
Michael Long – About cutting into the structure.
Israel Smith – reads staff report – is what is happening here anticipated by the ordinance? This is more a reconstruction than anything else. My next question for the applicant is what is the approach for the Secretary's Standards.
Jay White – Part I we have already done. In a historic district, Winooski Falls Historic District, Devin Colman confirmed that. It was added to that district. The 2nd part is more detailed; photograph, show how you are meeting the 10 standards. The only addition that is new is the balcony. There was a set of loading dock doors. Glass instead of

wood. Instead of a loading dock, a balcony. If we can get public works to accept. That goes to whether compatible or not,
Israel Smith – reconstructing is the attempt.
Jay White – Mary talked about slicing the building. We want all the historic integrity we can. Some of the bricks will fall off. We are going to keep all of them.
Michael Long – not cutting into the timber frame…
Jay White – Timber still hanging. Temporary steel beam under here. Keeping 8 x 8 posts. Simple, 2 bay building. Built like a mill building.
Brad Rabinowitz – Having that clarity [historic review] will be important. It will be a new building within an old building. And then you are going to rebuild the porches, but restoring, or in the style of the old?
Jay White – restore in the style of the old. We need to do this kind of research. We also have evidence in the brick itself.
Brad Rabinowitz – Reconstruction…
Jay White – porch will be reconstructed. This photo shows the crown of the road; it is misleading. The balcony, we are thinking an iron grate opening, will be compatible design. Metal railing, clarifies that it is compatible but new.
Israel Smith – I don't see the logic in reviewing the project under Demolition of Historic Buildings. That is a pretty drastic view of what is happening here.
Jay White – I was taken aback by that.
Randall Brisson – Anything you can save. Pounds in, pounds out. The building is interesting as the building is a picture of time and place. Many of these framing members are sawn rather than hewn. Not picking it up and moving it to Connecticut. Staying in its context, except for a few feet. If we can't get it to where its used value is appropriate, then I will do what any other owner would do. Tear it down. Otherwise, make it last another 200-300 years.
Michael Long – Commercial space, residential space.
Jay White – Bring all of the plumbing together so we don't have all these pipes running all over. I may end up renting one of these one day myself [laughter]. The bottom floor is a disaster.
Michael Long – will be a cellar?
Jay White – the remainder of the café, with a visual connection. Upgrade, foam insulation. 2' wide thick walls. On this back corner, probably storage of snow tires for tenants, building mechanical systems, hot water tanks. Right now there is the furnace. The rest of the basement is unusable, wet.
Austin Hart – Comments? None offered. Interested issues. Unique opportunities.
Jay White – How to proceed?
Austin Hart – refers to staff. Hopefully you can incorporate comments heard today.
Jay White – Need for a survey?
Austin Hart – we will know more when you come back for an application. How you are going to handle parking, right-of-way issues.
Michael Long – What about technical review?
Ken Lerner – Generally we would have a Technical Review meeting; critical to have that survey so we know what role is taken by whom. Let us know; we schedule those monthly.
Jay White – next step is to call public works and set up an appointment.
Ken Lerner – and get a survey.
Austin Hart - Closes hearing 6:30 pm.

VII. Other Business
None.

Discussion of deliberative scheduling. Next week is school vacation. The next week is Town Meeting.
Deliberative Meeting Date **WEDNESDAY,** March 4 2015 prior to public hearing, 4:00 pm.

VIII. Adjournment 6:32 pm.

Austin D. Hart — March 6, 2015

Austin Hart, Development Review Board Chair — Date

Mary O. Neil — March 6, 2015

Mary O'Neil AICP, Senior Planner — Date