

Meagan Tuttle

From: genesegrill <genesegrill1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 1:22 PM
To: Meagan Tuttle; SEA-Talk; saveopenspaceburlington; Bruce Seifer; Amey Radcliffe; Ibnar Avilix; C. W. Norris-Brown; Jen Berger; steve conant; Amanda Hannaford; John Murray; Lea Terhune; Charles Simpson; Barbara Headrick; barbara McGrew; Paul Schnable; Ruby Perry; Steve Goodkind; TONY Redington; Mannie Lionni; Diane Elliott Gayer
Subject: Re: planBTV South End: Economic Devt. & Arts/Affordability
Attachments: Econ Dev & Arts Affordability_revised text & plan notes.pdf

Categories: BTV South End

Thank you, Meagan, for sending along the attached revised Plan BTV section on arts and affordability for comment. I do have a few issues with the new document (surprise, surprise), as follows:

1. The discussion of the transformation of traditional industrial/manufacturing uses over the years is misleading, and seems to ignore the many traditional industries (like Edlund Co.) who are still operating in the area and providing many many good jobs. While there has been change, we need to remember that these older industries are still here (the draft plan tends to speak of them as if they have long ago moved on). And their interests must be taken into consideration. The jobs that they provide are probably far more important to our city than the trendy brew pubs that are popping up in the neighborhood. We learned from speaking with many business owners that they were being pushed out by the rising rents due to competing non-traditional uses such as high end office space. We might consider tightening regulations to allow for only maker/manufacturing uses in the zone. There is, also, a manufacturing renaissance happening in the country, due to the high cost of overseas and national transport. This is a good time to be incentivizing local manufacturing, not replacing it with restaurants and offices!
2. In the discussion of housing there is no distinction made between what is described as a desire for housing in the South End and desire for housing in the Enterprise District. We had to learn over the past year to be VERY careful about making this distinction. The language of the plan should also be very clear about that. There is, as far as we have ascertained, no meaningful

desire for housing in the Enterprise District, while there may be interest in it in the larger South End. While the third bullet on p. 2 does well in delineating the problem with putting housing in the ED, the main point in the heading is that workforce housing is desired in the South End. Is it? And should this be conflated with a desire in the ED? The businesses we spoke with (over 40) all said they did not want housing for their workers in the ED. This needs to be clarified! Furthermore, the suggestion that living in the ED would provide a high quality of life, ignores the problems of placing housing in industrial zones, already discussed.

3. Is there really a "strong demand" among ED workers for places to socialize, eat, and work out near their work place? Where is this statement coming from? Church street is a 10 minute walk from the ED. That could be some small exercise for someone who wanted to get a drink after work, without the fee of a health club!

4. I am so glad you are advocating thinking regionally with the Shelburne Road corridor. Finally! Also, the idea of improving workforce training is something that many people have been advancing over the last year. There are great opportunities for this: training schools, internship opportunities in traditional and newer manufacturing, and a collaboration between artists and industry. Let's do more with this for sure.

5. One thing missing here is a discussion of the possibility and benefit of tightening regulations in the ED. Instead we read over and over in PlanBTV about the benefits of deregulation (removing obstacles to development). Many people have spoken repeatedly about the need to study the possibility of tightening zoning in the ED to foster and protect its unique character, its energy as economic engine, etc. Grants could be researched to fund the creation of community centers, collaborative art centers and training schools that support and serve the community. This could be a priority or action item for the Plan.

Please make my comments part of the official record.

All the best,

-Genese Grill,
South End Alliance

On Tue, Jan 12, 2016 at 12:12 PM, Meagan Tuttle <mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Apologies, missed the attachment.

Meagan E Tuttle, AICP

Comprehensive Planner

City of Burlington, VT

[802.865.7193](tel:802.865.7193)

***Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.*

From: Meagan Tuttle
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Meagan Tuttle
Subject: RE: planBTV South End: Housing

Hello and Happy New Year!

The Planning Commission and it's Long Range Planning Committee are continuing their work to revise planBTV South End. The LRPC will meet at **SEABA this Thursday, Jan. 14**, and at the **Dept. of Public Works (645 Pine Street) on Jan 28** to discuss the Economic Development and Arts & Affordability sections of the plan. Both meetings are at noon.

Please see attached a document which contains DRAFT revisions to these two important sections of the plan. Pages 1-10 include only text, which is intended to replace the current text of these sections of the plan. The later part of the document includes excerpts of the plan, with purple call-out boxes to highlight where the text is to be inserted. These documents refer to the DRAFT Arts & Affordability Toolkit, [which is available on the planBTV website](#). (*Updates to this Toolkit will be forthcoming.*)

I invite you to also look over the revisions. After reviewing, please feel free to do any of the following:

- Attend the LRPC meetings on Jan 14 or Jan 28 to participate in the discussion
- Send your thoughts on the revisions to me or to a Planning Commissioner
- Share with others you think may be interested in reviewing the suggested edits

Thank you,

Meagan

Meagan E Tuttle, AICP

Comprehensive Planner

City of Burlington, VT

[802.865.7193](tel:802.865.7193)

***Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.*

From: Meagan Tuttle

Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 4:10 PM

To: Doreen Kraft; Sara Katz; Peter Owens; Diana Colangelo; Todd Rawlings; Kirsten Merriman Shapiro; Brian Lowe; Lee Krohn; gals@gothamcitygraphics.com; conewango@gmail.com; 'Maggie Standley'; 'Ibnar Avilix'; genesegrill1@gmail.com; director@seaba.com; echurchill@ccrpcvt.org; Andy Montroll; Bruce Baker; David E. White; Emily Lee (gmail); Emily Lee (Work); Harris Roen; Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur (jwb@burlingtontelecom.net); Lee Buffinton; Meagan Tuttle; Yves Bradley

Cc: David E. White

Subject: planBTV South End: Housing

Hi All—

As you're likely aware, the Planning Commission dedicated the majority of its last two meetings to a discussion of how the draft plan BTV South End's strategies for housing can be revised. With direction from the Commission, and dedicated South End stakeholders, staff has taken a stab at revising the text for the housing element of the plan, which is attached. This text has been sent to the Long Range Planning Committee, who will meet on Monday, November 23, 2015 at 12pm in the Planning & Zoning Conference room, to review and discuss.

I invite you to also look over the revisions, which are suggested to replace the text from pages 22-23 and 56-59 of the draft plan, which is available online [here](#). After reviewing, please feel free to:

- Attend the LRPC meeting on Monday to participate in the discussion
- Send your thoughts on the revisions to me or to a Planning Commissioner
- Share with others you think may be interested in reviewing the suggested edits

The Planning Commission will continue to review the draft plan element-by-element during its upcoming meetings. Once we've obtained some direction from the full Commission on how to update, the LRPC will work through the specifics. Please note that the next elements for PC discussion will be economic development and arts & affordability on November 24 at 6:30pm in CR 12.

Thank you,

Meagan

Meagan E Tuttle, AICP

Principal Planner for Comprehensive Planning

City of Burlington, VT

mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov

[802.865.7188](tel:802.865.7188) office

[802.865.7193](tel:802.865.7193) direct

[802.865.7195](tel:802.865.7195) fax

***Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.*

--

Genese Grill, PhD

<http://genesegrill.blogspot.com>

<http://contramundum.net/thought-flights.html>

<http://www.jstor.org/r/WorldAsMetaphor>

<http://musilattempts.blogspot.com/>

<http://researchsharingviapaper.blogspot.com>

<http://southendalliance.org>

Meagan Tuttle

From: Charles Simpson <simpsocr@plattsburgh.edu>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2015 7:14 PM
To: genese grill
Cc: Meagan Tuttle; SEA-Talk; saveopenspaceburlington; abbilmo@yahoo.com; beaukwin@yahoo.com; carolyn@whirledtree.org; carpediem@burlingtontelecom.net; cmclaughlin214@yahoo.com; consuelac@msm.com; johanne@ybba.com; josh-mcdonald@comcast.net; Katherine Taylor-McBroom; labossa1@hotmail.com; lida@lidawinfield.com; mjladesigns@gmail.com; rfeldmanvt@gmail.com; salmv145@gmail.com; walkerwrks@aol.com; wassuck@gmail.com; Aaron Grossman; Alexander James Dostie; Alexandra Halkin; Andrew Chardain; Andrew Russell; astein@sover.net; beth robinson; bobby hackney; Bren@flynn-dog; Bruce Seifer; Bryan Parmelee; Christina Erickson; christopher shar; Christy Mitchell; Clark Derbes; Danielle Patterson; Dylan Giambatista; Edward Burke; Ellen Goodrich; Evzen Holas; Guy Derry; Jared Maher; Jason Cook; Jason Pappas; Jean Cannon; Jessica Workman; Jewels Sparks; John Brickels; john marius; Katie Grauer; liz@shophelamp.com; Lydia Littwin; Madeline Mclennon; Mary Heinrich Aloji; Matthew Penney; Moe O'Hara; Patrick Tracy; reggie; Robert Chamberlin; Ron Hernandez; Ronald Wanamaker; Scottie Raymond; Stephanie Bush; Stephen Sharon; Steve Williams; studio@timothygrannis.com; Wylie Garcia; "Audrey Rose"; "Carrie Clabargh"; "Nancy Tomczak"; steve conant; Doreen Kraft; Sara Katz; Peter Owens; Diana Colangelo; Todd Rawlings; Kirsten Merriman Shapiro; Brian Lowe; Lee Krohn; gals@gothamcitygraphics.com; conewango@gmail.com; Maggie Standley; Ibnar Avilix; director@seaba.com; echurchill@ccrvcvt.org; Andy Montroll; Bruce Baker; David E. White; Emily Lee (gmail); Emily Lee (Work); Harris Roen; Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur (jwb@burlingtontelecom.net); Lee Buffinton; Yves Bradley
Subject: Re: [SOS-B] Re: planBTV South End: Housing

Thank you Meagan Tuttle for drafting these proposed changes to the South End plan and thank you Genese Grill for sharing Tuttle's comments as well as her own.

Here's my comments on the revision of the Housing Section:

First, is it restful to read text separated from the razzmatazz of graphics and images. How much shorter and less costly would the South End booklet have been had it followed a text-based model with index?

Second, the section on housing makes clear that opening up the Enterprise District to residential development has motivated the South End study. Now that Tuttle has indicated that that premise has been discarded, at least for the moment--"at this time."--there is an opportunity to reorient the recommendations toward enhancing the entrepreneurial and cultural economies of the area. Given that local, organic food production has emerged as a growth sector of the state's economy and that the market is centered in Chittenden County, the study might urge the location of a meat and vegetable processing facility in the South End available to many smaller producers and organized as a non-profit cooperative. Given the location of a new City Market with an ekes of 2 acres on their plot, an adjacent Flynn Avenue location seems the obvious choice. Second, given that Burlington is counting on a vibrant cultural economy with cultural innovators already clustered in the Enterprise Zone, it seems an obvious move to recommend that the huge city-owned lot on Pine Street formerly housing DPW be transformed into an arts and artisan facility with cooperatively shared and appropriately designed facilities for dance, music, woodworking, and sculpture. Such a facility should include instructional space, retail space for art products, performance space, and practice/rehearsal areas. Let the consultants challenge city officials to put

their money where their rhetoric is: that is, to use city-owned space to incubate the culture that Burlington City Arts celebrates.

Thank you,
Charle Simpson, Ward 6

On Fri, Nov 20, 2015 at 10:38 PM, genese grill <genese grill1@gmail.com> wrote:

Here is the attachment sent by Meagan Tuttle of the revisions to Plan BTV South End's section on housing.

On Fri, Nov 20, 2015 at 10:36 PM, genese grill <genese grill1@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks for sending this draft revision of Plan BTV's section on housing in the ED. It is a relief to read and really, finally, reflects the really hard-won conversations of the last few months. Thank you, thank you, thank you. As you probably can expect, I have a few comments/suggestions/questions:

1. Can we take out the word "currently" in paragraph two in the phrase "currently prohibits housing". It suggests that this prohibition is precarious and subject to change.
2. In the section on causes of the housing problem the mention of regulations and parking costs reads as justification for cutting important public review processes and eliminating regulations that protect our health, our neighborhood character, and so on. While I am sure developers would build faster and more if we continued to deregulate more, this would not necessarily be good. The argument for deregulation in Plan BTV Downtown/Waterfront led to Form Based Code and can be read as a justification for eliminating public review in exchange for getting the housing we need. Can't we hold out for a higher standard?
3. Bullet two (about providing housing for the middle) is much appreciated!
4. Add to cures: improve multi-modal transportation (bus/train/park and ride) combined with a regional eye to benefiting from housing possibilities in South Burlington and other nearby and outlying areas. The discussion about housing will be enriched by a discussion of regional possibilities and

transportation innovations. Urban infill is not the only answer to climate change! The people want park and rides, trains, and buses!

5. In Taste of Home section: can you remove the outdated language about it being difficult to make the argument against allowing any housing in the ED. It contradicts the fact that you then go on and make that argument a moment later.

6. The passage that says, "the conversation about new housing in this area should continue" must be qualified: it must be a conversation that takes into consideration the dangers of allowing housing discussed above.

7. When you talk about re-zoning areas adjacent to the ED, does that mean outside of the boundary line or inside it? I know that there are a few sites (that automotive shop on St. Paul, that are technically within the ED, but really more in a residential area, that might be rezoned, but I wouldn't want to see language that would encourage more spot zoning of areas that are at the edge of the ED but still central to its functioning. Can the language about adjacent areas and rezoning be made clearer to a lay person?

8. Can you say something somewhere (perhaps when you talk about changes ((good and bad)) to the neighborhood as a result of development) about the need for sensitive and responsible handling of toxic soils in the area along the waterfront?

I will send this out to our email list and hope that you get some more detailed responses from interested parties.

Yours,

Genese Grill

South End Alliance

On Fri, Nov 20, 2015 at 4:10 PM, Meagan Tuttle <mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Hi All—

As you're likely aware, the Planning Commission dedicated the majority of its last two meetings to a discussion of how the draft plan BTV South End's strategies for housing can be revised. With direction from the Commission, and dedicated South End stakeholders, staff has taken a stab at revising the text for the housing element of the plan, which is attached. This text has been sent to the Long Range Planning Committee, who will

meet on Monday, November 23, 2015 at 12pm in the Planning & Zoning Conference room, to review and discuss.

I invite you to also look over the revisions, which are suggested to replace the text from pages 22-23 and 56-59 of the draft plan, which is available online [here](#). After reviewing, please feel free to:

- Attend the LRPC meeting on Monday to participate in the discussion
- Send your thoughts on the revisions to me or to a Planning Commissioner
- Share with others you think may be interested in reviewing the suggested edits

The Planning Commission will continue to review the draft plan element-by-element during its upcoming meetings. Once we've obtained some direction from the full Commission on how to update, the LRPC will work through the specifics. Please note that the next elements for PC discussion will be economic development and arts & affordability on November 24 at 6:30pm in CR 12.

Thank you,

Meagan

Meagan E Tuttle, AICP

Principal Planner for Comprehensive Planning

City of Burlington, VT

mtuttle@burlingtonvt.gov

[802.865.7188](tel:802.865.7188) office

[802.865.7193](tel:802.865.7193) direct

[802.865.7195](tel:802.865.7195) fax

***Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.*

--

Genese Grill, PhD

<http://genesegrill.blogspot.com>

<http://contramundum.net/thought-flights.html>

<http://www.jstor.org/r/WorldAsMetaphor>

<http://musilattempts.blogspot.com/>

[**http://researchsharingviapaper.blogspot.com**](http://researchsharingviapaper.blogspot.com)

[**http://southendalliance.org**](http://southendalliance.org)

--

Genese Grill, PhD

<http://genesegrill.blogspot.com>

<http://contramundum.net/thought-flights.html>

<http://www.jstor.org/r/WorldAsMetaphor>

<http://musilattempts.blogspot.com/>

[**http://researchsharingviapaper.blogspot.com**](http://researchsharingviapaper.blogspot.com)

[**http://southendalliance.org**](http://southendalliance.org)

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SaveOpenSpaceBurlington" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to SaveOpenSpaceBurlington+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to SaveOpenSpaceBurlington@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/SaveOpenSpaceBurlington/CAEJZVKPehE1HPeX6SiZLWKE_HaBv3fMB%3DNBOHSRSQcvFBu%2Bv%2BA%40mail.gmail.com.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Comments: PlanBTV-South End — Amey Radcliffe — include in public record

Overall, there is much improvement to the new draft. Hooray! Here though, are some thoughts and suggestions. I've provided the first few words of the paragraph I am referencing in each comment.

1. Since much of the description and discussion of the South End, is really about the Enterprise District, I believe this should be clarified up front. The first line could read "Second only to Burlington's downtown, the South End Enterprise District (SEED) has long been an economic engine for the City and the region" A further suggestion would be to call the area the South End Arts and Enterprise District (SEAED) since there is a state designation in place for the arts district. This would serve to "brand" the area in a way that fits with both the reality and the aspiration of the area in many people's minds.
2. "Demand for spaces" section paragraph: The fact that industrial rents are higher in the SEED than in Chittenden County may be a misleading fact. One, there is very little industrial space in Burlington besides the SEED. The only other area may be the Riverside Ave. area. As for Chittenden County as a whole, the comparison is apples and oranges. Consider the "no man's land" feel to most industrial parks of CC in Williston, Essex, Winooski and Colchester. There is no historic charm and very little in the way of creative or artist activity. Two, proximity to downtown Burlington also makes the SEED very unique. It's a no-brainer that there is much desirability in the SEED for arts, enterprise, innovation and industry. We have the vibe, we have the space, we have the parking!
3. "Office rents....." paragraph: This section could use some more clarification. One, The kind of office space that is comparable between downtown and the SEED is limited to only certain buildings. The fact that rents are comparable in such spaces makes sense but the fact that parking is available shouldn't be downplayed. As a former renter in an upstairs Church Street office, I can attest to the every day challenge of finding free parking downtown (a preferable choice to a high monthly parking cost) and the fact that the lack of parking is challenging for clients as well. The SEED represents a lower cost more accessible alternative, so while office rents of a particular kind may be comparable, the ease of the SEED far exceeds downtown. The other important point is that the SEED offers a different kind of rental space than downtown in the rougher, older and less improved buildings and for these buildings, rent is much less than downtown. Our own move from a 400 square foot office in downtown allowed us to triple the space for less than double the cost. As a creative business, the roughness of the space is in fact desirable. I believe this less tangible quality to the SEED should be factored-in in desirability as well as what in fact needs to be preserved. I have seen many other offices in the SEED's older buildings that have this same quality and it's what draws the ooohs and ahhh's from a particular demographic of creative people and entrepreneurs.

4. “Increasing difficulty in finding affordable....” Paragraph: Some community experience may show that small spaces are mainly what is in demand at least in the artist community. In the Howard block, when a small space is available (less than 1000 sq feet) News travels through the community and a shuffle happens where one artist/business upgrades to a larger space, and an artist that may have been part of a collective space will opt for their own private space. The only time that does not occur is when a very large space opens. Case in point: When the artist community learned that Burlington Furniture would be moving to 747, the interest arose but because of the large amount of space and the total monthly cost, it represented too big a “nut” to crack for most artists. The space took several months to rent. The Unsworth’s did initially try for something closer to “market rate rent” due to the fact that the space was well improved by Burlington Furniture but in the end, the prices are more comparable to other Howard spaces. (8/ft for finished, 6/ft for warehouse) Unsworth’s difficulty in renting this space required them to hire Vermont Commercial to help. It is now under contract by two creative entities who will share it. The HR&A market study leaves out some important nuances to our SEED – in the same way I believe Goody Clancy and Civic Moxie also missed some particular phenomena of our area that needs consideration if we are to preserve the area for what it does, why people like it and what will keep it from further gentrification. Lastly, another local story that has inspired conversation in the community. Urban Moonshine wanted to stay in the SEED for its manufacturing facility but ran into compliance issues. Many of us wonder why CEDO and the City could not have stepped in to help make something work for them. This is the kind of business that is a good fit for the SEED. Bruce Seifer did a lot in his tenure to help businesses thrive and stay in the SEED. This kind of preservation effort should be continued. Embracing the area as the most vibrant creative economy center of Vermont can’t be emphasized enough. To further this thought: CEDO could also consider the following. What if they provided a space management service so that when a larger space like Burlington Furniture opens, they manage the space by breaking it into multiple smaller affordable spaces that are the ones MOST in demand? A small increase to sq ft rates for each space could cover operating costs if this is not looked upon with a high-profit motive. This would be a preservation effort for affordable spaces and perhaps the building owner could be given some incentives to keep yearly increases minimal to provide a long term affordability.

5. “An evolving economy and workforce....” Paragraph: I like the notion of diversity of jobs in the SEED. I also like the idea that the industrial/manufacturing/innovation/entrepreneurship aspects to the SEED help provide economic diversity for the city overall. Downtown is largely a mix of office, professional services, retail, restaurant and hospitality. A worker downtown could be a lawyer, a psychologist, a store clerk, a waitress or a housekeeper in a hotel. The evolution of downtown with increases in the hospitality industry, means that there is a big gap between high wage earners and lower wage earners. The SEED may offer a greater breadth of wage levels than downtown due to the fact that there is room for larger more diverse businesses

like Rhino, Edlund, Burton and Dealer. This should be encouraged and the balance of this kind of industry and manufacturing with retail and restaurant should be closely watched.

6. “Retail, entertainment and service uses....” Paragraph: This introduction of this facet of business, may in fact be the downfall to the SEED. Given that the framers of the original restrictions of the SEED prohibited certain uses and required certain perimeters should be revisited for today’s situation. What kinds of retail? What kinds of restaurants? Brattleboro’s downtown has discouraged chain stores. This has created a more interesting and unique downtown. Should “making” be an aspect of all retail/hospitality – or Vermont-made? I don’t agree with the idea of “strong demand from workers who are looking for places to eat, shop, exercise and socialize after work”. What makes the SEED desirable for many is parking... plain and simple. With the new downtown core parking costs, this has probably become even more true. Why try to park downtown to go to Penny Cluse or Magnolia if you can park at the Spot? Why wrestle with downtown parking to get a drink when you can park more easily at Citizen Cider? Regardless, an influx of more retail establishment and restaurants is not necessarily a good thing for the SEED.
7. “A demand for housing in the South End....” This section needs work. Firstly, discussions of “crisis” and “scarcity” could benefit from more clarity. From my understanding in listening to Michael Monte and others. the real problem is in fact a problem with affordability. Both subsidy level and all housing below market rate is needed in our city and in our region. While “workforce housing” is sometimes the term given for BMR housing, I think it’s a misrepresentation to say there is a “demand for housing in the South End to accommodate a growing workforce”. According to conversations with over 40 businesses, members of SEA did not find a conclusive call for worker housing from large SEED businesses. And in fact, the housing survey that went out to SEED businesses was so flawed that one large company did not want to give it out to employees as they thought it poorly executed. My own experience found two significant problems. One was that despite my own disclosure that I live in the country outside Burlington and I am happy doing so, the survey allowed me down a trail of hypothetical questions “if you did want to move would you want to live in x, y or z?....” My answers were not applicable and the survey should not have allowed me to continue. There were also leading questions along the lines of “wouldn’t you like to live in the industrial south end?” without the benefit of explaining current zoning restrictions and why they are in place which may bring about a different answer. In short, this section is misleading the data from which conclusions are being drawn is questionable.
8. As for the bullet “Employees of the South End businesses....” The issue raised here could most simply be solved with a good park and ride at Kmart or another accessible lot with a Pine Street shuttle every 10 minutes. Many people like myself, like living outside of Burlington for land, fresh air, proximity to outdoor

- activities like skiing and a less crowded environment. This will not change with housing in the South End.
9. Last bullet in this section should read “However, the demand for new housing in the Enterprise District has the potential....”
 10. I would add a bullet in the same section that states an effort to utilize lots and opportunities that already exist in residentially zoned areas of the South End including behind Champlain School, the Pine Street Deli corner, an additional floor on Jackson Terrace, and a below market rate housing building created by CHT and Housing Vermont by renovating the Blodgett building in an affordable manner to create small units of housing for many people who need it.
 11. Page 3. “As we look to the future” section... what is meant by “redefining the one-size-fits-all approach to land use regulation” This could use clarification.
 12. Strategies section. I’m skeptical of the sub-district approach for a few reasons. One is that it serves to divide an area that actually needs more connection. Because the SEED is a large area geographically and right now the best method to connect to outlying points is by car, we need to rethink transportation to maximize connection. Ideas such as city bikes, regular shuttle buses, trolley, monorail, tubes, tunnels, and other creative solutions should be considered to consolidate not separate areas for maximum benefit. What happens in my own block is fascinating with regard to shared services and resources amongst businesses. With a city-sponsored transport of people and goods, this could become District-wide.
 13. Page 7 – preserving arts and affordability. The number one way to preserve affordability is to stem gentrification. Many areas around the country and the world are looking at this issue.
 14. Page 9. “create zoning and development regulations....” I’d like to see this section expand to discuss more than just artist affordability, and perhaps it belongs in an earlier section. I’d like to see zoning and development regulations to help expand the creative, innovative, entrepreneurial and artistic possibilities of the SEED. How can zoning be used as a tool to direct change toward a most favorable goal.

Finally some overall comments:

1. We need more studies. We need a study that looks at the current climate of manufacturing/industry/artistry/innovation/entrepreneurship and makes recommendations for creating a fostering environment for more incubator facilities, micro-manufacturing and Vermont style business activity. What are

the ways to foster this and what are the threats to it. The path is started, how do we help it grow?

2. Gentrification study. What are the causes and effects? How is it discouraged? What guidelines/restrictions thwart it? What can Burlington do that other communities have failed at?
3. Study of how small cities come together to create amazing cultural centers. How did North Adams create Mass MOCA? How did the Torpedo Factory get done? What tools are available that do not require housing as a method? What federal grants could be utilized to create an energy innovation hub or a center for invention/innovation/entrepreneurship for all people including new americans, refugees, and marginalized populations. How can creativity be used for the greater good?
4. The plan is missing an important ingredient and one that needs to come from the community in a deliberate way: A “mission statement” for the SEED. It would be a statement of purpose, vision and the guiding principles to achieve it. This could be achieved through a community lead visioning workshop with much greater depth than what has been provided thus far. It could start with the revised draft of Plan BTV SE as a foundation, but should not be city run if it is to have true community buy-in. Many active and engaged citizens would appreciate this opportunity to create a simple vision directive that is what all future efforts are measured against in the same way a corporation measures its activities against its mission statement and brand identity. I have met with a woman who does this work for a living and would be willing to offer her services to run such a workshop. Do let me know if you would consider this idea and I will happily champion it in the community.

Lastly I offer my own participation in the next efforts of plan BTV-SE. I would volunteer to join the Collaborative Working Group and I would offer my design services for any next drafts at a reduced rate.

Thanks for reading my lengthy comments and ideas.

Thanks for the opportunity.

Amey Radcliffe,

Artist, co-owner of Gotham City Graphics now in our 27th year.