Burlington Planning Commission
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)
www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz

Yves Bradley, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Lee Buffinton
Emily Lee
Andy Montroll
Harris Roen
Jennifer Wallace-Brodeur
vacant, Youth Member

Burlington Planning Commission Minutes

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, May 24, 2016 - 6:30 P.M.

Public Works Conference Room, 645 Pine Street

Present: B Baker, L Buffinton, E Lee, A Montroll, H Roen, J Wallace-Brodeur
Absent: Y Bradley
Staff: D White, M Tuttle, E Tillotson

I. Agenda

No changes to the Agenda.

II. Report of the Chair

B Baker chaired meeting; no report.

III. Report of the Director

D White: Mayor is an ex officio member of the Commission and will be joining the meeting. At opening of Public Forum, will frame the Planning Commission role and focus.

IV. Proposed CDO Amendment: NAC-Riverside Boundary

M Tuttle: This proposed amendment in response to a request received which would affect the north side of Riverside Avenue; maps illustrating this are in the agenda. Initial staff recommendation to move boundary was an attempt to balance request with preservation of river bank. Commission requested a solution more sensitive to the steep slopes. Revised staff recommendation maintains concept of moving NAC-R 25 feet to the north, and incorporate buildable area definition on north side of Riverside Avenue. This means slope of 30% or more cannot be developed or counted in the lot coverage/density, and 15-30% slope can be considered for 50% of lot coverage/density by DRB Conditional Use approval.

L Smith: Suggested the buildable area consideration. The property is now a non-conforming piece of land. Boundary should follow the topography, make sewage treatment plant conforming, incorporate the plateau. Surprised that there was no site visit.

M Tuttle: The chair appreciated the request for the visit, but asked staff to provide a further recommendation.

M Furnari: Understand the reluctance to compromise the properties, but ask that the Commission consider one more time and include a site visit.

J Wallace-Brodeur: Can we get some concrete numbers on what the slopes are?

M Tuttle: In the area of the properties requesting the change, range from 12% to in excess of 30% along property lines. Can make information available.

L Smith: There is a lovely flat plateau way above flood plain.

H Roen: Should do a site visit.

M Tuttle: Will coordinate outside of this meeting.

L Smith: Suggest putting it off a little when there is not so much going on.

The Commission unanimously approved a motion by A Montroll, seconded by J Wallace-Brodeur, to table discussion of the proposed amendment until the fall.

V. Public Forum

D White: planBTV established the policy framework, regulatory, capital and other improvements for downtown. The mall has long been identified as underutilized. Question has been how to encourage and facilitate redevelopment. This area of downtown does not have an existing historic context, so there are many possibilities for this area. With a change of ownership of the mall, started a public engagement process almost two years ago. Have had a lot of public input during that time and City Council has anticipated a zoning change to incorporate proposals. Question now is how new development will interface with people on the street. Zoning limits height to 105 feet today. Proposed amendment expands that to 160 feet, and includes adjacent parcels as well. FBC Committee recommends this area as one for greater height.

H Roen: Read all of the emails that have been sent.

B Baker: Opened the public forum at 6:57 pm.

J Fayette: Support the project; ideally timed, thoughtful, environmentally sound, appropriate.

T Redington: No quarrel with a project at the zoning height maximum of 105 feet. planBTV establishes a basis for what the community wants to see, nothing over eight stories. Developer wants other rules, is exploiting the situation, especially with no environmental review.

A Taylor: Among colleagues and contemporaries, sit in the middle. This developer has made a lot of adjustments that were asked for; it is a green building, urban infill. Business is business. Using TIF will not burden taxpayers. Back to earth ethic needs to support this.

C Bates: Support some redevelopment. Propose that the Burlington Business Association buy the mall from Sinex and do development our way; have a team that could have local focus, lots of housing.

A Radcliffe: Building height is not human scale. planBTV does not support this proposal. FBC is not currently approved, should not be used as a justification. The plan does not measure up, will not impact housing affordability, zoning should not be changed in a random manner. Think about precedent this will set.

J Canning: Supports the town center redevelopment; however, the overlay should not apply to the City's parking garage behind Hotel Vermont.

M Fordham: Trying to spread the word about this project, not against smart development; however, first rule in business is when something works, you don't ruin it. This should not go forward.

G Grill: While the height is atrocious, the process is of utmost important and the request is an assault on the city. Planners and City Council are under pressure from the Mayor. The people have had enough, and if this is approved, Mayor will not be reelected.

R Herendeen: Process is happening too abruptly. Burlingtonians are actively engaged, it feels great nature is close. Mass, scale and height should honor the City, make the street level the focus. Need to respect the previous planning efforts, do not raise building heights at all.

DRAFT

C Messing: Project subverts zoning. Virtual tour shows Cherry Street empty of traffic, not realistic. If there was a scale model, the project would sink like a stone. Spoke to a construction worker, out of work, who said the local community will not gain employment in this venture.

J Brophy: Supports a livable city, should support infill, Williston's big box stores are not what we want.

K Andrews: Inclusionary housing ordinance in Burlington is excellent. This project is an unconscionable, luxury housing development. Separate affordable units is not what was meant to be. Most problems in our nation can be brought back to segregation.

A Petrarca: Vermont values are expressed here. In Pittsburgh, the citizenry organized and defeated a proposed downtown mall. The proposed height does not make any sense

C Dinklage: This has been a long process, dynamic process. We should consider why many young people are not choosing to move to Burlington right now. Smart growth is needed.

M Wallace: Have seen new Armenian development destroy character and not appeal to residents. Similarly, Burling will lose its character. There are no trade-offs worth the cost, do not see this as being good for Burlington.

M Holmes: Have traveled the world, and there is not anything better than Burlington. In own neighborhood, have seen redevelopment that blocks view of the sky. Didn't speak out then, so doing so now. Have to be careful with this project.

J Nick: All of the Church Street Marketplace merchants support the vibrancy of this project, believe it will improve the situation on Church Street. The turn of the century building at 1 Church Street is 125 feet high; with change in elevation to the mall property, 160 feet will not be much taller than existing historic buildings.

J Vos: Climate change is the elephant in the room. Bill Mckibben, Naomi Kline warn that the world will be a different place.

J van Driesche: Perspective on a livable community is one with lots of traffic on foot and on bike, a higher concentration of residents, lessening taxes, growing the grand list, fewer cars. We need more people living in close proximity to where they work. See a trend to kill projects that are not perfect. This project is not yet perfect, but there is time to get it right. Encourage retaining leverage for this project through the bonuses.

R Dean: Public should look at what is actually proposed. Higher building elements are set back toward the center of the block away from streets. Citizens live on the streets, bring economic vitality. Most important project component is how it engages the street. Posters in room are a misrepresentation. Hold back, get the facts, let project move forward so that the public can evaluate.

G Eppler-Wood: In favor of the mall, but is asking the Commission, Mayor, City Councilors, to do more research to reduce height. Not lip service, actual change of height. Underground parking should be explored.

S Burton: Opposes to fourteen stories. Not a slightly larger building, it is going against the City's own recommendations. Keep in mind the unique character and scale of city, show foresight and backbone.

L Tucker: Have been teetering on this subject but attended several meetings. Feel confident in the process and staff who care about the community. Downtown can be bigger and better. Density in our city is a good thing.

A Simon: We are experiencing a global crisis like we have never seen before. Expanding tax base is not the answer and fourteen stories reflects a lack of understanding of the problem. Which planet do you live on?

I Avilix: planBTV illustration shows scale and density which doesn't seem to agree with the proposed project. Let's stick with planBTV.

M Tracey: Will not vote for the ordinance as proposed. Student housing is a negative, the developer needs to do a lot more at a moral level. FBC transect is from less dense to more dense and more height. The

conversation tonight is a strong indication that there is need for more conversation. Need 3 D model. This feels like a choice-less choice.

S Overby: Supportive of redevelopment of mall, but really disturbed by process. Very sketchy plan with no model. Commission is in difficult position, doesn't have enough time. Participated in plan BTV which does support what is proposed.

C Simpson: Building our way out of financial problems is not likely, the purpose of the height bonus is for public good. The proposed amendment is throwing this out and overlay is wider than footprint of mall.

H Manske: Personally would like to see the mall redeveloped. It is a process and he appreciates everyone's comments. On the Ward 5 steering committee, we always hear about housing and parking, which are two things this project will address.

L Politi: Feels as if Burlington has already spoken on this subject. Has conferred with an architect friend who commented that this proposal is unrealistic, a misrepresentation.

D Purcell: Has heard a lot of good comments. Supports the project even if it is imperfect.

B Castle: Supports the project, feels the program is basically good for Burlington. Burlington is one of success stories, have to work with developer to do it right.

M Long: Nothing in our regulations is presently preventing the development of the mall. The process is backwards, the developer doesn't establish the schedule. Work within the existing zoning parameters.

N Kirby: Likes old buildings, likes Burlington. She is not against repair and renovation, but is against the height.

Resident: Honored to share comments. In acupuncture, taught that there is harmony and balance. This project can find balance if we give it more time and consideration. Continue dialogue, revitalization, growth, restoration. We all have a stake in this.

I Ahmed: Concerned about process and claiming once in a lifetime opportunity Need to make sure it's the right opportunity, need a more intense design and environmental study.

J Caulo: Support the project. While the process seems somewhat irregular, it is important that the process is being conducted in an open manner and that it not become tainted. Boards will have city's best interest at heart. Urban design something that we will be proud of. Have to keep process moving try to find a solution.

T Brassard: Is in support of the project. Housing is the crux of the project. State and city are challenged, stagnant population, need to have opportunity for younger generation. Burlington is the economic hub of the state, consideration needs to be given to growing the population. Adding housing is the issue.

G Seidler: Cannot park on own street anymore. Mayor proposed condos on block whic are now rentals. Has spoken to 311 people who do not know what is going on. Moved away from NYC, now will leave Burlington. Get the model, people have no idea.

J Kilacky: Conceptually is in favor of mall with inclusionary housing, walkable downtown, Pine Street open. Permanent jobs are needed to reinvigorate our city. The public is being asked to move the process forward in concept.

P Binelli: Horribly insufficient wastewater treatment system. No one sees problem with adding new housing units with sewage issues, failing wastewater system.

L McKenzie: It is imperative to vitalize our downtown. Affordable housing is an issue, tax burden is so substantial that many cannot afford to live in town. This is just the beginning of the process.

DRAFT

C Long: Burlington's population has grown. California has banned using TIF money because it was supposed to be for public good. The proposal seems impractical, what is the city going to get out of it? We need housing and to restore neighborhoods save the lake.

Resident: Supports the project. As a father of five kids, see real challenges ahead. Need to embrace development and smart growth.

H Easter: Sad about this inverted, weird process for the zoning ordinance. Developer should have to convince you why the zoning change is a good idea. Missing a view of what this looks like from Pine Street. Listen to this process.

Resident: This is a really important process. Take a step back and listen to public even ones who are just coming to the meetings.

Resident: No feasibility study, no model, real problem with process. Concerned about no parking. Conceptually, this doesn't work.

S Goodkind: Squandering a great opportunity, mall needs to be redeveloped. We shouldn't have to oppose this. Developer needs to conform to the zoning and work with us. Hold the line.

B Headrick: Against the height and dorms downtown. Read all the City Council minutes back to 2008. When increased height was proposed, five people were opposed for every person in favor. 160 feet is not consistent; let's not ruin our city.

C Rameka: All for intelligent development downtown, but don't do it like Hartford, CT. They have dead streets, a dead city.

Resident: Very concerned about consistency with planBTV, TIF. Would not have voted for it if it looks like this. People who work in mall do not live downtown. Other projects proposed affordable housing, but did not happen. UVM students are UVM responsibility. People come here because it's small and green.

Resident: Buildings look like 1960. Suggest we take current mall, give it a facelift, fill it with small Vermont businesses.

P Simon: Question is height and mass. Curious to see a model of a project with the same square foot and program within a 10 story height comparison to what is proposed, see if people like it better. Charge is to maintain character of Burlington.

Mayor Weinberger: Not typically at Planning Commission, but wanted to hear concerns directly. Lots of concerns, but sensing there is a need for more information. For example, the wastewater treatment capacity is quite adequate except during major storm events when the City has such a high volume of stormwater in the system. Improvements have been and continue to be made. Today FAQs posted on website. There was a zoning effort in 2000s to reform zoning with a resulting lack of consensus over some issues. What came out of that process was the City receiving a $300,000 federal grant for planBTV, marshalled by Karen Paul. It is worth noting that Don Sinex was excited about planBTV. We're still listening to ideas. But what we do now will define how successful planBTV was. A lot at stake for the future of Burlington.

E Lee: Read letter submitted to Planning Commission by Councilor Shannon.

VI. Proposed CDO Amendment – Downtown Mixed Use Core Overlay

D White: Commission has a nearly complete proposed ordinance amendment, including a map for where additional height would be worthy of consideration. Commission's role is to judge the community's attitude about building height. Have set up a number of meetings in June to get something back to City Council by

DRAFT

early July. City Council has said they are conceptually supportive of this proposal. Upcoming meetings include a work session June 9, a meeting June 14 and another meeting to make a recommendation to Council on July 6.

A Montroll: To confirm, if the public hearing is on July 6, by June 14th a draft would have be ready to warn.

D White: The Commission is free to make changes to the proposal after the hearing.

A Taylor: Don Sinex will be going to NPAs for more information for the public.

D White: Distributed handout regarding model. Important element is to consider what the utility of the model will be. 3D models are done for a variety of reasons. Model would look very different if it were to show a proposed building within its existing context, versus current zoning versus proposed zoning. What is most relevant to the Commission is a model of zoning buildout. Public is asking for a model of the proposed project. We are looking for someone who can get a model developed, but not sure can get that done during the Commission's review. Commission can help advise on what extent for a model.

H Roen: What about the digital model that was built to show possible buildout.

D White: As a staff, we will provide a variety of information for the Commission to use, including digital. Probably not a physical model, though.

E Lee: We will be doing ourselves a great disservice if we don't have a physical model. Really uncomfortable that it cannot be accomplished.

D White: We will build a model, the question is timeframe for Commission discussion.

M Tuttle: Goes back to what we can understand from the model. The Commission is being tasked with considering the proposed zoning compared to buildout potential under current zoning. Model will likely contain proposed project, which is not the purview of the Commission.

L Buffinton: Urge that we get every possible model. And the parking garage might need to be reexamined.

D White: The Mall team FAQ has information about garage cost.

J Wallace-Brodeur: The city has a technical team that looks at a variety of issues. Do we have access to them?

D White: The next meeting we will provide information from the tech team, a person to answer questions.

The Commission unanimously approved a motion by A Montroll, seconded by J Wallace-Brodeur, to defer the remainder of the items to the next meeting and adjourn at 9:34 pm.

VII. Committee Reports

Deferred to next meeting.

VIII. Commissioner Items

No Commissioner Items.

IX. Minutes/Communications

Deferred to next meeting.

_____ Signed: 2016

B Baker, Vice Chair

_____

E Tillotson, Recording Secretary

DRAFT