

Burlington Conservation Board

645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05401
<http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPI/CB>
Telephone: (802) 865-7189

*Zoe Richards, Chair
Rebecca Roman
Don Meals
Ryan Crehan
Hannah Brislin
Miles Waite
Caryn Connolly
Kyle Tansley
Lina Swislocki
Elizabeth Cunningham, Student*



Conservation Board Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 6, 2023 – 5:30 pm
Remote & In Person Meeting

Attendance

- **Board Members:** Zoe Richards (ZR), Miles Waite (MW), Caryn Connolly (CC), Don Meals (DM), Kyle Tansley (KT), Hannah Brislin (HB), Rebecca Roman (RR), Ryan Crehan (RC), Lina Swislocki (LS), Elizabeth Cunningham (EC)
- **Absent:**
- **Public:** Elizabeth Hermann, Seth Goddard, Rem Kielman, Lucy & Keye Wong, Patrick Dunseith, Nick Warner, Lauren Chicote
- **Staff:** Scott Gustin (Permitting & Inspections), Dan Cahill (Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront)

ZR, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

Minutes

A MOTION was made by DM and SECONDED by RR:

Adopt the minutes of December 5, 2022 as written.

Vote: 8-0-0, motion carried. (No MW yet)

Board Comment

HB met with Patrick Dunseith and LS to talk about deer management at the Intervale. They have reached out to councilor Bergman. Shelburne Farms has a deer management program in place and could be a good local reference. They are meeting again on Thursday. Looking to get the public involved in this discussion.

Public Comment

None.

Open Space Subcommittee

SG noted the Urban Forest Comprehensive Plan RFP discussion and the NBCS application form. Some additional comments were made as to the RFP. An updated draft will be put together this week. He noted the NBCS application needs to flesh out the back end more – items like verification that work was done and establishing time limits.

DM requested the full Board see the revised draft application. HB recommended incorporating income sensitivity to the grants. DM said the grant information needs to lay out criteria from the Climate Action Plan. Doing so would provide a guide to avoid funding personal benefit. HB, has anyone looked at current state grants that are available? Do any exist that are similar to what we're contemplating here?

The programs and services of the Dept. of Permitting & Inspections are accessible to people with disabilities. For accessibility information call 865-7188.

DM mentioned that he was able to get a subsidy for installing his pervious driveway from the LCBP. HB said folks aren't aware of these resources unless they are informed of them. LS noted EQIP. SG mentioned San Francisco has something similar. RC mentioned nonprofits that fund similar initiatives. LS mentioned Washington, DC, and ZR mentioned Cleveland.

MW appeared at 6:00 PM.

Project Review

1. **ZP-23-9; 98 Sunset Cliff Rd (Ward 4N, RL-W) Elizabeth Hermann / Keye & Lucy Wong** Demolish existing single family residence and replace with new single family residence.

Elizabeth Hermann, Seth Goddard, Rem Kielman, Lucy Wong, and Keye Wong appeared on behalf of this item.

SG overviewed the application and noted that its before the Conservation Board due to its location along the lakeshore. The property is largely within the lakeshore buffer. Consideration is given to tree retention, stormwater management, and low-mow areas along the lakeshore.

Elizabeth Hermann noted that the new home will be set back substantially further from the lake than the existing home.

DM asked why the demo? Ms. Hermann said that the existing structure is built more like a bunker than a home. It is in rough shape with a number of problems.

Rem Kielman noted that the condition of the home leaves a lot to be desired. Its also located atop the bluff on the shoreline. The new home will be set back to provide more breathing room for the lake.

Ms. Hermann noted that much of the existing home is subterranean. Its quite odd.

Seth Goddard overviewed the erosion control plan. He noted the low mow zone on the lakeshore. He noted the proposed bioretention area for post-construction stormwater management.

RC asked if there's a reason stormwater won't be directed away from the lake. Seth Goddard said the property slopes down towards the lake. RC asked about existing vs. proposed impervious surface. As proposed, impervious area will increase by 3,000 sf. DM asked if the pickle ball court was included in that. Seth, yes.

DM, what are the onsite soils? Seth Goddard, silt loam sands are the soils onsite. DM, is there opportunity for infiltration onsite? Perhaps infiltrate the driveway runoff into the adjacent green space.

MW said it looks like the driveway flows go into the proposed bioretention area. Do you know if infiltration can be done? Mr. Goddard, we need to do further soils analysis to know if this is possible.

RC, pleased with moving the house back from the lake and sees a good landscape plan. The bio retention area seems small. If stormwater can be redirected from the lake, he'd encourage that. Mr. Goddard said the size is based on preliminary calculations. The end result could be different.

ZR to MW, does this seem like a reasonable practice with the bio retention area where proposed? MW said he agreed that gravity doesn't work in the other direction. It would be nice to include infiltration if the soils support it.

DM agrees with MW but thinks additional analysis is needed as to infiltration. The bioretention area is within the lakeshore buffer.

Seth Goddard said he's happy to share the design data but will need time to do it. The soil tests are done in the warmer months without frost. Elizabeth Hermann, construction is slated to start as soon as possible in the spring.

DM said he can't vote to support this project without seeing the numbers as to how the stormwater system will work.

Lucy Wong said it seems the standards are shifting with this proposal. RC said the difference is the substantially larger impervious surface.

HB noted that the Board did a site visit to a nearby property. Would there be benefit to do a visit to this one as well?

MW said we're dealing with subsurface characteristics. A site visit would not help with that. Having soils information would be helpful. Approval could be granted with requirements to provide this data. RR agreed with MW.

Ms. Hermann said it would be nice to know that this info was required for this meeting. We know we can make this work one way or the other.

RC said that the amount of impervious running towards the lake could be minimized. Utilize the meadow area in the front to accommodate some of this runoff.

A MOTION was made by HB and SECONDED by CC:

The Board needs to see more data as to soils and stormwater design information.

Discussion: DM noted that there used to be hand-outs for BCB applicants. SG noted the Water Resources review for EPSC and Post-Construction Stormwater Management (both are checklists). LS, is there any info in the desired data that won't be covered in the formal review process? ZR, noted there is sensitivity of certain locations, like the lakeshore, that are within our purview. RC acknowledged deference to the stormwater program at some point, but the location within the lakeshore buffer is within BCB's purview.

Vote: 7-2-0, motion carried.

Executive Session

All Board members, Scott Gustin, Dan Cahill, Nick Warner, Lauren Chicote, and Patrick Dunseith present.

Adjournment

7:38 PM.