

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, November 15, 2022, 6:30 P.M.

Remote Meeting via Zoom

Minutes

Members Present	A. Montroll, J. Randall, B. Baker, E. Lee, M. Gaughan, A. Friend
Staff Present	M. Tuttle, C. Dillard, S. Morgan
Public Attendance	S. Bushor

I. Agenda

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

II. Public Forum

Name(s)	Comment
B. Headrick	B. Headrick spoke on the allowable uses in the Trinity Campus amendment. She was concerned about the use of a dry cleaner business allowed, as they can be pollutants. Further, she expressed that a dry cleaner business is not necessary for UVM's mission. B. Headrick was also concerned with Trinity Campus amendment lines 8-10 and 17-18 regarding parking garages. She requested that parking garages be considered a conditional use, rather than an approved use.

III. Chair's Report

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

IV. Director's Report

M. Tuttle	No report.
-----------	------------

V. Public Hearing: Proposed ZA-22-04 UVM Trinity Campus Rezoning

Action: Motion to continue the Public Hearing into the next meeting		
Motion by: A. Friend	Second by: J. Randall	Vote: Unanimous
Type: Motion to extend	Presented by: C. Dillard	
Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none">This amendment was originally requested by the University of Vermont to support the development of student housing on Trinity Campus. The request includes a mix of uses to ensure a vibrant space for campus and the surrounding community. The amendment allows for the reorganization of buildings and open spaces and makes improvements to the biking and pedestrian experience along Colchester Avenue. The amendment minimizes the use of parking. Basic changes include increased building height and revised setbacks and lot coverage. The Chair held a public hearing with the following public comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">K. Pillsbury stated that he was glad UVM is willing to provide more housing. He lives adjacent to the UVM campus and he expressed a desire for UVM to accommodate the number of out of		

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.

state students they bring in each year. He supported measures that would increase building height and density throughout the city, particularly for student housing.

- L. Kingsbury spoke as a representative of UVM. She thanked City staff, Planning Commissioners, and the public for their efforts on creating this draft amendment. She expressed UVM's commitment to find housing for its students, faculty, and staff. The desire to redevelop Trinity Campus is pointed out in UVM's 2022-2032 Campus Plan and Mayor Weinberg's 10 Point Housing Action Plan. She asked that the Commission approve the draft amendment and push it forward to City Council.
- T. Derenthal spoke in concern of how this draft amendment could affect UVM's overall student population. He worried that increased housing for freshmen and sophomores could lead to more upperclassmen eventually needing off campus housing. He also expressed disappointment that there is no longer a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and UVM.
- J. Van Driesche voiced support for the draft amendment. He stated that the current Trinity Campus setup is not the best use of land and the draft amendment provides a good path forward.
- S. Bushor followed up on the communication she sent to the Commissioners and Planning staff. She expressed disappointment that the parking lot between the Waterman Building and the University Health Center was not reviewed for development first. She also inquired as to why some other parts of the land on Trinity Campus were not considered for development. She was concerned that there is not enough green space in the current plan. She requested that the Commissioners review the setbacks in the draft amendment.
- B. Duncan asked the Commission and Planning staff how they arrived at the 65 foot buffer dimension. He also asked whether there were special protections on the historic nature of some of the Trinity Campus buildings.
- B. Butani agreed that parking lots should have been reviewed first for redevelopment. He expressed disappointment that UVM could not ensure that this proposed housing is reserved for upperclassmen.
- N. Kirby expressed that an increase in UVM students would be a detriment to the Burlington community. She was also concerned about a decrease in green space at Trinity Campus and the view from Colchester Avenue.

Commissioner Discussion:

- M. Tuttle shared that the Department of Permitting and Inspections provided technical suggestions on the draft amendment. The Commissioners can review at the next meeting.

VI. Public Hearing: Proposed ZA-23-01 South End Innovation District

Action: Motion to the Public Hearing into the next meeting		
Motion by: E. Lee	Second by: J. Randall	Vote: Unanimous
Type: Motion to extend	Presented by: C. Dillard	
Introduction:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This a comprehensive draft amendment for the 70-acre core area within the existing Enterprise/Light Manufacturing district in the South End. The inception of this draft amendment came from planBTV: South End with a purpose to protect and foster the arts and making community in this area, while also making space for the burgeoning office needs in the South End. The other catalyst was Mayor Weinberger's 10 Point Housing Action Plan and the need to build more units in Burlington. The draft amendment provides several urban design and land use standards. 		
The Chair held a public hearing with the following public comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Foley is a Ward 5 resident and is concerned about the allowable size of the buildings proposed in the draft amendment. He stated that a 6-8 story building would impact the view 		

<p>shed of the Five Sisters, Birchcliff, and Callahan Park neighborhoods. He asked the Commission to look at alternative options to address the housing needs in the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. Van Driesche expressed overall support for the draft amendment and a desire to reinvent the large parking lot next to the Innovation Center. However, he was concerned about the storm water capacity for new development in this area. The area currently experiences issues with storm water and wanted assurance that additional development would improve these conditions. • J. Weissman expressed concern for storm water management in this area. She worried about 8-story buildings being so close to the lake. She also expressed concern from the pedestrian perspective and the potential for increased traffic, light pollution, and noise pollution in the area. • J. Caulo spoke as a representative of 125 Lakeside Avenue and a South End resident. He spoke in favor of the draft amendment and commented on increased housing and economic development for the area. He was, however, concerned about the technical language surrounding "streets" and "multi-use paths." He spoke in favor of pedestrian and bike friendly paths but asked for clarification on what the guidance is in the draft amendment. He was also concerned about the maximum allowable building size of 15,000 sq/ft and requested that the language be more open-ended. He also asked for clarification on how the ordinance treats phased development. He then brought up concerns around the use table, particularly the makeup of primary and secondary uses within a development. He suggested that the use table be updated into allowable ground-floor uses and more flexibility with all other space. • H. Easter spoke as a resident of the Birchcliff neighborhood. He spoke in favor of walkable and bike-able development in the South End, however, he was concerned about the maximum allowable height of 85 ft. He stated that larger projects could be harder to develop. He expressed concern that other homeowners have difficulty building a second story on their existing homes, so it could be considered unfair that new development have allowable building height of 85 ft. He also was not in favor of hotels as an allowable use. <p>Commissioner Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Dillard followed up on a memo that Planning staff sent to the Commissioners, which asked for limited exemptions to the floor plate standards to facilitate larger format parking structures. The proposed change would also allow 2 ingress and egress spots in a parking structure (updated from 1). Planning staff also recommend that the plan unit development be permitted in the Enterprise/Light Manufacturing district, which facilitates phased development. Lastly, staff recommended that the use table language be clarified. • B. Baker asked whether Planning staff had plans to address the language changes requested by J. Caulo and others. M. Tuttle responded that staff already knew about some concerns, but the team will follow up on these items for the next meeting. • M. Tuttle responded to H. Easter's concern about fairness and building height. Planning staff are working also working on updating neighborhood codes in a separate draft amendment that aim to address these concerns. • J. Randall requested more information about the office space floor plate needs.

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"> • E. Lee brought up the conditions of the former YMCA building. There is excessive graffiti and vandalism on the building and E. Lee inquired about fencing off 2nd story access points. B. Baker offered that the building is currently under foreclosure and the owner has asked the city for support as the court system could take years. M. Tuttle added that she brought these concerns 		

to B. Ward, Department Head of DPI, and there are some ordinances that address graffiti where the City could issue tickets. B. Ward planned to send a building inspector to this location and try to work with the property owner on graffiti mitigation. Many of the suggestions, like fencing, would cause right of way and sidewalk issues. Another challenge is that covering up the graffiti would likely damage the historic nature of the building. A. Montroll asked that B. Ward come to a Planning Commission meeting to discuss this issue and see if there are any other tools the Commission could bring to the table.

- J. Randall thanked Planning staff for organizing the Missing Middle Housing trivia night.
- The next meeting is December 13.

VIII. Minutes and Communications

Action: Approve the minutes and accept the communications		
Motion by: J. Randall	Second by: M. Gaughan	Approved Unanimously
Minutes Approved: October 25.		
Communications Accepted: in the agenda packet and posted at https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas		

IX. Adjourn

Adjournment	Time: 7:45 pm	
Motion: J. Randall	Second: A. Friend	Vote: Approved Unanimously