

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
Michael Gaughan
Emily Lee
Julia Randall*

Regular Meeting Burlington Planning Commission Tuesday, October 25, 2022

Regular Meeting - 6:30 P.M. Remote Meeting via Zoom ONLY

To Join the Meeting on a Computer

Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82754488061>

To Join the Meeting on a Phone

Number: +1 312 626 6799 **Meeting ID:** 827 5448 8061

AGENDA

- I. Agenda (6:30 P.M.)**
- II. Public Forum** *See details on pg. 2 of packet for participating remotely.*
- III. Chair's Report**
- IV. Director's Report**
- V. Update on BTV Neighborhood Code Initiative**

Office of City Planning staff will present and provide an update on BTV Neighborhood Code, an initiative to evaluate zoning tools that regulate new homes in Burlington's neighborhoods and identify opportunities for new neighborhood-scale housing citywide.

Staff Recommendation: Ask questions and provide feedback on the initiative and a future CDO amendment package related to the work.

- VI. Commissioner Items**
 - a. Committee Reports
- VII. Minutes & Communications**
 - a. The minutes of the October 11 meeting are enclosed in the agenda packet on page 3.
 - b. Communications are enclosed in the agenda packet.
- VIII. Adjourn**

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



City of Burlington, VT
149 Church Street, 3rd Floor
Burlington, VT 05401
Phone: (802) 865-7144

www.burlingtonvt.gov/plan

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.

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
Michael Gaughan
Emily Lee
Julia Randall

Burlington Planning Commission

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

Remote Meeting via Zoom

Draft 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	The Planning Department will host a few upcoming events to highlight the work on missing middle housing. 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.
-----------	--

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"> • C. Dillard continued the discussion on four parts of the amendment: hotels, residential use location, building height, and blocks/new streets. • 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. • Planning staff recommend that residential uses should be permitted only in new buildings or as additions to existing buildings. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • Planning staff clarified that the shade and view studies are conceptual, but do reflect the allowable heights proposed in this amendment. • Commissioners were generally comfortable with the building height map proposed by Planning staff. • 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. • 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. • 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. 		

- 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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. 		

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"> • The next Planning Commission meeting is 10/25. There will only be one meeting in November on 11/15. 		

- 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.”

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
--------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

