

# 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  
Michael Gaughan  
Emily Lee  
Julia Randall

## Burlington Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 11, 2022, 6:30 P.M.

Remote Meeting via Zoom

### Minutes

Members Present	A. Montroll, M. Gaughan, J. Randall, Y. Bradley, B. Baker
Staff Present	M. Tuttle, C. Dillard, S. Morgan, S. Gustin
Public Attendance	B. Headrick, S. Foley, S. Bushor

#### **I. Agenda**

Call to Order	Time: 6:30pm
Agenda	No changes.

#### **II. Public Forum**

Name(s)	Comment
B. Headrick	B. Headrick spoke to the site visit at Trinity Campus. She was surprised that many of the properties toward the back of the property are small and do not utilize the space well. She would like to see UVM build housing on these parcels, rather than the parcels closer to Colchester Avenue. She was also concerned about the graduate housing being close to Colchester Avenue and the fact that the proposed undergraduate housing is intended for first-year students.
S. Foley	S. Foley is a resident of Ward 5 and spoke on the proposed South End Innovation District. He is concerned about the height limit of 85 ft, especially if these intrude on the views from Callahan Park. He asked Planning Staff to clarify what the benefits are for a height limit of 85 ft.
S. Bushor	S. Bushor spoke on the South End Innovation District. She thanked C. Dillard for his work on the proposed zoning amendment. She hopes the proposed changes keep a balance between new housing and the commercial needs of the city. S. Bushor also spoke on the Trinity Campus zoning amendment. She is worried that the current language signals a preference toward UVM as a "flagship academic institution." She also provided highlights of her communication to the Commission.
B. Butani	B. Butani expressed support for using the smaller buildings toward the back of Trinity Campus for housing redevelopment. He also expressed concern regarding UVM's response to his questions on housing stock and affordability in Burlington.

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

A. Montroll	No report.
-------------	------------

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

M. Tuttle	<p>The Planning Department will host a few upcoming events to highlight the work on missing middle housing.</p> <p>M. Tuttle and C. Dillard will be out of the office at the beginning of next week to attend the Northern New England Planning Conference.</p>
-----------	---

*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.*

**V. Proposed CDO Amendment: South End Innovation District Overlay**

Action: Motion to warn ZA-23-01 to a public hearing		
Motion by: M. Gaughan	Second by: J. Randall	Vote: Unanimously
Type: n/a	Presented by: C. Dillard	
<p>Commission Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Dillard continued the discussion on four parts of the amendment: hotels, residential use location, building height, and blocks/new streets.</li> <li>• Planning staff recommend one hotel per lot (as of January 2023); and, any individual hotel may not account for more than 80 percent of the gross floor area of the building in which it is located. J. Randall expressed support for this language and commented that the remaining 20% should be dedicated to art spaces, commercial use, etc.</li> <li>• Planning staff recommend that residential uses should be permitted only in new buildings or as additions to existing buildings.</li> <li>• Planning staff recommended a specific height area map to regulate height and mitigate shadow and view impacts to Pine Street, Barge Canal, and the Lakeside neighborhood. Properties closest to the Pine Street and Champlain Parkway have an allowable height of 85 ft., properties closer to Lake Champlain have an allowable height of 65 ft., and properties closest to Lake Champlain have an allowable height of 45 ft. C. Dillard provided graphics on what an FAR of 2.25 and 2.5 would look like, graphics of the Lakeside Neighborhood shade study, and a Birchcliff views study.</li> <li>• C. Dillard clarified that an allowable height of 85 ft. helps new development to meet the housing and commercial needs that arose from planBTV: South End and the city's housing crisis. M. Tuttle elaborated that the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) helps to balance the building heights across each lot. The community also strongly supported an allowable height of 85 ft. during the public engagement portion of this project.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan sought clarification on the shade study. The graphics are imperfect and depict what the shadows would look like if the surrounding areas were flat (which they are not). Therefore, the depicted shadows could actually be less noticeable in real life.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan referenced the Callahan Master Plan, which highlights the importance of views from this park. He noted that it is unlikely that developers will be able to build on top of the existing Innovation Center. He noted that the floor plate and block size should allow for visual permeability through the proposed district.</li> <li>• Planning staff clarified that the shade and view studies are conceptual, but do reflect the allowable heights proposed in this amendment.</li> <li>• Commissioners were generally comfortable with the building height map proposed by Planning staff.</li> <li>• Planning staff recommend a maximum block perimeter of 1,600 ft. and a provision that blocks can be enclosed by any combination of public streets and public paths. M. Gaughan asked about road standards and dead ends. S. Gustin responded that DPW has some road standards, but standards were removed from the Ordinance in the 1970s. M. Tuttle pointed to Article 6 in the Design Code that has language on road connectivity.</li> <li>• Y. Bradley expressed favor for a larger allowable footprint. He explained that regulations require office spaces to have a large, central elevator core with two elevators that eat up room for other spaces. One way to deter developers from building the tallest allowable properties would be to accommodate for a larger allowable footprint. He also stated that many office spaces accommodate multiple tenants. A larger footprint would allow for corridors and an easier design for multiple offices. Additionally, Y. Bradley expressed favor for high ceilings on ground floor office buildings to create a more attractive office lobby.</li> <li>• Planning staff recommend that only office buildings should be allowed up to 24,000 sq/ft. Mixed-use buildings (with retail and/or residential uses) would stay at a maximum of 15,000 sq/ft.</li> </ul>		

- A. Montroll expressed support for Y. Bradley's proposal on a larger footprint for office buildings. M. Gaughan was concerned that this larger footprint would affect other portions of the amendment, i.e. block size and view sheds, and is therefore not supportive of this proposal.

**VI. Proposed CDO Amendment: UVM Trinity Campus Overlay Zoning**

Action: Motion to warn ZA-22-04 for a public hearing		
Motion by: M. Gaughan	Second by: B. Baker	Vote: Unanimously
Type: n/a	Presented by: M. Tuttle	
Commission Discussion:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Tuttle provided an overview of the draft changes to this amendment with highlights on building height, setbacks, lot coverage, density, parking, uses, and process. UVM specifically asked for the changes on building height, setbacks, and lot coverage. The remaining four areas of change were drafted by Planning staff to align with the shared goals of increased student housing on campus.</li> <li>• Planning staff also added requirements for new applications within the Trinity overlay: submission of a conceptual plan or portion of the Campus Land Bank Plan, context for how individual developments relate to anticipated future user groups, and allow the City to anticipate and plan for broader view of potential public/capital/programmatic needs, potential future impacts. M. Tuttle explained that this additional language is in response to the public's desire for a more authoritative tone in this amendment.</li> <li>• In regards to the rear properties mentioned in the public forum, L. Kingsbury (UVM) responded that these are under-utilized but explained that renovating these properties would be quite expensive.</li> <li>• L. Kingsbury clarified that if freshmen and sophomores live in the proposed Trinity Campus dorms that would free up beds in other parts of campus for juniors and seniors.</li> <li>• M. Tuttle walked through the draft language throughout the amendment document. She explained that staff expects all new development to be associated with UVM, but there could be exceptions. The new application requirements, however, should be information coming from the institutions, i.e. UVM.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan asked for clarification on the process for the proposed application requirements. M. Tuttle clarified that the requirements are not a new review standard; rather the data requested is intended to be informational.</li> <li>• J. Randall asked whether the additional application requirements could also ask for context as to how the proposed development would alleviate housing concerns across the city. M. Tuttle explained that staff had explored this question, but ultimately discovered it was outside the scope of what the City can prescribe to applicants.</li> </ul>		

**VII. Commissioner Items**

Action: n/a		
Motion by: n/a	Second by: n/a	Vote: n/a
Type: n/a	Presented by: n/a	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next Planning Commission meeting is 10/25. There will only be one meeting in November on 11/15.</li> </ul>		

Tuesday, October 11, 2022

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• J. Randall provided an update on the Colorado American Planning Association Conference. She explained that many other communities are also planning similar concepts to the South End Innovation District. Sometimes they are referenced as “makerhoods.”</li></ul> |
|---|

**VIII. Minutes and Communications**

Action: Approve the minutes and accept the communications		
---	--	--

Motion by: J. Randall	Second by: M. Gaughan	Approved Unanimously
-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Minutes Approved: September 27

Communications Accepted: in the agenda packet and posted at <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas>

**IX. Adjourn**

Adjournment	Time: 8:15pm
-------------	--------------

Motion: J. Randall	Second: M. Gaughan	Vote: Approved Unanimously
--------------------	--------------------	----------------------------