AGENDA

I. Agenda

II. Public Forum See details on pg. 3 of packet for participating remotely.

III. Chair’s Report

IV. Director’s Report

V. Proposed CDO Amendment: South End Innovation District Overlay (E-ID)
   Staff will give a presentation summarizing concepts included in the draft zoning amendment, as well as a summary of public input to date. Information related to this item is in the agenda pack on page 4.
   Staff Recommendation: Ask questions and provide feedback on the proposed zoning changes outline, including on any public feedback.

VI. Committee Appointments
   Staff will provide an update to the Commission regarding DRB appointments to two Planning Commission Committees:
   - Caitlin Halpert has been nominated as the DRB representative to the Ordinance Committee
   - Brad Rabinowitz has been nominated as the DRB representative to the Long Range Planning Committee
   Planning Commission bylaws are enclosed for reference in the agenda packet on page 45.

VII. Commissioner Items

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. Written comments on items may be directed to the Planning Commission at 149 Church Street, Burlington, VT 05401, or at mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov.
a. Upcoming Meetings will be hybrid in-person/online unless otherwise noted – August 23, at 6:30 pm
b. Committee Reports

VIII. **Minutes & Communications**

a. The minutes of the July 26 meeting are enclosed in the agenda packet on page 51.
b. Communications are enclosed in the agenda packet.

IX. **Adjourn**
Guidance for Participating in a Virtual Planning Commission Meeting

As social distancing measures to preserve public health and safety continue to be required to prevent the spread of COVID-19, or are recommended as a standard practice, the Office of City Planning will be supporting the Planning Commission to conduct their meetings online via Zoom. Here is information about how to join a virtual meeting, and what to expect while participating.

General Guidance for Public Participation

Please remember that in this digital meeting environment, meetings are open to the public and anyone may be watching or listening even if you cannot see them. Meetings will be recorded, and both the recording and chat content of the meeting will be maintained as a public record.

Please ensure your display photo and screen name are professional, such as using your first and last name. Please test your audio and video prior to the start of a meeting, and familiarize yourself with how to join a meeting by your chosen method. And finally, please be patient with us. Technology doesn’t always work as planned, and we are all learning how to hold a successful virtual meeting!

How to Join a Virtual Meeting

Zoom allows participation via either computer or telephone. Each agenda for a meeting that will be conducted virtually will include details about how to join via either of these options, including a web address, phone number, Meeting ID, and password.

If you participate via computer, you have the option of seeing Commissioner videos and any presentation materials that may be shared. If you use either a standard phone or cell phone to call in, you will only hear the audio portion of the meeting. If you join via a smartphone, you may have the option to download the Zoom app, which will enable you to see and hear the meeting.

How to Participate in a Virtual Meeting

During meetings, only Planning Commission members and limited staff members will be viewed on video. Members of the public attending a meeting will be muted, except when invited to speak during public forum or a public hearing. Whether members of the public can speak at other times during the meeting is the discretion of the Chair.

If you want to speak during public forum, please take the following steps to assist us in making this process run as smoothly as possible:

- Email staff at mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov by 5pm on the day before a meeting to indicate your interest in speaking. You do not need to provide your comments. Staff will enable your microphone as your name is called from a list of interested speakers.
- During a meeting, you can use the “Raise Hand” feature, or indicate in a chat message that you wish to speak during public forum. Staff will enable your microphone as your name is called.
- If you are interested in submitting your comments in writing instead of speaking during the meeting, you may do so by 5pm the day before a meeting, they will be forwarded to the Commissioners ahead of the meeting.
Public Engagement

Introduction
The South End Innovation District is a concept generated through the planBTV: South End planning process, which included extensive public engagement. In implementing the plan’s recommendation to create the Innovation District, City staff have facilitated and participated in opportunities to engage the community on how its vision may have changed in the years subsequent to planBTV: South End’s adoption, particularly in light of the housing question and the COVID-19 pandemic. This public input summary documents feedback gathered at the following engagement events:

- Three Ward 5 NPA Meetings
- One in-person public meeting
- One virtual public meeting
- One web-based Storymap providing history, context and rationale for the District
- One web-based Miro engagement board open to the public for the month of July
- One South End Arts & Business Association Annual Meeting
- One Burlington Farmers Market
- Seven Stakeholder Advisory Group Meetings

Ward 5 NPA
City staff from the Office of City Planning, CEDO and DPW participated in three Ward 5 NPA meetings. Two of these meeting – March 17th and May 19th, featured staff presentations and an open discussion period in which NPA members commented on and asked questions about the proposed zoning amendment. A third meeting was facilitated by the NPA and was an opportunity for City staff to listen and respond to community concerns and priorities with respect to the South End as a whole, along with related infrastructure initiatives, including Champlain Parkway, the South End Multimodal Center Feasibility study, and the Barge Canal. Throughout these three NPA events, the following themes arose:

Ecology
The area’s ecology has been a primary topic at the Ward 5 NPA meetings. Specifically, many meeting participants advocated for the continued conservation of the Barge Canal. While the Barge Canal and immediately adjacent land is not within the proposed district boundary, the district’s development will impact this ecosystem. Recognizing potential impacts, multiple residents expressed a desire for the City to allow ongoing natural regeneration of the Barge Canal land and water to continue. Indeed, the Barge Canal is rich in biodiversity and key to sustaining species populations will be continuing efforts to maintain and improve water quality in the streams and wetlands that drain to the Barge Canal.

Mobility
A frequent discussion topic at NPA meetings has been how residents move through their neighborhood today and how future development may impact these travel patterns. Within the general theme of mobility, a few common community goals were expressed:

- Many residents spoke about their neighborhood’s walkability and proximity to the lake as being valued amenities. As such, multiple residents expressed a desire for future development to maintain, improve and expand upon pedestrian infrastructure, particularly that which would improve access to the lake. Meeting attendees also noted that the district is within walking distance of downtown, including the train station.
- The Harrison Avenue bike path connection at the western edge of the city-owned 68 Sears Lane parcel is a critical link for local residents to access the waterfront and bike path. Numerous Ward 5 residents expressed a desire to see this connection maintained and improved.
- Where current and future employees, residents and visitors of the Innovation District will park was a common topic. Numerous residents of the Lakeside neighborhood commented that many HULA-based workers currently park in their
neighborhood, negatively impacting parking availability and mobility for residents. Residents worried that this situation could be a harbinger of future parking problems as a result of Innovation District buildout.

**Equity**
The lack of affordable housing options in the South End was a frequent Ward 5 NPA discussion topic. Multiple residents cited the specific need for affordable housing as a current concern and a desire that the Innovation District can be a place where abundant affordable housing can be provided. One resident suggested that affordable homeownership options, in addition to rental opportunities, are in great need.

**Arts**
The South End has long been the heart of Burlington's arts community. Ward 5 NPA meeting attendees spoke of their experience as witnesses to the declining artist population and presence as a result of rising costs for housing and studio space. Residents expressed a desire to see the zoning amendment prioritize the artist community through the creation of affordable homes, studio and market opportunities.
Stakeholder Advisory Group

Beginning in April, City staff from Planning and CEDO have facilitated a series of seven meetings with advisory stakeholder group members consisting of the following:

• Leslie Avril (Champlain College)
• Sara Katz and Doreen Kraft (Burlington City Arts)
• John Caulo (representing HULA and owners of 125 Lakeside Avenue)
• Meg Hammond (Generator)
• Rick Davis (property owner)
• Steve Conant (property and business owner)
• Michael Monte (Champlain Housing Trust)
• Corrine Yonce (Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity)

As property owners, affordable housing developers, arts and economic opportunity advocates, this group represents a diverse range of interests and expertise. Over the course of three months of meetings, the following themes have emerged:

Equity
The topic of equity as it relates to housing, community services and the arts community was a frequent topic of stakeholder conversation.

• The group acknowledged that residential uses would likely produce more revenue for property owners than uses associated with arts, making and manufacturing. As such, the group agreed that residential uses should only be permitted in new construction, as a way to facilitate the continued affordability of existing non-residential space in the Innovation District.
• Also related to housing, the group discussed at length the City’s Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) standards. Some advocated for a higher inclusionary zoning requirement, while some expressed a desire for a multi-tiered approach that could provide affordable housing at multiple income levels, including levels that may not be directly encouraged by the City’s IZ ordinance.
• Recognizing that the Innovation District will be home to hundreds of households in addition to being a new community and commercial hub of the South End, stakeholders expressed a desire to see care work services such as childcare and elderly care prioritized within the zoning amendment.

Public Realm
Stakeholders discussed a shared goal that the district should be a car-light neighborhood with ample shared community amenities, including parks, plazas and play spaces. To advance this shared goal, City Planning staff has facilitated ongoing infrastructure coordination discussions with colleagues from Department of Public Works.

Public Meetings
Office of City Planning staff facilitated two public meetings and one extended web-based engagement site. The in-person public meeting was held on June 29th at Generator within the proposed Innovation District boundary. Around 20 members of the public attended the meeting and took part in a series of activities meant to gather input on the district boundary, land use, district scale and urban form and the character of the district’s public spaces and streets. One week later, staff facilitated a virtual public meeting on Zoom that included a facilitated online engagement board that replicated the previous week’s in-person activities. Subsequent to the virtual meeting, the online Miro engagement tool remained open for the month of July, during which time many Burlington and area residents provided input. City Planning staff collected input at two additional public events: the July 16th Farmers Market and the July 20th SEABA Annual Meeting. City Planning staff collected input at the Burlington Farmers Market. For members of the public who were unable to attend any of the in-person meetings and for whom the Miro board was inaccessible, City staff produced physical, take-home engagement materials and offered one-on-one assistance. The summary of input collected across these public engagement opportunities is provided below and grouped according to themes.
Engagement Activities and What We Heard

To facilitate dialogue throughout these public engagement events, City staff created four activities, each of which addressed a unique planning concept related to the proposed zoning amendment:

**District Boundary:**
The proposed South End Innovation District boundary includes an area at the core of today's Enterprise – Light Manufacturing District (E-LM). The vast majority of the land within the proposed boundary is composed of vacant land or large surface parking lots. While this proposed boundary has been the focus of work to date, the boundary remains subject to approval by the Planning Commission, City Council and Mayor. As such, staff has asked members of the public for their opinion on how large – or small – the district should be. Using thread and sticker dots, meeting participants were able to suggest which properties should or should not be included in the boundary. Central to this activity has been a discussion, facilitated by city staff, regarding the likelihood that allowing residential uses on land currently used for arts, making, manufacturing or other local businesses, could compromise the sustainability of such uses, given the higher rents and land value generated by residences relative to non-residential uses.

**What We Heard:**
The complex nature of the boundary discussion unsurprisingly produced a range of opinions. Artists and arts community advocates generally advocate for the existing working boundary that consists mostly surface parking and vacant lots. They argue that expanding the District and allowing residential uses in more places could exacerbate a troubling trend that has seen artists pushed out of the South End due to lack of affordable studio and market space.
Land Use:
A primary task of the community and staff in crafting the South End Innovation District is the regulation of what uses or activities will be permitted. To that end, staff created a pair of image-rich boards that asked meeting participants what types of land uses – businesses, activities, community services, and amenities, they would like to see in the district. Using color-coded stickers, participants were asked to prioritize types of uses. The boards also included space for post-it note comments so participants could elaborate on their input.

What We Heard
Urban Convenience
Voting and comments show strong support for a district that provides the range of services and businesses that people need to live a car-light (or car-free) lifestyle.

Local Economy
Unsurprisingly, the “art and making” uses received the strongest support in the ranked sticker exercise. Facilitating the sustainability and growth of the arts and maker community should be a focus of the zoning amendment and development according to participants. Of note, residents expressed strong opposition to hotels and other tourism-focused amenities.

“Just a note as it relates to art spaces - I would say the highest priority for me would be inexpensive studios that could allow someone to get their business off the ground! It took me two years to turn a profit, and it takes time to learn ow to make things work. I would say $300-500 a month for a 15x15 studio... something like that. High prices are going to keep artists out.”

“An overlay that allows residential development across the Enterprise-Light Manufacturing District is not favorable.”

“No hotels. Hotels will encourage gentrification towards tourist-friendly retail/restaurants, and that honestly has very little crossover with what I as a current resident/worker/make need more of in this City. Keep the hotels and tourism in Downtown.”

“Uses should serve the neighborhood and south end rather than be regional draws like entertainment and hotels”

“Having a mix of both businesses and residential creates an accessible and close- knit community. Good for growing Burlington economically.”

“Burlington over the years has definitely started to become more gentrified, making this new district should reflect local values, ideals, and wants while making it green and sustainable.”
**Buildings and District Scale:**
Using the same sticker and comment approach as the land use activity, meeting participants were asked to rank and comment on three questions related to the scale, type and ground-floor activity of the district’s buildings. The scale board asked how tall buildings should be allowed to rise. The housing types board presented participants with a range of housing types, including low-scale rowhouses, medium-sized apartments to full-block apartments. The third board asked participants whether buildings should be required to include space for commercial and community activities (e.g. shops, restaurants, and services such as childcare or small medical clinics).

**What We Heard**

**Height**
Building height preference is a topic that produces a range of opinions. However, the ranked sticker exercise shows a strong preference for a mix of building heights (4/6/8 stories). Advocates of taller buildings acknowledge a need for open spaces to balance the district’s scale, but also support the density and activity such buildings can bring. Advocates of shorter buildings prefer a district that is less in contrast with existing buildings in the South End and that preserve lake views.

> “Having views of the water is one of the best things about living in the South End. Don’t take that away.”

> “A mix (of building heights) but with shorter buildings closer to the lake to maintain the view as much as possible.”

> “We need density! Build up as much as possible.”

> “This area could be a great example of buildings of mixed height which act visual interest to the area.”

> “A variety always makes for the best urbanism.”

> “Include option for mix of building sizes midsize + triplex/quad + town/rowhouse etc.”

> “Maximize possible development density, particularly for housing opportunities. Encourage buildings which break down scale to not be the size of full city blocks.”
Landscape
The Innovation District will be the densest area within the South End. Participants commented that the scale of buildings will require careful attention to guarantee visual and physical connections from adjacent neighborhoods, as well as generous open spaces.

“Provide plenty of natural landscape between/throughout with bike lanes and walking paths. blend with appropriate parking.”

“Maximize possible development density, particularly for housing opportunities. Encourage buildings which break down scale to not be the size of full city blocks.”

Street Life
Voting and comments related to the way buildings’ ground floors should be regulated and designed show a desire for an active, pedestrian-based street life with many shops and services. However, there is some concern that commercial tenants may be difficult to find if shops and other non-residential uses are required on the ground floor.

“Would love to have full retail, but would be concerned that development wouldn’t be able to find commercial tenants.”

“Having a mix of both businesses and residential creates an accessible and close-knit community. Good for growing Burlington economically.”

Public Realm Character:
Again, using the same sticker and comment approach as the two previous examples, participants were asked to provide input on their vision for the district’s public realm, including its streets, parks and the way in which it should integrate the Champlain Parkway into its urban landscape. While the zoning amendment does not contemplate requiring a specific design character, this input will help staff determine how much space should be allocated to different ways of moving around (e.g. walking, wheeling or biking), and pervious surfaces, or those that can soak up water and thus take strain off of the area’s water bodies and infrastructure.

What We Heard
Cars + Parking
The ranked sticker exercise and written comments show a clear desire to create a district where streets and paths are accessible to all ages and abilities and where driving is limited to only necessary trips. In line with preferences for a “car-light” district, participants commented that parking should neither exist on-street nor within lots or structures in the district’s interior, but rather should be located at the district’s edge to encourage walking within.

“Have a Church Street-like area without fear of cars, but need to balance serving new buildings. Maybe mixed use based on times of the day, with parking outside of the area for walking within.”
Economy
A few participants provided economic rationale beyond safety and the climate imperative in their support for a car-free district, noting Burlington's limited land supply, the high cost of car infrastructure and the vitality that dense, walkable neighborhoods can support.

Open Space
Consistent with a common desire for human-scaled streets, a few comments expressed a preference for small open spaces well-integrated into the districts buildings and street and path network, rather than large "campus-like" open spaces.

Heritage: Like years of public input into planBTV: South End demonstrated, Burlington residents support a strong arts and enterprise presence and character in the South End.

“Combo of green infrastructure & art & creativity spaces.”

“Look at the heritage and see if we can do something interesting if there is something to work with.”
South End Innovation District

Planning Commission Update and Public Engagement Summary

Meagan Tuttle, Director of Planning
Charles Dillard, Principal Planner
Sarah Morgan, Planner
August 9, 2022
Key Question

How can large surface parking lots and other underutilized sites on and near Lakeside Avenue be re-envisioned to:

- Become vibrant places that enhance and preserve South End identity
- Create new space for makers, jobs, and even homes
- Increase the area’s environmental and economic resilience
Innovation District

Roughly Howard St. to Sears Ln. west of Pine Street

Focus on properties with large surface parking lots, other underdeveloped areas

*planBTV: South End* identified as the heart of an “Innovation District”
Innovation District and planBTV: South End

“I think that the area around Lakeside has a lot of potential for development (big parking lot) and housing should be allowed there, but always as part of a mixed-use building, on top of some commercial uses, like a grocery store for example.” COMMUNITY COMMENT FROM WEBTOOL

Transform surface parking and underutilized sites and expand connectivity to create a walkable, mixed-use innovation hub for businesses and maker activities. Incorporate parking in shared structures, new pocket parks and plazas, a “green corridor” along both sides of the Champlain Parkway, and better link Pine Street to the Lake.
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October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

ELM
1 large district

Concept
3-6 sub-districts
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

1 - Arts District - a “see-it-made destination” celebrating the creation of craftsman/artisan-scale products and the creative arts.
   - A “fine-tuning” of the current zoning with a broader range of uses

2 - Innovation District – a new mixed-use employment center focused on incubating and growing emerging technologies, science, R&D, tech-transfer, manufacturing, and innovation.
   - An opportunity to facilitate the redevelopment of brownfield sites and large surface parking lots.

3 - Light Manufacturing District – a reserve for traditional scale and format of manufacturing, value-added, production, warehouse, shipping, etc.
   - Also just a “fine-tuning” of the current zoning with a narrower range of uses
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

4 – Enterprise – Railyard - Uses restricted to railroad operations, intermodal transfer and limited storage of freight/materials
  • Is this a stand-alone zone or just part of E-LM?

5 – Enterprise – Pine Street
  • Light manufacturing, outdoor storage, vehicular service
  • Neighborhood-oriented and scaled retail, hospitality and services with size limits
  • Small-scale (<8k sq ft) and affordable spaces are preferred and protected
  • No housing – so not NAC?

6 – Enterprise – Flynn Avenue
  • Research & Development, Labs, Technical Office
  • traditional scale and format of manufacturing, value-added, production, warehouse, shipping, etc.
  • Accessory retail and hospitality with size limits
  • No housing – so not NAC?
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

• Discussion points
  • Boundary – Focus on surface parking and excluding Pine St.
  • The District should include elements of a form code, but not be too prescriptive
  • Housing
    • Strong demand and feasible
    • Primary vs. supportive use?
    • New buildings only or allow retrofit of existing commercial/industrial?
  • Office
    • Strong South End office market
    • Is new office space feasible?
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

- Two part Zoning Amendment Process
  1. Amendment for South End Innovation District (2022)
  2. Separate Amendment(s) for remaining portions of EL-M
Innovation District =

planBTV: South End

Housing as a Human Right Action Plan

Net New Residential Units
Goal: 1,250 New Residential Units by 2026

- Actual
- Estimated
- Future Market Rate
- Future Affordable
Innovation District Intent

• An evolving, vibrant urban district

• A mix of uses and building scales and types

• A place for hundreds of new homes and neighbors

• A district where arts, light manufacturing and office coexist in harmony with new residents

• A 21st century district that limits emissions, cleans our water, and fosters a healthy ecosystem
Public Engagement Summary

• Three Ward 5 NPA Meetings
• 7 Stakeholder meetings (property owners, arts/maker reps)
• One in-person public meeting
• One virtual public meeting
• One ongoing Storymap
• One ongoing Miro engagement board
Ward 5 NPA

• March 17th, May 19th and June 16th

• Barge Canal
  • Support for allowing natural regeneration of site

• Champlain Parkway
  • Concern that it will perpetuate car-dependency

• Housing
  • Increasing support but focus on equity

• South End Multimodal Center Feasibility Study
Public Meetings

- June 29th @ Generator
  - 20 Attendees
- July 7th on Zoom
  - 25 Attendees (63 Registered)

Four Themes:
1. Land Use
2. District Scale
3. Public Realm
4. District Boundary
CHARACTER OF PUBLIC SPACES

USE TYPES

WHAT SHOULD THE SOUTH END INNOVATION DISTRICT DO?
WHAT’S IMPORTANT TO YOU IN A NEIGHBORHOOD?
TAKE A SET OF STICKERS

○ IS A HIGH PRIORITY FOR YOU
○ IS A MEDIUM PRIORITY FOR YOU
○ IS A LOW PRIORITY FOR YOU
○ IS NOT A PRIORITY FOR YOU

PUT A ★ STICKER ON A PARTICULAR USE THAT YOU’D LOVE TO SEE IN THE INNOVATION DISTRICT

HAVE OTHER IDEAS? SHARE A NOTE WITH US!

Streetscapes - HOW DO YOU WANT TO MOVE?
Below are four examples of streetscapes that could be developed in the Innovation District, each with varying amounts of pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle interaction. What type do you prefer?

Public Space Design - WHERE DO YOU FEEL INSPIRED?
What do you want the character of public spaces in the Innovation District to be? Below are four examples - use your stickers to decide what you want public spaces to prioritize.

Champlain Parkway Public Realm
Below are examples of the different ways that Champlain Parkway can coincide with the Innovation District. How do you imagine the edges along the corridor to look?
Innovation District Storymap

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/a2c763fcba5a4aaab2b6a7df2dc8a2bc?item=1

About the South End Innovation District

The City of Burlington Office of City Planning
Innovation District – Land Use

- Residential uses we are considering:
  - Attached, multi-family dwellings only
  - Other residential uses may be considered on a limited basis (e.g. co-housing, assisted living, group homes)
Non-Residential Uses we are considering:

- Art Gallery/Studio
- Light Manufacturing
- Office
- Community (e.g. library, community center, etc.)
- Childcare
- Other uses supportive of dense, residential districts (e.g. café, small retail establishments, medical/dental clinic)
- Retail uses should feature goods/services produced in the district
Innovation District – Land Uses

- Uses we are considering not permitting or strongly considering how to limit:
  - Single Detached Dwellings
  - Hotel
  - Heavy Manufacturing
  - Large format retail
  - Auto-oriented uses
“Hard to enforce this in zoning laws, but: diverse retail is great, but the way it has gentrified on Church Street in the last ~5 years is an example of what not to do. Church street has lost most of its retail appeal for me as a local, and feels almost strictly for tourists now.”

“Keep the hotels and tourism in Downtown.”

“How do we keep ownership (and hence, decision making) diversified and local?”
Innovation District – Urban Form

- Buildings should be close to streets, paths and open spaces
“Shared roads that have through-access for deliveries and emergency vehicles when needed is great, but the streets should be lowest speed (and no street parking) to discourage any automobiles that don’t “need” to be there.”

“Parking outside of the area for walking within.”

“Love the idea of pocket parks - can be small but areas for shelter from heat of Pine St.”

“Prefer more "urban jungle" than "urban meadow". (See parts of Portland, OR for reference)”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• Buildings should include active frontages – shops or other community uses along Pine Street, Lakeside Ave., Sears Ln., Champlain Parkway, and new internal streets.
“Ground floor commercial space makes "where you live" much easier to also be "where you shop/go to the doctor/drop kids at daycare."

“Would love to have full retail, but would be concerned that development wouldn’t be able to find commercial tenants."

“Residential on the ground floor could be great, but would prefer if it is not at grade.”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should include a mixture of attached and detached buildings
Innovation District – Urban Form

- The District should include large, medium and small buildings, from one story up to six or eight
Innovation District – Urban Form

6 Stories

Mix of Stories
“Provide plenty of natural landscape between/throughout with bike lanes and walking paths. Blend with appropriate parking.”

“Mix of 4 & 6, 8 is too high.”

“If people want the end result to be a "mix", perhaps the best policy is to allow 8 in the zoning, and allow for natural variation to provide the mix. "Preferred outcome" should not necessarily be "the rule."

“Include option for mix of building sizes - midsize + triplex/quad + town/rowhouse etc.”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should include publicly accessible open spaces and paths for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should be ecologically harmonious and include green stormwater infrastructure
Next Steps

• August – Draft zoning amendment to Planning Commission
• Additional engagement events TBD
• End of year - adoption
BYLAWS OF THE
BURLINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION

(A) Establishment of Bylaws

The Bylaws of the Burlington Planning Commission, hereafter referred to as the "Commission," are hereby established pursuant to 24 V.S.A. S. 4323 (C) and Sec. 2.2.2 of the Burlington Comprehensive Development Ordinance. These bylaws shall be effective from the date of adoption, and may be amended from time to time by a two-thirds vote of the Commission.

(B) Membership

In accordance with 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117 and Sec. 120 of the Burlington City Charter, the Commission shall consist of seven (7) residents of the City of Burlington appointed by the City Council. Any appointment to the Commission shall be for a term of three (3) consecutive years. Members may be appointed to successive terms without limitation. Any member desiring reappointment, or city resident desiring an appointment to the Commission, must apply to the City Clerk’s office and obtain a nomination from a member of the City Council.

(C) Vacancies/Removal

Vacancies shall be filled by the City Council upon the expiration of such term or an unexpired portion of any term. Any member of the Commission may be removed at any time by unanimous vote of the City Council.

(D) Abstentions from Participation and Voting

In order to secure, protect, and preserve the highest level of public trust in the deliberation and decision of the Burlington Planning Commission, it is incumbent upon each member not only to scrupulously avoid any act which constitutes a conflict of interest established in law, but also to avoid any act which gives the appearance of bias, favoritism, or of interest.

(1) A member shall withdraw from all participation, including all formal and informal discussion and voting, in any deliberation of the Commission or its committees or any issue upon declaration of a conflict of interest or upon the assertion that there is a reasonable public presumption that bias, favoritism, or a conflict of interest may exist. Circumstances under which this provision shall be exercised include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) If the member has a direct or indirect financial interest in the outcome of the matter at issue. A direct financial interest shall include, but not be limited to, circumstances in which the member is an applicant, a provider of professional or business service to the applicant, serves on the board of directors, or receives any form of remuneration or benefit from the applicant. Indirect financial interest shall include, but is not limited to, if an immediate family relative or close personal friend has, or is likely to have, a direct financial interest in the outcome of the matter; or

(b) If the matter at issue involves the member's own official conduct; or

(c) If participation in the matter might violate the letter or spirit of a member's code of professional responsibility; or

(d) If a member has such close personal ties to the applicant that the member cannot reasonably be expected to exercise sound judgment in the public interest.

[As amended: November 7, 2002]
(G) **Offices**

At the first meeting in July of each year, the Planning Commission shall elect, by majority vote, a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from among its members, and shall also elect a Clerk who may or may not be a Commission member or municipal employee. Terms of office shall be for one year. Vacancies in these offices may be filled for the unexpired terms only by majority vote of the Commission.

(H) **Committees**

1. **Standing Committees**

There shall be three standing committees of the Planning Commission: Executive, Ordinance, and Long Range Planning. Membership comes from those serving on the Planning Commission, the Development Review Board, the Design Advisory Board and/or Conservation Board. With the exception of the Executive Committee, each standing committee shall be composed of a minimum of three (3) persons with a maximum of five (5) persons, of which three (3) must be members of the Commission. The Commission Chairperson may not serve, as the Committee Chairperson for either the Ordinance Committee or Long Range Planning Committee. Each standing committee shall report on its activities and/or recommendations within its purview to the full Commission for its disposition at each Commission meeting. Except as noted, the establishment of standing committees does not constitute a delegation of any responsibility of the full Commission, which retains the exclusive agency for the City under law and ordinance.

1) **Executive:** The Executive Committee shall be composed of three members consisting of the Commission Chairperson, who shall serve ex-officio as Chairperson of the Committee; the Commission Vice-Chairperson, who shall serve ex-officio as Vice-Chairperson of the Committee; and a Planning Commissioner selected at-large by the Commission at its organizational meeting. The duties and functions of the Committee shall be as follows:

i. Appointment of standing committees and ad hoc committees including chairpersons unless noted otherwise herein, and appointment of special liaisons as the Commission shall establish, and oversight of committees and liaisons;

ii. Oversight, including preparation of the annual department budget; supervision and the annual review of the department director; such other tasks as the Commission shall assign.

iii. Relationship of the department and Commission to city, regional, and state departments and commissions, including scheduling of special work sessions as necessary;

iv. Commission bylaw revisions and amendments;

v. Oversight of all contracts as the Commission or department shall enter into or be delegated responsibility for;

2) **Ordinance:** The Ordinance Committee shall have at least four (4) and no more than five (5) members. Members may be appointed from the following: one (1) member each from the Development Review Board, the Design Advisory Board, or the Conservation Board, in addition to one (1) member from the Planning Commission Executive Committee, and two (2) at-large of the Planning Commission elected by the Commission at its organizational meeting. The chairs of the Development Review Board, Design Advisory Board or the Conservation Board may appoint a member of their board to serve on the Ordinance Committee. If all boards appoint a member the Planning Commission, by election at its organizational meeting will confirm which appointee(s) will serve on the Ordinance Committee. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Ordinance Committee shall be elected by a majority of committee members. The duties and functions of the Committee shall be as follows:
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i. Preparing and reviewing all revisions of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, Official Map and the Zoning Map;

ii. The enforcement of the zoning and subdivision ordinances and the zoning map, and;

iii. Such other tasks as the Commission shall assign.

3) Long Range Planning: The Long Range Planning Committee shall have at least four (4) and no more than five (5) members including one (1) member from the Development Review Board appointed by the Board’s Chairperson. The Committee shall have one member from the Executive Committee, and two (2) at-large members of the Planning Commission elected by the Commission at its organizational meeting. The chair of the Design Advisory Board or the Conservation Board may appoint a member of their board to serve on the Long Range Planning Committee. If both boards appoint a member the Planning Commission will decide which appointee(s) will serve on the Long Range Planning Committee. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Long Range Planning Committee shall be elected by a majority of committee members. The duties and functions of the Committee shall be as follows:

i. The development of an implementation plan for the Municipal Development Plan.

ii. Develop a process with a budget for each eight year revision to the Municipal Development Plan;

iii. Review plans of other departments and the regional planning commission and provide comments to the Planning Commission; and

iv. Such other tasks as the Planning Commission shall assign.

2. Ad hoc Committees and Commission Liaisons:

From time to time ad hoc committees and commission liaisons may be established by the Commission for special assignments that do not fall within the general purview of standing committees.

3. Committee Meetings:

When appropriate, standing committees should have regularly scheduled meeting times. All committee activity should be ratified by vote of the committee before presentation to the Commission. All substantive actions of the committees should be recorded in the written minutes kept current by the committee chairperson or designee. At the request of the committee chairperson, a committee meeting shall be taped.

(I) Annual Work Plans

The Planning Commission and each of the standing committees shall set work plans every year. These work plans shall be reviewed periodically. The schedule for work plans and their evaluation follows:

May: Each standing committee evaluates the extent to which it fulfilled its old work plan and a brief (1-2 page) evaluation report is written and submitted to P.C. in time to be part of the packet for the first P.C. meeting in June.

June: Standing committee work plans are evaluated by the P.C. at the first meeting. Feedback for recognition, encouragement and improvement is provided.

Standing committee work plans end at the end of the month.

The work plan for the following year (July – June) is written during June and early July. It is submitted to P.C. in time to be part of the packet for the first P.C. meeting in July.
July: New work plans are discussed, modified if necessary, and approved by the P.C. at the first meeting of the P.C. New work plans begin in July and run through June.

(J) Powers and Duties
In accordance with 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, and the Burlington Code of Ordinances, the Burlington Planning Commission:

(1) Shall prepare a Municipal Development Plan and amendment thereof for consideration by the City Council and to review any amendments thereof initiated by others as set forth in 24 V.S.A. 4384;

(2) Shall prepare and present to the City Council, from time to time, proposed bylaws and make recommendations to the City Council on proposed amendments to such bylaws;

(3) Shall undertake studies and make recommendations on matters of land development, urban renewal, transportation, economy, and social development, urban beautification and design improvements, historic and scenic preservation, the conservation of energy, and the development of renewable energy resources;

(4) Shall prepare and present to the City Council recommended construction specifications for streets and related public improvements pertaining to subdivision development;

(5) Shall prepare and present to the City Council a recommended annual capital budget and future capital programs for a period of not less than five (5) years;

(6) Shall hold public meetings;

(7) Shall undertake comprehensive planning, which may include related preliminary planning and engineering studies;

(8) Shall prepare and present to the City Council, from time to time, recommended fees for the administration of zoning and subdivision regulations;

(9) Perform such other acts or functions as it may deem necessary or appropriate to fulfill the duties and obligations imposed by, and consistent with, the intent and purpose of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117 and the Burlington Code of Ordinances.

(10) May require from other departments and agencies of the City such available information as it relates to the work of the Planning Commission;

(11) May, in the performance of its functions, enter upon land to make examinations and surveys;

(12) May participate in a regional planning program;

(13) May retain staff and consultant assistance in carrying out its duties and powers.

(K) Meetings/Minutes
Meetings of the Planning Commission shall be held at the call of the Chairperson on the second and fourth
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Tuesday of each month unless otherwise determined by majority vote of the Commission. The Chairperson may also call special meetings of the Commission. All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public, except as provided by law. The Commission shall keep minutes of every regular or special meeting. The minutes shall include, but not be limited to, the names of the persons appearing and addressing the Commission, any action taken by the Commission, the findings, if any, made by the Commission and reasons thereof. The minutes shall, thereafter, be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the office of the Administrative Officer. Any interested party shall have the right to a reproduction of the minutes in an amount sufficient to cover the costs of such reproduction.

(L) Notice

No regular or special meeting of the Commission shall be held without providing at least twenty-four (24) hours written notice to the City Clerk. Public hearings shall require no less than fifteen (15) days prior notice including advertising in a newspaper of general publication within the City and posting on the City Hall community board(s).

(M) Quorum

For the conduct of any meeting or hearing and the taking of any action, a quorum shall be no less than a majority of the members of the Commission and any action thereof shall be taken by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(N) Public Hearing

Prior to Planning Commission action on the adoption of any amendment to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulation, Official Map, or Municipal Development Plan, a public hearing shall be held by the Planning Commission after public notice.

(O) Ex-Officio Member

The Mayor of the City of Burlington shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Commission.

(P) Special Meetings

Special meetings of the Commission may be called by the Chairperson, when he or she deems it expedient, or upon the request of two (2) members of the Commission for the purpose of transacting any business designated in the call. Notice to each member of the Commission for a Special Meeting may be by telephone or otherwise at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the date of such special meeting. At such special meeting, no business shall be considered other than specified in the call. Additionally, if more than three (3) members of the Commission participate in a meeting with staff, conduct a site visit, or participate in other activities related to the responsibilities of the Planning Commission outside of a regular meeting, the gathering must be warned as a special meeting with proper notice given.

(Q) Governance Procedures

Robert’s Rules of Order, as revised, shall govern proceedings of the Commission in all cases which are not specifically covered by other laws, ordinances, bylaws, or regulations.

History:

Established: June 26, 1986
Amended: October 10, 1991
Amended: February 12, 1998
Amended: May 10, 2001
Amended: November 7, 2002
Amended: October 14, 2003
Amended: July 10, 2008
Amended: October 12, 2016
Members Present | A Montroll, B. Baker, E. Lee, M. Gaughan, A. Friend
--- | ---
Staff Present | M. Tuttle, C. Dillard, S. Morgan
Public Attendance | B. Headrick, A. Magyar, S. Bushor

I. **Agenda**

| Call to Order | Time: 6:35pm |
--- | ---
| Agenda | The agenda states the appointment of Commission Clerk as Charles Dillard, but that should read Bridget O’Keefe. PC will consider a new Agenda Item – ZA-22-08 - Short Term Rentals to provide update on City Council action and to warn a Public Hearing. PC will also defer discussion on Trinity Campus to the next meeting.

II. **Public Forum**

| Name(s) | Comment |
--- | ---
| S. Bushor | S. Bushor spoke to the Trinity Campus Rezoning. She highlighted points in her communication to the Commission such as a request for a site visit and to consider that Redstone Campus is not a good comparison to Trinity Campus. |
| A. Magyar | A. Magyar spoke on short term rentals as she is someone who has a B&B permit. She asked for clarification on the yearly process to register a short term rental. |
| B. Headrick | B. Headrick spoke on the cottages at Trinity Campus. She recommended UVM bring forward a development plan for those cottages. She asked the Commission to reconsider commercial use on Trinity Campus, especially buildings that may be accessible from the street. She also asked that if commercial use is allowed on campus, those businesses should be taxed as if they are off-campus spaces. She recommended parking for Trinity Campus be structured parking at the Giffords lot. |

III. **Chair’s Report**

| A. Montroll | No report. |

IV. **Director’s Report**

| M. Tuttle | M. Tuttle pointed out that a revised agenda packet was sent to the Commissioners with updated correspondence. There is a ribbon cutting ceremony at Union Station on Friday, 7/29, to celebrate the return of the Burlington to New York City Amtrak. |

*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.*
The Planning Department is hosting a movie night, in partnership with BCA, in City Hall Park on August 11. There will be a showing of the documentary, *Owned*.

The Short Term Rental Ordinance will go into effect next week.

City Council voted to warn the Maximum Parking and Change Management Amendment, which will go to a public hearing on August 15. City Council will also hold public hearings on the BHS Amendment and Steep Slopes Amendment.

The Planning Department is meeting with CEDO and Scott Gustin to discuss Inclusionary Zoning.

V. **Public Hearing: ZA-22-08 Short Term Rental**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve ZA-22-08 and refer to City Council with the recommendation to adopt the resolution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: A. Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Motion to Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction:**
- S. Gustin explained that the Short Term Rental Amendment expired. City Council had one year to act on the Planning Commission’s recommendation to adopt the amendment and that has since lapsed. City staff adjusted the language, but much of the ordinance has stayed the same.

The chair held a public hearing with the following public comments:
- No public comment.

**Commissioner discussion:**
- A. Montroll clarified that these zoning changes are, essentially, what was presented before with a difference in the language in chapter 18.
- Though it is rare that amendments expire, this is not the first time it has happened.

VI. **Public Hearing: ZA-22-09 Public Art**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve ZA-22-09 and refer to City Council with the recommendation to adopt the resolution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: E. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Move to Council and adopt report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction:**
- C. Dillard explained that when the Downtown Form Code was adopted the regulating language on public art was removed. This zoning amendment both defines public art and prescribes standards on its display and direction.
- Planning Department staff added legal language regarding art on private property and added that public art that does not meet the standards should not be constructed. Section 19 b. notes that public art shall not be discriminatory or incite hate.

The chair held a public hearing with the following public comments:
- No public comment.

**Commissioner discussion:**
- Immediate motion to approve. No Commissioner discussion.

VI. **Proposed ZA-22-05 Burlington High School Zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve the amended by-law report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: M. Gaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Motion to pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction:
M. Tuttle provided background on the work that has been done so far to change the Burlington High School zoning from an RCO district to an Institutional district. The City Council Ordinance Committee recently discussed the appropriate parking district for BHS. Currently, it is zoned as a neighborhood parking district but the Ordinance Committee decided a multimodal mixed use parking district is more appropriate. This has the most restricted maximum parking limits.

When City Council makes changes to a zoning amendment, it comes back to the Planning Commission so the Commission is aware and has an opportunity to comment.

Public Comment:
- S. Bushor commented that she was concerned over the reduction in parking for athletic events. She was concerned that this could affect BHS’s ability to host large events.

Commission Discussion:
- M. Gaughan asked what the net change in parking spaces is between a neighborhood parking district and a multimodal mixed use parking district.
- This change reduces the number of maximum allowed parking spaces from 720 to 400. The School District did express concern on this change as it relates to special event parking. The Ordinance Committee heard these concerns and determined that the TDM process and waivers could ultimately provide the School District enough parking flexibility.
- S. Gustin pointed out a typo in the proposed language.
- M. Gaughan expressed that it is difficult to comment on this change without understanding the capacity of the new auditorium, capacity for sports events, etc.
- E. Lee offered that shuttling services or shared parking services could accommodate large events hosted at BHS. She expressed concern that large surface parking lots affect the City’s storm water.
- A cap at 400 maximum allowed parking spots covers parking for faculty, staff, and the student body. The School District did not present the Ordinance Committee with a specific number of spots needed for special events or a number of events expected per year.

VII. Proposed ZA-22-05 Burlington High School Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve the amended by-law report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: M. Gaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Motion to pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction:
M. Tuttle provided background on the work that has been done so far to change the Burlington High School zoning from an RCO district to an Institutional district. The City Council Ordinance Committee recently discussed the appropriate parking district for BHS. Currently, it is zoned as a neighborhood parking district but the Ordinance Committee decided a multimodal mixed use parking district is more appropriate. This has the most restricted maximum parking limits.

When City Council makes changes to a zoning amendment, it comes back to the Planning Commission so the Commission is aware and has an opportunity to comment.

Public Comment:
- S. Bushor commented that she was concerned over the reduction in parking for athletic events. She was concerned that this could affect BHS’s ability to host large events.

Commission Discussion:
- M. Gaughan asked what the net change in parking spaces is between a neighborhood parking district and a multimodal mixed use parking district.
- This change reduces the number of maximum allowed parking spaces from 720 to 400. The School District did express concern on this change as it relates to special event parking. The Ordinance Committee heard these concerns and determined that the TDM process and waivers could ultimately provide the School District enough parking flexibility.
S. Gustin pointed out a typo in the proposed language.
M. Gaughan expressed that it is difficult to comment on this change without understanding the capacity of the new auditorium, capacity for sports events, etc.
E. Lee offered that shuttling services or shared parking services could accommodate large events hosted at BHS. She expressed concern that large surface parking lots affect the City’s storm water.
A cap at 400 maximum allowed parking spots covers parking for faculty, staff, and the student body. The School District did not present the Ordinance Committee with a specific number of spots needed for special events or a number of events expected per year.

VIII. **Annual Organizational Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve the amended by-law report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: M. Gaughan  Second by: E. Lee  Vote: 5-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Motion to pass  Presented by: M. Tuttle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chair**
- Andrew Montroll nominated by Bruce Baker.
- Motion to approve Andrew Montroll as Chair. Vote 5-0.

**Vice-Chair**
- Bruce Baker nominated by Emily Lee.
- Motion to approve Bruce Baker as Vice-Chair. Vote 5-0.

**Commission Clerk**
- Motion to approve Bridget O’Keefe as Commission Clerk. Vote 5-0.

**At-Large Member of Executive Committee**
- Emily Lee nominated by Michael Gaughan.
- Motion to approve Emily Lee as At-large Member of Executive Committee. Vote 5-0.

**Long-Range Planning Committee**
- Michael Gaughan nominated by Emily Lee
- Andrew Montroll volunteered as a member of the Executive Committee
- Alex Friend volunteered as an at-large member of the Commission.
- Motion to approve Michael Gaughan, Andrew Montroll, and Alex Friend as members of the Long-Range Planning Committee. Vote 5-0.

**Ordinance Committee**
- Emily Lee volunteered as an at-large member of the Commission.
- Bruce Baker volunteered as a member of the Executive Committee.
- The third member of the Ordinance Committee will be decided at the next Ordinance Committee since Yves Bradley is absent from this meeting.
- Motion to approve Emily Lee and Bruce Baker as members of the Ordinance Committee. Vote 5-0.
- Motion to approve Jack Qualey from the Design Advisory Board to the Ordinance Committee. Vote 5-0.

IX. **Proposed CDO Amendment: UVM Trinity Campus Zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Commissioner Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: n/a  Second by: n/a  Vote: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: n/a  Presented by: M. Tuttle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction:**
M. Tuttle walked through the draft text changes in comparison with the existing language for the overlay zone. Staff added language to the building height and setback sections, marking the centerline of Colchester Avenue as the starting place. Text changes propose a lot coverage increase from 40% to 60%. Text changes propose no new surface parking but makes structured parking allowable. Text changes propose conditional uses become permitted. M. Tuttle provided graphics and maps to
demonstrate the proposed changes. M. Tuttle also shared the review standards for a Major Impact Study.

Public Comment:
- S. Bushor thanked the Commissioners for agreeing to arrange a site visit. She expressed concern that the proposed building height and setback requirements may make pedestrians feel claustrophobic.

Commission Discussion:
- E. Lee noted that many of UVM’s renderings take the perspective of someone driving in a car along Colchester Avenue. She invited the Commission to think of what the setbacks and building heights would feel like to pedestrians. B. Baker and A. Friend agreed with viewing the setbacks and building heights from the pedestrian’s perspective.
- Commissioners agreed that they would try to gather for a site visit to Trinity Campus.
- M. Gaughan asked about a comprehensive plan on housing at UVM. Planning Department staff is continuing to research a recommendation.
- E. Lee pointed out that the old medical college building is also close to the sidewalk and asked Planning staff to review those setbacks.
- L. Kingsbury from UVM clarified that the shared use bike path on the southbound side of Colchester Avenue is in the City’s right of way.
- M. Tuttle went into more detail on the proposed language of the setbacks. Staff decided to use the centerline of Colchester Avenue as the starting line because the Colchester Ave Corridor Plan is planning a number of improvements to the curb and sidewalk.

X. Minutes and Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approve the minutes and accept the communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion by: A. Friend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes Approved: July 12
Communications Accepted: in the agenda packet and posted at https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas

XI. Adjourn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjournment</th>
<th>Time: 8:00pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion: E. Lee</td>
<td>Second: M. Gaughan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Planning Office,

As a resident of the South End, I have many questions, concerns and comments about the South End Innovation District. I appreciate your time in replying in as much detail as you are able at this juncture. Thank you!

First of all, the website asks a visitor to click on sections for a "deeper dive" and more info, but in reality there is very little detail. What are the exact zoning changes? How will the goals be implemented through zoning?

This is clearly another example of spot zoning in the South End that benefits a few developers. What was the impetus for this? Who asked for these changes? I do not think it was the residents of the area. Perhaps it was a request from those very developers. The fact that you include bowling alleys in the list of allowed uses confirms this. I feel strongly that accommodating developers is not the right way to grow and change our city. Those priorities are not for the benefit of all, much less for the benefit of historically oppressed groups. It is more of the same old paradigm: the wealthy get richer at the expense of inclusion, access and affordability. The City can and should do better.

The Champlain Parkway corridor was billed as the new innovation/green tech district, with promises that it would alleviate the increasing traffic on Pine St. Now the wealthy developers and the City are proposing this new idea, which will unavoidably add tremendous amounts of car and truck traffic to Pine St. It also seems to be counter to Plan BTV: South End in numerous aspects. What is being proposed to deal with the traffic? I believe we should keep the focus on the growth along the CP. I believe we must be focusing our efforts much more on making this a bikeable and walkable city with better public transportation and much more biking infrastructure - as many cities in Europe offer.

Will the re-zoning ensure that art and small business will be there in perpetuity? What tools are available to ensure that these spaces will not gradually be taken over by more and more housing with the attendant rise in costs and pushing out of low and middle income people? (Please don't
claim any reasoning that resembles trickle down benefits. We know those are false claims and that does not work.)

How will you ensure that housing will not simply become more and more expensive in this zone? The current % of "affordable" and the definition of "affordable" are entirely inadequate for meeting the needs of most families.

How will parking for all the housing and new uses be provided? The statements in your plan are unrealistic. We are NOT past reliance on cars. Dreaming that we will be someday and planning based on that not-yet-here reality will mean that parking will be entirely inadequate, causing congestion, idling, frustration, lack of access to the businesses. This needs a much more thorough and inclusive approach, creative ideas, and ADEQUATE parking.

It is stated: "We are also taking this opportunity re-evaluate some uses that are allowed today, but which are not central to the district’s goals going forward." This statement is too vague to allow an evaluation of its meaning and possible effects.

How will the "public space" and infrastructure as noted in the plan be paid for? ("new streets to include dedicated space for cyclists and wide pedestrian paths. These public spaces should also include generous landscape plantings and architectural elements to create a comfortable environment in all four seasons." ) We are already heavily tax burdened, and I don't believe we should use even more TIFF funding than we already have. The new high school is going to be a huge tax burden.

What methods will be used to not further burden the stormwater situation with all the new housing you propose?

There are too many "can" and "may" words in the section about energy usage. The targets and regulations for a small carbon footprint must be encoded and required, not optional.

The height of buildings should definitely be limited to 5-6 stories in my view.

I am supportive of keeping the Barge Canal area undeveloped and/or as a park with foot traffic only.

Thank you and I look forward to your responses.

Almy Landauer