

PlanBTV: South End Community Workshop Comments

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT FRAMEWORK

In the last hours of the planBTV: South End Community Workshop, Feb. 11 – 14, 2015, a draft framework illustrating many possibilities for the future of the neighborhood began to take shape. This framework emerged from over 3 days of community discussion and 18 Workshop events that drew hundreds of community members. The draft framework synthesized three “vision plans” and incorporated many new ideas suggested by Workshop participants. The draft framework was the topic of discussion at the Feb. 14 Closing Workshop, as well as several sessions on Feb. 13.

Attendees expressed enthusiasm for many aspects of the draft framework, and questions, concerns, or suggestions about other aspects. The possibility of affordable market rate housing (i.e., workforce housing) in the Lakeside area was a topic of debate, with some attendees in favor of the idea and some opposed. Summary notes from the Closing Workshop discussion are provided below. Several attendees posted yellow sticky notes with their comments on the framework diagram and adjacent topic summaries, and those comments are transcribed below.

For more information on the Community Workshop, the Framework Plan, or planBTV: South End, please visit www.planbtvsouthend.com.



DISCUSSION AT THE CLOSING WORKSHOP

- Question about character of Art Hub – what’s it look like?
 - o Gallery space to sell art to local and regional audience
 - o Parking that’s convenient to use for visitors but not dominant feature
 - o Workforce housing important
 - But what about families? What happens if big companies leave?
- Comment: “I really love this plan – it conveys all our discussions/ideas in one place”
- Housing in South End in context of larger area – increasing housing downtown especially
- artist conversation about need for public gathering space
- Need/desire for “aging in place” options
 - o Parking lot at end of Myrtle Ave? near Pine St. housing on bus line...
- What are tools to ensure “workforce” price point – market pressures push rents up
 - o David White: inclusionary requirement exists today (15% for 40-80% AMI) – consider increasing to 120% AMI. Don’t want housing here unless it addresses opportunity/need for workforce housing.
- How to ensure housing for workers is lived in by local employees? Can’t, but mobile renter population moves a lot
- In context of housing need in city – why not build more dense housing here?
- Glad to hear inclusionary requirement brought up in this forum – it’s important
 - o David White: some of critics are non-profit devel. – need to modernize requirement area. Where it applies is restrictive, 5 unit trigger is very difficult.
- Would like to be part of inclusionary requirement discussion
 - o South End Square area is last big undeveloped area – adding housing above commercial space limits type of industry that can come in
 - David Spillane: Brookings research/other examples show mixing of uses that wasn’t considered compatible before
- Wednesday’s 3rd option showed tank farm as redeveloped site – don’t see it in Saturday plan but should consider (re: gas near lake, environmental concerns)
- Should keep Enterprise District as commercial/industrial without housing. If considering housing, how do you find out what realistic market is for work-live, etc.?
 - o Local examples raise questions about how it works, i.e. details important
 - Rose Street co-op in North End by Land Trust
 - Richmond or Ridgemont? Also by Land Trust
 - Co-op housing model is growing nationally, not just artist focused, helps affordability
- Transit corridor/Parkway thru South End Square – would traffic detract from sense of place?
- Relation of Blodgett waterfront/South End Square → green space there unused now but has large value for future (and current) housing
- Better transit could change paradigm of parking for workers, need to improve it though
- Champlain Parkway = “artery” in DOT documents, heavy traffic → how to address?
- Roundabouts didn’t have much support Wednesday but still here
- Roundabouts done right are about how pedestrians/bikes/cars interact better
- UVM workshop in March about good roundabout design; Winooski example is bad

COMMENTS PROVIDED VIA STICKY NOTES

- Plan shows mixed-use = to redevelop like Winooski which is not people friendly
- Food hub that is defined by production, jobs, industry and production!
- Workforce housing is useless if jobs are driven out. Do NOT turn this into a bedroom community for Chittendon County.
 - Commuter Artery! (arrow pointing to potential new street extending through Barge Canal)
 - Balance does not = mix of housing and work. instead = enterprise is mix of work types
 - A city is more than housing...services, jobs, food mix are critical to whole and support neighborhoods
 - Industrial Preservation Heritage site at railroad yards - railroad museum
 - No village square
 - limit buildings to 2 stories
 - not another Winooski
 - No roundabouts all along Pine Street - traffic disaster
 - Keep industry in Burlington. Not more housing complexes. Room for start-ups and business expansion.
 - Add a year-round space for autonomous artists to sell work as entrepreneurs.
 - More housing/business = less autonomy for artists
 - Please continue outreach to residents who couldn't make these workshops or didn't know they were happening
 - SMALLER BLOCKS. Scale same in downtown.
 - Trolley/Pine Street shuttle!

- There needs to be accessible space for current residents and not just for future residents
- Triangle diagram: point1 - (overlay) energy production; point2 - ecosystems, services (land use); line in between - inclusive of people and water; point3 - innovation, jobs center (bldg)
- No to future street does not = "WILD"
- BED energy zone - 2030 district
- Job training and multi-gen connected to Champlain School property
- Housing mix = buffer zones only
- No housing. This is in conflict with enterprise and industry.
- Need street ["transit corridor"] important to neighborhood.
- Build a park and ride & capture lot @ 189 and Shelburne Road
- What happened to grid (street) crossings (across transit corridor)?
- Infill where it says "add sidewalk" [industrial pkwy]
- Connections to park [Red Rocks Park]
- Bridge sucks, needs sidewalks
- Residential facing lakeside; commercial/industry facing parkway

COMMENTS PROVIDED VIA STICKY NOTES

<p><u>“SOUTH END SQUARE (URBAN VILLAGE)”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why do we assume that workers who live here will work here? - Only worker housing in So. End Square - keep industry thriving - support Burlington biz. 	<p><u>“GROWTH NETWORK”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food enterprise hub - intersection of food, water, production jobs and energy. - This is Burlington's ONLY industrial innovation enterprise zone = keep that real. Do not gentrify this into housing. 	<p><u>“GREEN NETWORK”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerted street tree plan! - What happened to "WILD, WEIRD, AND MYSTERIOUS?"
<p><u>“ENHANCED STREET NETWORKS”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No roundabouts - it will ruin Pine Street. Ruin pedestrian/bike quality of life. 	<p><u>“HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Portion of Blodgett? - Study the impact of 8 story growth downtown with all that additional housing to bldg. stock in Burlington. 	<p><u>“PEDESTRIAN/BIKE”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No Pine Street or parkway roundabouts.