

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

Monday, July 11, 2016 – 5:30 pm
Planning and Zoning Conference Room - City Hall Lower Level
149 Church Street

Attendance

- **Board Members:** Zoe Richards (ZR), Don Meals (DM), Matt Moore (MM), Jeff Severson (JS), Miles Waite (MW), Stephanie Young (SY),
- **Absent:** Damon Lane (DL), Scott Mapes (SM), Will Flender (WF)
- **Public:** Chris Snyder, Erik Hoekstra, Dan Goltzman (316 Flynn Ave)
- **Staff:** Scott Gustin & Meagan Tuttle (Planning & Zoning), Jesse Bridges (Parks & Rec)

JS, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Annual Organizational Meeting

Nomination and election of Chair, Vice Chair, and Committee members.

Defer to August meeting.

Minutes

June 6, 2016 meeting minutes

MW stated "Pughe" is misspelled.

A MOTION was made by DM and SECONDED by ZR:

Accept the June 6 meeting minutes as corrected.

Vote: 5-0-0

Board Comment

DM, have any board members had experience with Solar City? No one had. DM said someone had been going door to door in his neighborhood.

Public Comment

None.

Open Space Subcommittee

JS, met today in executive session.

Jesse Bridges attended to discuss the former BC lands closing costs item.

He overviewed his memo explaining the request. He noted the \$500K from VHCB. The first \$250K will be a loan, as the conservation is not yet complete.

ZR asked for the total cost. Jesse said \$2M. A grant request had been made to the Land and Water Conservation Fund to help cover costs.

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).

MW asked what the RSF is. Mr. Bridges, it is the bank. MW, VLT got the loan? Mr. Bridges, yes.

DM, do you know what the interest will be? Mr. Bridges, yes. Less interest the quicker we pay down the loan. DM, do you anticipate seeking BCB comment on the LWCF monies, if awarded? Mr. Bridges, yes. He also said that it is possible that none of this money will come out of the CLF if fund raising efforts are successful. MW pointed out that the reverse is true too.

JS, can you explain what VLCT's justification for legal fees is? Mr. Bridges, it relates to costs of securing the loan.

MW, thinks we should do it.

A MOTION was made by MW and SECONDED by ZR:

Recommend expenditure of \$37,857 as requested.

Discussion:

JS, reluctantly supports use of the money. He thinks the process was flawed as to how these figures came up after conservation of the land was pursued. This information could have influenced the discussion. He is thrilled to see the effort come to fruition. In the future, this type of discussion should occur up front, even if just a ballpark figure.

ZR, as Board members, we're not directly involved in the negotiations and procedural details. Mr. Bridges, fair criticism. The numbers, even ballpark numbers, weren't there.

JS, the cleaner and more transparent the process could be, the better.

ZR, it seems likely that we may get by with spending only a portion of the total due out of the CLF. The work has been impressive, but it may not have turned out as well.

DM, largely agrees with JS. We have articulated the opinion that we are reluctant to spend down the CLF on one project. We don't know what's coming down the line.

Mr. Bridges, will provide an updated fund balance report to the Board for September.

SY, the next time Mr. Bridges will return is if LCWF funding did not work out? When is it possible that more money might be sought? Mr. Bridges, we have a 3-year timeframe with VLT. We're 6 months in now.

Vote: 5-0-0, motion carried.

Update & Discussion

1. Riverside Avenue rezoning request (RCO-RC to NAC-Riverside)

Meagan Tuttle appeared on behalf of this item.

Meagan Tuttle overviewed the request. Several property owners made the request to rezone along the river corridor. They had asked to reinstate the prior zoning originally. Since then, they've requested scaled back changes, such as simply allowing development within 150' of Riverside Ave. The city has an interest in promoting reinvestment along the corridor. She pointed out the present RCO corridor along the river bank and also the riparian buffer zone. There are some competing interests. We're looking to find a balance among them.

ZR, the properties could still be redeveloped as is? Ms. Tuttle, yes. ZR, it sounds like a matter of scope.

Ms. Tuttle, the PC asked staff to reconsider the proposed 125' boundary, particularly where the steep slopes are close to the road. She also noted the existing buildable area provisions in the zoning code – pertain only to residential and RCO zones presently. She noted that the WW Treatment Plant sits on a mid-slope plateau. Further to the east, it becomes a steep bank. Floodplains are also a consideration.

MW, there should be no expectation to build further downslope.

Ms. Tuttle, we're looking for input. The initial problem stems from the request to open up developable areas along this corridor. There's some assertion that existing conditions don't allow for meaningful redevelopment. We're looking to improve their usability without significantly impacting the bank.

ZR, can we make that determination?

MW, would like to go down behind these buildings to see the conditions. With an engineered retaining wall, development could be possible.

JS stated that he has walked this area. There's a recreation path along the river. There has been a catastrophic slope failure. He pointed out the recently demised home on Plattsburg Ave. The riverbank gave way. Building to the edge of the slope results in vulnerability. There is a real slope stability question here. Is there a way to allow greater density within the existing parameters? He pointed out areas along the river bank that may be particularly susceptible to erosion. There is a real public safety concern. He'd want to see a slope stability analysis by a geotechnical engineer along the entire corridor – or one from each applicant that comes in.

Ms. Tuttle noted that the City Engineer made similar comments relative to geotechnical analysis.

DM, sees some pretty major differences between existing and proposed commercial zoning limits. Rather than moving the line, slope calculations and geotechnical analysis should govern what happens. MW, agrees with DM.

[MM appeared at 6:15 PM]

ZR, it's hard to increase developable area right along the riverbank. The vegetation there now does much for slope stability.

MW, it would be nice to revitalize Riverside Avenue. JS, agrees. If the intensity of development could be increased on the buildable areas, that may be a reasonable solution.

MM, hesitant to change zoning from RCO to commercial, especially next to the river.

DM, ideally there could be a 3rd party analysis of slope stability along the river, but it's very unlikely.

MM, suggests keeping the line where it is.

Project Review

- 1. 16-1507CA/MA; 316 Flynn Ave (NMU, Ward 5S) G&C Properties, LLC / 316 Flynn, LLC**
Demolish existing buildings. Construct mixed use building with 30 residential units and 2 commercial spaces and associated site improvements.

JS recused from this item.

MW said has done consulting for Redstone, but not for this property. No objections to his participation were made.

Erik Hoekstra, Chris Snyder, Dan Goltzman appeared.

Dan Goltzman overviewed the project. The 3 existing buildings would be demolished and replaced with a mixed use building with 30 apartments and 2 commercial spaces. 34 parking spaces are proposed, and a small parking waiver will be requested.

The stormwater scheme is very similar to what was previously approved. The updated plan has been discussed with Megan Moir. She signed off on it. Mr. Goltzman noted that there will be a slight reduction in overall lot coverage. The flat roofs will have internal drains that will connect to a tank and then flow through a level spreader for discharge into the brook. Surface runoff will be directed into the same tank via bioswale and ultimately into the brook.

DM, will there be maintenance access to the level spreader structure? Mr. Goltzman, yes, there has to be.

MW, does the current design account for the larger roof area? Mr. Goltzman, yes. DM, so it's basically a settling tank? Mr. Goltzman, yes. DM, will steps be taken to make sure newly restored green space will actually be made pervious, rather than just placing sod over compacted earth? Mr. Goltzman, not sure.

MW, the new VT stormwater manual outlines standards for loosening up compact earth for improved permeability. Rejuvenating the soil while the bioswale is constructed would make sense.

MM, is a state stormwater permit required? Mr. Goltzman, no. MW, will the bioswale be under-drained? Mr. Goltzman, yes, but no liner. It is exactly the same as the prior proposal. He noted that the bioswale was incorporated at the recommendation of the Board.

MW, is the ground level parking proposed as a result of contaminated soils? Erik Hoekstra, there's not enough room to dig down on this and ramp to parking.

DM asked about the commercial spaces. Mr. Hoekstra said they are pursuing restaurant use, but that may change depending on who the selected tenants are. It may require a change of use permit.

MM, typically we encourage reduced parking. MW, noted the bike parking to be provided. Mr. Hoekstra noted they are talking with Carshare VT.

SY asked about heating and cooling. Mr. Goltzman said each unit will have a heat pump.

A MOTION was made by DM and SECONDED by MW:

Support the project with standard EPSC and stormwater conditions. Support the anticipated parking waiver request.

Vote: 5-0-0, motion carried.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM