

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
Holly Ransom, Youth Member*



Burlington Planning Commission

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, March 24, 2015 - 6:30 P.M.

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

MINUTES

Present: B. Baker, A. Montroll, H. Roen, L. Buffinton, E. Lee, J. Wallace-Brodeur

Absent: Y. Bradley

I. Agenda

No changes.

II. Public Forum

No members of the public present.

III. Report of the Chair

No report.

IV. Report of the Director

The director presented the following report:

- He is just back from vacation and getting back to the swing of things. Staff continues to be busy with the Form-Based Code and the development review planners are extremely busy as well.

V. Burlington Town Center Redevelopment Process Update

N. Wildfire provided an update on the Burlington Town Center Redevelopment process. There has been a two and a half month public process so far and there is a report now ready to be shared with the consultants about what we've heard from the community.

B. Baker – Important for the commission to engage with the advisory committee.

A. Montroll – What is the role of the PC in this process?

D. White – This proposed process is loosely based on a similar process they do in Chapel Hill, NC but is adapted to Burlington. The work under way may involve change to the zoning regulations so the commission may have an important role to be play in that. Even without a zoning change, it is likely that the City Council would still want input from commission.

N. Wildfire – Very unusual process for CEDO to work with private developer.

Input so far included about 1,000 people and the following activities:

- January 8 event with 150 people in Contois with presentations and stations. All comments are online at www.burlingtonvt.gov/btvmall/, all 263 of them.
- Website
- Neighborhood Planning Assemblies Visit
- Committees (Planning Commission, Accessibility, etc.)
- Community Planning Workshop Feb 18-21 – 400 comments during that workshop, all online.

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

- Comment boxes all throughout the city at different locations – 245 comments

N. Wildfire – Provided information about what was heard with the public comments received. See report attached for a summary of comments on the following topics:

- Circulation & Mobility
- Mixes of Uses
- Public Space and Amenities
- Urban Design

L. Buffinton – North-South Connection – how many people wanted the road to be re-opened for cars?

N. Wildfire – Was really a mix.

L. Buffinton – The New England Culinary Institute (NECI) model that used to be on Church Street would be great for job training example to follow.

A. Montroll – On the mix of uses, is office also part of the conversation? If we create more housing we need to remember to provide places for people to work.

N. Wildfire – The developer is planning on having some level of office but it's also the softest place in the market and where we have the most availability.

H. Roen – Did people comments about having downtown and waterfront connections down the bluff?

N. Wildfire – That was mentioned a lot with providing connections to the waterfront, especially at the end of Cherry Street.

B. Baker – Can you talk about next steps?

N. Wildfire – The committee is taking a last crack at the report and that will go to the developer. The developer will then come back early April with a concept or narrative for feedback on the report. Then, the City's technical team will weigh in every step of the way with the developer. Then, once good draft/concept is ready, there will be another large public meeting for feedback on that. Then, we finalize the development agreement with steps that need to happen from there. They still need to go through the normal review processes.

VI. Proposed Amendments

Low Impact Development

S. Gustin – Presented the proposed Low Impact Development (LID) amendment to provide lot coverage credits or reliefs for the use of pervious pavement on a lot. This amendment is not the end all but a good start. A stormwater manual will be much better place for additional changes and incentives. This is an initial step in the right direction. Pervious surface needs to be a system that actually works and that needs to be proven to staff in order to receive credits.

L. Buffinton – Could we clarify the second paragraph and the example in there a little?

E. Lee – She has a pervious driveway and it was quite an ordeal to get put in and cost much more than a regular driveway. There is no way of knowing that people put it in. The systems take maintenance as well and that needs to be done regularly so that the systems continue to work over time.

S. Gustin – There is a procedure in place now with the stormwater planners so that when people come in for zoning permits it's being reviewed by them and the engineers need to provide their report. There is also a maintenance report requirements.

E. Lee - What are the consequences if not maintained?

S. Gustin – At that point it's a zoning violation.

A. Montroll – In a district where lot coverage is 50% already, what does this give you?

S. Gustin – Could allow someone to build an addition or a deck by removing coverage with pervious pavement.

L. Buffinton – Megan should give her feedback.

S. Gustin – Megan and the Conservation Board have given their blessing to this proposal.

On a motion by H. Roen, seconded by L. Buffinton, the Commission refers this proposed amendment to the ordinance committee for further review and consideration.

Community Garden Impact Fee

S. Gustin – City has an open space protection plan with goals which discuss where community gardens are needed within the City. The Urban Agriculture Task Force report requested incentives. If a new development provides community gardens on site, they can be managed by Parks or by the property owner but need to be open to the public at large. Providing the gardens can reduce the Parks impact fee that the developer has to pay by the same amount equal to the cost of building the gardens themselves.

L. Buffinton – We should not be dictating the width of the aisles within the gardens.

H. Roen – The width is provided between the plots not within the individual gardens themselves.

A. Montroll – Is the value of the garden the cost of installation?

S. Gustin – Correct, the impact fee reduction is the cost of installing the garden itself.

H. Roen – If someone provides these gardens they will be available for anyone?

S. Gustin – Yes.

On a motion by J. Wallace-Brodeur, seconded by A. Montroll, the Commission unanimously warned a public hearing for ZA-15-07 for April 28, 2015, as amended.

VII. Committee Reports

The joint FBC committee is meeting again on April 1st. Hopefully, the make-up of the committee will not change with the new council. The commission probably has another 8 to 9 more meetings to get through the document. We need to make sure that there is a public process.

Long Range Planning Commission – Got an update of the planBTV South End process. There is divergent of opinions on the housing question mostly, but a lot of consensus on other issues.

Ordinance Committee – There is a 15 year limitation amendment coming to the commission soon. The committee is now working on a shared parking amendment.

VIII. Commissioner Items

None.

IX. Minutes/Communications

On a motion by A. Montroll, seconded by H. Roen, the Commission unanimously accepted the communications and placed them on file.

X. Adjourn

On a motion by E. Lee, seconded by L. Buffinton, the Commission unanimously adjourned at 7:54pm.

Yves Bradley, Chair

Sandrine Thibault, Recording Secretary