

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Section: About the Plan

I'm assuming that you are collecting and posting comments. On that assumption I'll provide my own response. I read the plan and attended the "rollout" organized by Planning and Zoning. First, I question what I understand was over one hundred thousand dollars paid to outside consultants for the development of a glitzy study. It is less an analysis explaining and justifying the points in the program than a propaganda piece designed to create the appearance of public consultation and unanimity. It is a badly written fifth grade text book. Case in point: the Champlain Parkway. There is no balanced analysis of the need for this 30 plus million dollar boondoggle or a look at alternative uses for the roadbed: affordable housing, industrial space, etc. The map suggests that there is a more direct link east from the Industrial park to the interstate than that proposed. At the "rollout", David White of Planning and Zoning said that while the Parkway was indeed included in the South End Plan, it was not up for public discussion at all. Nor, apparently, were the alternatives: a trolley line down Pine, a municipal peripheral garage on the K Mart parking lot, etc. No, we were only going through the motions of consultation, on this issue at least. At that point the mask of pretend democracy--let alone rationality--came off. Second, there's the matter of assuring the artist presence in the South End. The Plan lauds the presence of artists as part of urban "vibrancy" but treats their presence as an unintended development which needs neither protection nor encouragement. The facts are quite the reverse. Eliminating industry-only zoning will allow landlords to consider the more profitable housing option as they consider renovation or construction in vacant namedland. Common sense tells us they will opt for housing, and high end housing. The outside consultants know this; the City's planners know this. I know this from studying SoHo in NYC. Yet the plan denies this proven real estate dynamic. Nor is any promotion of the arts presented in detail with funding sources identified. This city needs practice and performance space for dancers. It needs cooperative working space for small manufacturers and artisans, It needs a facility that integrates arts education with performance with retail. Where is the commitment to such a future? Not in the Plan. Sure, the discussion of a Barge Canal park is great, especially one integrated with a water conservation plan. Lets have that, but certainly not as the icing on a cake that includes an outdated 1960s Parkway and the annihilation of the arts district.. Finally, the plan assumes that the manufacturing age is over in Burlington. Yes, manufacturing is less than before the globalizers, the neoliberals, the trade agreement mafia in both parties sent 5 million industrial jobs to China and Mexico since the NAFTA and WTO agreements. Globally, there is nothing "post industrial" about the present; it is rather that political leaders in the US have preferred to see transnational profits and rust bucket American cities. But the point is that the job of our elected officials is to buck this trend, denounce it, support decent wages here, protect our jobs with industrial zoning. Not cave to the cheap fix offered by the housing development lobby. Charles Simpson

The integrity of a neighborhood respects the access and affordability of established businesses and people that can continue to exist in it's area. Survival of both artists and working class people have long been treated as a secondary item in lieu of developmental pressures that are high end and expendable of existing businesses and residents. This appears to be the final nail on the coffin. The study real is a soft sell for inviting the elites that want to buy and play in the city and damn the rest of us. The city powers to be might as well put up signs similar to that in the former Italian community and give lip service to what was a vibrant and affordable part of the city. There is nothing of value or respect given toward what has existed as part of the city's residents and economy over the last 40 years with this study. It just fortifies the bloody concept that believes we have a bottom line that can be bought and sold and fully insults those Vermonters trying to hang on in their community because another expensive playground is being developed to run over them like a third world country. Maybe you can bus in the low income labor for outside to keep things running, since the closest example of a town that plays this form of class politics is Stowe, or perhaps, Stratton?

This all "sounds" great, but in reality the plan is mostly a capitulation to market forces as opposed to a community-value-based protection of our neighborhoods. Yes, the South End is changing and yes, we need to stop and consider whether we want the changes that the market is bringing. But the idea that this plan represents the community voice or a defense of what is good in the South End is really mis-representative of the top-down process involved as well as the very powerful profit motives behind most of its conclusions. Just one obvious example: changing the zoning in the Enterprise District to mixed use will not make the region a "more resilient economic hub for the city and region...where creative art/maker enterprises continue to flourish". It will have the opposite effect as many studies make overwhelmingly clear. "Getting in front of the next wave of change" is not to accept the boondoggle of the Champlain Parkway but instead would be to actually listen to the people (who don't want it anymore than they wanted the Southern Connector) who are asking for real 21st century solutions to environmental, economic, and social problems. anyone who looks at the paper trail in the city about visions for the South End can clearly see that most of the "conclusions" in this document were already decided upon as policy by the city before this "public" planning process ever began. This entire document is an elaborate advertising campaign for the city's agenda, and its data, its assertions, and its conclusions should be trusted as little as we can trust a television commercial for some new gadget that promises to cure all our ills for just \$11.99. Alas.

RESULTS OF CITY'S OWN WEBTOOL SURVEY SUMMARIZED: By my count there were 651 votes explicitly against allowing any housing in the Arts and Enterprise zone and 188 in favor of a possible zoning change; another 26 were only in favor of housing if noise, grit, industrial uses, and affordability were maintained. 5 votes for market rate housing are negated by the 8 against it and the many others calling for only affordable housing, often recommended for artists only within the Arts and Enterprise zone. Many people we have spoken to over the course of the last 6 months initially favored housing until they realized that it would drive up rents and drive out arts and industry, so we may assume that many of those who favored housing in the survey would change their minds if they understood the implications of their initial choice. Many other comments, while not specifically mentioning housing, indicated that everything should be done to protect the district from outside forces such as the market, development, or inorganic city planning. Many comments expressed a need for a community center, public meeting/performance/gallery/market space in the South End, often noting that the needs of the community should be met before the interests of developers. An overwhelming proportion of comments and votes (approximately 2120) throughout the survey call for protection of the Arts and Enterprise zone through a combination of zoning, protective regulations, conservation designation, rent controls, incentives to landlords, and land trust and private sponsorship of low-rent spaces. While there are a few comments suggesting that the artists should work toward owning their own spaces, the majority of comments and votes supported governmental zoning and regulatory protections/conservation for this area. The section on how to keep the "funk" evidences an overwhelming consensus that this naturally occurring cultural district should not be legislated or planned from above, but should, at most, be fostered with city resources, so that it can continue to flourish on its own. The survey evidences overwhelming support for preserving green and wild spaces and preserving natural corridors for animal and human use (84 pro/0 con), including in a number of areas slated for development (88 pro/15 con). There is overwhelming agreement that we should discourage car use in the South End. A large majority of comments and votes support encouraging biking, walking, public transport and park-ride/shuttle options instead of increasing parking (638 pro/19 con). 92 voters said no to the Champlain Highway, to 14 who supported it. Many people want a grocery store, and these people would probably be very upset to learn that City Market may not move to Sears Lane as proposed, because the Mayor has told them that they cannot set up shop unless they incorporate housing into their plan.

South End Resident: 69 Marble Avenue. 1. Please no new housing in the enterprise zone. Such a small area of Burlington, and there is no need for housing right there. The schools are already overflowing. Tell the colleges to house all their students on campus and the housing crunch will go away. 2. No parkway. I know this is not discussed as a part of the plan, but it should not be a "given." There is no reason to add to Pine Street's traffic problems. No one wants the parkway and it won't help the city at all, it will only add to downtown traffic.

Public Comment regarding draft planBTV: South End

Plan Theme

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Section: About the Plan

I'm hoping it's this cumbersome method of commenting, whereby you need to login allowing disquis.com your gmail account information, that is preventing people from commenting and not that they don't have something to say. I went to the meeting on June 16th, and there were plenty of people who disagreed with what this plan is proposing. Our city is allowing big developers to develop big buildings with little to no parking spaces. I've haven't heard a peep about 289 College Street, or Pearl Street (across from the Beverage Liquor Store) but they've been approved for large buildings with little parking. It would be wonderful if we could all live without a car but that's unrealistic. I know these addresses are not the South End, but the issue is the same - giving developers the upper hand, congesting the city even more. I wonder how many city workers, especially the top directors and managers, live in Burlington. Maybe we should focus on mandating that all city workers live in the city in which we pay taxes, and therefore their salaries. I wonder then the outcome of these studies, or if there would even be such studies in the first place in which we spend a lot of money on consultants. Also, I'm referring to city workers who wouldn't have the luxury of a driveway, who would have to live with roommates as I have to afford the rent, not those who could afford Summit Street.

Comments on Burlington's Plan BTV: Mary Twitchell, South End Resident June 28, 2015

1. Abandon the Champlain Parkway: It is time to convert the entrance to the Parkway into a Park and Ride facility. Generally something is wrong when a project is still in the planning stages after 50 years—most likely its time has come and gone. At the Park and Ride drivers will enter downtown by commuter rail, bike, bixibike, bus, and on foot. Why? (a) Climate change will soon force us out of our cars. Why not be ahead of the curve by figuring out other modes of transport now. (b) The original purpose of the Parkway was to divert truck traffic from South End neighborhoods via the Parkway to Pine Street businesses. But the businesses have disappeared. The visual on p. 26 shows there are only .4% trucks to every 90 cars on Pine Street (not a sufficiently compelling reason to invest in the Parkway). (c) Pages 16 & 75 show a rail line, bike path, sidewalk, Pine Street and the Champlain Parkway within a block of each other. Does this make sense? Before any redesign of the South End Enterprise Zone is done there should be a vision. And the vision should start with infrastructure. Further accommodation of the car will no longer do. In ten years, I will either be working from home or riding to work on mass transit. In plan BTV there is no discussion of increased rail or bus service. (CCTA has in fact removed some of the bus stops on Shelburne Road.)
2. Post-It-Note Visioning: Pages 50-60 and 64-73 are attempts to present a larger view, i.e., "Policies" and "Implementation". There appears to be a Table of Content for the two sections, but it is not really identified as such, and there are nopage references. The page layout for the Policies and Implementation Sections are scrambled and hard to read as there no hierarchy of information, the premises and discussions are intermixed, and there seem to be no conclusions. This creates a limited and unfocused view of what the City's vision might be and how it could be achieved.
3. Missing Pieces: Housing belongs in the South End as it does in the rest of Burlington; it does not belong in the industrial/retail/artist South End Enterprise District. There are plenty of uses compatible with current ED businesses: (a) Food Coop (b) Canning/Food Processing Kitchen (as they have in Hardwick) (c) "Generator" space moved into the Enterprise District (d) Multi-gen or Community or Senior Center (e) Energy demonstration projects. With two utilities in the ED. there should be wind turbine demonstration project, solar panels atop the flat roofed buildings of Pine Street, stormwater mitigation with rain gardens and other management techniques, etc.
4. Barge Canal: This a Superfund site and must be preserved as is; other parcels west of Pine Street are former sites of coal yards, a gasification plant and other industrial uses. Plan BTV has even labeled them "High" or "Medium" risk. Page 59 of plan BTV allows for "artist work-live space between Maple and Sears Lane". This strip of land west of Pine Street is too contaminated to be used for housing. Disturbing the soil is risky and may endanger the health of residents. There is no reason to be building here.

The PlanBTV South End comprises two basic components--a transportation plan and a land use plan. Land use and transportation are interdependent--one affects the other. So, when there is a completely inadequate/inappropriate land use or transportation component the plan basically fails to meet a reasonable level of acceptance in any form--that is the problem with PlanBTV South End as the plan assumes--as Director of Planning David White precisely explained--as a given the Champlain Parkway. Before reading a single page, looking at a single photo, or land use design--the PlanBTV South End arrives, as they say, dead on arrival (DOA). How sad to waste much money and so much time and so much public involvement for such shoddy work. The highpoint of the initial meeting on this draft plan occurred when an almost unanimous, emotional rejection of the Parkway when the hundred plus attendees were asked their view, yes or no. What does it take to get through the DPW and Planning Department? The three day Burden workshop last September called for only roundabouts on Pine Street, the Walk Bike Council afer six months analysis and discussion last December called for all roundabouts (including the "McCormack" roundabout at the south end of Pine allowing that area access to Queen City Park Road and areas to the south--named after State Representative Curt McCormack who led writing of a lot of Act 250 in his State legislative committee which he chaired), separate walk and bike pathways throughout the Parkway route--in a word the kind of design already approved by the Council and Mayor for North Avenue last October! The residents and businesses of the South End deserve the same treatment as their neighbors to the north--a world class infrastructure with the highest quality and highest safety for all modes. The Parkway design really does date to TV's "Happy Days"--it would be funny if it were not \$30 million tragic. The rest of the plan--and yes, it makes no sense to re-zone the industrial area for residential--becomes almost irrelevant because like a plane with no engines, the plan cannot get off the ground with the transportation portion an anathema to good, quality, transportation to all modes!!

I find it disgusting that I am required to agree to a private corporation (Disqus)'s "terms of service" in order to comment on a public planning process.

I find it disgusting that I am required to agree to a private corporation (Disqus)'s "terms of service" in order to comment on a public planning process. Surely those citizens who do not agree to the company's terms still have an equal right to have their say in this municipal planning process? That said, the Champlain Parkway is an outdated plan from the '80s that will not serve Burlington well in the present (let alone the future). The lack of bicycle/pedestrian/transit/rideshare facilities, and the increased higher-speed traffic, are not going to serve Burlington well. It reminds me of the plan from the 1960s to put a north-south interstate highway right along the Burlington waterfront... I'm sure it seemed like a good idea at the time, but would have been a blight on the city for decades to come. That's what we're looking at with the Champlain Parkway.

There are a number of places where data and percentages seem to be inconsistent, leading to confusion. In order for the public to respond to what is being proposed, we need to know what is being proposed. Please work to clarify the discrepancies. Here are some I have found: On page 76, we read : "Consider allowing up to 35% of new square footage for uses that will help support the Maker'hood Center as a lively place—uses such as: café or coffee shop; small market; retail space associated with production facilities; work-live space for artists and craftspersons; multi-family workforce housing, affordable to local workers." Which suggests that the general plan for new development in the ED would be a ratio of 35 % non-industrial/not art-related uses and 65% art/industry uses. However, on page 42 ("Spice it up"), the text suggests "5 to 10 % of square footage" that might be allotted for artist space in new buildings. Further along on the same page, we are told that a "set proportion" of new housing could be devoted to affordability, which again is different from the impression given to us by David this morning (he seemed to be suggesting that all of the new housing would be affordable). But then on page 43 the text talks about potential affordable "by right" work/live spaces. Would these work/live spaces be considered in addition to the percentage of inclusionary affordable units mentioned on the previous page (which would require, I assume, a majority of non-affordable units) or instead of these? Again, on p.56, we read that housing inside the ED could include "a portion" of affordable units, and it is suggested that this proportion would be the 15% usually allocated to inclusionary zoning.

Public Comment regarding draft planBTV: South End

Plan Theme	Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website
<i>Plan Section: About the Plan</i>	
	<p>The current exclusion of housing from the Enterprise Zone should be maintained. Burlington’s sustainability depends in part on having a diverse character, including a creative industrial zone that isn’t suppressed by the pressures that would accompany any level of encroachment by housing. As the city’s need for housing grows, its capacity for intelligently preserving the systems that are fundamental to expression and industry should also rise. We should have a development vision that respects the city’s potential and doesn’t squander it wastefully. I’m grateful for the positive energy of South End residents who have recognized that a more complete public engagement process is possible and not yet achieved; resources of community outreach have been left untapped and stakeholders have been overlooked. I urge extending the public input process with dedication to an authentic engagement effort.</p>
	<p>Now that the mayor has dropped the zoning issue, it's time to turn to the Parkway. Two major initiatives in this chirpy PR plan call for building up the pedestrian friendliness and bike safety on the Pine Street corridor while at the same time, funneling highway traffic into downtown right through the center of it. Huh? And when did this plan get discussed and approved? I mean within the last year, not all the discussions over the last 20 years that ended with a firm NO. Suddenly it's a done deal. It has always been a bad idea, and now it's an even worse one. Now that the Pine Street corridor is turning into a lively zone of enterprise and art, now that we need sidewalk safety and bike safety more than ever – now we are going to have the Parkway routed down the center of it? Ridiculous!</p>
	<p>I live in the South End, work in the South End Enterprise & Arts District, and have been regularly attending the planBTV/SE events and meetings. If what you are saying is true Mr. Redington, then the only way to rectify this crucial discrepancy-between “plan” and something that works exceptionally well for people, multi-modal transportation AND the environment- is actively involve the city public back into the planning process for this proposed “Champlain Parkway”. Who has been working on this Parkway design and why has the public been banned from participating?? Every time I address a city official of the planBTV/SE public participation process, with questions about this Parkway design, I am told the design is done and the project is moving ahead. I keep asking “Why are we not seeing the design?” “How will the design affect traffic, businesses, the character of the South End, the safety of pedestrians, the ecology of the fragile landscapes that are being remediated by letting nature grow (Superfund site at the Barge Canal for example)” -For reasons that are slim and unclear, the Parkway is nothing but a dotted line on video arcade looking graphic novel of a draft plan. To me the draft plan document is cluttered with attractive pictures, feel-good slogans, and is virtually negligent in displaying complete information. As Dr. Grill mentions, surveys have been done, and as I read the information given in the plan from the consultant group from Boston, MA, Goody Clancy- I am struck by a sense of feeling that I am being given “cherry-picked” statistics and opinions to support the major impact suggestion underlying the whole document, which is: advising the city to allow for housing in the Enterprise District. I too, have had the opportunity to review the survey documents and comments and come to a very different tally that the consultant is choosing to promote. Goody Clancy is being paid \$140,000 to put this together. A REAL and TRUE plan that is of and for the public, is one that let’s the public see deeply considered options and choices, rather than using this process as a tool to drive opinion in a pre-ordained way. How about footnotes? A bibliography? References to articles pertaining to the hot-button issues- a diversity of views that look deeply at both sides of the concerns we have here?- i.e. about gentrification, rising land values, livable wages, modernizing public transportation~ as Dr. Charles Norris-Brown has noted all throughout the planning process, and I wholeheartedly support his inquisitiveness, and courageous declarations for transparency and his mighty thoughtful, considerate call for a study on MANUFACTURING, the history, the present and future of Manufacturing here in our Industry and Light Manufacturing District, also known as the “ Southend Enterprise & Arts District”. Yes, a study is often referenced in the planBTV/Downtown & Waterfront, and here again in PlanBTV/SE- The HR&A Real-Estate Market Analysis. This is the only area zoned for Manufacturing and yet, are we to trust that Real-Estate experts have the best advice for what to do with our Industry/Light-Manufacturing/Enterprise & Arts District?!! The public has been asked to participate and help create a plan for our future. Yet, the process has in my opinion been dominated with designs that occurred from voices other than the public. Early on, housing was shown in “three variations” of designs for the South End/ Enterprise & Arts District. The public had yet to even weigh in! We were just meeting one another and beginning to talk about our dreams at the 3 day workshop back in February. And we were handed major deviations from what we have come to know and love here in all three of these “design” “options”. WTF? Soon, we are about to see a finished document from Massachusetts: a plan that might be a future for our South End/Enterprise & Arts District here in Burlington, Vermont. During the year of this public process, regular planBTV/SE attendees have been getting to know one another, researching facts and conditions, listening to each others dreams, and sharing ideas. Now we are ready to work together – as a strong and committed community- on creating a vision. I hope that our councilors and our planning commission will see this planBTV/SE as only the first step, and to initiate STEP 2: give to a local steering committee, local guidance of a public process that provides a truly inclusive arena for We, the public, to design which major moves to make, and to create something exceptionally fine for the character, culture, businesses, and ecology of a special, delicate district- full of innovative strength- that is waiting, less patiently now, to be invited to design a truly community centered vision and plan.</p>
	<p>We need to form a committee of people from the South End, residents, teachers, business owners/large and small, artists, to study many factors in the south end, and bring in experts as needed. They should include a real thorough study of the southern connector and bring the design into the modern times and use alternative transportation to the car, and be environmentally user friendly at all times. They can study Plan BTV for some solutions, but there are so many other alternatives to this that will be much better to use. It is so sad that the city took much needed money and paid an out-of-stater who just did "not get it right at all" instead of someone local, who would have done it very well. I hope from now on, we will regard local talent as the best and hire them. And we need to be very wary of signing on to monumental construction that will disrupt the fine new industries that have built on Pine St in the past few years.</p>
	<p>COMMENTS RE. THE BARGE CANAL The area of the South End known as the Barge Canal is an identified brownfields site under EPA guidelines for remediation. The Barge Canal and Englesby Brook are both identified on the City’s Natural Resource Protection District map as natural resource features with accompanying buffer zone. The Barge Canal should NOT be designated as a future roadway or shortcut as is currently shown on the draft PlanBTV SE report. We continue to advocate for the Barge Canal to remain wild as this is the only way the soil and wetland conditions will continue to heal the disturbed and polluted conditions. Informal community activities, especially in winter, are low-impact and thus harmless, but new trails and dedicated bike paths, especially residential development are in conflict with brownfield restoration efforts. Futhermore the efforts to remediate Englesby Brook should be expanded from the nominally-funded activity to something more substantial and neighborhood supported.</p>
	<p>ENERGY: The existing Enterprise District (ED) is a critical component of Burlington’s Arts & Industry Sector. It is an economic engine that the City and CEDO have spent over 20 years in the making. Why are we now trying to undermine that effort, especially as it is finally coming into its own? Rather than creating risk and conflict within our ED, let’s look forward to supporting the existing businesses, arts, and industry with leading-edge thinking such as joining the national program of “2030 Energy Districts.” This area has two critical utilities – Burlington Electric Department and Vermont Energy Investment Corp/Efficiency Vermont both known for innovation – and many others who would support such an investment in the future. Other New England states ahead of Vermont on creating 2030 Energy Districts are New Hampshire and Maine. Burlington’s ED is much better adapted for stepping into the future by testing out an Energy District rather than compromising this unique zone with “new urbanist” mixed-use housing complexes.</p>

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Section: About the Plan

As part of the South End Alliance (which is an alliance of businesses, artist, innovators, and residents!) I am advocating for a preserved and enhanced Enterprise District that keeps the existing zoning intact. This small (4%) of the city is home to 20%of the jobs and 92% of the industrial space for the city of Burlington. We believe a commitment to its preservation and empowerment for the future would create an even more exciting and innovative center for our city. We have a number of visions that could be combined and supported to create a truly unique area, focusing on qualities that are consistent with what was intended by the creation of the Enterprise District in the late 80s/early 90s. Instead of making the common mistake of destroying a healthy and growing "Cultural District" by converting industrial zoning to mixed use, Burlington has the opportunity to be on the cutting edge of sustainable city planning. Vermont is known for boldly going where other states do not and we believe this choice will make all the difference. IMAGINE: 1. Energy Efficiency The district will become a 2030 energy district with goals for net zero by 2030.This area has two critical utilities – Burlington Electric Department and Vermont Energy Investment Corp/Efficiency Vermont both known for innovation and many others who would support such an investment in the future. Other New England states ahead of Vermont on creating 2030 Energy Districts are New Hampshire and Maine. Burlington’s EZ is much better adapted for stepping into the future by testing out an Energy District rather than compromising this unique zone with “new urbanist” mixed-use housing complexes. 2. Transportation The area becomes a model of enhanced regional collaboration to address Burlington’s housing issues through real transportation reform. Currently there is no regional authority promoting transit and multi-modal solutions over single-occupancy vehicles and car dependency. Additionally the Burlington housing problem seems NOT to be thinking about a regional inclusionary strategies--the housing and jobs types and locations. Public transportation is the glue that ties these factors together, but in PlanBTV South End, it is mentioned only in passing as an inappropriate analysis (you can’t compare Burlington to Portland OR, for example), or in an insufficient way (as in: there is a need for better bus scheduling). We have got to be thinking beyond the SOV! The central issue of how better public transportation can both help empower the Enterprise Zone as well as help resolve the “affordable housing” problem is never given any weight. Imagine cool housing projects anywhere outside of the Enterprise Zone with improved bus service and/or parking garages with commuter rail. Public transportation can turn a whole number of issues on their heads if we think outside the limited vision of PlanBTV South End, and certainly if we stop glorifying the Champlain Parkway as any kind of solution. Instead of talking about building housing and other infill in the rail yard, we envision promoting the revival of the transportation railroad already planned by the stakeholders of the rail yard. 3. Ecological Design With an emphasis on values and principles of ecological design, the area will embrace cutting edge approaches to storm water, watershed design, and preservation of green space and wildlife sanctuaries. Imagine roof-top gardens and community parks, re-greening and responsible clean-up of contaminated areas, connectivity between streets, homes, studios, and lake. Imagine a holistic approach that takes the future generations of all living beings and systems into consideration. The Barge Canal needs to continue to heal without untoward intervention; stormwater ponds and buffers areas and treatment/catchment basins needs to added into the physical environment; the various remnant wetlands need to be protected; backyard and street runoff programs need to be brought out and implemented. Burlington needs to whole-heartedly and holistically and politically take on the Clean Lake Champlain challenge. 4. Education/Economic Development The area is home to both artists and makers and manufacturers. Imagine a center of training, making, building, creating and hands-on learning that educates a strong and diverse artisan and manufacturing workforce to both provide person power to existing business as well as create innovators of new business. The PlanBTV seems to focus on mixed-use housing as the development planning and that's not even legal in the South End ED. 5. Resources When we place an emphasis on the area’s innovation, incubation, entrepreneurship, business, artistry and craftpersonship, we can work to provide resources that allow this activity to flourish and go beyond the current parameters. Resources would include legal, professional, health care, insurance, patents, mechanization, and other support services, at reasonable rates to allow ordinary makers to take their work to the next level.. The district is home to hundreds of creative people and businesses. We envision this resource of creativity supported in all possible ways, both in avenues to expression as well as financial support. Think innovation and incubator programs across the district! There used to be HUD moneys for this, now maybe they come from USDA small business and farm programs... either way CEDO used to have a community economic development person that worked on these kinds of jobs related functions and programs. 6. Culture and History The industrial history of the area, as well as the history of the rail yard, provide cultural opportunities to explore, exhibit, and educate on this colorful history, as well as on the continuation of that historic tradition into the present. Imagine a museum of industry that follows the early history of the Pine Street corridor from Lumiere to Maltex to the Bottling plant to the brush factory. What was made here and how? What is made here now and how is it related and different from what was made in the past? Such a museum would include examples of actual products and services that come from this industrious area. Imagine all new buildings in harmony with the aesthetic of the district, some made with re-used materials, all featuring public art; all sensitive to the history of the area. People love trains and the history of trains, taking rides and visiting the roundhouse... why was none of this discussed in the PlanBTV document. The RR is central to the whole South End. 8. Local business Local business and manufacturing create local dollars and local jobs, ie a local economy. And a local economy tends to be a useful buffer to the unreliability of national/global jobs as those tend to come & go at a different rate, and for different reasons. Local businesses and manufacturing in the ED are part of a larger pattern of sustainable jobs in Vermont. We need to recognize this and work with those businesses Instead of replacing them or stressing them by changing the zoning rules. We also have an opportunity to think beyond traditional Vermont craftsmanship and trades and pay attention to the role of technology within these businesses. 9. Food hub With the growing mix of food/beverage industry in the ED (chocolate, cider, beer, bread, yogurt and bagels, etc.) the area is already a hub for food production and distribution... how to help grow farm-to-product and farm-to-table would be useful to this discussion of planning... as would developing a food processing community center (as part of the school, food coop, or NAC) and food growing opportunities. 10. Innovation With an emphasis on enhancing and supporting creativity and maker activity, there is no telling where innovation could be expanded, whether artistic, inventive, entrepreneurial or handcrafted. Room to grow in organic ways is what we want most for the Enterprise District. As the former president of CEDO, Bruce Seifer says, the young innovators of today are the world savers of tomorrow. Our vision of the Arts and Enterprise District is a vision of an area that supports and protects all the creative potential for the city. Instead of altering a city zone which is already healthy by changing the existing zoning, why not use the invest in what is currently working. Manufacturers in the South End complain about dis-incentives to industry such as high taxes. Imagine creating incentives to expand and sustain manufacturing in the South End as part of the "manufacturing renaissance" that is happening in the USA today!]]>/message>

PLEASE keep the zoning as is in the EZ zone. NO HOUSING PERIOD. It is such a skinny zone, that you can easily walk to it, from the existing housing that almost completely surrounds it. As few industries in the EZ zone or other groups like the school board, have been included in the discussion by Goody Clancy before they made this plan for us, I ask that we form a long range steering committee that includes all factors in the EZ zone to study each idea, problem, possible solutions, and take the time it needs...2, 5 years, perhaps an ongoing lifetime committee, to come to realistic solutions for the EZ zone. We spent 5 years with a splendid committee to discuss and solve the barge canal problem, instead of using the one the EPA gave us. Why can't we do the same here?

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Section: About the Plan

HOUSING: The South End is comprised of a mix of single family and multi-family residential zoning. It also contains the Enterprise District (ED) which is zoned to allow no housing. The residential land use comprises over 60% of the South End with the rest (27%) being ED. The ED is only 4% of the overall City of Burlington but provides 20% of the jobs. It is Burlington's only designated Industrial Zone. Can we risk losing it by allowing housing in the ED? Whether you call it workforce housing, live/work, or mixed use, any kind of housing brought into an area that has been zoned to prohibit it is problematic. Why? Housing and Industry Do Not Mix With a square foot rate considerably higher than commercial/industrial rates, housing has the effect of pushing the market toward a more profitable use. Little by little buildings used for industrial and commercial purposes will be converted to housing so that land owners can reap greater profit. Housing in the Enterprise District is like Pandora's box. Once opened, the future of the area will be on a very different path. Not only will existing buildings be converted over time. Any empty lots will be seen as profit centers and will be snatched up by housing developers. This means that industry that does manage to survive will find it very hard to grow into a lot next door — the space to grow will simply not be available. Incompatibility between residential and industrial activity has been a well understood complication of bringing housing into an industrial area. Residents don't like the noise, the smells, the delivery traffic or the early or late hours that can come from industry. Residents complain and industry finds it harder to do what it does without conflict. In addition to the cost factors above, industry begins to consider more favorable locations What About Workforce or Work/Live Housing? A common problem with any specifically designated housing type such as "workforce" or "artist live/work" is that it is often the case that the intention ends up being temporary. These housing types come with promises of affordability for the group they are intended to support. But perhaps the workers don't really want to live in the workforce housing or there are not enough artists interested in the live/work option? Ultimately this housing becomes regular market rate housing. What About Mixed Use Housing? Experience shows that this model doesn't really work. Perhaps the people living over the candle showroom don't like the smell, or the noisy clatter of the bar below keeps them up at night. Maybe the business does not like the restrictions that may come with being below a living space. Eventually problems occur, and once zoned to allow some form of housing, these commercial spaces, which are like "sleeper cells" just waiting to be housing, are converted into apartments. The South End Alliance is wary of how PlanBTV South End promotes housing in the ED. We also know that almost all of the small and larger businesses we have contacted in the ED are also concerned about this. The same goes for artist live/work units. While the city will have you believe there is a large demand for it in the ED, we are not finding this to be true in our discussions with artists, nor do the City's own surveys really support this. The South End Alliance is wary of an alarm call of a housing crisis when we see evidence of housing being advocated and pushed for in all parts of the city and at the same time. This does not give confidence that there is a real strategy or a specific plan for numbers of units/year and populations to be served. The current draft Housing Plan is incomplete and has no accounting for regionally needs/solutions. Instead, the city seems to be crying wolf as a means to tug on heartstrings and garner support for development that is being fast-tracked throughout our neighborhoods. We are not against housing in general and are in favor of affordable housing at all the levels needed. We simply believe that jobs cannot be pushed at in favor of residential housing as an economic driver for Burlington; there is a good and proper role for this 4% of the city called the Enterprise District and it would be better left protected for what it does best.

CHAMPLAIN PARKWAY: This 1960s attempt at a highway connection into Burlington has lost its purpose. Continuing to build it will destroy the network of businesses and neighborhoods that have arisen since then. Instead the existing roadbed can be rehabilitated into a badly-needed "park 'n' ride"; a network of streets that connects rather than cuts-off critical access to Burton and other industrial businesses; stormwater mitigation as identified in the current plan; and on-grade street improvements compliant with the design of "complete streets." The draft PlanBTV does not properly address the needs for a network of connectivity and use of green streets within the area, but rather makes assumptions about the Champlain Parkway / Southern Connector that are inaccurate and obsolete. Its time to review the EIS and transportation assumptions before spending \$30million (+ more for underground street repairs to water and sewer) of taxpayer money. This is too a big investment to do it more than once, so let's get it right!

RAIL: The railway and associated yards are part of a network which links Burlington to other parts of the state and beyond. It is an active rail yard with potential for more. For example, the State of Vermont continues to invest in a program to rebuild the rail link with Montreal. Commuter trains were tried (stopped due to loss of funding, not ridership) and they are still successful on festival days, and should be part of the commuter solution by being linked to the "park 'n' ride" system and bus depot. PlanBTV ignores the role of Rail in its planning. We cannot ignore the role and needs of rail in our collective future.

ENTERPRISE DISTRICT: The ENTERPRISE ZONE (EZ) is part of the South End Zoning District and is shown in Burlington's Comprehensive Plan and Official City Map as making up 4% of the city in overall area. It also provided 20% of the jobs and 92% of the industrial space. It is currently protected by being zoned Industrial, and by excluding Residential land uses. I (and others in South End Alliance) disagree with the draft PlanBTV report which calls for changing the current Zoning to allow a different mix of uses, especially the call for Residential mix. From research in other cities, especially those who have changed their Industrial Zones to Mixed-use Zones and Combined Residential the loss of jobs and industry have been marked. The zoning change will easily transform Burlington into a bedroom community as jobs move to other parts of Chittenden County. Also please see research and data by Amey Radcliffe re. interviews with residents and workers within the ED by going to the SEA website [http://southendalliance.org/en...](http://southendalliance.org/enterprise-zone/)

I grew up in Burlington, and well remember trips down Pine St., when I was a child. A then, less traveled road, and short cut, to shopping on Shelburne Rd. Riding in the back seat of the family car, on a good day, there was the sweet smell of malt, emanating from the Maltex Building. More days than not, however, that wonderful aroma, was overpowered, by the stink of oil and gas fumes. An assault, on all the senses. So bad, at times, that it burned the eyes, and lingered on the tongue. An area, not suited to housing, then, or now. C'mon, Burlington! If we really want a city that's "vibrant and sustainable", we need to honor those areas of our city, that already ARE vibrant, and sustainable! Most of all, let's honor the artists and businesses, that currently reside in the Enterprise Zone! Those, who have turned a once dank, and dreary drive through an industrial wasteland, into something magical.

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme	Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website
------------	--

Plan Section: About the Plan

Thanks for the opportunity to weigh in on the future of Burlington's south end. We've lived in the five sisters neighborhood for 11 years and love it. What makes the neighborhood so special to us is that it is one of the places in Burlington that lives up to the city's claim of being "livable." For us, a "vibrant" community is one that supports a healthy, kind, respectful, and connected way of life. On our street, neighbors know each other, talk to each other, and share tools and plants and food. Children play together outside. We live within walking distance of restaurants and stores, and we have access to CarShare vehicles so that we don't have to own a car. But VERY importantly, it's quiet and peaceful at night. This makes it possible for the elderly, for families with small children, and for working people who get up early to get a good night's sleep. This is a big part of what makes this neighborhood special. The south end has been home to residents, artists, and businesses for a long time. During our 11 years here, we have been very happy with the mix. Recently, however, several new establishments have opened, and we understand they have asked for and sometimes been granted entertainment permits and exemptions from the noise ordinance. We think this is the wrong direction for the future of the south end. We first moved to Burlington 17 years ago, because we were attracted by its promise of being a livable city. We bought a condo downtown so we could get rid of a car, shop locally, and reduce our environmental footprint. But we soon learned that we couldn't live happily there because the city government viewed the downtown primarily as a business/entertainment district with residents' needs coming second. In our experience, there was no incompatibility between the great majority of businesses and residents. However, for working people like us and seniors living downtown, the city's policy of granting entertainment permits exempting bars from the city's noise ordinance until as late as 1 a.m. on weeknights was a big problem. When we and other residents raised concerns about this, we were informed by city councilors, the city administration, and business people that if we wanted to avoid late-night entertainment noise, we shouldn't live downtown—we should move to one of Burlington's other neighborhoods. So we did. We moved to the Five Sisters neighborhood, a place known for its family-oriented, quiet quality of life and easy access to downtown. While we still don't believe it's fair or kind that downtown residents don't receive the protection of Burlington's noise ordinance, we believe it is a huge mistake to allow the bar/entertainment district to expand into the Pine Street corridor. To do so will spoil what has for a long time been a livable neighborhood for residents. It will also lead to increased rents that will make it difficult for artists to continue to lease space here. In summary, the south end and/Pine Street corridor should remain a place where residents can continue to enjoy a high quality of life. This can include the presence of new businesses, but a delicate balance between residents and businesses must be maintained. The growing number of bars and breweries who are seeking to expand hours and offer entertainment exempt from the noise ordinance is putting this balance at risk. -This district should not become a bar/entertainment district. -Existing permits allowing businesses to be exempt from the noise ordinance should be reversed, and no new permits granted. -Any new uses in this area should be compatible with maintaining the quality of life of families, seniors, and working people who live here. Trina Magi and Doug Dunbebin

Plan BTV SE has been flawed from its inception. The approach of using outside consultants as the facilitators and concept managers, taking "input" via closely managed community events that don't really consider opinions that contradict those of the city's decision makers, "unveiling" the draft plan while failing to pay attention to the negative reactions of community members: all of these indicate a rigged process. How can we take it seriously? Here are some reactions to the very slickly presented Draft Plan: 1. The Champlain Parkway must be stopped. In a world pushed to extinction's edge by climate change, we cannot afford to build yet another road to funnel cars into the center of Burlington. This is a faulty premise that should have been dropped decades ago. I support new multi-modal thinking that brings people into the center via other modes of transport, encourages/facilitates walking and biking, incorporates pedestrian-friendly roundabouts at every feasible intersection. I live on Locust Street. The Parkway plan will make life worse for all residents of the South End and will bring cars where they do not belong. 2. "Value to the city" This phrase is repeated at least twice in the Draft Plan. The "values" that are behind this plan are those of maximum profit for developers and business owners. Let's rethink our values when evaluating elements of planning for the South End. What is best for Lake Champlain? How can we maximize permeable surfaces without, for example, building a structure with a "green roof"? What will make life better for pedestrians, artists, squirrels, geese, children? If we are looking ahead even ONE generation, let alone seven, we will have a very different view of value that doesn't involve profit/loss statements or padding the city's Grand List. 3. The Barge Canal should remain a wild area. Original plans for the Superfund site included a giant mound and a highway over it. Thankfully, these were abandoned and the polluted wetland has done very well ever since with minimal human intervention. When we approach the Barge Canal site, let's respect the work that Nature is already doing there. Yes to some interpretive signs and access via paths. No to the taming and suburbanization of this unusual, heavily impacted, wild area. And while we are celebrating the South End's "industrial heritage", let's remember what the cost was and how planners almost made it worse. Finally, there is cause for celebration. The City has dropped plans for pushing housing into the Enterprise District. I hope for more good news. I hope we can re-start a planning process for the South End that doesn't lean heavily on glitz and fancy page layout. Imagine a planning process that starts with human needs and depends on residents' voices. Envision a city that is "green" not just for the purposes of self-promotion but is earth-oriented at its heart.

Dear David White and Department of Planning and Zoning Staff: The Burlington Business Association (BBA) is a membership-based organization with the mission of enhancing Burlington, VT's economic vitality. We advocate for community initiatives and special projects that we feel will benefit the local business community and the economic development of Burlington and the surrounding area. The South End Action Group (SEAG) is a BBA committee made up of business leaders in the south end of town. On behalf of this group, we are reaching out to you with our feedback on the Plan BTV South End Draft document. The Plan BTV South End Draft recommends solutions to existing issues with infrastructure, including streetscape improvements and mobility and access issues. We believe that with the growth of the Pine street corridor, the need for improvements to the street which encourage pedestrian and bicycle transportation by assuring safety for these modes of travel, including fixing sidewalks, enhancing greenbelts, improving bike lanes and creating traffic calming solutions should all be priorities that will help residents and visitors travel safely within the South End. The intended development of the Champlain Parkway has the potential to solve some of the existing traffic and parking issues that are the result of Pine Street's use as a thoroughfare into the downtown of Burlington. Although we are in support of this project, there is the potential for construction to have a negative impact on small businesses in the short term, due to access issues (i.e. entrances to parking lots and entryways being hindered). The potential for the parkway to help alleviate traffic in front of the elementary school, and re-route truck traffic off of local streets would ultimately have positive impacts on the South End. Along with infrastructure improvements, we believe that Economic Development is a key aspect to be considered in the planning of the South End. Without adding housing to the enterprise zone, it is important to find other resources that will build the tax base and provide revenue to fund improvements. Tax producing entities are limited, and individual property taxes are already high. We believe it is important to undertake the treatment of brownfield sites so as to create more sites for future development. We fully support the re-zoning from light industrial to retail that is necessary in order for City Market to proceed with the development of their intended South End location. Housing continues to be a critical issue for Burlington. We believe that the South End should be considered along with other parts of the city for housing development. We, along with other members of the business community believe that the high cost of housing and consistently low vacancy rate in Burlington are issues that urgently need to be addressed in order to ensure our city's economic future and enhance Burlington's ability to attract and retain employees at all levels. Thank you for your work on the Plan BTV South End Draft. We believe the process of developing this draft plan and the resulting public dialogue has brought city attention to the South End, and has highlighted the importance of this cultural hub for all of Burlington. We are excited about the energy and growth of the arts, industry, community and the long-term sustainable evolution of this vibrant, unique neighborhood. On behalf of our South End members, thank you for your time. Please feel free to reach out to me directly with your questions, comments or concerns. Sincerely, Kelly Devine Executive Director Burlington Business Association
Russ Scully Committee Chair & Owner of The Spot, WND + WVS

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Theme

Plan Section: About the Plan

As a graphic designer, I am highly motivated by a deadline, so I've finally taken the time to pour over the draft document page by page (almost). My very first reaction to the document was a wide-eyed imagining of what this document must have cost to produce. Design, photo selection, photoshopping, map making, graph making, illustration, architectural rendering... it must have amounted to hundreds of hours. The way that this document was printed could have been far more efficient cost-wise so that 1000s of booklets could have been printed and distributed throughout the city to make it much more accessible. I have had similar reactions to other city drafts including the Plan BTV Downtown booklet and the graphic intensive Form-based code document. This one is no better. I did offer recommendations to planning team members that a "draft" should look like a "draft", both so that it does not eat up a significant piece of the budget and even more importantly so that it doesn't look so "final" which offers the wrong message to the public. A document this slick doesn't invite the kind of changes and reworks for the average citizen in the way that it might, especially if public participation is truly desired. This booklet, like the plan itself does come across more like a promotion than a process. As a piece of communication this piece also fails. It's nice enough to look at, but it is very busy — with so many page styles, colors, font styles, shapes and images — that it becomes really difficult to navigate. I also have trouble with the multiple ways the maps of the study area are shown — in the way they are cropped, angled, sized, recolored and shown in different perspectives — comparison between maps is challenging and even a map lover with a deep knowledge of the area can have a hard time finding their place on these maps. And forget this document for over-50 eyes. Lots of small print and white print on colored backgrounds.... all no-nos for true readability. All this is to say that the impression I get from the booklet design itself, does not reflect a spirit of clarity, transparency, accessibility, ease and a true desire to inform. What does that say about the plan itself?

While I appreciate the vibrant discussion on these topics, there are many points on which I feel differently. I thought that the consultants' report did a helpful job of trying to define the key issues and balance various concerns. When people take absolute positions, there is little opportunity for compromise and the only outcome is winners and losers. I am not convinced that we cannot come up with a plan that represents the diversity of interests in the South End, even if no group ends up with exactly what they wanted. I favor some carefully developed housing in the Enterprise zone...not everywhere but in places where it can be accommodated. I would like to see singles and younger families be able to move into the area and afford the rents rather than only people who bought their homes in the 70s and 80s. The idea of promoting policies that favor artists and makers as residents in the limited housing developed in the Enterprise zone makes a lot of sense to me. In general, I find mixed use neighborhoods with housing, entertainment, work, and shops in close proximity to be much more congenial and healthy than ones that exclude particular elements, even though I agree that there may be particular uses (such as noisier or dirtier factories or activities) that require special protection in specifically delineated areas. It is not evident to me that the best place for that sort of factory/production is within a few blocks of the waterfront and downtown. I am surprised by the vitriol on the Champlain Parkway, which is so vastly different from what was proposed in the past. People seem to act as though it is the same project. I, too, would like to see fewer cars in the downtown but I don't think developing alternative transport strategies in the future conflicts with the need to manage the very real traffic problem that already exists. People are asking for safer streets for pedestrians and cyclists; it seems to me that this is exactly what the Parkway proposes. Mostly, I just wish that the people engaging in this conversation would do so in a way that respects the legitimate diversity of perspectives on these topics rather than implying (as some...not all...are doing) that there is only one "right" answer and they have it. Let us allow all views be heard, let us look for common ground and ways to accommodate as many concerns as possible. And let us be open to the possibility of compromise.

In some ways the plan is too big and in others it is too small. I would like to see bigger goals and smaller first steps. For me the big goals should be about climate action, sustainability, fostering art /culture/innovation, blossoming of micro-manufacturing and jobs, an emphasis on local business and local community, a holding off of gentrification and a holding dear of our green spaces, recovering Barge Canal and historic architecture. What ideas fit with these goals and what ideas don't? Big ideas are held out for us to move toward step by step. Implementing small actions today that pave the way for the future. A 2030 district? Why not? The most creative Arts and Enterprise District in the U.S.? Yes! The best plans take time and evolve with diligent guidance toward an end. In the meantime, "first things first". What does the South End really need help with right now? 1. Safer intersections (lights?) 2. A bike path next to Pine Street not on it. 3. Solutions for the storm water problems at Lakeside and Pine and other places. 4. Sidewalks that help people without over-cutting trees. 5. More public transportation like a free Pine Street Shuttle bus that comes every 10 minutes. 6. A innovative solution to parking needs. 7. Clear perimeters for what kinds of commercial activity supports the goals of the Enterprise District and respect neighbors. Those are just a few on my list. So when I see a response to a call for "greater connectivity" from the public being answered by adding streets to the grid, it doesn't seem logical or necessary. When I hear the plan for the Champlain Parkway, it does not seem like 21st century innovation and it's not climate action focused. When existing lots that would allow future industry or artistry to grow into them naturally, are called "underutilized" there seems to be a need to plan and implement change more quickly than I think the community may actually want. When there is mention of the Barge Canal needing to be "activated", there is less respect for nature than there should be.

however here are good and awful ideas good: 1. building a parking garage and new buildings between lakeside and sears lane 2. creating new streets through this area: lakeside to sears lane gives us more access to ways to drive north 3. have sidewalks and bike paths continuous through entire area. 4. building worker housing multi story behind champlain school perhaps maintenance for school is incorporated in this building? 5. adding a multi story parking on industrial parkway so present biz can expand storm water retention: See St Albans and what SE Group did to redesign the streets by the park and have 100 percent of storm water retained in beautiful ways and hire them to do this in South End. not so good: 1. using barge canal for so many things? or will this be Ok? Great if we could walk to lake. However we need a gate for railroad to go through. 2. adding non industrial businesses to mix VERY VERY VERY BAD MUST NOT HAPPEN the cutting off of the end of pine st and making it into a cul de sac.This will force everyone to circle around in circles to go north. We need to have two streets going north. Questions? 1. Who bought Blodgett? Can city acquire beach? 2. Does Redstone own the development rights to the land south of Maltex Bldg? Are they putting in an unique food processing plant in this 100,000 five story bldg? Should be added to plan new streets between pine and so champlain st. To Do: we need research into finding new kinds of messy noisy businesses to bring here. Carolyn Bates

Thumbs up: Callahan park entrance on Pine Street better sidewalks more sidewalks if it doesn't compromise nature roundabouts (with Tony R. input) improved bus frequency art park connection from Pine to lake - but not through Barge Canal bike path along lake to Lakeside Maker, artist, industrial, business space - if grown organically creative strategies to help small businesses and artists creative strategies to preserve affordability protect the brook housing outside the Enterprise District community center local business support green space open space energy-efficient buildings support for economic development housing outside the ED if thoughtfully planned a south end working group Thumbs down: streets turned into dead ends adding streets to grid "activating" the barge canal traversing the barge canal anything that gentrifies infill for the sake of infill planning for the short term the Champlain Parkway a hurry to build on brownfields (let's not repeat Leddy leach) Church Street on Pine Street plans not rooted in the South End community itself short sighted-ness lack of concern for climate change

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Theme

Plan Section: About the Plan

Despite the fact that housing has been taken off the table, I think a manufacturing study could still be very useful in studying the Enterprise District. What are all the things made in the area? Who are the largest manufacturer's? What are the jobs associated with each of them? How can the city support this activity and keep businesses and jobs here? Are there cases where the city has not supported industry/manufacturing in the way that is could?

well said!

I am a Five Sisters homeowner, part-time musician with shared studio space in the Howard Space block, and a former member of the city's Planning Commission. I agree with what others have said: that the central assumptions (e.g. to favor higher-density commercial development in the EZ, and that construction of the Champlain 'Parkway' is a given) seem to have been assumed beforehand, rather than being driven by the public process so carefully stage-managed by the city's hired consultants over the past year. That said, & with the pro-housing zoning changes now officially 'off the table' for the final version, I do agree with one of those assumptions: that higher-density infill development of previously under-utilized spaces is a good idea generally in the South End, & specifically should be encouraged with zoning changes in the EZ to foster more intensive & higher value uses of sub-zones of the EZ that are now mostly large surface parking lots. I'd particularly like to see the large tractor trailer lot behind the former bus station building & the Innovation Center lot behind Champlain College's Miller Center be replaced by more useful, vibrant commercial structures with solar panels and/or green landscaping on the roofs and ground-floor retail. I would support zoning changes to allow multi-story buildings up to 4 stories in both instances, if that would make it feasible for developers to consider building on those sites. However, I'm not sure that two of the approaches suggested in this draft are feasible: requiring a 5% square foot set-aside of new development for artistic uses, and building multi-level parking garages in several So. End locations. Both depend on a developer coming in with a lot of capital & a willingness to dedicate a significant part of their capital budget to create those public amenities. It can work (e.g. kudos to Dealer.com for their exemplary set-asides of facilities for public art displays, and numerous donations to support off-campus art displays), but it assumes deep pockets (either on the for-profit or non-profit side). And I gotta say: building new parking garages in the absence of highly dense commercial need is looking less & less relevant as we aim towards a lower carbon footprint future. It would be great if we could find developers with both deep pockets & the vision to make investments in public transit and bike commuting infrastructure, instead of building large parking garages (which are likely to sit nearly empty on most nights, weekends & holidays). But I wouldn't necessarily count on either one of those outcomes. & truly, 5% of a big development budget won't buy much square footage for artists to show their wares. At most, we might get a few large public outdoor sculptures & some first-floor lobby space for exhibits. I think we need a more visionary approach than that to achieve these worthy public policy objectives. Finally, about the 'Parkway'--we should all get used to the fact that the final product will more closely resemble a 2-lane urban street with tree plantings, better sidewalks and other amenities than a traditional highway. It will 'neck down' from 50 mph to 25 mph at the northbound intersection with Home Ave. Because it will create many bottlenecks further north, it is doomed to fail in its stated purpose of easing car access to downtown from the south end of Burlington. Consider this: the approved Parkway design includes 8 traffic signals between I-89 exit 13 northbound to its intersection with Main St. downtown. By contrast, the path of least resistance going northbound now is: Exit 13, to north on Shelburne Rd., & then So. Union St., which has just 5 signals & 3 stop signs (plus the future roundabout where So. Willard & So. Union split after the traffic island northbound) to get you to the intersection with Main St. downtown. I won't be taking the Parkway: it will be a MUCH slower route, with more stoplights and bottlenecks, to get home--neither will most people. It may take a few trucks off Home Ave. & Flynn Ave.--but that's about all the benefit anyone will ever see from this turkey. But, not too late to keep protesting this egregious waste of time, effort & precious public resources!!

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme

Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website

Plan Section: About the Plan

To the Planning Commission/P&Z Dept/Consultants: Today is the deadline to provide feedback on the "Draft Plan." As i requested at a recent Planning Commission meeting, I strongly suggest this deadline be extended at least until the end of the year. Given recent events and information, this is just not enough time to give all stakeholders the chance to chime in. I also assert that The Long Range Planning Committee of the Dept of P&Z, needs more time to outreach to a variety of stakeholders, (or make sure that outreach happens,) that have not engaged on their own and don't know about commenting. Perhaps sending out a survey/postcard to businesses? Working with the SEA (South End Alliance) regarding their outreach to various manufacturers etc...Sending postcards to all residents of the South End? There are many people that are not as plugged in digitally, or otherwise, as others. The LRPC serves an important role in guiding this process and has not had the time necessary to delve into the process in some ways, given their limited meetings thus far. According to my palette, (not palate): Forest Green: Keep the Enterprise District Enterprising. I applaud the Mayor's statement regarding support to keep zoning regulations the way they are within the Enterprise District. It's overdue that clarity regarding what the Enterprise District is and isn't has started to come to the forefront. It is a small strip of land, comprising about 4% of total city land and 27% of the South End area. It is specifically set aside for business and manufacturing purposes. Had this not been the case, it is very likely that for example, Dealer.com, which has created many jobs, would not have had the space to expand within Burlington and would have headed to the hills of Williston or Milton. The same could be said for Burton and Lake Champlain Chocolates. Black: Thus I disagree with Draft Plan leanings to change zoning to allow housing in the ED and for land policy changes overall that would threaten this specifically defined area. There are other areas within the South End where housing can indeed go. An emphasis needs to be placed on these spots as well as others around the city. Purple: Infrastructure for pedestrians/bikers etc...Of course we could use better sidewalks / bikelanes etc...in the South End and many of us have been asking for this for years who have businesses there, but, do we need a \$500,000 Plan BTV South End to point that out? We have also been advocating for signage and support to drive the throngs of tourists who come to Burlington to the SEAD/South End Arts District. While work is being done on this by membership groups such as SEABA and spearheaded by individuals, economic development of this sort is not prioritized by the city and has not been for many years thus I support some of the Draft Plans "Let it Rise!" statements such as: expand the economic development toolbox to support growth, provide direct assistance to businesses and organizations. Black: However, I feel it is short sighted and not of value to the city to advance land use policy changes within the South End. The South End is zoned just fined with housing allowed in areas outside of the ED. Value to the city over the long term, for generations to come, will arise from thoughtful and creative use for industry/business, green space, wild/wildlife space, recreational opportunities in the open spaces in the Enterprise District. Sky Blue: "Housing is not currently permitted in the South End Enterprise Zone, the focus area of this plan," p.56 I believe, zoning should stay that way. Suggestion: So for continuing this community conversation, can we rename the "plan," The South End Enterprise Zone Plan? or Plan BTV SE(squared)Z or....for if this is the "focus area" of the plan, people need to know that and let's cut to the chase. Yes, we need housing. How much? Who knows? I have inquired numerous times for an idea, a goal of how many units is needed to meet the demand. This is a complex issue, but does it have to be? Let's start with a goal/target to work towards. It is mostly fruitless to say we need housing, when we don't know how much. Phthalo Blue: Where can housing currently go? We need a city wide map of open land that is currently zoned for housing. We need to communicate with our neighboring cities regarding land available on the peripheries of adjoining towns. Colleges need to do more to house students on campus. Tiny houses and alternative housing options need to be supported and started. Quinacronidine Magenta: Work/live housing for artists? I for one don't want to live where i work. How about work/live for everyone? Do you want to live where you work? why just for artists? I don't think this is at all a viable option or way to provide affordability, especially not in the Enterprise Zone. Mango Orange: Solutions to the Opportunities & Challenges ahead 1. This is a great chance for P&Z to institute a diverse Steering Committee w/ stakeholders from varied backgrounds who will meet 2X month for the next year. They will use the work put into the "Draft Plan" and hone the needs, resources and goals of the community to meet housing, economic, environmental and educational needs. This Steering Committee will provide "The Revised Draft People's Plan" at a reveal and take input from there to reroute the process to tap into community resources, knowledge and innovation. 2. Hit pause with the planners being paid \$140,000 for this and use remaining funds to pay for local experts to: a) compile a map of available space for housing b) ascertain how much housing is needed to meet demand c) launch a pilot tiny house project 3. While it's great to go to Commission and Committee meetings, and it's amazing these folks volunteer all this time and I applaud them, these are not venues where dialog can occur. A citizen can comment. A committee member replies etc...but this does not take the place of a Steering Committee which is very much needed. Piscine Pool Blue: Based on an engagement youth project I did, funded by BCA with part of their NEA Our Town grant funds, the kids i worked with, overwhelmingly want a swimming pool. We need a public facility, open year round, with slides etc...Indoor, outdoor activities. Tied in w/ a community center and more. A "Maker Space" of fun, recreation and possibility for kids and adults alike. Much like the Miller Center in the North End, but with a pool! Hot Pink: Noise, noise, noise. How to cohabituate with it is a tricky business because while space/land is owned" the air, technically is free flowing, or not. I'm happy to have several establishments that offer libations, food, entertainment. However, I caution handing out too many more permits or exceptions in the South End for this type of thing as it will turn the Industrial/Enterprise Zone into an Entertainment Zone. There is much more to comment on, but others have covered areas quite eloquently. I urge the leadership of the city and of P&Z to slow down this Plan BTV SEEZ process and put in place a diverse, transparent Steering Committee to take us into the next phase of the planning. I realize the Mayor and some others, are excited about the prospects of Form Based Code as a way to "grow" the city and that this is being considered for the Downtown and Waterfront areas. However, I do think we need to be very careful regarding The South End. While the Mayor of Miami feels it is a huge triumph to have there, I do think comparing Miami to Burlington, is a bit like comparing, well apples to oranges. Moving forward, there is no harm in slowing down. Change is indeed constant, inevitable, part of life. However, it is within the mechanisms of the city whether to grant permits and/or exceptions or not. Everyone will never be pleased, but no one will be pleased if such an important process is rushed to completion without the proper venue/platform for deep dialog and innovative solution generation and compromise. I urge the people in charge of this process, to extend the process and form a diverse, transparent Steering Committee of people from all walks of life. Up until now, there has been too much "siloiing" of stakeholders and the absence of other crucial stakeholders at the table.]]></message>

Plan Section: About the South End

- Page 13 should show more small arts businesses. That's really what people think about when they think about the south end.
- Label on Page 16 should read "Proposed Champlain Parkway" not "Future Champlain Parkway"
- Page 18 should show where artists fit in to the "Jobs by Industry Sector." Again, when people think about what's going on in the south end they think about the south end they think about artists.
- Good idea about page 18. I agree. I also think the circle graphic on page 19 could break down the three sectors into more south end specific categories. Certainly art studios should be shown.

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme	Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website
Plan Section: What's Important?	
	<p>The problem with comparing the Enterprise Industrial District with these areas is that our industrial district is still thriving. Industry is alive in the South End. And the little 4% area of the Enterprise zone creates 20% of the city's jobs. In fact, it is already such an attractive and successful area for business and industry that there are more businesses that want to grow there and go there than can. The solution, then, of adding mixed use to the area makes no sense except as an excuse to fill developers' pockets with quick gains on residential building. Current industrial workers are already being pushed out by more high end uses today. Instead of introducing mixed use and effectively pushing out our industry and our traditional Vermont craft workshops, we should be looking for ways to help them stay and prosper. Everyone knows that changing zoning to mixed use pushes out industry and artists. Furthermore, residential life does not work next to industry (noise, mess, smells). What some city leaders might like is to supplant the traditional working class industry and the traditional Vermont craft with clean technology which can exist next to housing and which is usually work done by higher earners who would add to the tax base. I have nothing against increasing the tax base, but what will happen to industrial workers, the jobs they provide, and our traditional Vermont culture if we turn into a new Silicone Valley?</p> <p>On the list on page 28, add "Do not price artists and other small businesses out of current and future spaces." This is a consensus item that should be emphasized.</p> <p>When I look at the principles listed on the right column, they seem reasonable and I can imagine these ideas coming from public comment. I agree with all of these ideas/principles except for the last one. Education about the Barge Canal may need to be much more extensive than what has been presented in the planning process thus far. According to those who understand environmental issues and ecology, the Barge Canal should not be repurposed. Instead it should be left alone with very minimal impact from people. The wild, natural area has become habitat for many species and it is important to allow it to continue. Like the housing issue, until the implications are fully understood, it is hard for the public to provide a educated viewpoint. In general, this plan has a way of taking a list like this and proceeding carte blanche to a solution, remedy or action that I don't believe is in the spirit what the public is saying. For example if a call for expanded studio and maker space is used to justify "infill", or a request for traffic mitigation is used to justify the Parkway, or a desire to access the Lake from Pine is used to support a path through the barge canal — greater leaps are being taken than what people might actually want. How can the public be involved in the creation of ideas that support its own interest? This is where some kind of steering committee, or community action team could come in handy. Otherwise we have planners, with planners' mindsets acting as interpreters or what the people want. We need to be careful.</p>
Plan Section: Welcome to the Maker'hood: Our Plan for the South End	
Topic Based Ingredients	
The let it rise: 5 steps to economic development	<p>What I would like to see in the realm of economic development are ways to shape the trends of the market. There are some forces that are out of our small city's control, such as the economic downturn of 07. Others are in our control. How do we foster diversity in the economic hub of our Enterprise District? We want a mix of "soft and hard" industry. We want large and small business. Local makes good sense. Rather than looking at gentrification as a given, what can we do to slow it and stop it. Gentrification is the upscaling and "fancy-ing" of an area that happens in a number of ways. How can the Enterprise District shape it's future to limit certain activities and types of business to steer away from a Church Street environment? I like the first two ideas in the strategy section (page 39). In some senses, we may need to return to restrictions originally set forth for the Enterprise District. A balance is needed. Not one sector can run amok.</p> <p>Something that is missing from the plan is the kind of big vision that supports arts/culture and economic development in a big way. Mass MOCA is an economic engine in and of itself in North Adams, Mass. It's a world class art exhibitor/gallery as number one, but also provides jobs, support for local artists, education, movies, concerts, food, etc. Something like this takes longer to develop than quick profit housing, but the long term benefits far outweigh and both include and benefit the community from the ground up if done well. Plan BTV-SE lacks big vision along this direction and could consider ideas that would put Burlington on the map in some new ways.</p>
Spice it up: Preserving Arts + Affordability in the South End	<p>Should it be surprising that all of these solutions add up to giving developers the right to build as easily as possible wherever they choose? The planners are suggesting trading public review process, zoning regulations, and other protections in exchange for 5-10% of artist space in new infill buildings that no one even wants. This is obviously a bad bargain when we already have 100% potential arts/industry space now. This whole plan is trying to give us the idea that we are getting more protections when really we are being seduced into taking away the one basic protection we have (industrial zoning) in exchange for a few measly crumbs. Instead of getting rid of our industrial zoning, the regulations should be increased in the ED to disallow most exceptions that are not in character with the district. The ideas about providing incentives and help for landlords to renovate without raising rent are good ones. But the idea that we have to trade industrial space and protective regulations to get more space doesn't make sense. The planners talk about the market as if it were a wild uncontrollable force. In fact, as they should know, the market can and must be controlled by zoning and regulation. This zoning and regulation can benefit and foster community values and true economic sustainability or it can benefit short term gains for developers.</p> <p>The left column on page 40 this sounds way too patronizing.</p> <p>I'd like to think that "owning" isn't the only way to insure affordability. If the city is behind the greater vision of the Arts and Enterprise District and puts thought into how to shape it, affordability should be able to be maintained in some ways. That said, I would like to see small spaces — tiny studios, repurposed shipping containers or other small spaces available for artist ownership. Using the CHT model, a parent organization owns the land and part ownership of spaces in order to insure perpetuity or affordability. The Artist/Maker/small business, if not able to completely own, would have majority ownership with the help of the partner, and could realize return on their investment.</p>
Choices for every palate: Mobility	<p>Why is there a one-page ad for the Champlain Parkway in here?</p> <p>I find sharrows on crowded city streets dangerous, and really do not understand their function (pg. 46). Aren't bikes allowed on the road with or without sharrows?</p> <p>The community is split on the Champlain Parkway, so I think it should not be depicted as inevitable in this plan. Regardless, many of the street improvements listed such as traffic calming, roundabouts, bike lanes and links to the lake, etc.should remain in the plan.</p> <p>I am having a really hard time understanding WHY the Champlain Parkway is still being considered, or actually shoved down our throats. In all of the public comment I saw there was little to NO support for it but to quote David White of Planning and Zoning, "it is a given". This is the most blatant example of how flawed this process was/is.</p> <p>How often do you ride a bike on Pine St. during rush hours? I would feel a lot safer knowing that there is a barrier between me and a vehicle. Sharrows keep vehicles out of the bike lane. On Pine St. it isn't much of an issue (currently) since the bike lane is poorly marked and barely exists but if you ride a bike on say, Union St. where there is a bike lane, that is clearly marked, you can rest assured that there will be a vehicle driving in it. The physical barrier can also serve a traffic calming function.</p>

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme	Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website
Topic Based Ingredients	
Choices for every palate: Mobility	<p>I'm all for bike lanes separated by a barrier. A sharrow is different, it is merely some paint indicating that bikes can use the road, but it does not exclude cars (see pic). It seems redundant to me at best, because bikes are allowed in the road anyway. At worst I think it increases the danger of bike/car interactions.</p> <p>I think Pine Street could accommodate a dedicated bike path from Curtis Lumber to Feldman's rather easily and perhaps above and below that as well with some creativity. It doesn't have to be a huge swath of land, but something functional and safer than riding on Pine Street. I'd also like to see an easy transition from the bike path near Blodgett Beach to the street level at Lakeside without having to go past this area and wind through the Lakeside neighborhood. As for connection between Pine Street and the lake, that would be one place, and another could be further North, say just before the Barge Canal near the CSWD? I like the idea of two bike paths - one along Pine and one along the Lake and easy way between the two.</p> <p>I'd like to see the built section of the Champlain Parkway continued just past Sears Lane and turned into an access road to a state of the art, energy-efficient (and very affordable) parking garage to keep cars from going into downtown. Let's call it the Champlain Park and Ride Way. Electric buses powered by rooftop solar, artfully designed and well-lit garage with indoor station on the ground level and free shuttles into downtown every 10 minutes. Combine this with Bixi style free bikes and access to a lake front bike path and a Pine Street path. I understand that parking garages are very expensive, but perhaps with the greenhouse gas reduction potential, Federal money that would go to Parkway completion could be channelled into a more beneficial 21st century plan. Some may say a parking garage is not forward thinking enough, yet there is nothing to say that in 20 years this garage can't be repurposed to a bike garage and a electric car charging station. It would help our car dependence today, save individuals from high downtown parking prices and meters, lessen the number of cars downtown, encourage bike use, and if done right, would be a creative draw for tourists. The buses can be wrapped with local art. By the way, this may not require the full width of the current parkway, this could allow a separate bikeway or other creative uses. Trucks can still use it to spare neighborhood streets and there would be no need to dead-end any streets. At Pine and Access road intersection a well-designed roundabout.</p>
Get your greens: Parks, parklets, beaches, and the connections between them	<p>It seems like there ought to be room for a 'Miller Center' style public space as part of the parks plan, something with a gymnasium and community meeting rooms. The South End is seriously lacking that type of indoor facility for recreation, something that kids (especially) could use. One only has to observe the wonderful use of all facets of Calahan park to recognize that we need something similar for winter months. This seems like a great opportunity to address this need.</p> <p>This section is excellent. On page 54-55, I would add in the flooding problems at the corner of Pine and Lakeside, on Briggs Street, etc. The storm water issues there and other places go beyond soils and have more to do with elevations relative to the lake, outflows, capacities, etc.</p> <p>I understand the concerns of pavement in creating storm water, yet as mentioned in a recent Ward 5 NPA meeting, a building in the same spot may create much more water issues than the pavement if you consider the entire water treatment system. If parking areas make good sense in some cases, perhaps they switch from traditional paving materials to permeable pavement.</p>
Clean before use: Brownfields	
Add water slowly: Stormwater management	<p>How is the commitment to "minimize paved areas--the primary sources of runoff" consistent with the rage for infill all over the South End? How about re-greening some of the parking lots and leaving the Barge Canal completely wild (don't add bike paths, bridges, or potential roads) instead of aiming to use up every piece of space for building? The problem with this plan is that it is talking out of both sides of its mouth. You can't be green on one page and reckless with natural resources on the other.</p> <p>I meant to add this comment here instead of where I did add it... permeable pavement could replace traditional pavement where surface lots are needed. Also it's important to recognize that whatever is done with any particular lot, there will be implications. According to a citizen at a recent NPA meeting, a building erected on a lot would mean many more gallons of water to be dealt with through the sewage treatment plant per person utilizing the building. Ever use of space has implications that must be compared if critical analysis is to be taken</p>
A taste of home?: Housing and the South End	<p>First of all, the idea of housing in the ED has not been debated back and forth at all. The planners and the city have provided no responsible analysis of what adding housing into the ED would do to threaten the industrial and arts uses of the area. This, despite the fact that the city's own consultants have noted that bringing mixed use to a traditional "Naturally Occurring Cultural District" has been known to destroy such a district and that in places where this has been done cities have tried in vain to bring back the industrial and artistic uses which adding housing have pushed out. Despite this, and despite the fact that Michael Monte of Champlain Housing Trust has noted that adding housing to the ED mix would threaten the area's uses, there has been no acknowledgment from the city or the city's planners that these threats should be taken seriously. Secondly, an "increase" in supply of art-related space may sound good in these pages, but what it amounts to here is a 3-10% inclusion in new infill, which means that the non-artist space is increased by 90-90%. What we really have is a proportionate increase in non-artist/non-industrial space along with a privileging of non-artist/non-industrial priorities. Saying there will be expanded artists' space with new non-artist infill is like telling the people in Oceania (1984) that the chocolate rations have risen when some of us still remember that they were higher the day before. Hopefully the people of Burlington are not that stupid. Thirdly, there has been no evidence (certainly none shared with the public) that there is a need to locate new housing in the 4% area of the ED (27% of the South End and 92% of the industry in the city). Fourthly, the housing surveys were completely unreliable, including lead-in questions and misleading and confusing terminology. People should not have been asked to vote on whether they would like to live in the ED without educating them first on what that would mean for the continued prospering of jobs, industry, and the arts district. The only fair question would have been: would you like to live in the ED if you knew that it would push out industry, jobs, and artists from the area? Also the qualifications "if it was affordable"/ "if it was appropriate" make the whole question moot. It will not be affordable and it will not be appropriate!</p> <p>The setup on page 56 is one of the few places in the plan that reflects the divided nature of community. I'm not sure if the policy change does.</p> <p>I want to throw this plan into the polluted lake. It's a real estate dream, and has nothing to do with making city residents happy. I'd like to present them with a plan that houses the homeless and leave it at that. Nothing should be built on Pine St., we don't need the Highway, and any trees still standing should stay standing.</p>

Public Comment regarding *draft* planBTV: South End

Plan Theme	Comment Shared by User on planBTV: South End Website
Topic Based Ingredients	
A taste of home?: Housing and the South End	<p>A constant challenge in Burlington is providing housing. We currently have a housing market that is completely out of whack, with many either unable to find housing in Burlington, or paying very high proportions of their income on housing. For example, the following quote is from the current draft of the Burlington Housing Action Plan: "Burlington renters (about 58 percent of the community) spend an average of 44 percent of their income on housing, one of the highest ratios of any American city." Obviously, there are many sites throughout Burlington where building housing doesn't make sense. But there are also sites, including several in the South End identified in this plan, where well-designed and sited new housing may well make sense. Instead of making blanket pronouncements that no new housing should be built in any particular neighborhood, let's find those specific locations where it might fit in. Many also complain about the weakness of our transit system and call for better, more frequent, bus service. Well, building housing near transit routes, including in the South End, is one way to get people out of their cars and into CCTA buses. I think the policies set out in this plan offer a fairly balanced approach to providing for some needed new housing in the South End, while being sensitive to the special character of the area.</p> <p>Harris makes an excellent point where discrepancies between public comment and policy exist. To weigh in on the housing issue, a few thoughts. I've spent some time looking at page 23. The second bullet on the "symptoms" section does a very good job of explaining exactly what the housing crisis is. It's not a general crisis, but a very specific one and each time I hear it generalized I believe it's both misleading and used as an excuse for unthoughtful development. Continuing to look at this page, I see the causes and I do agree, there are limited spaces available (bullet #1). Bullet #2 sounds like a pitch for Form-Based Code and I don't believe any aspect of public engagement has brought this notion to the forefront and this is true for the downtown plan as well. The "cures" section is lacking the most logical cure. Figure out how to implement the development of the housing that is needed — what is called "in the middle" or more specifically below market rate and above subsidy level. This may take city subsidies, tax credits, or other financial mechanisms that will incentivize the creation of this specific need for housing. Otherwise each project provides only a drop in the bucket of what is needed and every available space will be consumed with an inefficient solution to the problem. I'm relieved that housing was taken off the table for the Enterprise District. We were on the brink of seeing our economic engine chipped away at by housing which in the end would do very little to solve the problem. Now that we have that out of the way, let's be smarter with the housing problem and real solutions.</p>
Place Based Ingredients	
Reinforce the arts hub	<p>Do we really need structured parking on Industrial Parkway? What purpose does this serve?</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with expanding studio space, funky facades, a linear art park, and improving walk, bus, bike. No to "major new and improved bike and pedestrian connection" THROUGH the barge canal. This can easily be done on either side if it. No "signature park" either. I think the barge canal should be carefully left with minimal impact.</p> <p>The term "infill development" is another one that can't possibly have come from public comment. The problem with this concept is that it leads with development and seeks to find a use for it, rather than a development project that is born from need or inspiration from the community. Let's not infill for the sake of it. Let the organic needs of the area create the reasons for additional structures.</p> <p>I don't think new street connections around the railyard are a good use of funds. The whole notion of expanding the grid seems more about development potential than a benefit for the community. One of the things that makes the Enterprise District interesting is the idea of "you can't get there from here", especially by car. You can walk or bike around the hidden areas of the ED and that's fun. Kind of the way the nooks and crannies of the Howard Space Center get revealed during art hop. A little mystery, a little surprise, a little bit of the unknown is part of what makes the area "funky".</p>
A new maker'hood center	<p>The small and large industries in this future "Maker'Hood" are already struggling to afford the rising rents due to competition from higher end uses. Instead of inviting new high end uses and fostering gentrification of the area, the city should be supporting and helping its traditional industries to be able to just afford to keep doing what they are doing. As to the housing survey, any sociologist would be scandalized by its lead-in and confusing questions. While a number of artists did indicate that they might be interested in live/work situations in the ED, the question was confusing because it lumped in studio space with live/work. Some of the people who said yes meant that they were interested in studio space only. Further, the question should have been posed transparently: would you be interested in a live work space if you knew that the zoning change that would allow it would also allow for market rate housing that would price out the industry and the artists in the neighborhood? Had the question been posed transparently, the results would have been much different. Please note that according to current city-wide zoning restrictions, many of the activities and uses currently allowed in this district are not allowed anywhere else in the city, or only in areas that are prohibitively expensive. If you allow mixed use in this industrial area, the industry will have nowhere to go.</p> <p>Don't rezone Pine Street. It's all a scam to make developers money and leave the artisans and people who actually work on the built environment of this city out in the cold.</p> <p>On page 76, why not a large market? I believe a City Market satellite would be a great addition to the community.</p> <p>I like page 81</p> <p>City Market wanted to move to Sears Lane but has been blocked by the city since City Market does not want to allow housing on its upper levels. The people of the South End want the market, but the city's behind-the-scenes machinations have forced them to another area altogether.</p>
The eclectic ecosystem: from brooks to beaches to breweries	<p>On page 85, a priority should be to retain connectivity to the lake if Champlain Parkway gets built.</p> <p>Page 90, a crosswalk should be added crossing Home Ave at Wells St. This is an important crossing for the community to get to Price Chopper Plaza. There is no crosswalk on Home Ave for about a quarter mile going west from Shelburne Road</p>
R & D + Industry: creating room to grow on Industrial Parkway	<p>Overall, very impressed with the effort and like everything I see. However, I have to strongly disagree with the plan to site a parking garage on the last unused plot of land on Industrial Parkway (Between Rhino and Edlund). There are so many uses that could be developed and there is such a limited amount of open space appropriate for commercial uses. I've never seen parking issues on Ind. Parkway and there already is a very large lot across the street that can be used. A parking garage seems like a tremendous waste for this lot. Also, I think the plan should reference a connection to Red Rocks Park. I know RRP is in S. BTV but it is a resource that many people in the South End use and should be recognized and connected to planned bike/ped paths.</p> <p>On page 93, why does Pine Street have to dead end if the Champlain Parkway is built? Why not put a traffic light there? It would be a good addition to traffic calming.</p> <p>There is VERY LITTLE public support for the Champlain Parkway, why is it in the plan? Wasn't this plan supposed to be generated by public comment?</p> <p>Given the proposed slow speeds on the parkway, I don't think any dead-ends make sense. In fact, I think we learned from the urban renewal debacle (the mall) that cutting off connectivity in streets is a lousy idea. But then again, the whole Parkway seems to make little sense and in fact it probably was conceived of at the time of urban renewal. Instead of riding a wave from the past, why not reconsider the whole thing. What are today's problems, and what solutions make sense for today and for the future.</p>