

## 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 Montrroll, Chair  
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair  
Yves Bradley  
Alexander Friend  
Michael Gaughan  
Emily Lee  
Julia Randall

## Burlington Planning Commission

Tuesday, December 20, 2022, 6:30 P.M.

Remote Meeting via Zoom

### Draft Minutes

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Members Present   | A. Montrroll, J. Randall, B. Baker, M. Gaughan, A. Friend   |
| Staff Present     | M. Tuttle, C. Dillard, S. Morgan  |
| Public Attendance | S. Bushor, M. Lang, D. Castrigano, C. Larsen, J. Van Driesche, C. Long, C. Bates, J. Tiano, R. Thornton, M. Arnold, C. Esquivel Cordova, J. Caulo, N. Persampieri, Gordon |

### **I. Agenda**

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Call to Order | Time: 6:30pm   |
| Agenda        | Planning staff proposed changing item VIII (meeting schedule) on the agenda to item V. Staff also flagged that, beginning in 2023, public meetings may no longer be virtual only, but can still be hybrid. |

### **II. Public Forum**

| Name(s)         | Comment  |
|-----------------|--|
| M. Lang         | M. Lang spoke in regards to the UVM Trinity Campus rezoning. She expressed concern that there is a lack of a pedestrian plan.  |
| S. Bushor       | S. Bushor was concerned that the setback for the UVM Trinity Campus rezoning starts at the center of Colchester Avenue. She also pointed out that there was more public engagement with the South End Innovation District than with the UVM Trinity Campus item. She also raised concerns about the increased number of students at UVM. |
| D. Castrigano   | D. Castrigano stated the two proposed zoning changes are necessary, but he feels do not go far enough to combat the housing crisis and climate change.   |
| C. Larsen       | C. Larsen spoke in regards to climate change and redeveloping/building the future of Burlington.   |
| J. Van Driesche | J. Van Driesche stated the City has leverage with UVM to negotiate increased student housing (beyond Trinity Campus). He also stated that the South End Innovation District is popular among South End residents, but there is hesitation regarding building height.   |
| C. Long         | C. Long stated that the City should take this rezoning opportunity to hold UVM accountable for student housing numbers. She noted that upperclassmen do not like living on campus because UVM is a dry campus and on-campus housing can be expensive.  |
| C. Bates        | C. Bates stated that the South End Innovation District public engagement surveys showed residents were in favor of 4-6 story buildings. She also expressed concern   |

*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.*

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
|                     | for storm water capabilities in this area. She requested that all solar energy requirements and local materials for new development as well.   |
| J. Tiano            | J. Tiano spoke in support of the proposed minimum parking ordinance. J. Tiano also spoke in support of the UVM Trinity Campus rezoning and the South End Innovation District. He did not believe the proposed building height would negatively affect the neighborhood.                        |
| R. Thornton         | R. Thornton spoke in support of the proposed minimum parking ordinance. He supported any rezoning measures that would provide as much density and housing as possible, in light of climate refugees.   |
| M. Arnold           | M. Arnold spoke in support of the UVM Trinity Campus rezoning and the South End Innovation District. He stated that the City should provide housing for commuters from surrounding towns. He asked the Planning Commission to take measures that would increase the rental vacancy rate to 5%. |
| C. Esquivel Cordova | C. Esquivel Cordova spoke as an employee of Pathways Vermont about the housing crisis. He supported measures that would increase housing density.  |

**III. Chair's Report**

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

**IV. Director's Report**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| M. Tuttle | The Planning Department is presenting a contract for the impact fee study to the Board of Finance. Staff are also reviewing proposals for the transportation demand management study. The public art zoning amendment will go through a City Council public hearing in January. |
|-----------|---|

**V. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

|   |                          |                 |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Action: Approve the Planning Commission 2023 schedule   |                          |                 |
| Motion by: A. Friend  | Second by: M. Gaughan    | Vote: Unanimous |
| Type: Action  | Presented by: C. Dillard |                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The schedule will resume with meetings on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of every month.</li> <li>M. Tuttle asked that the Commissioners save the date for January 17<sup>th</sup> to have a joint meeting with the Department of Permitting and Inspections and the Development Review Board.</li> </ul> |                          |                 |

**VI. Public Hearing: Proposed ZA-22-07 Maximum Parking and TDM**

|   |                         |                 |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Action: Motion to re-approve the report and send back to City Council   |                         |                 |
| Motion by: A. Friend  | Second by: J. Randall   | Vote: Unanimous |
| Type: Action  | Presented by: M. Tuttle |                 |
| Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Planning Commission previously sent this zoning amendment to City Council in July. Council made changes to the proposed amendment, so it is back with the Planning Commission for review.</li> <li>Council changed language surrounding properties location at 0 and 52 Institute Road to be consistent with the Institute Parking Management Plan. Council also added TDM criteria for "affordable projects," which are primarily affordable housing units.</li> <li>Council removed some requirements from the outreach and education portion of the TDM, nominally the annual meeting for tenants. Council also added benefit options that property owners are required to offer their tenants.</li> <li>Council also created a pathway for previously approved parking plans to be amended.</li> </ul> |                         |                 |

|   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning staff added language that exempts parking in driveways that are already compliant with other ordinances.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Randall expressed support for the pathway to amend previously approved parking plans.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan noted that there are concerns from the affordable housing community about the impact of TDM.</li> </ul> |
|---|

**VII. Public Hearing: Proposed ZA-22-04 UVM Trinity Campus Zoning**

|   |                          |           |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| Action: Motion to move the amendment and the memo forward to City Council.  |                          |           |
| Motion by: M. Gaughan   | Second by: J. Randall    | Vote: 4-1 |
| Type: Action  | Presented by: C. Dillard |           |
| <p>The Chair held a public hearing with the following public comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T. Schlossberg spoke as a Ward 1 resident. He noted the recent increase in class size and the lack of housing on-campus. He recommended that the Planning Commission table this proposed amendment and that the City explore an MOU.</li> <li>• N. Persampieri spoke in support of this proposed amendment. He stated the Commission should do everything possible to increase housing in the city.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Dillard showed the technical changes made to the amendment since it was last presented to the Commission. "Bed and Breakfast" was removed from the use table. Some other words were changed or removed for clarity.</li> <li>• Planning staff drafted a letter on behalf of the Commission that shows support for a tangible commitment from UVM to address housing concerns.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan stated that while the Commission does not have the power to regulate UVM's student numbers, it is important to acknowledge external factors affecting Burlington's land use.</li> <li>• J. Randall added that the Commission can submit informational requests to UVM, but cannot set requirements on student body numbers or who is housed at Trinity Campus. She added that the letter could include suggested elements of a draft MOU. She also commented on the public forum comments about leveraging this amendment for an MOU with UVM and noted that building on Trinity Campus may be a better priority.</li> <li>• A. Montroll commented that an MOU with UVM is ultimately for City Council and the Mayor's Office to decide. A. Friend noted that this presents an opportunity to withhold the recommendation to approve this amendment until there is an MOU in place.</li> <li>• M. Gaughan expressed favor of going forward with this proposed amendment. He pointed to the UVM developments in South Burlington and suggested that future UVM developments should stay in Burlington/closer to campus.</li> <li>• Based on the public forum, A. Montroll asked staff for clarification on the setback line. M. Tuttle clarified that the previous draft put the setback at the front property line, but the uniqueness of Trinity Campus actually made that setback more difficult to understand. Staff modeled the proposed setback on another setback line in the institutional core.</li> </ul> |                          |           |

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

|                  |                          |           |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Action: n/a      |                          |           |
| Motion by: n/a   | Second by: n/a           | Vote: n/a |
| Type: Discussion | Presented by: C. Dillard |           |

The Chair held a public hearing with the following public comments:

- Gordon asked about the proposed floor area ratio and commented that an FAR of 2.25 would limit density. He also asked why the area around Cumberland Farms and Burlington Furniture are not included in this district. He was in favor of 4-6 story buildings across the district to increase density.
- N. Persampieri expressed support for this proposal because it will increase housing and be a walkable district. He stated that people who live in downtown Burlington have a smaller carbon footprint than those who live in the suburbs and the City should increase housing. He spoke in support of 8 story buildings in this district and disagreed with the height buffer along the Pine Street-Barge Canal boundary. He suggested adding more "teeth" to the parking language so that parking is limited to the perimeter of the district and not allowed in the walkable/bikeable core. He also suggested increased residential uses in the district.
- C. Larsen expressed support for the proposal, but recommended that housing be prioritized. He was concerned that the proposal allows for the flexibility of an above-ground parking structure, which he opposes.
- J. Caulo added to his previous public comment. He stated that the ordinance is too prescriptive in regards to non-residential uses. He suggested increased flexibility and removing the primary and secondary uses table.
- M. Arnold stated that the FAR is too low and suggested increasing the FAR to 4 or 5.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Planning staff prepared a presentation, but Commissioners agreed to extend the discussion to the next meeting.
- J. Randall asked about the phasing and placement of parking structures. C. Dillard responded that 30,000 and 60,000 are standard Planning measurements for parking structures, and added that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission recommended 60,000 in the 68 Sears Lane feasibility study.
- M. Gaughan commented that he would like to review the primary and secondary use table in the proposed amendment.
- J. Randall asked to discuss the FAR in the next Commissioner discussion.

**IX. 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>• A. Friend thanked the public for their engagement and participation through these three proposed amendments.</li> <li>• M. Tuttle reminded the Commissioners that the next meeting will have an in-person component.</li> </ul> |                   |           |

**X. Minutes and Communications**

|   |                      |                       |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Action: Approve the minutes and accept the communications   |                      |                       |
| Motion by: J. Randall   | Second by: A. Friend | Approved: Unanimously |
| Minutes Approved: November 15.  |                      |                       |
| Communications Accepted: in the agenda packet and posted at <a href="https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas">https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CityPlan/PC/Agendas</a> |                      |                       |

**XI. Adjourn**

|             |               |
|-------------|---------------|
| Adjournment | Time: 8:37 pm |
|-------------|---------------|

|                   |                    |                            |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Motion: A. Friend | Second: J. Randall | Vote: Approved Unanimously |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|

DRAFT