DPW COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
August 24, 2022
6:30 p.m.

To join in person: 645 Pine St., Burlington, VT
To Join via Zoom: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83495330508
To call into the meeting: 301-715-8592 Webinar ID: 834 9533 0508
Channel 17 also often livestreams this on their YouTube channel and airs it over the air at a later date.
Note that comments on YouTube are not monitored.

1 Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments

2 5 Min Agenda

3 5 Min Election of Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary

4 10 Min Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)

5 5 Min Consent Agenda
   A Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-15-22
   B Main St – Willard St No Parking Zone
   C Lakeside Ave 1 Hour Parking
   D South Champlain St Vehicle Loading Zone Removal
   E Hyde Street ADA Space Removal
   F 86 Oak St – 15 Minute Parking Removal
   G Birchcliff Parkway Parking Removal
   H Union Station Area Parking and Loading/Unloading Revisions
   I Kilburn St Stop Sign Addition
   J Lavalley Lane No Parking

6 20 Min PlanBTV Walk/Bike Progress
   A Presentation, Burlington Walk/Bike Council
   B Commissioner Discussion
   C Public Comment
   D Action Requested – None

7 20 Min Railyard Enterprise Project
   A Presentation, N. Baldwin, C. Mims, O.
   B Commissioner Discussion
   C Public Comment
   D Action Requested – None

8 10 Min Director’s Report - Verbal
Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – September 21, 2022
Commissioners Present: Commissioner Barr, Commissioner Hogan (Chair), Commissioner Munteanu, Commissioner O’Neill-Vivanco (Vice-Chair)

Commissioner Absent: Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Bose, Commissioner Overby

ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Hogan called the meeting to order at 4:37 p.m.

ITEM 2 – AGENDA

Commissioner Barr made a motion to accept the agenda
Commissioner O’Neill-Vivanco seconded
Unanimous Approval

ITEM 3 – PUBLIC FORUM

No attendees

ITEM 4 – CONSENT AGENDA

A – Approval of Draft Minutes 5-18-22
B – Summer Saturdays Parking Rate
C – Parklet & Loading Zone on Oak Street

Commissioner Barr made a motion to accept the consent agenda
Commissioner Munteanu seconded
Unanimous approval

ITEM 5 – FY 23 Capital Budget Overview

Director Spencer – originally looking at a more constrained FY23 Capital budget especially after the 40 million dollar bond was not approved by voters, but with the voter approval on town meeting day for the smaller budget 23.8 million dollar bond, we have been able to advance a number of timely smaller projects and reserve some of the funds for year FY23 & 25.
Capital Program Director Ashely Parker started off with the capital budget covering various projects across the board throughout the city – Parks, TIFF projects, Fleet, major capital projects within the Department of Public Works. We have been working on implementing a new tool called OpenGov to evaluate and access the budget throughout the fiscal year to help us track and forecast what our needs are overtime so we can do a better job of planning what are capital needs are in the future. The other piece of this software is to better connect us with members of the public. Goal is to have a platform for residents to have a better sense of projects.

Commissioner Munteanu is interested in OpenGov Platform. Would like to know if there is a place to communicate and leave comments like See Click Fix.

Capital Program Director Parker will check into this.

Commissioner Barr – Excited to see many projects underway and to see things moving forward.

Commissioner O’Neill-Vivanco – asked if we knew of any other cities that have used this platform and how it works for them. Once of the challenges of having comments in See Click Fix needs to be monitored due to inappropriate comments. The ability to communicate about a project to a person is key. Encourage the City to look at other Municipalities. Can we track the progress of projects to see where we are? Looks great and excited for the city to dig in on projects.

Chair Hogan – seconds Commissioner O’Neill-Vivanco on about not wanting to invite negative comments but want feedback in a structured scalable way. Can OpenGov host other budgets?

Director Spencer explained that just the city’s General Fund budget will be done for now.

ITEM 6 – DIRECTOR’S REPORT

No other updates to what was in the packet.

ITEM 7 – COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATION

Commissioner Barr – Noticed a lot of construction going on around the city and it looks good. Glad to see things are being productive. Great job DPW.

Commissioner O’Neill-Vivanco – Ditto on Commissioner Barr’s comment. Didn’t realize about on Pine St. Excited about moving forward on the Champlain Parkway.
Chair Hogan - Eliana Fox will be joining next month as a new commissioner. Folks at The Walk/Bike Council have put together a progress report of the walk/bike Master Plan where we are at and what’s in the works. Possibly a review at the July or September Commission meeting?

ITEM 8 – ADJOURNMENT & NEXT MEETING – JULY 20, 2022

Commissioner Munteanu made a motion to adjourn the meeting
Commissioner Barr seconded
Unanimous Approval

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm
Memo

Date: August 24, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Alexandra I. Gordon, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: Main St No Parking Zone East of S Willard St

Staff recommends the DPW Commission adopt, see Attachment-1:

(7) No-parking Area

No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:
- On the north side of Main Street, beginning at the West driveway of 360 Main Street and extending to the driveway for 362 Main Street.

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of the recommended traffic regulation amendment is to implement a no-parking to improve the effective travel width of motorists approaching the intersection of Main Street and Willard Street, this recommendation provides a safety need for local residents.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusion:
The existing parking on Main Street obstructs the flow of traffic and narrows the street where Main Street splits into two lanes approaching the intersection of Main Street and S Willard Street. A no-parking zone between the driveways of 360 Main Street and 362 Main Street should improve safety for motorists, and ensure an appropriate travel width for vehicles, see Attachment-2.
**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the 6/15/22 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents in the vicinity of 360 Main St. DPW Staff received two emails in support of the no-parking zone (see attachment 3).

**Attachments:**

1. Traffic regulation.
2. Site map.
3. Public input correspondence.
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 7, No parking areas

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

1 That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 7: No parking areas, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 7: No parking areas

(1)-(289) As written.

(290) Reserved. On the north side of Main Street, beginning at the West driveway of 360 Main Street and extending to the driveway for 362 Main Street.

(291)-(580) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec 7

08/24/2022
Attachment 2:

Site Map:

Proposed No-Parking Area

144 S Willard St.

360 Main St.
Attachment 3:

Email Sat 6/4:

**Lang House -- No Parking beginning with 360 Main Street**

Hi, Alexandra,

I received your alert about the DPW proposal to put a no parking area in front of the Lang House extending to South Willard Street.

Years ago a sign was put in place in front of 360 Main St and someone stole it.

The curb is painted red. Drivers rarely park their cars in that stretch between our west and east driveways.

I continue to favor that no parking area.

I actually favor extending the no parking zone farther east toward 368 Main Street (Kappa Sigma Fraternity house). Some drivers park very close to our east driveway entrance creating the possibility of cars being hit by garbage, recycling, delivery trucks.

My two cents. Kim

Kim Borsavage

Email Sat 6/4:

**Parking on Main St**

Good morning Alexandra,

We own and live at 144 So Willard/350 Main St. We have been here for 22 years. I do not remember anyone parking in your designated area since we have been here. It is obvious to all that the two downhill lanes start there.

We have plenty of onsite parking at our house and think your plan makes great sense. We will not object.

Martin V. (Marty) Lavin
Memo

Date: August 24, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Alexandra I. Gordon, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: Reallocation of Three 15-Minute Parking Spaces to 1-hour Time Limited Parking Spaces on Lakeside Avenue

Staff recommends the DPW Commission remove (see Attachment-1):

(9) Fifteen-minute parking
No person shall park any vehicle, at any time, longer than fifteen (15) minutes at the following locations:

- 3 spaces on the north side of Lakeside Avenue, beginning 20 feet east of the western most driveway to #128 Lakeside Avenue and continuing east for 60 feet. To be effective Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Staff recommends the DPW Commission approve:

(11) One-hour parking
No person shall park a vehicle for a period longer than one (1) hour between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following locations:

- 3 spaces on the north side of Lakeside Avenue, beginning 20 feet east of the western most driveway to #128 Lakeside Avenue and continuing east for 60 feet. To be effective Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this request is to reallocate the existing 15-minute parking spaces adjacent to 128 Lakeside Avenue to one-hour parking. This change will better accommodate the customers of the adjacent business.
**Project Checklist:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Conclusion:**
The existing 15-minute parking adjacent to 128 Lakeside Avenue was originally used by customers of a bank at 128 Lakeside Avenue, (see attachment 2). The bank is no longer located at 128 Lakeside Avenue and is now an interior design firm. 15-minute parking is no longer adequate to service the customers of the adjacent business, instead, one-hour parking has been deemed more appropriate.

**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the 6/15/22 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents and businesses in the vicinity of 128 Lakeside Avenue proposing to reallocate these 15-minute parking spaces adjacent to 128 Lakeside Avenue to a no-park zone. The owner of an interior design firm that recently moved into 128 Lakeside reached out via email and by phone in response to DPW’s public outreach flyer looking to preserve the parking. It was proposed that the spaces get reallocated to one-hour parking rather than no-parking. After this exchange, an attorney writing on behalf of Fortieth Burlington reached out via email objecting to the original proposition to reallocate the spaces to a no-park zone (see attachment 3).

**Attachments:**
1. Traffic regulation.
2. Site map.
3. Public input correspondence.
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 9, Fifteen-minute parking.
Section 11, One-hour parking.

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 9: Fifteen-minute parking, and
Section 11: One-hour parking, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 9: Fifteen-minute parking.
(a) As written.
(b) No person shall park any vehicle, at any time, longer than fifteen (15) minutes at the following locations:
   (1)-(27) As written.
   (28) 3 spaces on the north side of Lakeside Avenue, beginning 20 feet east of the western most driveway to #128 Lakeside Avenue and continuing east for 60 feet. To be effective Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Reserved.
   (29)-(34) As written.
(c)-(d) As written.

Section 11: One-hour parking.
(a)-(e) As written.
(f) No person shall park a vehicle for a period longer than one (1) hour between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted, in the following locations:
   (1) On the north side of Lakeside Avenue, beginning 20 feet east of the western most driveway to #128 Lakeside Avenue and continuing east for 60 feet.

** Material stricken out deleted.
*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec.9 & Sec. 11
08/24/2022
Attachment 2:

1) Site Map:
Attachment 3:

Email Fri 7/1:

Objection to Proposed Elimination of 15 Parking Spaces at 128 Lakeside Ave (Innovation Center)

Mr. Gordon

I write on behalf of Fortieth Burlington, the owner of the Innovation Center at 128 Lakeside Avenue in regard to the attached notice from you proposing to eliminate the existing 15 minute spaces in front of its property.

Those spaces are provided in accordance with

APPENDIX C

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION

9 Fifteen-minute parking.

(a) No person shall park a vehicle longer than fifteen (15) minutes, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following areas:

(b) No person shall park any vehicle, at any time, longer than fifteen (15) minutes at the following locations:

(28) 3 spaces on the north side of Lakeside Avenue, beginning 20 feet east of the western most driveway to #128 Lakeside Avenue and continuing east for 60 feet. To be effective Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

While these spaces were previously established for a bank tenant in the building, they are now used by a new retail tenant and are a valuable asset to the property.

My client objects to any change in the use of those spaces and if the Department plans to proceed to change the Rules and Regulations requests a hearing before the Public Works Commission and will appeal any decision to remove those spaces.

Please copy me on any correspondence regarding these spaces.

Thank you

Liam Murphy
Email Fri 7/5:

[Reply to Liam Murphy]

Liam Murphy,

My supervisor Phillip Peterson has been in contact with the owner of Abode VT at 128 Lakeside Avenue, about this situation. The proposition to reallocate the three 15-minute spaces to a no-park zone has changed. The recommendation is now to reallocate the existing three 15-minute parking spaces to three one-hour parking spaces to better serve the current adjacent business, Abode VT Interiors & Styling.

Though the parking spaces are currently in ordinance, the suggestion would be to change the ordinance to better suit the current situation. This is currently only a suggestion however as it will need to be approved by the commission for the ordinance to change. Again, the change now being suggested is to reallocate the existing three 15-minute parking spaces to three one-hour parking spaces.

Public input is welcome at Public Works Commission meetings should you want to provide your input in person before the commission. This exchange will also be documented for the commission as public input correspondence.

Regards,

Alex Gordon
Engineering Intern

Email Fri 7/1:

Parking Spaces

Good morning Phillip,

My name is Juliet Palmer and I just moved my business into the front space of the Innovation center. I understand that there is the potential for the 3 parking spaces in front of the old credit union space of the building to be removed and I’m wondering if there is a possibility of preserving any or all of those.

I’m happy to connect with you if there is a good time to come by public works or give you a call (I tried the number on the business card they gave me for you and it came up as disconnected), let me know what’s best

Thanks so much for your time and consideration, Juliet
Memo

Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Beatriz Altura, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: South Champlain Vehicle Loading Space Removal

---

**Staff recommends the DPW Commission remove, see Attachment-1:**

**Vehicle Loading Space**

*No person shall park a vehicle at the following locations unless engaged in loading or unloading the vehicle:*

- (21) On the west side of South Champlain Street beginning ten (10) feet south of the King Street crosswalk and extending thirty (30) feet south.

**Purpose & Need:**

The purpose of this request is to remove a vehicle loading space that is no longer needed and convert it to no parking with the rest of the West side of South Champlain St. This change will meet the needs of South Champlain St. residents and local drivers.

**Project Checklist:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established City Policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Conclusion:**

This vehicle loading zone was originally used by customers of King Street Deli at 41 King Street. The building is used as a residence, and there is no need for the vehicle loading zone.
Public Engagement:
In preparation for the 8/24/22 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents in the vicinity of 41 King Street. DPW Staff received no public comment.

Site Map:

Attachments:

1. Traffic regulation.
In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 12-1, No parking except vehicles loading or unloading.

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 12-1: No parking except vehicles loading or unloading, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 12-1: No parking except vehicles loading or unloading.

(1)-(20) As written.

(21) On the west side of South Champlain Street beginning ten (10) feet south of the King Street crosswalk and extending thirty (30) feet south. Reserved.

(22)-(52) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

08/24/2022

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec 12-1
Memo

Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Beatriz Altura, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: 58 Hyde Street Accessibility (ADA) Parking Change

Staff recommends the DPW Commission remove, see Attachment-1:

7A Accessible spaces designated.
No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations, except automobiles displaying special handicapped license plates issued pursuant to 18 V.S.A. § 1325, or any amendment or renumbering thereof:

- (137) The space in front of 64 Hyde St

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this request is to reallocate an accessible (ADA) space as public parking because it is no longer in use. This change will provide parking need for residents of Hyde St.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusion:
Staff received a request to remove an ADA space in front of 58 Hyde Street, which is actually signed at 64 Hyde Street. Staff received the request to reallocate the space because the resident who needed it passed away. Reallocating the space to public parking will allow more parking for local residents.
Public Engagement:
In preparation for the 8/24/2022 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents in the vicinity of 58 Hyde St. Staff received one phone (1) call and two emails, all of which supports the Staff recommendation, see Attachment-2.

Site Map:

Attachments:
1. Traffic regulation.
2. Public Input Correspondence.
In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 7a, Accessible Spaces Designated.

Sponsor(s): Department of Public Works
Action: Approved
Date: 8/24/2022
Attestation of Adoption:

__________________________________
Phillip Peterson, EI
Public Works Engineer, Technical Services
Published: _________________________
Effective: _________________________

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

1 That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 9: Fifteen-minute parking, and Section 7a: Accessible spaces designated, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 7a: Fifteen-minute parking.

1 (1)-(136) As written.

5 (137) The space in front of 64 Hyde Street, Reserved.

6 (138)-(173) As written.

8** Material stricken out deleted.

9*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec.7a
08/24/2022
Public Works Intern Beatriz Altura received a phone call from Bree Wyenandt, a resident of Hyde Street in support of the removal of the ADA space. The resident noted that they had not seen the space used in the past year.

Hello Beatriz,

My name is Bridget and I received a paper notification from you regarding the ADA parking spot in front of 58 Hyde street. I have lived in my current apartment for over three years and have only seen this parking spot used a very small handful of times. As someone who relies on off street parking, I would be ecstatic to see this spot moved to a general public parking space. Since this is a residential street with no commercial use, parking should be for all residents.

Thank you,

Bridget O'Keefe, she/her

Hi Beatriz,

I think this is a great idea! Hyde street could really use the spaces.

Best,

Emma
Memo

Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Beatriz Altura, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: 86 Oak Street 15-Minute Parking

Staff recommends the DPW Commission remove, see Attachment-1:
Fifteen Minute Parking
No person shall park a vehicle longer than fifteen (15) minutes, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following areas:
- (107) In the parking space in front of 86 Oak Street.

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this request is to remove a 15 minute parking space in front of 86 Oak Street. This will provide an effective travel width needs, as well as discontinue greenbelt parking.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusion:
The request was made by the owner of the building so the greenbelt and curb could be restored. The request to remove the 15 minute parking space will allow the greenbelt and curb to restored in the space and reduce hazards for all road users.
**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the 8/24/22 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents in the vicinity of the Oak Street and Intervale Avenue intersection. Staff received one phone call which sought clarification about the Staff recommendation, see Attachment-2.

**Site Map:**

![Site Map](image)

**Attachments:**
1. Traffic regulation.
2. Public input correspondence
In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 9, Fifteen-minute parking.

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

1 That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 9: Fifteen-minute parking of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

2 Section 9: Fifteen-minute parking.

3 (a) No person shall park a vehicle longer than fifteen (15) minutes, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following areas:

4 (1)-(106) As written.

5 (107) In the parking space in front of 86 Oak Street. Reserved.

6 (108)-(126) As written.

(b)-(d) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec.9

08/24/2022
Attachment 2:

Public input correspondence via phone call

Thursday, June 16, 2022 10:30 am

Public Works Intern Beatriz Altura spoke with Aisha of Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) about the removal of the fifteen minute parking spot in front of 86 Oak St. CHT owns the 86 Oak St residence. Aisha had previously called to request the parking space be removed on behalf of CHT to allow for the greenbelt in front of the residence to be restored; this was reiterated in the phone call. She noted that there is currently no sign in the space and expressed concern that residents of 86 Oak St may have more trouble finding residential parking when the space is reallocated as greenbelt.
Memo

Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Beatriz Altura, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: Birchcliff Parkway No Parking Zone

Staff recommends the DPW Commission edit, see Attachment-1:

No Parking Zone

No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:

- On the north side of Birchcliff Parkway, from Pine Street to Cherry Lane

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this request is to remove parking on the north side of Birchcliff Parkway between the intersections with Pine Street and Cherry Lane. This will provide an effective travel width need in the area.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW Narrow Streets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW Narrow Streets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusion:
Staff received a request from local residents, requesting parking be removed on the north side of Birchcliff from Pine to Cherry to increase safety. Staff conducted site visits and found the effective travel width (see Attachment 2) of the road is 13 feet, which is 1 foot less than the travel width recommended by DPW’s Narrow Streets policy. This situation is additionally exacerbated due to the lack of greenbelt (for snow storage) for a long section of the recommended area, which can shrink the effective travel width further during heavy snow events. Removing the spaces would increase the effective travel width, allowing for emergency services to conduct operations, and for
streets crews to conduct snow removal operations appropriately. Consequently, Staff recommend the Commission approve of removing parking on the north side of Birchcliff Parkway, from Pine Street to Cherry Lane.

**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the 8/24/2022 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed flyers to residents in the vicinity of Birchcliff Parkway and Pine Street businesses near the intersection. Staff received (see Attachment 3) two (2) emails opposed to the Staff recommendation and 13 which support the Staff recommendation.

**Attachments:**

1. Traffic regulation.
2. Site Map.
3. Public Input Correspondence.
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 7, No parking areas

Sponsor(s): Department of Public Works
Action: Approved
Date: 8/24/2022
Attestation of Adoption:

Phillip Peterson, EI
Public Works Engineer, Technical Services
Published: 
Effective: 

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 7: No parking areas, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 7: No parking areas

(1)-(213) As written.

(214) Reserved. On the north side of Birchcliff Parkway, from Pine Street to Cherry Lane.

(215)-(580) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

Published: 08/24/2022
Hello Beatriz,
I was delivered this notification this week, and I am writing today in strong opposition to the proposed changes to parking on Birchcliff PKWY. I am the owner and operator at Zero Gravity which is the business directly adjacent to the proposed changes. Parking is already very limited in our part of the south end, and this would impact our employees and customers considerably. If the City of Burlington is in fact considering making this change, I would respectfully request a meeting with whomever is responsible for making this final decision to discuss the matter further.

Thank you,
Matt Wilson

Hi Phillip, thanks for speaking with me the other day about parking on the western terminus of Birchcliff Parkway. As I mentioned, I fully support restricting parking to only a single side for the section of Birchcliff between Pine St. and Cherry Ln.

I am a resident of the Birchcliff neighborhood and regularly use this stretch of road. On the weekends, there are often cars parked on both sides of the street, which I attribute to visitors of Zero Gravity/Queen City Brewing. When cars are parked on both sides, it is often difficult for cars going in different directions to pass each other. Even worse is when cars turn off of Pine St and a car is either at or approaching the stop sign; with very little room to navigate or react, it is a dangerous situation. I've personally witnessed three close calls.

The Champlain Elementary Pedestrian Improvements project was completed two years ago. Part of this project plan was to restrict parking on this stretch of Birchcliff Pkwy to a single side. I was a big supporter of this project and feel that limiting parking is key to making that stretch of road safer for pedestrians, as having cars on both sides significantly limits visibility and increases the risks for pedestrians who travel the intersection of Pine St & Birchcliff Pkwy.

Thanks for listening and please convey my opinion to the Parking Commission.

Regards,
Mike Fisher

Sir,

Burlington may have problems but parking on the north side of Birchcliff is not one of them, and I've lived in the neighborhood all my life.
Occasionally a truck may pull up on the north side of Birchcliff to set up to back into Zero Gravity but it's very rare - and it's actually the only way a tractor trailer can set up to get into Zero Gravity, v. i. r., by starting on the north side of the street.

Thank you for your work on this.

Ted Cohen

**Tues, July 19, 2022**

I’ve lived on lower Cherry lane since 92’. I’ve never understood why parking has been allowed on the Birchcliff switchback hill. Dark with shady trees, early ams driving east into the sun- and don’t get me started on the ‘speed table’!! What a joke.

That was before all the restaurant bar trade moved in. I’d rather have parking right up my street instead of on Birchcliff- oh right they park here anyway. But to have both sides of Birchcliff near Pine for parking?! How are emergency vehicles meant to make in by? And cars parking in the intersection of Cherry and Birchcliff? That is never legal elsewhere.

So yes- I support sane parking restrictions for Pine Street bar hopping.
I’m grateful I have the best parking spot - my own driveway:)

Claire Graham-Smith

**Tues, July 19, 2022**

To whom it may concern,

The current parking situation at the bottom of Birchcliff Parkway presents a threat to public safety at the edge of a residential neighborhood in close proximity to an elementary school, ostensibly due to the overflow parking of Zero Gravity/Great Northen customers.

The City of Burlington needs to get it's sh-t together and serve its citizens, limit parking to one side of the street minimum.

Sincerely,

Erick Baur and Michaelyn Bachhuber

**Wed, July 20, 2022**

Hi Phillip,

I am a resident in the Birchcliff Neighborhood, and am writing to voice my 100% support for limiting parking on Birchcliff Pkwy between Pine St and Cherry Ln to only the south side (the Champlain Chocolates side), and prohibit parking on the north side (next to Zero Gravity/Great Northern).

I commute home from work south on Pine St and take a left onto Birchcliff Parkway, and it is often a dangerous situation. When cars are parked on both sides, there is only enough space for one car to pass through. As you turn off Pine St, it is difficult to have to be looking all the way up Birchcliff to make sure no other cars are coming down. It causes distraction and hesitation as drivers try to figure this out. It also causes a backup on Pine St.

Once on Birchcliff, cars often have to stop completely and/or back up if another car approaches in the opposite direction.
This is all happening while people are trying to park and cross the street. It is all very dangerous. I worry every time that there will be a car accident or a pedestrian accident.

I would NEVER let my children walk on lower Birchcliff alone - and even hesitate to walk there as a family.

Thank you for your time on this important safety issue.

-Christine Hagan

**Wed, July 20, 2022**

Hi, Phillip – A recent Front Porch Forum email encouraged this feedback and I hope it is useful. I live on Bittersweet Lane, one block up from Cherry.

I support the proposal to limit parking to the south side of Birchcliff between Cherry and Pine. On a Friday night, when both sides of the street are full of parked cars, Birchcliff is reduced to one lane. I have navigated this situation multiple times and without incident. But I’ve been lucky that I haven’t encountered another driver trying to go the opposite direction.

However, the nearest I’ve come to an accident on Birchcliff in the 28 years I’ve lived in the neighborhood occurred at the curve just below Bittersweet. A full-size pick-up was parked on the south side of the street in front of the lawn of the first Birchcliff house, at the middle of the curve. At that precise spot I met a car going down Birchcliff as I was heading up. It was one of those harrowing moments most drivers experience and I’m still not sure how I missed the pick-up, or the other car. There is, I think, three car-widths of space at that point. But that is effectively reduced by the angle a driver chooses to navigate the curve. Not being able to see approaching drivers is what makes the curve treacherous. Therefore, in addition to banning parking on the north side between Cherry and Pine I also suggest some sort of modification between Bittersweet and Cherry. These could include a limit on parking, speed, the dimension of the road, or the shape of the curve. I’m not sure the best method, but it seems simplest would be to limit parking on the south side of Birchcliff to some point above the curve and below the driveway of the first house on south side.

For most of the years I’ve lived here Birchcliff has been a fairly quiet street. Whether the cause is roundabout construction, population increase, or business activity, the traffic on Birchcliff has increased significantly. If we do nothing I think we should assume that an accident at the curve between Bittersweet and Cherry is inevitable.

Thanks very much,

Michael MacCaskey

**Wed, July 20, 2022**

Dear Mr. Peterson,

I am a resident of the Birchcliff neighborhood writing to express my concern about safety (walking and driving) on Birchcliff Pkwy between Shelburne Road and Pine St.
It’s my understanding that the PWC is considering a recommendation to limit parking on Birchcliff between Pine St and Cherry Ln to the south side thus prohibiting parking on the north side. While I fully support this parking restriction, I don’t think it goes far enough in making Birchcliff a safe road.

The most dangerous point on Birchcliff is actually the curve from Cherry Ln. east to Bittersweet Ln. Visibility of east-bound traffic from Bittersweet Ln. is very poor, especially when cars are parked on the curve. What’s more, in winter with snow cover Birchcliff essentially becomes a one-lane road from Bittersweet west to Pine St. This is dangerous bottleneck for all east-west traffic. Again, while I support the proposed parking restriction, I would like to see the restriction extended from Pine St. up to Bittersweet Ln.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lynn Ocone

Wed, July 20, 2022
Dear Mr. Peterson,

As a resident of Birchcliff Parkway, I was happy to learn that there is discussion at the Public Works Commission about changing how parking is managed at the bottom of the street, where it intersects with Pine Street and where Champlain Chocolates and Zero Gravity Brewing are located. We love the active and vibrant character of our neighborhood, and we enjoy people coming here to patronize our neighboring businesses. However, those visitors sometimes ignore or forget (especially after an evening of drinking) that those businesses are adjacent to a residential neighborhood. The fact that our street is often used as a cut-through between Pine Street and Shelburne Road exacerbates this problem, as people drive very fast on our street, where there are often children, families, and elderly people walking and there are no crosswalks above Cherry Lane. Especially during peak business hours at Zero Gravity, the congestion at the west end of the street is very difficult for residents to navigate, on foot or by car, and feels like an accident waiting to happen.

More could be done to clarify for visitors the boundary between the recreational, business end of the street and where our residential neighborhood begins at Cherry Lane. Earlier this year, a speed-detector was placed on Birchcliff within sight of our house, and we noticed an improvement in the speed of traffic during that period. The addition of speed bumps or, at the very least, cross walks, would also help to remind drivers that they are in a pedestrian zone, different from Route 7. Prohibiting parking on one side of the street near Pine Street would help to ensure easier access for residents during those busy evening hours when visitors are enjoying the brewery — and people who live here are trying to get home safely from work and school. I hope that the Public Works Commission will consider making these changes without delay.

Thank you for your important work,
Abby Paige

Wed, July 20, 2022
Greetings,
My name is Leonard Yordan. I am writing in response to a Front Porch Forum post that is addressing the parking at lower Birchcliff Pkwy near Zero Gravity. As someone who lives in this neighborhood, many residents have been at times terribly inconvenienced by the parking on both sides of the road. There are safety issues, traffic flow issues, and even standards outlined by DPW and Burlington as a city that are not being adhered to as well. There is a minimum of 19 feet wide for two-way traffic on our streets. I measured with cars parked on both sides recently (both full size pickup trucks) and there was only 12 feet between cars while they were parked on both sides opposite of each other. Birchcliff is already being used as a cut through to avoid the rotary construction. Massive amounts of traffic come through here. On several occasions, you will see multiple cars waiting to turn on to Pine St, thus not allowing traffic from Pine St. to come up, especially for the residents such as myself. God forbid you are waiting for a car to turn left onto Pine St. This always holds up traffic dramatically while the cars stack up behind that person turning left. With cars sometimes 4 or 5 deep waiting on Birchcliff to get onto Pine, it forces a car on Pine to wait to turn on to Birchcliff Pkwy. until all the cars are clear, thus in turn holding up traffic on Pine St. All because it is not wide enough for two cars while parking on both sides. We were victims of this just a couple of weeks ago. We were coming home from a camping trip with our camper. The ONLY way to safely come up Birchcliff is from the bottom off Pine St. with our camper. We sat on Pine St. waiting for multiple cars to turn on to Pine St. because it was not wide enough for us. Finally, after 5 cars went, a driver was courteous enough to wait above Lake Champlain Chocolates loading dock, knowing we needed to turn on, all while we held up traffic on Pine St. just trying to turn into our own neighborhood. If you add in tractor trailers that illegally come down Birchcliff, trucks loading and unloading for Zero Gravity and Lake Champlain Chocolates, this adds another huge dimension to the issue. We already fought the town in our neighborhood when they wanted to add a sidewalk on the north side of Birchcliff on a blind, downhill curve which would have taken away 8 feet of the width (sidewalk and green belt). Thankfully they saw the light and thought better of that. This in essence would have the same negative impact by continuing to allow parking on both sides at the bottom of Birchcliff. Let’s jump ahead to winter. With an average snowstorm of 5 inches of snow, I measured the width of the street between snowbanks after it was plowed. It was 19’2” with no cars on the street. Take away the width of an average car which is 6 feet (and that is being conservative). Deduct that on both sides and you are left with a road that is 7-8 feet wide! The snowbanks are always a foot or two off the curbs. Now have a plow come through that is 8-9 feet wide. It is so painfully obvious for a multitude of reasons why you need to eliminate parking on the north side at the bottom of Birchcliff Pkwy. How about a fire truck or ambulance? Time is crucial and they always come up from Pine for emergency services. If they are waiting because cars are lined up and cars can’t get out of the way to let emergency vehicles through, that is a risky precedent to set. I would think safety is paramount in a neighborhood with so many families walking, biking, and just to prevent traffic issues in a very busy area. I am by no means against the businesses trying to do business, but this issue needs to be addressed immediately before a collision happens, a pedestrian is struck, or a cyclist is struck, or an emergency vehicle can’t get through. Feel free to call me. I would be happy to give more detail if needed.

--
Leonard Yordan

Wed, July 20, 2022
Hi Phillip,
I saw that the Public Works Commission will be discussing parking on Birchcliff between Pine and Cherry. As a resident of the neighborhood, this is a critical issue! I already filed an issue on SeeClickFix about this parking issue [https://seeclickfix.com/issues/12120833](https://seeclickfix.com/issues/12120833)

I know it’s challenging to balance all these issues, and I love all the restaurants and businesses on Pine, but with the additional traffic on Birchcliff it’s apparent that this parking is a safety issue. Limiting parking to only the South Side would only eliminate about 6-8 parking spots so it doesn't seem like a big trade-off.

Thanks,
John Stanton-Geddes

**Wed, July 20, 2022**

I am a resident in the Birchcliff development living on Bittersweet Lane. I do find when I am exiting or entering Birchcliff on to or from Pine St. I have to be extremely careful as the cars parked on both sides of the street make for a very narrow roadway to turn into. I would agree that it would be helpful to allow parking only on the south side of the street. I actually find myself using this road less and less as it has really become a hazard especially at mealtimes. I’m amazed that there have not been more accidents at that corner. Thanks for dealing with this problem.

JR

**Wed, July 20, 2022**

Hi Phillip,

Cars parking on both sides of lower Birchcliff has caused a substantial bottleneck and risk to safe passage at peak frustration hours.

I’ve had a couple close calls and have, at times, resorted to bypassing this interchange by cutting thru the parking lot behind the facilities at Lake Champlain chocolates. 😊 Limiting parking to just the south side of Birchcliff from Pine to Cherry seems an obvious and reasonable solution.

Most sincerely,
Julie Senesac

**Thurs, July 21, 2022**

Hi Phillip I just saw the FPF about the parking on Birchcliff Parkway. I live in that development. It is hard enough to drive up or down when there is parking on one side of the road especially when you get to the bend. Lately people have been parking on both sides of the road and it becomes a one lane road. So it is difficult to get through and again unsafe.

It would be so nice if there was parking on just one side with no parking signs on the other side. I appreciate any help with this matter.

Julie Citorik

One more thing: it makes it difficult to turn onto Birchcliff from Pine and can cause a traffic backup on Pine as you can’t turn if a car is waiting to turn on to Pine from Birchcliff. And as you know Pine can be a very busy street.
Thanks again.
Julie

**Thurs, July 21, 2022**
Hi Phillip,
My name is Ron Citorik and I have lived in Linden Terrace for 38 years. I am very happy to see the development of Pine St businesses but feel the parking on Birchcliff Parkway has become very dangerous. With cars parked on both sides of the street there is barely room for a single car to get through let alone two cars approaching from opposite sides. Please consider single sided parking on Birchcliff before something catastrophic happens.
Thank you

**Mon, July 25, 2022**
Good morning,

I would like to share my concerns with the parking on lower BirchCliff. On several occasions I have had to maneuver questionable parking, or have had to sit with my car hanging out on Pine St waiting for people to figure out how to get out of their own way. As you may realize, if a fire truck needed to get through it might not happen in a timely manner, safety is a definite concern!

Best,
Pamela McGonagle
Memorandum

Date: August 24, 2022  
To: Public Works Commission  
From: Madeline Suender, Associate Public Works Transportation Engineer  
CC: Laura Wheelock P.E., Senior Public Works Engineer  
Subject: Union Station Loading Zone Accommodations

Staff recommends the DPW Commission remove and add:

BCO Appx C, Sec 9, Fifteen-minute parking.
(a) No person shall park a vehicle longer than fifteen (15) minutes, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following areas:
   (21) In the two (2) parking spaces in front of the entrances to the premises at 1 Main Street.  
       Reserved.

BCO Appx C, Sec 12-1, No parking except vehicles loading or unloading.
No person shall park a vehicle at the following locations unless engaged in loading or unloading the vehicle:
   (39) Reserved. In the fifty (50) foot space in front of the entrances to the premises at 1 Main Street.
   (40) Reserved. In the forty (40) foot pull off space on the south side of College Street just west of Lake Street.

BCO Appx C, Sec 7, No-parking areas.
No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:
   (468) Both sides of College Street from Lake Street west to its terminus, excluding the loading zone on the south side of College Street just west of Lake Street.

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this request is to allocate vehicle loading zones proximate to Union Station Train platform to accommodate the train and associated passengers and buses. This will not be removing any parking resources as these changes make use of existing loading zones and a pull off on College Street that is currently not available for any parking. This need would serve any users in the Waterfront area in need of loading/unloading.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Conclusion:
The vehicle loading zones will be used to accommodate train/bus passengers, deliveries, and any visitors to the Waterfront. The space directly in front of 1 Main St is currently in ordinance as 15 minute parking (see above), though it is currently signed and operating as a Vehicle Loading Zone. This change will allow the ordinances to match the signage and accommodate the current needs at the space. The College Street space will allow an unused space to support loading and unloading.

Public Engagement:
In preparation for the 8/24/22 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff distributed fliers to properties in the vicinity of 1 Main Street. DPW Staff received two responses. One in support and one in opposition of this proposal (see Attachment 1).

Site Map:

Attachments:
1. Public Correspondence
2. Regulation Change Form
I rent office space at 1 Main Street. I 100% support the addition of a loading zone on College Street directly west of Lake Street.
Thank you!

Hi Maddy,
I’m planning on attending the meeting, but wanted to submit this particular comment in case something comes up in my day/evening.
The spot where GMT is proposing to do its loading/unloading is currently a very busy loading zone throughout the day. It serves dozens of businesses in the Union Station Building, the Wing Building and the Cornerstone Building -- including UPS and FedEx deliveries, US mail, flower deliveries, personal business loading and unloading, etc. We are also expecting Santiago’s, the new restaurant in the Cornerstone Building, to create new demand for the loading zone, including mobility limited patron drop-offs, food and other related deliveries.
I’m not suggesting that loading and unloading not happen in front of Union Station, but I’m surprised that there’s an interest to use the existing loading zone, as the former bus stop was set slightly to the north of the spot shown on the site map, in front of the row of cars parked along Lake Street. Of course my concern is for the smooth running of businesses in Main Street Landing’s properties but, as an urban planner, this proposal makes no sense to me. For their own convenience, I don’t see a bus full of passengers waiting 30 minutes (allowed in the loading zone) while Claussens makes deliveries to both the Cornerstone Building and Union Station. Or the postal service fills up the mailboxes sitting in front of Union Station and in the Cornerstone Building. Or any of the other numerous conflicts that will surely arise if different parties are competing for the same space.

**Would it be possible to shift the loading zone back to the bus stop as it existed previously?**
The loading zone and the bus stop co-existed in the past and neither blocked the other, but there will certainly be conflicts as currently proposed.
Thanks for your time, Maddy, and for that of the Public Works Commission.
Sincerely,
Owiso
Attachment 2: Regulation Change Form
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty-Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Sec. 7 No-parking areas,
Sec. 9 Fifteen-minute parking, and
Sec 12-1 No parking except vehicles loading or unloading.

It is hereby Ordained by the City Council of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington be and hereby is amended by amending Sec. 7 No-parking areas, Sec. 9 Fifteen-minute parking, and Sec 12-1 No parking except vehicles loading or unloading, thereof to read as follows:

**Material underlined added.**

BCO Appx C, Sec 9, Fifteen-minute parking.
(a) No person shall park a vehicle longer than fifteen (15) minutes, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., Sundays and holidays excepted, in the following areas:
(1) – (20) As written.
(21) — In the two (2) parking spaces in front of the entrances to the premises at 1 Main Street. Reserved.
(22) - (126) As written.

BCO Appx C, Sec 12-1, No parking except vehicles loading or unloading.
No person shall park a vehicle at the following locations unless engaged in loading or unloading the vehicle:
(1) – (38) As written.
(39) Reserved. In the fifty (50) foot space in front of the entrances to the premises at 1 Main Street.
(40) Reserved. In the forty (40) foot pull off space on the south side of College Street just west of Lake Street.
(41)– (52) As written.

BCO Appx C, Sec 7, No-parking areas.
No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:
(1) – (467) As written.
(468) Both sides of College Street from Lake Street west to its terminus, excluding the loading zone on the south side of College Street just west of Lake Street.
(469)–(580) As written.
* Material stricken out deleted.
** Material underlined added.

Sponsor(s): Department of Public Works
Action: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
Attestation of Adoption:
________________________________
Phillip Peterson, EI
Public Works Engineer, Technical Services
Published: _______________________
Effective: ________________________
Memo

Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Beatriz Altura, Engineering Intern

CC: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

Subject: Kilburn Street Stop Sign

Staff recommends the DPW Commission adopt, see Attachment-1:

Stop sign location.

Stop signs are authorized at the following locations:

(191) At the intersection of Kilburn Street and St Paul Street causing traffic on Kilburn Street to stop.

Purpose & Need:
The purpose of this recommendation is to assign vehicular right of way at the intersection of Kilburn Street and St Paul Street. The need is to ensure good sight distance at the intersection of Kilburn Street and St Paul Street by causing traffic on Kilburn Street to stop.

Project Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established City Policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusion:

DPW Staff recommend (see Attachment 2) a stop sign on Kilburn Street at St Paul Street causing traffic on Kilburn Street to stop. The principal motivation behind this traffic regulation amendment is to accommodate for sight line issues from St Paul Street. This recommendation
also fulfills MUTCD conditions for stop signs to be placed on minor street approaches where through traffic exceeds 6,000 vehicles a day.

**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the September DPW Commission Meeting, staff placed flyers on properties along Kilburn Street and St Paul Street which are most impacted by the proposed traffic regulation change. Staff received two emails (see Attachment 3) one opposed to the recommendation, and the other supporting the recommendation.

**Attachments:**

1. Traffic regulation.
2. Site Map.
3. Public Input Correspondence.
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 3, Stop sign locations.

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 3: Stop sign locations, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 3: Stop sign locations.

(1)-(192) As written.

(193) Reserved. At the intersection of Kilburn Street and Saint Paul Street, causing traffic on Kilburn Street to stop.

(193)-(319) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec 3

08/24/2022
Dear Mr. Peterson,

I have been a tenant of Kilburn and Gates for 25 years. Never once had a long delay or a problem coming on to St. Paul Street from Kilburn Street. Totally unnecessary in my opinion.

Thank you.

Christopher J. Cain

Fri, August 12, 2022

hi peter,
	hanks for your note. i rent office space in the kilburn gates building and am in favor of a stop sign at the bottom of kilburn. i always stop anyway, before turning onto pine street, but i believe this would be helpful to other drivers, as well as to bicyclists.

thanks,
suzanne fay
Date: August 24th, 2022

To: Public Works Commission

From: Phillip Peterson E.I., Public Works Engineer

CC: Norm Baldwin P.E., City Engineer

Subject: Lavalley Lane No Parking Zone

Staff recommends the DPW Commission approve (see Attachment-1):

**No Parking Zone**

*No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:*

- On Lavalley Lane

**Purpose & Need:**
The purpose of this request is to remove parking on Lavalley Lane. This will provide an effective travel width need in the area.

**Project Checklist:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with MUTCD standards and/or established City Policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW Narrow Streets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with City plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW Narrow Streets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Public Engagement Plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These Traffic Regulation changes are defined as an INVOLVE project in the Public Engagement Plan (PEP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Conclusion:**
Due to the redevelopment of Lavalley Lane, as an interim measure, The Burlington Police Department have removed all parking on Lavalley Lane, see Attachment-2. Lavalley Lane was redeveloped to accommodate overnight storage of Amtrak on a new rail spur on the western edge of the Railyard. This redevelopment narrowed the roadway, and therefore there is no longer enough effective travel width to accommodate parking on Lavalley Lane. DPW Staff are seeking full approval from the Public Works Commission in order to properly memorize this parking prohibition in Burlington’s Traffic Regulations.
The parking prohibition on Lavalley Lane includes the elimination of the tour bus parking zone. DPW Staff have developed an interim solution. Tour buses may utilize City property just northeast of the intersection of Pine Street and Queen City Park Road. This particular parcel is part of the Champlain Parkway Project; consequently this interim measure will be beneficial for approximately the next two years. DPW Staff are working on a more permanent solution.

**Public Engagement:**
In preparation for the 8/24/2022 DPW Commission Meeting, Staff communicated directly with Vermont Rail System (VRS); as VRS is the only business in the vicinity of Lavalley Lane. Staff received (see Attachment 3) one (1) email which support the Staff recommendation.

**Attachments:**

1. Traffic regulation
2. Site Map
3. Public Input Correspondence
CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty Two

A Regulation in Relation to

Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission—
Section 7, No parking areas

Sponsor(s): Department of Public Works
Action: Approved
Date: 8/24/2022
Attestation of Adoption:

Phillip Peterson, EI
Public Works Engineer, Technical Services
Published:
Effective:

It is hereby Ordained by the Public Works Commission of the City of Burlington as follows:

That Appendix C, Rules and Regulations of the Traffic Commission, Section 7: No parking areas, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Burlington is hereby amended as follows:

Section 7: No parking areas

(1)-(242) As written.

(243) Reserved. On Lavallely Lane.

(244)-(580) As written.

** Material stricken out deleted.

*** Material underlined added.

JP/hm: BCO Appx.C, Sec 7
08/24/2022
Attachment 3:

Public input correspondence via email

Thursday, June 14, 2022

Phillip,

It was good to speak this afternoon. As I explained when we spoke, trucks delivering to the railroad (and to the wastewater plant) need every inch of Lavalley Lane, especially when there is a need to service and support railroad equipment such as Amtrak passenger trains. Allowing buses or any other vehicles to park along Lavalley creates access problems for us, and with the newly reconstructed LaValley lane there is even less space than there was before construction.

Please let me know what we can do to support City efforts to retain safe access for the railroad along this stretch. Both Chapin and Norm are familiar with the extensive process associated with reconfiguring LaValley lane. If this requires an application to the Public Works Commission we would be glad to support such an effort.

Regards,

Peter F. Young
General Counsel
Vermont Rail System