

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)

www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz

Andy Montroll, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Yves Bradley
Alexander Friend
Emily Lee
Harris Roen
Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur

Burlington Joint Planning Commission with City Council Ordinance Committee

Tuesday, February 11 2020, 6:30 P.M.

Burlington Police Department, One North Ave. Burlington, VT

Minutes

Members Present	Planning Commission: A Montroll, B Baker, H Roen, E Lee City Council Ordinance Committee: C Mason, S Bushor
Staff Present:	D White, M Tuttle, S Gustin, K Sturtevant

I. Agenda

Call to Order	Time: 6:35pm
Agenda	No change.

II. Public Forum

Name	Comment
C Campbell	Include RH in the areas without parking requirement; it is a silo that needs to be considered separately from RM and RL areas.
J Sharpe	Call to attention letter shared ahead of the meeting posted in agenda packet.
A Magyar	Applied for permit for ADU, thanked committee for addressing these barriers to make this possible.

III. Chair's Report

A Montroll	No Report
------------	-----------

IV. Director's Report

D White	Dept. head report will be in next agenda; will be out of office Week of Feb 17. M Tuttle reported ADU Public Hearing & Adoption by Council expected on Feb 18.
---------	---

V. Public Hearing: ZA-20-04 Minimum Parking

Commission held public hearing; approved motion to refer back to staff to amend parking map to include College St (Union to Williams) and incorporate TDM requirement that reflects CarShare proposal.		
Motion by: E Lee	Second by: B Baker	Vote: Approved Unanimously
Type: Public Hearing, Action	Presented by: D White	
D White Presented overview of the proposed minimum parking amendment. Slides posted online here: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas .		
The chair opened the public hearing at 6:49pm and closed it at 7:14pm, with the following Public Comments submitted:		

The City of Burlington will not tolerate unlawful harassment or discrimination on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, place of birth, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, disability, HIV positive status, crime victim status or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at (802) 540-2505.

Tuesday, February 11, 2020

- P Murphy, CarShare Vermont: Propose an amendment to the TDM requirements—a more flexible benefit for users, more predictable cost to developers by requiring a \$70/mo subsidy for persons without a parking pass. A more equitable benefit by including those that may choose to use transportation forms other than transit.
 - S Bushor asked if P. Murphy if cost assumptions were discussed with a developer and wondered about whether tying benefit to forfeiture of parking pass would incent people to drive. P Murphy responded that proposal hadn't been discussed with developers; proposed offering the benefit 2x per household, so 2-person household could have one car and one subsidy.
- J Hanson: Strongly support CarShare VT proposal as more effective, predictable, easier to administer, cheaper alternative than what has been proposed to date. Building new housing without parking will still have an impact; this helps ensure that developers manage some impact regardless of what mode of transportation is used. Takes savings from not building parking and passes it to tenant who is enabling the developers' savings by not having a car.
- A Bunsen: Support the proposed amendment due to climate emergency. City's 2030 Net Zero Energy Roadmap calls for net reduction in VMT and this is a real step in that direction.
- G Bergman: Strongly support eliminating the parking minimums along with and depending upon a strong TDM program. Support the CarShare approach because it will be more equitable and build the alternative transportation system we need.
- E Hanley: How long do property owners have to provide the incentives? Is there a limit to the number of guaranteed rides home (GRH)? Why couldn't property owners become a CATMA member and extend the benefits to tenants?
 - D White noted that CATMA and GoVermont! offer this service with no ride limit, no additional charge to property owner based on rides used. National utilization rate for GRH programs only 1%. Owner could join CATMA to comply with proposal, but not mandated.
- T Liamis: If these incentives have to be offered in perpetuity, why would anyone build anything?
- J Katz: Savings to developers by not building parking is the mechanisms that funds this. Support CarShare proposal; quells many of the committee's concerns about fixed costs for developers.
- M Kuprych: Is this required for all new development? Is there an escape clause built in as transportation costs and demands evolve, and how will this impact salability of properties under this requirement?

Committee Discussion:

- B Baker: How does the 200-ft requirement apply to a PUD or an assembly of lots with an agreement to share parking? D White noted it would apply if it were a merged lot.
- S Bushor: Concerned about Colchester Avenue not being downtown as is stated in the purpose. Concerned that someone could build a SF home without a driveway, or have an easier path to build an STR without a parking requirement, which would be detrimental to Ward 1. Concerned that this would prevent the adaptive reuse of properties in the future.
- C Mason: concern that Council won't support eliminating parking requirements for affordable housing, as it didn't get traction in the IZ Reform amendment. Concerned that CarShare proposal isn't tied to a reimbursement to verify that alternative methods are being utilized.
- E Lee: Hole in the bucket policy bucket is free parking, parking cheaper than \$70/mo. Issue isn't lack of parking, it's that there are too many cars; as long as car ownership is subsidized this problem will continue. Propose to extend the new parking district to include College St from Union to Williams, for flexibility to manage the YMCA transportation, and support CarShare proposal.
 - D White noted the corridors proposed were identified in planBTV as areas for growth, high frequency transit, and mix of uses.

- M Tuttle recommended the Commission look at zoning districts or entire areas that are appropriate to add to the district, such as all of RH, rather than individual streets.
- C Mason noted concern about adding individual streets as there are constituents on S. Champlain asking for the same change as E Lee recommended for College Street. E Lee agreed that need to look at RH holistically because it is always an outlier, but doesn't feel it would have support at this time.
- S Bushor noted her concern about including all of RH as it would permit more STRs without a parking requirement.
- D White presented data comparing costs of proposed and suggested alternative TDM approaches. Key to this proposal is to remove the parking requirement to encourage more affordable housing and create more units instead of using space for cars. In order for TDM to be utilized by a developer/owner, it needs to be a cheaper alternative than building parking.
- E Lee expressed that this analysis showed proposal has merit, but perhaps amount of subsidy needs more study.
- H Roen expressed concerns that the subsidy as proposed won't actually incent use of alternatives or directly encourage transit use. Possible to offer dollar amount or a specific mode subsidy?
- B Baker requested more information about the factors used to compare costs of TDM to parking
- A Montroll asked staff to update the draft ordinance to incorporate the CarShare concept with a recommendation on the dollar amount for the subsidy for further discussion.

VI. Proposed CDO Amendment ZA-20-05 Short Term Rentals

No Action		
Motion by:	Second by:	Vote: N/A
Type: Presentation	Presented by: S Gustin, M Tuttle	
<p>S Gustin and M Tuttle presented additional data and information for discussion regarding host-residency and housing replacement. Slides posted online here: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L Jensen: Questioned staff data regarding housing units built since 2010 and asked if City knows how many long-term housing units have been converted to short-term housing units? M Tuttle noted vast majority aren't permitted, so unknown at what time the STR use started. S Gustin noted that of those permitted, only about 2 were new units created as STRs. • T Liamis- Lack of housing in Burlington is a result of how hard it is to get a permit cost of fees in Burlington. Using STR to support the cost of long-term tenants. • M Kuprych- Hosts are waiting for clarity about permitting before registering. Use STR to support maintaining the building, experience for long term tenants, and to live and age in place personally. Support owner or host on site. STR tenants treat properties better, renters are supporting city economy and employees, showcasing the city's uniqueness. STR not the enemy. • J Sharpe- Only 0.8% of the STRs are 2-bed units. While City says host could get a permit, there are barriers for people who live off-site and would have to pay housing replacement. What is the cost to the city of HostCompliance? • E Hanley- Have units that struggle to retain long-term tenants. Don't understand what benefit there is to require host on site. Employing people to be hosts as their jobs. • D Lyons, K Cassella, L Jensen- speaking for "BTV STR Host Coalition." Propose no more work until more data collection. Should require City to work with group of STR hosts to determine what registration looks like, what data could be collected from hosts. Use model like Boston in which City only submits compliant hosts to Airbnb for listing. Need to consider impact of zoning conversion from residential to commercial. 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J Marks: Based on long-term low vacancy rate, one would assume no correlation between vacancy rate and growth of STRs. Many in attendance are the small landlords; if STRs aren't available, how will they provide long-term housing? City shouldn't reinvent the wheel, but research what other cities have done. Need more data before policy develops. • A Magyar: Support data first, and shared story about how renters supported local business. • E McArdle: Thousands of units being built in the city, and problem is city not doing anything about luxury housing developers and hotels. • S Offenartz: is there a correlation between the cost of owning property and the spike in STRs? <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S Bushor: Don't want to end STRs, not saying STR hosts are bad. Understand this is a lucrative way for people to age in place. Not just looking at present, but also impact on vacancy rate, finding balance between STR and long-term housing. • C Mason took exception to statement that City is doing nothing about housing, reminding attendees that STR is one of many policies currently under consideration, and Council just spent over a year revising Inclusionary Zoning requirements. • B Baker- a lot of the housing demand is by 25-34 year olds who wish to buy property but can't, which is consistent with national trends. • A Montroll indicated next meeting will begin with a Commission work session, with public comment to follow at the end.
--

VII. Commissioner Items

Action: N/A		
Motion: NA	Second: NA	Vote: NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint Committee will continue working STR proposals at Planning Commission's regularly scheduled meetings on February 19 and tentatively March 10 - M Tuttle updated that PC Ordinance Cmte meeting was rescheduled to Feb 20. 		

VIII. Minutes & Communications

Action: Approved the minutes and accepted the communications		
Motion by : E Lee	Second: H Roen	Vote: Approved Unanimously
Minutes Approved: Joint Committee Meeting on January 28, 2020		
Communications Filed:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written communications enclosed in packet, submitted in advance of meeting (posted online) - Additional Communications submitted by P Murphy and D Lyons during meeting 		

IX. Adjourn

Adjournment	Time: 8:57pm	
Motion: E Lee	Second: H Roen	Vote: Approved Unanimously



Signed: February 21, 2020

Andy Montroll, Chair

Respectfully submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Meagan", with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Meagan Tuttle, Comprehensive Planner