

## 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](http://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, March 10, 2020, 6:30 P.M.  
Contois Auditorium, City Hall, Burlington

## Minutes

Members Present	Commission: A Montroll, Y Bradley, H Roen, J Wallace-Brodeur, A Friend, B Baker Council: C Mason, S Bushor, A Roof
Staff Present: M Tuttle, D White	

### **I. Agenda**

Call to Order	Time: 6:32pm
Agenda	Change the order of items V and VI.

### **II. Public Forum**

Name	Comment
J Hanson	For residential TDM requirements, like proposed mandatory cash-out program, but understand some pushback. Recommend requiring to pick three TDM strategies as an alternative so developers can determine what they can administer and afford.
E Hoekstra	BCA has purchased 405 Pine Street, and Redstone is guaranteeing the lease to help them financially. Want to convert the half not used by BCA to a bowling alley.

### **III. Chair's Report**

A Montroll	Executive Committee discussed major slated projects and plans, and staff capacity to carry it all out. In the past, city has used consultants which has not always been successful. Asked staff to draft a proposal from the Commission to Council and Mayor for additional staff for the department.  S Bushor noted that in the FY20 budget, the Council Board of Finance did not support a position proposed by D White due to uncertainty about the reorganization of Planning & CEDO.
------------	--

### **IV. Director's Report**

D White	Refer to Director's Report posted online.
---------	---

### **V. Proposed CDO Amendment- Bowling Alleys in ELM**

Approve the report and warn a public hearing on the amendment as drafted		
Motion by: H Roen	Second by: A Friend	Vote: Unanimously Approved
Type: Presentation, Discussion		Presented by: M Tuttle

*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.*

M Tuttle noted that the Planning Commission Ordinance Committee discussed the request to allow Bowling Alleys in the Enterprise Light Manufacturing District, including two options for how to proceed. Committee ultimately recommended a simple change to Appendix A-Use table to permit the use.

A Friend noted that the Committee also wants to advance a comprehensive review of the ELM district, but didn't want to delay this request when the timeline for review is unclear.

**VI. Proposed CDO Amendment ZA-20-04 Minimum Parking**

Approve municipal bylaw amendment report and forward amendment to Council, with staff's recommendations for the TDM section, along with the strong recommendation that the Council consider studying non-zoning TDM measures.

Motion by: Y Bradley	Second by: H Roen	Vote: 4-1 with A Friend opposed
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------

Type: Discussion, Action	Presented by: D White
--------------------------	-----------------------

D White noted that the Commission discussion in recent meetings has centered on the TDM requirements, one provided by staff and an evolving one offered by CarShare VT and others. D White offered an analysis and staff recommendation, which is to maintain the original TDM framework, but eliminate requirement for guaranteed ride home, increase transit pass subsidy from 20% to 28%, and allow participation in a TMA as an alternative. Slides are posted online: <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas>

Public Comment:

- E Farrell: Share desire to get people out of their cars. Subsidize CarShare pod at Cambrian Rise and buy tenants' memberships, but very few use it. Building a climate controlled transit shelter, bike-washing stations, just 1.1 parking spaces/unit, and studying parking utilization patterns for shared parking. Don't want to build one more space than needed, and don't want to build one less. Don't want to pay subsidies and build parking in the time when parking is still demanded by tenants.
- G Bergman: Key is to get developers to not build parking. Debate about Winooski Ave reflects what happens when little parking is built with no TDM in place, and the resulting tension around street parking. Substantial progress has occurred on this amendment, but need to move the needle further. Need to be bold about TDM, and feel the question is really about finding the right subsidy amount.
- M Furnari: Considering a project on Riverside Avenue and met with CarShare to understand their proposal. Lean toward staff proposal, but remain concerned about applying any requirement only to new development and not what is already built. Don't penalize new development; get creative about broader solutions.
- A Magyar: It is nearly impossible to get people to change. Can't take something away and force a new requirement; it won't work. Need to focus on how to encourage and reward behavior change, particularly in our winter climate.
- J Hanson: Support a comprehensive TDM/Impact Fee study, but don't want a gap between changing zoning and completion of TDM study. Developers need to account for trip generation, but in sustainable modes. Needs to be both more convenient to use alternatives and more difficult to park.
- P Murphy: Principal of induced demand in transportation planning recognizes what you build influences behavior. Can see this with the new YMCA. Cambridge is one of the most successful ordinances, and there has been both new development and reduced VMT. Purpose behind the proposed subsidy was to provide flexibility for a tenant to change behavior by any means. Strongly support move to eliminate minimum parking requirements, but staff proposed TDM requirement not enough. Based on E Farrell comments, without stronger TDM we won't achieve

Tuesday, March 10, 2020

goal of more housing with less cars. Appreciate how public comment has been incorporated and this ordinance has evolved, but stronger TDM is needed.

- E Farrell: Financing a project also affects parking, and tenants have to make the choice. In the short term, won't be able to build a project without parking, but happy to remove over time as use declines. Picking up the cost of a subsidy will make housing more expensive.
- G Bergman: E Farrell comments show why need TDM to encourage building less parking.
- P Murphy: City's current parking management plan requirements are not resulting in TDM measures. If there are staffing issues to implement these requirements, need address this.

#### Committee Comments

- S Bushor noted initial support for the CarShare proposal, but remains concerned about the cost, whether banks would support it, and whether it rewards only people without cars. Favor the staff recommendation, which is pretty strong based on public input, but shouldn't be a final step. Some of the model TDM programs mentioned re in cities with much more robust public infrastructure; don't feel Burlington/Vermont are there yet. Why not apply TDM citywide?
- C Mason noted his support the staff recommendation, and reiterated that this proposal came out of the Housing Summit despite the fact that the Committee is deep in the weeds on transportation policy outside the scope of zoning. Don't feel a year for a study is a burden if it means we will do it right.
- H Roen stated he is leaning toward the staff recommendation, and ultimately feels it makes more sense to charge for parking rather than giving a subsidy.
- J Wallace-Brodeur also noted that this started as a conversation about housing. As a person who works professionally in transportation efficiency, very excited that this includes any TDM measures because outside the normal scope of the Commission. Question is about what solution can meet multiple goals. Commission's role is to set land use policy that is going to incent certain development and behaviors. Parking minimums is one of the biggest problems and getting rid of them is long overdue. Requiring unbundled parking costs is also going to make a big difference. Worried if we go too far, may undermine the original goal of making housing more affordable. Building alternative infrastructure is critical, but zoning requirements don't build them. TDM is really hard and deserves a focused conversation. Support staff recommendation and a TDM study, and feel that the whole package is meaningful, especially when combined with other requirements.
- A Friend expressed that he wants to keep the focus on the land use issues, but feels the 28% subsidy isn't enough. Felt it is reasonable to ask for something in return for the benefit.
- Y Bradley stated the goal is to incentivize dense urban infill by eliminating parking as a burden, and that there is a difference between incentivize and disincentivize/penalize. He feels it is a myth that people in the business of building housing would be getting a favor when they're carrying a huge risk, and noted that anything that increases costs will get passed on. Urged focus on the commitment to reducing cost of housing, while the ordinance is a good first step which can be studied further.
- A Roof shared that his concern is about changing behavior at a scale and pace that is unnatural. Feels that the proposal has room to go further, but concerned that we don't know what is the point where we push too far and then housing costs goes up and how that is communicated to potential beneficiaries. Feel that it is time to move this forward.
- A Montroll noted this conversation highlights the failure of zoning to deal with this, and feels the limited applicability of this requirement will not actually improve transit, bike lanes, and apply to enough people to affect the curve of utilization and investment especially on its own. Need a tool outside of zoning that is more comprehensive and immediate than zoning. If Council delays action until a TDM study is done, don't think it will affect what happens in the city one way or the other. Remains concerned about how this is applied to non-residential uses,

Tuesday, March 10, 2020

<p>particularly creating a relationship between the building owner and businesses' employees, and if the cost of this will disincentivize people from having offices in Burlington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S Bushor asked about the timeline for the impact fee study. D White noted he has an RFP ready to release when he gets the confirmation of funding.</li> <li>• J Wallace Brodeur noted that the cost of CATMA membership is a good value for beneficiaries and lowers the potential cost being passed on.</li> </ul>
--

**VII. Commissioner Items**

Action: N/A		
Motion: NA	Second: NA	Vote: NA
- Joint Committee Meeting on Tuesday, March 24 @ Burlington City Arts, 135 Church Street		

**VIII. Minutes & Communications**

Action: Approved the minutes and accepted the communications		
Motion by: A Friend	Second: H Roen	Vote: Approved Unanimously
Minutes Approved: February 19, 2020 Joint Planning Commission & City Council Meeting		
Communications Filed:		
- Communications Enclosed in packet		

**IX. Adjourn**

Adjournment	Time: 8:28 pm	
Motion: Y Bradley	Second: A Friend	Vote: Approved Unanimously



Signed: May 21, 2020

Andy Montroll, Chair

Respectfully submitted by:



Megan Tuttle, Comprehensive Planner