

## Burlington Conservation Board

149 Church Street  
Burlington, VT 05401  
<http://www.ci.burlington.vt.us/planning/>  
Telephone: (802) 865-7189  
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)

*Matt Moore, Chair  
Will Flender, Vice Chair  
Scott Mapes  
Don Meals  
Jeff Severson  
Miles Waite  
Damon Lane  
Zoe Richards  
Stephanie Young*



## Conservation Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 21, 2016 – 5:30 pm  
Planning and Zoning Conference Room - City Hall Lower Level  
149 Church Street

### Attendance

- **Board Members:** Stephanie Young (SY), Zoe Richards (ZR), Don Meals (DM), Matt Moore (MM), Damon Lane (DL), Scott Mapes (SM), Will Flender (WF)
- **Absent:** Jeff Severson (JS), Miles Waite (MW)
- **Public:** None.
- **Staff:** Scott Gustin (Planning & Zoning), Jesse Bridges (Parks & Recreation)

WF, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

### CLP funding application: Burlington College land acquisition

Discussion and revote

A MOTION was made by DM and SECONDED by ZR:

Approve the application for BCLF monies submitted on behalf of Eric Farrell with the following stipulations.

- The Board strongly opposes location of stormwater pond and related surface and subsurface items/infrastructure on public conserved land.

Discussion:

SM stated he is concerned with subsurface stormwater too. DM, supports addition to include “subsurface stormwater.”

Jesse Bridges noted the development agreement provisions regarding stormwater. It’s not a blanket easement for stormwater management. It’s to be designed by the parties together. The intent is to look at any and all solutions possible to limit impacts on the combined sewer. SM said the proposal has no connection to combined sewer. He’s concerned that the project is relying on this 12 acres to develop its stormwater system. He’s not comfortable with that scenario. We shouldn’t be carrying that burden without the developer paying for that service. Mr. Bridges, we’re not approving what’s depicted on the map as stormwater management. He went on to note that the new site concept is significantly better. There are less units and better massing. Discussion of subsurface stormwater management is ongoing. BCB will be the primary body to review this during the permitting process. He said that Eric Farrell wants to retain access to the box culvert. What he’s proposing in the ravines are step pools, not stormwater ponds.

ZR, if we approve this expenditure, what’s our ability to prevent stormwater infrastructure that we find unacceptable? SM, also, who’s responsible for long term maintenance, future clearing, and other activities that might be inconsistent with the conservation values of the property? He supports the project and the purchase. He is uneasy with burdening the property with as-yet unknown stormwater infrastructure.

The programs and services of the Dept. of Planning and Zoning are accessible to people with disabilities. For accessibility information call 865-7188 (865-7142 TTY).

DL, since the design comes later, can we approve the purchase assuming no stormwater improvements? If there are changes in the future, can the purchase be modified? Lot lines adjusted? Mr. Bridges noted that the \$1M is half of the \$2M value. DM doesn't see how this approval affect BCB's / DRB's prerogative in reviewing the stormwater system. DL doesn't want to get to that point with the developer assuming its ok.

SM doesn't want the development agreement to handcuff us in the future. The project should be more creative and be able to stand on its own. If offsite stormwater infrastructure is needed, we can entertain that down the road.

MM thinks we can do that. We can take action on the purchase and remain silent (or not) relative to stormwater.

ZR, let's be explicit so there's no perception of tacit agreement.

Mr. Bridges noted changes to the boundary lines, reduction in units, and building massing and siting. The ratio between rental and owner-occupied units has been changed. There are no significant changes to the affordable housing component. The new property boundary line seeks to address concerns about how the trail interacts with the development. It is still 12 acres. The layout and lot lines are more consistent with the topography of the site, separating developed versus conserved land. It is Parks' plan to have robust management in place for the property including tree management and trail maintenance. The revised development plan increases lot coverage by 1% but remains well below the maximum allowable. The wildlife corridor is primarily in the UR and will remain unaffected. There is a better boundary with the cemetery property to the north.

DL, the recommendation does not account for the value of stormwater services to the developed land.

WF, we are covered with the motion as is. If developer comes back asserting it's been approved, it's in the record that it's not.

Vote: 6-0-1 (MM abstained)

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM