

## Department of Planning and Zoning

149 Church Street, City Hall  
Burlington, VT 05401  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz)  
Phone: (802) 865-7188  
Fax: (802) 865-7195

*David White, AICP, Director*  
*Meagan Tuttle, AICP, Comprehensive Planner*  
*Jay Appleton, Senior GIS/IT Programmer/Analyst*  
*Scott Gustin, AICP, CFM, Principal Planner*  
*Mary O'Neil, AICP, Principal Planner*  
*Ryan Morrison, CFM, Associate Planner*  
*Anita Wade, Zoning Clerk*



### MEMORANDUM

**To:** The Design Advisory Board  
**From:** Mary O'Neil, AICP, Principal Planner  
**RE:** ZP17-0623CA/MA, 329-375 North Avenue  
**Date:** December 13, 2016

---

**File:** ZP17-0623CA/MA

**Location:** 329-375 North Avenue

**Zone:** NAC-CR Ward: 4N

**Date application accepted:** November 23, 2016

**Applicant/ Owner:** Eric Farrell dba BC Community Housing LLC and 375 North Avenue LLC

**Request:** Planned unit development of 11 (14 as lettered) buildings containing 733 residential units, approximately 45,000 sf of non-residential support/amenity space, approximately 45,000 sf of commercial space; 1093 parking spaces.



#### Background:

- **Sketch Plan Review 17-0581SP;** Sketch Plan Review of proposed PUD at 329-375 North Avenue. November 2016.

The programs and services of the City of Burlington are accessible to people with disabilities. For accessibility information call 865-7188 (for TTY users 865-7142).

- **Zoning Permit 17-0267SD**; Preliminary plat review of 11-lot subdivision. No development included. October 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 17-0252SP**; Second sketch plan review of planned unit development with mixed commercial and residential uses, related buildings, and infrastructure. October 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-1487CA**; Change to top floor, add veranda on roof. Amendment to zoning permit 16-0007CA/MA. July 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 17-0010CA**; revisions to west chapel elevation. July 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-1183SP**; Sketch plan review of 700+ unit planned unit development with mixed commercial and residential uses, related buildings, and infrastructure. June 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0437CA**; replace three garage doors, new roof on front half of garage. May 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0177MP**; Tree maintenance plan for 311 and 329 North Avenue. November 2015.
- **Zoning Permit 16-1026CA**; relocation of garden shed. April 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0785LL**; Lot line adjustment with 329 North Avenue. March 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0622CA**; replace slate roof on former orphanage building with copper. January 2016.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0649LL**; Lot line adjustment with 329 North Avenue. December 2015.
- **Zoning Permit 16-0007CA**; Amendment to 63-unit apartment approval to include removal of 1st floor assembly space, add 2 living units and 2 parking spaces, relocate/redesign west entrance with associated landscape changes. Also add small fenced in dog park, grilling patio, utility pad, and indoor bike parking spaces. February 2016.
- **Non-applicability of Zoning Permit Requirements 15-0548NA**; replacement of asphalt shingle roofing with same. October 2014.
- **Zoning Permit 13-0037FC**; install new wire fence around community garden. July 2012.
- **Zoning Permit 12-0705SN**; new freestanding sign for Burlington College. February 2012.
- **Zoning Permit 12-0627CA**; Replace five existing double windows to basement on side of building with new clad wood single casement windows with vertical mullion to simulate the look of a double window. Building is on the Vermont State Register of Historic Resources. December 2011.
- **Zoning Permit 11-0280CU**; Convert existing institutional office use and group home use to post-secondary school. No site or exterior building changes proposed. November 2010.

**Overview:** Known as Cambrian Rise, the application proposes development with mixed commercial and residential uses, related buildings and infrastructure across approximately 21.65 acres (per plan BA1) at 329-375 North Avenue.

Sketch Plan Review of the development (November 22, 2016) allowed the Design Advisory Board an opportunity to get an overview of the proposal; comments were limited to questions about the overall development, and a desire to cut back the hard edges of the buildings along North Avenue as they abutted smaller structures (to the south). The Board acknowledged the large scope of the project, and their limited time or opportunity to discuss any particular building or part of the plan in any depth. They requested additional work sessions during the formal review process.

The project is simultaneously under review under subdivision regulations to organize the land area into several separate parcels for development.

Previous review by the DAB (May 24, 2016) recommended providing a more sensitive transition in scale from the homes along North Avenue to the much larger buildings in this development. The DAB also recommended consideration of varying roof forms and strengthening the buildings' interface with the streets. The applicants were encouraged to better anchor the northeast corner at the main entrance into the project site (referred to as "the hub" on those sketch plans) and to provide terminus views within the street network where possible.

There have been 3 Sketch Plan Reviews (one at the DRB); comments below may include language from those reviews where no new information has been provided.

The City Council has approved the new zoning district (NAC-CR) specific to this project area. Those standards and dimensional requirements will apply to this review.

### **Part 1: Land Division Design Standards**

A separate subdivision application has been filed for subdivision of the development area into multiple lots. For reference, see Subdivision Plat, P1.

### **Part 2: Site Plan Design Standards**

#### **Sec. 6.2.2 Review Standards**

##### **(a) Protection of Important Natural Features:**

At present, the majority of the project area west of the former orphanage is lawn. Extensive examination has been made of the existing site conditions during preparation of a tree management plan for this and the parkland area (2016) and stormwater planning for this development. The precipitous grade change from North Avenue west to the parkland is the most significant natural feature; one which is incorporated within the development plans submitted. The separate 12-acre parcel conveyed to the city contains and protects several important natural features, including the lakeshore itself.

**(b) Topographical Alterations:**

One of the most distinctive features of this site is the grade change; nearly a 70' difference between North Avenue and the westerly edge of the project area. The buildings and parking decks are arranged to take advantage of the steep grade change specific to the site. Documents provided outline, where necessary, topographic adjustment to facilitate the development, including construction of sub-grade parking garages, building foundations, pathways, green areas, and roads. Plans C2.1-C2.4 specifically address grading. Reference is made to specific landscaping plans within the submission documents to identify grade elevations at identified areas of the site. Modeled renderings reveal a complicated fabric where openings provide access to differing floor and parking plates; stairs emerge, walls support.

**(c) Protection of Important Public Views:**

Views from and through private property are typically not protected. The new public park, west of this development, will provide an opportunity for the public to enjoy westerly views of the lake and mountains. Residents within these new housing units will be afforded a similar vista.

An east-west greenway will extend behind the orphanage, with buildings C and E, P and Q as a structural frame. The visual greenway continues west, across west road (trees allowing) to the walkway and orchard.

Buildings with favorable orientation have included rooftop terraces and decks, patios, balconies and *galerias* to exploit opportunities for extraordinary views.

Public views can be created by orchestrated terminus vistas via public roadway; east/west on both South and North roads. South Road offers a greater potential as the westerly end is not interrupted by structure. The location of building Q will likely obfuscate a natural westward vista; and provide no identified structural terminus view in its place.

Revised design has created a more focused terminus view southward on West Road, where the building has been treated with additional attention to attract and define a focal point of interest.

**(d) Protection of Important Cultural Resources:**

*Burlington's architectural and cultural heritage shall be protected through sensitive and respectful redevelopment, rehabilitation, and infill. Archeological sites likely to yield information important to the city's or the region's pre-history or history shall be evaluated, documented, and avoided whenever feasible. Where the proposed development involves sites listed or eligible for listing on a state or national register of historic places, the applicant shall meet the applicable development and design standards pursuant to Sec. 5.4.8(b).*

Alterations to the former orphanage have been permitted under previous permits. The former elementary school / priests' quarters attached to the south of the orphanage have been incorporated into this development, now as building "B" and "G". Building "G" has shouldered in front of the former orphanage, its orientation and location assuming a dominant position close to the street. As an attachment to the identified icon of North Avenue, it has little relationship with its host, diminishes its grandeur and delays views of the historic structure as one travels north on the Avenue. The newly created zoning district (NAC-CR) offers a range of setbacks from North Avenue from 20' (minimum) to 30' (maximum.) From scaled plans, Building G appears to be set back approximately 25' from the front property line. Due to the proximity of

the historic orphanage and the design to allow for the maximum amount of viewscape to that building, the maximum front yard setback afforded by the zoning district is recommended (30’).

The UVM Consulting Archaeology Program (CAP) conducted an extensive Phase I site identification survey within previously determined sensitive portions of the development parcel. No pre-contact era Native American archaeological sites were identified. Test pits confirm some re-grading (suggested related to farming activities) and plow zone strata disturbance. The historic period artifacts that were recovered reflected the mixed uses of the parcel over time, such as children’s toys likely associated with the orphanage (jacks, marbles), and building materials from structures no longer extant (bricks, cinders, mortar). That study recommended no further archaeological analysis.

**(e) Supporting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources:**

The project proposes limited solar installation; identified in images on Building I and C. No part of the application will preclude the use of other renewable energy resources.

**(f) Brownfield Sites:**

The Vermont DEC website does not include these addresses.

**(g) Provide for nature's events:**

*Special attention shall be accorded to stormwater runoff so that neighboring properties and/or the public stormwater drainage system are not adversely affected. All development and site disturbance shall follow applicable city and state erosion and stormwater management guidelines in accordance with the requirements of Art 5, Sec 5.5.3.*

A fully developed Stormwater Management Plan has been prepared and included within the application materials. The material has been forwarded for review to the Stormwater program.

*Design features which address the effects of rain, snow, and ice at building entrances, and to provisions for snow and ice removal or storage from circulation areas shall also be incorporated.*

The applicant should be prepared to identify snow storage locations, and where appropriate, snow management for the overall site.

Building features that address the effects of inclement weather and the adequacy of resident shelter at entrances can be reviewed on a building-by-building basis.

**(h) Building Location and Orientation:**

The overall plan continues to be one of very large buildings encircled with new streets or parking areas. The importance of building orientation toward the street (which will be eventually turned over to the city) becomes essential in reinforcing the street line. The weakness remains at the southerly entrance to the neighborhood. An important entrance from North Avenue and a principal neighborhood corner continues to lack a meaningful anchor. Building “G”, joined to Building B crowds Building A, but leaves the street corner without the weight and definition of a building. Part of that plan introduces a diagonal walkway to a small shelter, surrounded by a patio area. None define the street edges; a significant deficiency in the plan. For the definition of the street wall and as an anchor to the neighborhood entrance, it is paramount that a building

be located at the corner of North Avenue and South Road. It is strongly recommended that Building G be detached and it (or another substantial building) be relocated south; fronting on both North Avenue and South Road; creating a distinct street edge and replacing the void that is currently proposed.

Other than Building “G”, buildings remain substantially set back from the public sidewalk and inner streets. It does not appear that buildings have been pulled in closer toward the streets, as has been previously recommended. Such wide streetways, with buildings 85’ (buildings L and C) to 145’ (buildings O and H) across streets weakens the sense of enclosure and place typically associated with a city neighborhood. (And this is a *new* urban neighborhood.) Streets are spatially designed by a wall of buildings that front the sidewalk in an ordered manner. The plan leans toward the maximum front yard setback (0-20’ for inner streets, as prescribed by the standards for the new zoning district) rather than building placement organized toward the street. (Building P and Q; 15’ front yard setback; Building I 20’.) Arrangement that holds the street wall as paramount is strongly preferred.

Setbacks from North Avenue are 20’ minimum, 30’ maximum. The proposed buildings on either side of the orphanage are in the neighborhood of 28’; Building K south of South Road ranges from 23’-45’. Front yard setbacks within the development may be between 0-20’, with structures setback a minimum of 12’ from the curb on a public street. Although the streets have not yet been turned over to the city, the arrangement should be designed to meet that standard.

Side and rear yard setbacks only apply to the periphery of the district and not individual parcels. Building N has a westerly corner that encroaches into a required 20’ rear yard setback along the westerly boundary of the district. Required 15’ setbacks from the residential zoning district to the south and west are met.

*Principal buildings shall have their main entrance facing and clearly identifiable from the public street. The development of corner lots shall be subject to review by the city engineer regarding the adequacy of sight distances along the approaches to the intersection. To the extent practicable, development of corner lots in non-residential areas should try to **place the building mass near the intersection and parallel to the street to help anchor the corner** and take advantage of the high visibility location.*

The revision to the street corner at South Road and North Avenue (which no longer strengthens either street, North Avenue or South Road) fails to provide the strong structural component needed. Building “G” has an incongruous relationship with its host building and the streetscape. The patio is not sufficient to anchor the corner, and leaves a visual void. It is essential that this corner have a strong structural anchor which this plan does not provide.

Analysis of building entrances promises to be challenging, given the number of buildings and their orientation toward streets, sidewalks, parking areas, inner walkways, and recreation paths. Building “C” has a principle (southerly) entrance fronting South Road. The concrete retaining wall and the isolation of the entrance make this less inviting. As a residential entrance, greater emphasis toward creating an inviting entry consistent with the residential or retail nature of the use.

Building “G” has a series of entrances fronting North Avenue which appear commercial in nature. The east elevation lacks the architectural clue of finding the entrance by virtue of a

canopy, awning or porch; the entrances alternate with storefronts along the first floor. The southeast corner is more successful here, as an overhang suggests building entrance. Unfortunately, the street corner itself lacks structure and loses the opportunity to settle the corner and strengthen the arrangement.

There is an entry portal between Buildings E and F. Building E along North Street is largely dedicated to vehicular entry/parking deck openings. Vehicular entry points seem unusually steep in grade.

Building F has an entry focus within the brick three story portion on North Avenue, under a porch roof with heavy piers. Other entries are more difficult to identify, may be recessed and appear concealed in imaging. There are a series of identifiable entrances along North Road, their location identified by stairs of increasing height. Additional parking entry is west of Building D, connecting to Building I.

Building I has a vehicular entry portal on the north and pedestrian doors on the raised porch area. Pedestrian entries exist on the west and south as well. As one of the principle entrances is elevated over the sidewalk, it is not immediately identifiable and less welcoming than an at-grade portal. The west entry is more successful for identification under an abbreviated canopy and welcome presentation to West Road. The gym/event space has no identifiable entrance; the change in building vocabulary gives no clear direction to the passersby how to enter the structure.

Building Q has a visible pedestrian entry on the east (fronting West Road), with clues to its location (canopy, sidewalk.) Views on plan Q2 appear to be mislabeled.

Buildings O and P have a centrally identifiable pedestrian entrance (Plan OP-2 & OP-3), two wing entrances and apparent first floor entries from West Road.

Building H has clearly identifiable entrances from raised stoops along West Road, and one along South Road under an extended canopy.

The north elevation of Building M fronts South Road, which has several double entries. Building N does not front any street, but is connected to Building M. The entry to that building must be defined.

Building K fronts North Avenue and South Road; entrances are visible under extended canopies and highlighted by a change in building material. Building L (L-2) has visible entries along South Road under a canopy; and on secondary east and west elevations.

Opportunities to create terminus views have been largely missed; the plan lacks an identified structural focus at the west end of North Road, a feature appointment or landscaping at the north end of West Road (visible going north up the street), or an identified and curated viewscape at the south end of West Road. The DAB previously acknowledged some gesture made here. Vistas are made or unmade by the objects on which they focus. Rather than simply lining the streets with buildings, there exists an opportunity to capture attention with something symbolic

or of interest. The UCC Church is an excellent example at the top of Church Street, or the Old Mill at the east end of College St. It is worthwhile to capture these opportunities and cultivate a curated view. Much greater thought could create self-appointed meaningful focus of street termini.

The garage entrances and service access on North Road have been set back from the principal structure, becoming secondary and subordinate in scale and design. See Plan I-3 and EF-3.

A new zoning district, NAC-CR (Neighborhood Activity Center, Cambrian Rise) has been approved by the City Council, with standards similar to other NMU zoning districts. Reference is provided to the zoning amendment and the associated changes to Tables and Standards of the NMU zoning districts.

**(i) Vehicular Access:**

*Curb cuts shall be arranged and limited in number to reduce congestion and improve traffic safety. A secondary access point from side roads is encouraged where possible to improve traffic flow and safety along major streets. The width and radius of curb cuts should be kept to the minimum width necessary, and sight triangles and sufficient turnarounds for vehicles shall be provided to reduce the potential for accidents at point of egress.*

The number of curb cuts has been diminished along interior roads, although entrances to parking lots punctuate South Road. West and North Road have minimized curb cuts dramatically from earlier plans. The width of these openings should meet the approval of the city engineer as these streets are expected to be adopted as public thoroughfares.

*Driveways that have a slope of 5% or greater (towards the right of way) shall be made of a solid surface including conventional pavement, pavers or pervious pavement.*

Pavement is proposed for vehicular circulation areas. Modeling images of the driveway access at Building E is markedly steep. The applicant shall confirm the accuracy of that image. DPW typically expects continuous sidewalks at vehicular entrances. The applicant shall consult with the Traffic Engineering staff to assure the plan meets their criteria, as the dedication of streets and street adoption by the city is anticipated.

*Driveways for commercial properties may require a traffic study to identify the impacts of the movement of traffic to and from the property, and design for safe access. Access for service and loading areas should be located behind buildings or otherwise screened from streets or public ways with landscaping or other barriers. Whether commercial or residential shared driveways are encouraged where possible and appropriate.*

A traffic study will be required for Development Review Board review. The service/loading access is from North Road, between buildings E and I. The garage openings should have doors or some method of screening the large openings from the public street per this standard.

**(j) Pedestrian Access:**

*Pedestrians shall be provided one or more direct and unobstructed paths between a public sidewalk and the primary building entrance. Well defined pedestrian routes shall be provided*

*through parking areas to primary building access points and be designed to provide a physical separation between vehicles and pedestrians in a manner that minimizes conflicts and improves safety. Where sidewalks and driveways meet, the sidewalk shall be clearly marked by differentiated ground materials and/or pavement markings.*

Sidewalks line each street, connecting to walkways to each building. The network continues on the interior of the site, with connected access between buildings, parking areas, and green spaces. Sidewalks line parking areas as well, providing a separation between vehicles and pedestrians. See previous note about continuous sidewalks at vehicular entries.

**(k) Accessibility for the Handicapped:**

*Special attention shall be given to the location and integration of accessible routes, parking spaces, and ramps for the disabled. Special attention shall also be given to identifying accessible access points between buildings and parking areas, public streets and sidewalks. The federal Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) shall be used as a guide in determining the adequacy of the proposed development in addressing the needs of the disabled.*

From pre-development meetings to the present, the applicant has remained committed to providing an all-accessible community. Buildings have been projected to be served by (sometimes multiple) elevators; grades are intended to meet accessibility requirements, and h/c parking spaces are illustrated on plans. Full compliance with ADA requirements is under the jurisdiction of the building inspector.

**(l) Parking and Circulation:**

*To the extent possible, parking should be placed at the side or rear of the lot and screened from view from surrounding properties and adjacent public rights of ways. **Any off-street parking occupying street level frontage in a Downtown Mixed Use District shall be setback from the edge of the front property line in order to provide space for active pedestrian-oriented uses.** Where street-level parking is provided within an existing structure, the cars shall be screened from the sidewalk and the area shall be activated with landscaping, public art, or other design amenities. Parking areas of more than 20 spaces should be broken into smaller areas separated by landscaping.*

The corner of South Road and North Avenue continues to have too much visibility of pavement and parking. Generally, parking areas are located interior to the site and between buildings, less visible from streets. The parking areas east of Building C and on D are greater than 20 spaces (which require breaking into smaller areas with landscaping), although protection of the view shed to the west is a goal of the plan.

*Attempts to link adjacent parking lots or provide shared parking areas which can serve neighboring properties simultaneously shall be strongly encouraged.*

Access to parking and lots is shared across the plan. Recently adopted ordinance amendment ZA17-01 will facilitate parking across parcel boundaries within the same zoning district.

*Parking shall be laid out to provide ease in maneuvering of vehicles and so that vehicles do not have to back out onto city streets. Dimensions of spaces shall at a minimum meet the requirements as provided in Article 8. The perimeter of all parking areas shall be designed with*

*anchored curb stops, landscaping, or other such physical barriers to prevent vehicles from encroaching into adjacent green spaces.*

Parking spaces in Building D are 20' x 9', as are parking spaces east of Building H and east and west of Building L. Parking dimensions are not expressly given, but must meet the requirements of Table 8.1.11-1 unless the DRB determines that a lesser standard is appropriate. The applicant should identify any areas where leniency in parking standards are requested.

*Surface parking and maneuvering areas should be shaded in an effort to reduce their effect on the local microclimate, air quality, and stormwater runoff with an objective of shading at least 30% of the parking lot. Shading should be distributed throughout the parking area to the greatest extent practical, including within the interior depending on the configuration. New or substantially improved parking areas with 15 or more parking spaces shall include a minimum of 1 shade tree per 5 parking spaces with a minimum caliper size of 2.5"-3" at planting. Up to a 30% waiver of the tree planting requirement may be granted by the development review board if it is found that the standard requirement would prove impractical given physical site constraints and required compliance with minimum parking requirements. All new shade trees shall be: of a species appropriate for such planting environments, expected to provide a mature canopy of no less than 25-feet in diameter, and selected from an approved list maintained by the city arborist. Existing trees retained within 25-feet of the perimeter of the parking area (including public street trees), and with a minimum caliper size greater than 3-inches, may be counted towards the new tree planting requirement.*

The submission materials include a shading calculation (L-EX1) which provides a percentage based on the entire buildout, rather than a parking lot by parking lot analysis. The total shade on site is 45.1%; greater than the 30% prescriptive standard. The standard however, specifically states: *Surface parking and maneuvering areas should be shaded in an effort to reduce their effect on the local microclimate, air quality, and stormwater runoff with an objective of shading at least 30% of the parking lot.* Some parking areas, like on building D, are not shaded at all and therefore do not meet this particular standard. Weight should be given to the anticipated shading provided by adjacent buildings (like C, in this instance) which will likely cast shadow on a portion of that lot.

There are no existing trees that might contribute toward that shading calculation.

*All parking areas shall provide a physical separation between moving and parked vehicles and pedestrians in a manner that minimizes conflicts and gives pedestrians a safe and unobstructed route to building entrance(s) or a public sidewalk.*

See Section 6.2.2. (j), above.

*Where bicycle parking is provided, access shall be provided along vehicular driveways or separate paths, with clearly marked signs indicating the location of parking areas. Where bicycle parking is located proximate to a building entrance, all shared walkways shall be of sufficient width to separate bicycles and pedestrians, and be clearly marked to avoid conflicts. All bicycle parking areas shall link directly to a pedestrian route to a building entrance. All bicycle parking shall be in conformance with applicable design & construction details as provided by the dept. of public works.*

Bicycle parking is a strong feature of this application. Reference is made to all Hardscape plans (L201-206) for specific locations and L605 for bike racks specs. The applicant must

demonstrate by calculation compliance with Table 8.2.5-1 for each building. All bicycle parking shall meet the requirements and guidance of **Section 8.2.7. Location and Design Standards.**

**(m) Landscaping and Fences:**

A fully articulated landscaping plan has been submitted. See plans LL501-508 for planting schedule, and associated plans for hardscape, play equipment, street furniture and site amenities. The applicant is encouraged to consult with the city arborist early in plan review for assistance in selection of species and caliper of street trees.

**(n) Public Plazas and Open Space:**

*Where public open space is provided as an amenity to the site plan, it should be sited on the parcel to maximize solar exposure, with landscaping and hardscape (including fountains, sitting walls, public art, and street furniture) to encourage its use by the public in all seasons. Public plazas should be visually and physically accessible from public rights-of-ways and building entrances where appropriate and shall be designed to maximize accessibility for all individuals, including the disabled and encourage social interaction.*

A plaza type area has been more finely defined between Buildings K and L, intended for use by Cathedral Square and Champlain Housing Trust residents. Planters, seating, garden areas and a play area are suggested; all welcome amenities for resident use and enjoyment.

A large uninterrupted viewscape to the west is provided behind the former orphanage. Accessible at differing levels as the grade falls to the west, several public gathering or green areas are included. Plans include for a community swimming pool, public gardens, an orchard, and pathways between Cambrian Rise and the bike path.

*Public space should be coordinated with the surrounding buildings without compromising safety and visibility. Public spaces should be surrounded by active uses that generate pedestrian traffic, and connect the space to major activity centers, streets, or corridors.*

*New structures and additions to existing structures shall be shaped to reduce shadows on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces. In determining the impact of shadows, the following factors shall be taken into account: the mass of area shaded, the duration of shading, and the importance of sunlight to the utility of the type of open space being shadowed. Proposed development shall be considered for solar impact based the sun angle during the Vernal and Autumnal equinox.*

Although the development is the creation of an entire new neighborhood, a shading study will be valuable to the DRB to understand impacts of large buildings across the project area. The shading plan submitted is relative to a calculation of shading provided to meet requirements for parking lot shading. An overall study of site shading (Vernal and Autumnal equinox) has not been proffered. It is anticipated that the distances between buildings will preclude significant shading impact on adjacent structures. A shading study will answer those questions.

**(o) Outdoor Lighting:**

*Where exterior lighting is proposed the applicant shall meet the lighting performance standards as per Sec 5.5.2.*

A lighting plan, with fixtures, illumination levels and a photometric has been submitted. In general, street lighting (which is typically not reviewed by this office, however the project will be “private” until the streets are accepted by the city) is a hybrid of what has been installed at Waterfront North. BED engineers have indicated that districts need to be adopted for decorative fixtures (as are proposed here) before they will agree to adopt the streets and lights. That designation has not as yet occurred.

Street light poles are proposed to be 25’ (they are 30’ on the waterfront); poles and fixtures will be black rather than Burlington’s preferred grey. Lighting itself is LED. Assurance has been provided that BED will have the capability to repair and replace these fixtures when and if they are damaged. As LED, they are anticipated to have a life expectancy of 20 years. If they fail (or are knocked over), BED officials say they will be replaced with grey as that is the city standard.

Lighting levels will be driven by street classification (collector roads versus residential roads.) That discussion must find an agreement with the public utility prior to DRB approval.

The photometric shows some ‘hot spots’ in illumination. Areas under building canopies tend to be a little higher, but average foot-candle measurement up to 5 is acceptable at a building entrance. If not an entrance, light levels should diminish in those areas. Similarly, the area under the diagonal canopy are too high for a walkway, which has a specific maximum illumination of 2 fc. Many patio areas have elevated lighting; the one west of Building A, and another south of Building E exceed the 2 fc limitation.

The walkway east of Building C has several light readings > 2 fc as does the west walkway behind Building K. The area between buildings M and N have higher light levels as well. In general, walkways shall not exceed 2 fc; parking lots 4 fc, and building entrances 5 fc.

**(p) Integrate infrastructure into the design:**

*Exterior storage areas, machinery and equipment installations, service and loading areas, utility meters and structures, mailboxes, and similar accessory structures shall utilize setbacks, plantings, enclosures and other mitigation or screening methods to minimize their auditory and visual impact on the public street and neighboring properties to the extent practicable.*

*Utility and service enclosures and screening shall be coordinated with the design of the principal building, and should be grouped in a service court away from public view. On-site utilities shall be placed underground whenever practicable. Trash and recycling bins and dumpsters shall be located, within preferably, or behind buildings, enclosed on all four (4) sides to prevent blowing trash, and screened from public view.*

*Any development involving the installation of machinery or equipment which emits heat, vapor, fumes, vibration, or noise shall minimize, insofar as practicable, any adverse impact on neighboring properties and the environment pursuant to the requirements of Article 5, Part 4 Performance Standards.*

It is challenging to find appropriate locations for service areas, dumpsters, recycling and similar facilities within a project area that has so many public and visible frontages. Areas for refuse should be identified within structures, not as an afterthought on a site plan. A trash access is identified for building K (Plan AO-0.0) Collective trash and recycling areas for connected buildings are recommended for efficiency and to minimize visibility.

Transformers should observe minimum setbacks.

The North Road loading area has been somewhat diminished with suggested internalization of activities. That needs confirmation. Doors are recommended for those service loading bays.

Mailbox locations will need to be identified for each building. Any HVAC or external machinery must be identified on site plans and/or elevations as appropriate. If roof mounted, roof plans will be required with an assessment of total area utilized to assure compliance with height limitations.

### **Part 3: Architectural Design Standards**

#### **Sec. 6.3.2 Review Standards**

##### **(a) Relate development to its environment:**

###### ***1. Massing, Height and Scale:***

This is a neighborhood without an easy comparison. From revised summary, there are six five-story buildings (including the orphanage), 7 four-story, 2 three story, a three story parking garage, and two one story/ ground level structures for a fitness center and greenhouse. Rather than a typical neighborhood that may have evolved over a period of time, this proposal will create an entire new one out of whole cloth. There is no analogous prototype to be found locally, short of college dormitories or congregated mill buildings. The structures themselves are all large scale; most with flat roofs. The size of the orphanage, itself one of the largest buildings in Burlington, will be negligible among this collection of sizable buildings. This is a newly created neighborhood based on a building model of very large structures; which in itself invents its own context.

Common design elements include breaking up building mass by color block and window arrangement; top floors are on occasion “pedestaled” and set back from the lower block. Some buildings enjoy balconies or *galleries*, particularly those facing the west. There is homogeneity in the treatment of building mass by articulation, despite the rearrangement of windows and manipulation of building plane. Creation of new urban fabric should include a diversity of form, style and scale consistent with evolutionary neighborhood development; more in keeping with Burlington’s character, providing greater visual interest and more familiar and therefore comfortable to its residents.

###### ***2. Roofs and Rooflines.***

Building I, the pavilion tops and the south portion of H and the bus shelter have pitched roofs. All others are flat.

A few roofs appear to be parapetted, but there is rarely any rooftop elaboration or detailing, further emphasizing the cubist vocabulary (Building F, B, G.) Building M has the suggestion of a corbelled cornice which artfully softens the building’s upper edge. Building H has a sawtooth reference in the jagged rooftop pavilions, but abruptly transitions to flat roofs at the south end.

Porch roofs are typically flat projections with hefty piers.

The orphanage building retains its gabled roof, although now over sheathed in copper.

### 3. *Building Openings*

Openings vary by building, elevation, frontage to a public way or by topography. Overall, buildings have similar treatments of organizing windows in columns or reflective of floor plate. Rhythms are established within wall plane; the geometries of the building mass are echoed in the manipulation of window shapes and sizes. Greater complexity is evident in the buildings fronting the lake (M, N, O, P and Q.)

Much less detail has been afforded Buildings G, B, L and K. From the south, Building L resembles a warehouse in the almost regular arrangement of uncased openings and Spartan simplicity of its four stories. Its starkness is emphasized in the immediate juxtaposition with a 1 ½ story cottage.

Some window arrangements do not maintain consistent patterns (see pavilions of L); other buildings have a more discernable schedule. (Building M, where the window refrain is repeated across the façade and around the corner.) Window variations sometimes occur as buildings turn corners or are modeled as separate volumes, like Building H or C. Openings appear more vertical than horizontal.



Cambrian Rise  
As modeled from the east

**(b) Protection of Important Architectural Resources:**

*Burlington’s architectural and cultural heritage shall be protected through sensitive and respectful redevelopment, rehabilitation, and infill. Where the proposed development involves buildings listed or eligible for listing on a state or national register of historic places, the applicant shall meet the applicable development and design standards pursuant to Sec. 5.4.8. The introduction of new buildings to a historic district listed on a state or national register of historic places shall make every effort to be compatible with nearby historic buildings.*

Buildings G is now attached to B, which in turn connects to the former orphanage (A.) The arrangement is unsatisfactory for several reasons: There is no deferential treatment of the historic structure, the building design reflects no sympathetic or compatible design with the 19<sup>th</sup> century institutional building, and the orientation to the street creates greater prominence than the orphanage. As noted, the building has “shouldered” in front of the building, cutting the view from the south and limiting the surrounding site.

Overall, the scale of proposed buildings and their collection minimizes the stateliness of the iconic orphanage, which becomes less grand among the assemblage.

Similarly, the large buildings placed close to North Avenue minimize the view of both the



orphanage and the former home of Dr. Waldo Upton / Lakeview Sanitarium / John Bosco school, at 311 North Avenue just south of the development area which is also listed on the Vermont State Register of Historic Resources. That building is not only isolated, but dwarfed by the collective development. Efforts to transition from the 4 story building K to this more modest structure have been suggested by the DAB to help ease the difference.

**(c) Protection of Important Public**

**Views:**

See Section 6.2.2. (c).

**(d) Provide an active and inviting street edge:**

Although revised plans show some movement, overall massing of the buildings and their alignment to the street will determine the success of the new urban fabric. As noted in Section 6.2.2, there remain voids in the streetscape (north corner of South Road and North Avenue, particularly), elongated buildings that make for uncomfortable pedestrian distances without relief (Buildings F, E, I and G, B, A), and an abundance of visible surface parking that collectively diminish success for the overall development. Building facades demonstrate some variation by building materials, window openings and plane changes. That is challenging when the task is to ameliorate a 340’ continuous building wall. (Buildings E and F.)

Building design with two, three or four story block finishes over a five story building front attempt to create human scale surroundings. Roof overhangs, identifiable and inviting building portals and colonnaded entrance porches help in that manner along ground levels. The newly

designed public area between buildings K and L have humanized and warmed that area for collective use.

**(e) Quality of materials:**

*All development shall maximize the use of highly durable building materials that extend the life cycle of the building, and reduce maintenance, waste, and environmental impacts. Such materials are particularly important in certain highly trafficked locations such as along major streets, sidewalks, loading areas, and driveways. Efforts to incorporate the use of recycled content materials and building materials and products that are extracted and/or manufactured within the region are highly encouraged.*

*Owners of historic structures are encouraged to consult with an architectural historian in order to determine the most appropriate repair, restoration or replacement of historic building materials as outlined by the requirements of Art 5, Sec. 5.4.8.*

The permit set includes identified sheathing and roofing materials for each building. In general, exterior sheathing draws from a palette of fiber cement panel or lap siding, corrugated metal, board and batten and wood siding. Walls are concrete, brick, stone veneer or Gabion. Roofs are typically metal. Trim is composite or aluminum; windows fiberglass or storefront framing. The ribbon-style screening along first floors is not identified. All are considered of reasonable durability. Nothing in the application indicates that any are extracted or manufactured locally.

**(f) Reduce energy utilization:**

All new structures must meet the Guidelines for Energy Efficient Construction pursuant to the requirements of Article VI. Energy Conservation, Section 8 of the City of Burlington Code of Ordinances.

**(g) Make advertising features complementary to the site:**

No advertising is included within this review. Any signage will require separate permitting.

**(h) Integrate infrastructure into the building design:**

See Section 6.2.2 (p) above.

**(i) Make spaces secure and safe:**

All appropriate means of ingress and egress, and code requirements for building and life safety as defined by the building inspector and fire marshal must be observed.

Building entrances must be visible and adequately lit. Intercom systems for multi-family housing is recommended to maximize personal safety.

**For consideration:**

1. There are no created terminus views westward from North Road, or northward from West Road. It is recommended that further exploration is made to create focal points at these critical street termini.

2. A weighted and meaningful structural anchor is needed at the corner of South Road and North Avenue.
3. It is recommended that Building G be detached from B, and set further west off North Avenue.
4. A stormwater management plan will need the approval of the Stormwater Engineering team for assurance with compliance with Chapter 26.
5. Snow storage areas must be identified. A snow management plan is recommended.
6. Building N encroaches into a required (rear) setback along the westerly boundary of the district.
7. The south entrance to Building C is recommended for revision to present a warm and welcoming entry from the street.
8. A defined entry for Building N needs identification.
9. The delivery bays in the building between E and I should have operable doors to screen activities and storage.
10. Continuous sidewalks across vehicular entry paths will be required by the Department of Public Works.
11. A building shading study will be helpful to the Development Review Board to assess the impacts of the development on buildings within the plan. The parking lot shading study will require revision to demonstrate the required shading for each lot.
12. The applicant shall identify any area within the project plan that may require leniency in parking dimensions for review and consideration by the DRB.
13. The applicant shall demonstrate consultation with the City Arborist for trees that will be within the anticipated right-of-way.
14. Prior to acceptance of the lighting plan, the area will need to be designated as a specific decorative lighting district.
15. After street classification, appropriate light levels for streets can be determined with the assistance of Burlington Electric Department.