December Housing Action Plan

Establishes a goal for Burlington’s share of the regional Building Homes Together campaign’s target of 5,000 new housing units in next 5 years:

- Support the creation of 1,250 new homes, including 312 (25%) permanently affordable by end of 2026

- Support the creation of 78 new homes for formerly homeless residents (25% of the permanently affordable goal) through partnership with affordable housing developers

More at: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/mayor/housingpolicy
BTV Housing Dashboard

This dashboard shows the creation of new housing in Burlington by year. Use the year slider to the left to expand the time frame, and the drop down menu on the map to add other years.

From: 2005  
To: 2022  
Total Units Built: 1,687

New units are drawn from current and legacy Burlington permitting systems. Data from earlier years (approx. pre-2005) are less reliable than more recent data, and recent year totals are subject to change.

Explore the dashboard: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning/btvstat/housing
BTV Housing Dashboard

Explore the dashboard: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning/btvstat/housing
December Housing Action Plan

This plan included a number of strategies related to the goal to end chronic homelessness:

• **Invest at least $5 million of ARPA funds**
  - $3 million has been designated to initiatives to end homelessness
  - $1-2 million additional to build new permanently affordable housing invested through partners

• **Fully fund Housing Trust Fund to voter-approved levels ($0.01/$100 assessed value)**
  - FY23 Budget expected to generate nearly $565,000 for the Housing Trust Fund

• **Create a Special Assistant to End Homelessness position in CEDO, single point of accountability for expanded community efforts**
  - Sarah Russell joined CEDO in April, from Burlington Housing Authority

• **New investments to strengthen the Chittenden County Coordinated Entry team’s progress towards “functional zero” with a comprehensive, real-time data effort**
  - ARPA funds invested to increase staffing capacity for Coordinated Entry, with 1.5 new FTE staff

• **Invest in approx. 30 shelter pods and related infrastructure to create a new low-barrier facility for 2022**
  - DRB approval of permit for Shelter Community & Community Resource Center @ Elmwood Avenue- late June

More at: [https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/mayor/housingpolicy](https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/mayor/housingpolicy)
December Housing Action Plan

Items that have been on Planning Dept. & Commission’s work plan are a big part of this plan and complement to these specific efforts:

• New on-campus UVM student housing opportunities through zoning changes for UVM’s Trinity Campus
  • Underway- https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/plan/trinitycampus

• Consider housing opportunities as part of the creation of an Innovation District in a portion of the South End Enterprise Zone
  • Underway- https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning/implementation/SEID

• Expand opportunities for new homes in every neighborhood in ways that reflect the character of these parts of the city through “missing middle” zoning reforms
  • Upcoming
Discussions To-Date

*Potential zoning changes for the Trinity Campus have been discussed during:*

- **January** - UVM Zoning Change Request to City Council
- **February** - UVM Zoning Change Request to Planning Commission
- **Feb. Ward 1/8 NPA** – Focus on UVM Campus Planning & Enrollment
- **Mar. Ward 1/8 NPA** - Q&A on Housing Issues with Ward 1/8 PC Members
- **May Ward 1/8 NPA** - Focus on City Housing Plans & Policies, including near-campus neighborhoods
- **May Planning Commission Meeting** - initial feedback on potential zoning changes
- **June 23 Public Meeting** - feedback on goals for rezoning, specific questions & reactions to potential changes
- **June & July PC Meetings** - feedback on potential changes in public forum
Goals for Trinity Campus Rezoning

*Potential zoning changes guided by shared goals for this part of campus:*

- Facilitate the responsible development of **additional student beds on campus**
- **Build new undergraduate residence halls, graduate apartments**, upgrade some of the existing residence halls on the Campus and expand dining hall
- Mix of uses in a **vibrant residential community and enhance sense of community on campus** to attract interest from a range of students
- Reorganize buildings and open spaces to **activate campus open space**
- **Synergy with walking & biking improvements** planned for Colchester Avenue, ensure adequate bike facilities
- **Minimize parking on the campus**, and focus on structured parking that may also provide community benefit if new parking to be created
Requested Zoning Changes

In February, UVM presented request to the Planning Commission to modify zoning provisions:

- **Height:**
  - 45’ within the setback from Colchester Ave
  - 80’ beyond (i.e. Mann Hall to north)

- **Lot Coverage:**
  - increase to 60%

- **Setbacks:**
  - 25’ setback for buildings 45’ or less
  - allow buildings closer than 115’ from Colchester Ave

Graphic of setbacks & development area courtesy of UVM Feb presentation
Requested Height & Setback

Requested Zoning Changes:
- **Setback:** 25 ft. from **property line** (property line is ~15 ft. from inner edge of sidewalk, for ~40 ft. total from inner edge of sidewalk)
- **Height:** 45 ft. within existing 115 ft. setback; 80 ft. to the north of existing setback

Existing Campus Example:
- **Redstone Commons**
- **Setback:** ~33 ft. from inner edge of sidewalk
- **Height:** 40 ft.
What we’ve heard

When asked about priority goals for Trinity Campus, ~50% of attendees at June meeting indicated additional student beds on campus as 1st or 2nd priority (note: not all attendees had poll access)

- General support for increased on-campus beds on the Trinity Campus, rehabilitating existing dorms to make more modern and attractive living options

However, questions and concerns remain about this goal, including:

- How do new beds on Trinity fit into campus plans, historic/planned enrollment?
- Who does UVM anticipate housing in additional beds?
- How does increased housing on campus ultimately impact off-campus housing supply pressures?
- Can zoning amendment can be tied to concrete enrollment or specific campus housing commitments?
- Concerns focus on desire for UVM to create even more new campus beds; and Junior/Senior enrollment, students’ access to affordable on-campus options, and student preferences for on-campus vs. off-campus housing
What we’ve heard

Regarding goals for enhanced sense of community and reorganizing buildings and activated open space for campus residents & users:

- Mixed reactions to potential infill buildings & increased height closer to Colchester Avenue
  - Many have responded favorably to development concept & precedent images shared by UVM
  - Some have expressed reservations about buildings closer to the street/taller along the street in terms of compatibility with homes on Colchester Ave.
  - Fewer concerns about new development set back within the campus
  - Interest in adequate landscaping & design of new buildings for streetscape on Colchester Avenue

- Some openness to allowing some non-residential uses on the campus, particularly to support goal to attract student residents, but not as a primary use
  - Other ideas shared for campus amenities that could attract students (i.e. dining & fitness options)
  - One resident has shared extensive concerns about non-residential uses on Trinity or other parts of campus
  - Some expressed preference that housing be the main focus on Trinity, with space maximized for this purpose
What we’ve heard

Regarding goals for synergy with Colchester Avenue walking/biking enhancements and limited new parking resources on the campus residents & other users:

• Question about whether changes to setbacks will preclude implementation of Colchester Ave plan
  • Specifically whether a round-about would fit at intersection with East Avenue

• Support for not increasing parking on the campus, but questions about where parking will accommodated for increased campus beds
Key Topics for Further Review

What is the right balance between setbacks/height limits and the goal to see UVM take on a larger share of student housing needs on-campus within the Trinity Campus limitations?

- Not all of Trinity Campus is in Overlay, providing a buffer to residential areas to the east and west
- Balance use of site area for residences, some parking, open spaces, etc.
Landbanks organize future development in a flexible framework.

Opportunities to add student housing through new construction, renovation and/or redevelopment of existing housing.

Academic landbanks near existing academic uses provide opportunities for additions and adaptive reuse to foster interdisciplinary work, research growth.

Unassigned landbank has potential for mixed-use development and active green space including stormwater management practices.

No new parking is envisioned for this area. Parking needs for new development would be met in other parts of campus.

No landbanks located on “ears” leaving buffer for residential neighborhood.
Key Topics for Further Review

What is the right balance between setbacks/height limits and the goal to see UVM take on a larger share of student housing needs on-campus within the Trinity Campus limitations?

• Not all of Trinity Campus is in Overlay, providing a buffer to residential areas to the east and west

• Balance use of site area for residences, some parking, open spaces, etc.

• Not all of campus area highly suitable to new developments- what can reasonably be achieved within remaining area?
Key Topics for Further Review

*For clarity, staff presented additional considerations for Commission discussion as they relate to goals for Trinity Campus (not all of Institutional district):*

- Most Campus Overlays do not apply a limit on housing in order to enable institutions to maximize their anticipated growth within their campus areas.
- Cafés, small grocery stores, similar business types are limited to existing buildings, or have to be reviewed by the DRB before being permitted in new buildings.
- DRB review is required for smaller development projects than required in other Institutional and Mixed Use zoning districts.
- Continued interest in overall growth & development plans for the Institutions and how specific project proposals fit the vision, such as expanded campus planning requirements to complement Parking Management Plan process.
For clarity, staff presented additional considerations for Commission discussion as they relate to goals for Trinity Campus (not all of Institutional district):

- Most Campus Overlays do not apply a limit on housing in order to enable institutions to maximize their anticipated growth within their campus areas.
  - **Reason for consideration:** How does this relate to desire for more campus housing, specifically on Trinity Campus?

- Cafés, small grocery stores, similar business types are limited to existing buildings, or have to be reviewed by the DRB before being permitted in new buildings.
  - **Reason for consideration:** How does a mixed-use community with limited non-residential uses support the goal for a vibrant community that is attractive to students who otherwise can choose to live off-campus? Some have also indicated that some limited neighborhood-oriented uses can support and enhance the attractive neighborhoods around the Trinity campus.
  - Some non-residential uses are already permitted or conditional uses in Institutional Districts generally, and in the Trinity Overlay area specifically. Key question is about how they are incorporated into potential new buildings on Trinity.
Existing Zoning Standards

Trinity Campus Overlay Zone applies to central portion of the Campus and allows:

- **Building Height**: 35 ft – 55 ft max (up to height of tallest existing structure)
- **Setbacks**: Buildings required to be 115 ft from Colchester Ave
- **Lot Coverage**: 40%
- **Density**: 20 units/acre (4 beds = 1 unit)
Existing Zoning Standards

*Overlay Zone also specifies:*

- **Parking:** Prohibits new surface parking, parking demand & supply part of Institutional Parking Management Plan
- **Uses:** Housing permitted. Non-residential uses are limited to buildings built before 2002, or required to be reviewed as a conditional use
- **Process:** Any development greater than 15,000 sq.ft. requires Major Impact Review (in other parts of city, this is 40,000 sq.ft.)
UVM Trinity Campus Ideas

Infill Concept & renderings for Trinity Campus courtesy of UVM
Key Question

How can large surface parking lots and other underutilized sites on and near Lakeside Avenue be re-envisioned to:

• Become vibrant places that enhance and preserve South End identity
• Create new space for makers, jobs, and even homes
• Increase the area’s environmental and economic resilience
Innovation District

Roughly Howard St. to Sears Ln. west of Pine Street

Focus on properties with large surface parking lots, other underdeveloped areas

planBTV: South End identified as the heart of an “Innovation District”
Innovation District and **planBTV: South End**

“I think that the area around Lakeside has a lot of potential for development (big parking lot) and housing should be allowed there, but always as part of a mixed-use building, on top of some commercial uses, like a grocery store for example.”  COMMUNITY COMMENT FROM WEBTOOL

Transform surface parking and underutilized sites and expand connectivity to create a walkable, mixed-use innovation hub for businesses and maker activities. Incorporate parking in shared structures, new pocket parks and plazas, a "green corridor" along both sides of the Champlain Parkway, and better link Pine Street to the Lake.
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

ELM
1 large district

Concept
3-6 sub-districts
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

1 - Arts District - a “see-it-made destination” celebrating the creation of craftsman/artisan-scale products and the creative arts.
   • A “fine-tuning” of the current zoning with a broader range of uses

2 - Innovation District – a new mixed-use employment center focused on incubating and growing emerging technologies, science, R&D, tech-transfer, manufacturing, and innovation.
   • An opportunity to facilitate the redevelopment of brownfield sites and large surface parking lots.

3 - Light Manufacturing District – a reserve for traditional scale and format of manufacturing, value-added, production, warehouse, shipping, etc.
   • Also just a “fine-tuning” of the current zoning with a narrower range of uses
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

4 – Enterprise – Railyard - Uses restricted to railroad operations, intermodal transfer and limited storage of freight/materials
  • Is this a stand-alone zone or just part of E-LM?

5 – Enterprise – Pine Street
  • Light manufacturing, outdoor storage, vehicular service
  • Neighborhood-oriented and scaled retail, hospitality and services with size limits
  • Small-scale (<8k sq ft) and affordable spaces are preferred and protected
  • No housing – so not NAC?

6 – Enterprise – Flynn Avenue
  • Research & Development, Labs, Technical Office
  • traditional scale and format of manufacturing, value-added, production, warehouse, shipping, etc.
  • Accessory retail and hospitality with size limits
  • No housing – so not NAC?
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

• Discussion points
  • Boundary – Focus on surface parking and excluding Pine St.
  • The District should include elements of a form code, but not be too prescriptive

• Housing
  • Strong demand and feasible
  • Primary vs. supportive use?
  • New buildings only or allow retrofit of existing commercial/industrial?

• Office
  • Strong South End office market
  • Is new office space feasible?
October 26 Planning Commission Discussion

• Two part Zoning Amendment Process

  1. Amendment for South End Innovation District (2022)
  2. Separate Amendment(s) for remaining portions of EL-M
Innovation District =

planBTV: South End

Housing as a Human Right Action Plan

Net New Residential Units
Goal: 1,250 New Residential Units by 2026
Innovation District Intent

- An evolving, vibrant urban district
- A mix of uses and building scales and types
- A place for hundreds of new homes and neighbors
- A district where arts, light manufacturing and office coexist in harmony with new residents
- A 21st century district that limits emissions, cleans our water, and fosters a healthy ecosystem
Public Engagement Summary

- Three Ward 5 NPA Meetings
- 7 Stakeholder meetings (property owners, arts/maker reps)
- One in-person public meeting
- One virtual public meeting
- One ongoing Storymap
- One ongoing Miro engagement board
Ward 5 NPA

- March 17th, May 19th and June 16th
- Barge Canal
  - Support for allowing natural regeneration of site
- Champlain Parkway
  - Concern that it will perpetuate car-dependency
- Housing
  - Increasing support but focus on equity
- South End Multimodal Center Feasibility Study
Public Meetings

• June 29th @ Generator
  • 20 Attendees
• July 7th on Zoom
  • 25 Attendees (63 Registered)

Four Themes:

1. Land Use
2. District Scale
3. Public Realm
4. District Boundary
Public Meeting Activities

CHARACTER OF PUBLIC SPACES

USE TYPES
WHAT SHOULD THE SOUTH END INNOVATION DISTRICT DO?
WHAT'S IMPORTANT TO YOU IN A NEIGHBORHOOD?
TAKE A SET OF STICKERS

IS A HIGH PRIORITY FOR YOU
IS A MEDIUM PRIORITY FOR YOU
IS A LOW PRIORITY FOR YOU
IS NOT A PRIORITY FOR YOU

PUT A STICKER ON A PARTICULAR USE THAT YOU'D LOVE TO SEE IN THE INNOVATION DISTRICT

HAVE OTHER IDEAS? SHARE A NOTE WITH US!

Streetscapes - HOW DO YOU WANT TO MOVE?
Below are four examples of streetscapes that could be developed in the Innovation District, each with varying amounts of pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle interaction. What type do you prefer?

Public Space Design - WHERE DO YOU FEEL INSPIRED?
What do you want the character of public spaces in the Innovation District to be? Below are four examples - use your stickers to decide what you want public spaces to prioritize.

Champlain Parkway Public Realm
Below are examples of the different ways that Champlain Parkway can connect with the Innovation District. How do you imagine the spaces along the corridor to look?
Innovation District Storymap

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/a2c763fcba5a4aaab2b6a7df2dc8a2bc?item=1
Innovation District – Land Use

- Residential uses we are considering:
  - Attached, multi-family dwellings only
  - Other residential uses may be considered on a limited basis (e.g. co-housing, assisted living, group homes)
Innovation District – Land Use

- Non-Residential Uses we are considering:
  - Art Gallery/Studio
  - Light Manufacturing
  - Office
  - Community (e.g. library, community center, etc.)
  - Childcare
  - Other uses supportive of dense, residential districts (e.g. café, small retail establishments, medical/dental clinic)
- Retail uses should feature goods/services produced in the district
Innovation District – Land Uses

- Uses we are considering not permitting or strongly considering how to limit:
  - Single Detached Dwellings
  - Hotel
  - Heavy Manufacturing
  - Large format retail
  - Auto-oriented uses
“Hard to enforce this in zoning laws, but: diverse retail is great, but the way it has gentrified on Church Street in the last ~5 years is an example of what not to do. Church street has lost most of its retail appeal for me as a local, and feels almost strictly for tourists now.”

“Keep the hotels and tourism in Downtown.”

“How do we keep ownership (and hence, decision making) diversified and local?”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• Buildings should be close to streets, paths and open spaces
“Shared roads that have through-access for deliveries and emergency vehicles when needed is great, but the streets should be lowest speed (and no street parking) to discourage any automobiles that don’t *need* to be there..”

“Parking outside of the area for walking within.”

“Love the idea of pocket parks - can be small but areas for shelter from heat of Pine St.”

“Prefer more "urban jungle" than "urban meadow". (See parts of Portland, OR for reference)”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• Buildings should include active frontages – shops or other community uses along Pine Street, Lakeside Ave., Sears Ln., Champlain Parkway, and new internal streets
Innovation District – Urban Form
“Ground floor commercial space makes "where you live" much easier to also be “where you shop/go to the doctor/drop kids at daycare”

“Would love to have full retail, but would be concerned that development wouldn’t be able to find commercial tenants.”

“Residential on the ground floor could be great, but would prefer if it is not at grade.”
Innovation District – Urban Form

- The District should include a mixture of attached and detached buildings
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should include large, medium and small buildings, from one story up to six or eight
Innovation District – Urban Form

6 Stories

Mix of Stories
“Provide plenty of natural landscape between/throughout with bike lanes and walking paths. blend with appropriate parking.”

“Mix of 4 & 6, 8 is too high.”

“if people want the end result to be a "mix", perhaps the best policy is to allow 8 in the zoning, and allow for natural variation to provide the mix. "Preferred outcome" should not necessarily be "the rule."

“Include option for mix of building sizes - midsize + triplex/quad + town/rowhouse etc.”
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should include publicly accessible open spaces and paths for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities
Innovation District – Urban Form

• The District should be ecologically harmonious and include green stormwater infrastructure
Next Steps

• July 12\textsuperscript{th} - Planning Commission update
• July/August – Draft zoning amendment to Planning Commission
• Additional engagement events TBD
• End of year - adoption
“Missing Middle” Housing

Project is about re-legalizing opportunities for “house scale” homes in neighborhoods:

• Evaluate opportunities for some duplex, triplex, 4-plex housing options in residential areas

• Explore opportunities for other small multi-unit building types along major corridors from planBTV
Why Missing Middle Housing?

- Increase access, choice, inclusion within existing neighborhoods

- Creating options within neighborhoods to realize opportunity for aging in place, multigenerational households, and inclusion

- Some estimates project that 60%+ of new housing in the U.S. needs to be Missing Middle (Nelson)

- Residential areas make up nearly 40% of all land area in the city, and two-thirds of area that is developed/developable in the city
What is Missing Middle?

This work will focus on:

• **Missing**: housing types that were once legal and widely created, but are now prohibited

• **Middle**: housing types that have similar overall size and character as single-family homes, mix well with existing buildings, can be way to deliver affordable housing

• **Infill** that more closely resembles existing neighborhood patterns than typical zoning standards may enable

• **Alternatives** for new homes outside of the denser, mixed-use areas of the city

*Image credits: Opticos Design, Inc. via AARP-VT May 2018 speaker series*
What is Missing Middle?

- Moves from regulating the number of units on a lot (density) to regulating new buildings and additions to ensure “house scale”

- Address standards that effectively limit some neighborhoods to only single-family homes (i.e. minimum lot sizes)

- Considers interconnected issues of affordability & choice, historic preservation, parking, stormwater management, etc.

Credit: Opticos Design, Inc.: “Top 5 Missing Middle Implementation Mistakes and How to Avoid Them”
Project Scope & Next Steps

• **Background analyses- Underway**
  • Evaluating existing residential patterns, significant changes to residential zoning over time, limits of zoning ordinance to achieve missing middle, etc.
  • Staff analysis, with support from AARP-VT & CNU

• **Kick-off community education & engagement on missing middle – Aug to Nov**
  • Opportunities to learn about missing middle generally, what exists in city today, opportunities for future
  • Planned events: Film screening, walking tours, workshop, etc.
  • Staff-led, in collaboration with AARP-VT, some consultant support

• **Develop & evaluate appropriate models for missing middle – Winter to Spring ‘23**
  • Staff in collaboration with consultant support
  • Community engagement to explore options for city

• **Consider zoning amendment(s) to facilitate appropriate types – Spring to Summer ‘23**
  • Planning Commission + City Council consideration of zoning changes