



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
**CITY COUNCIL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT &
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE**
c/o Community & Economic Development Office
City Hall, Room 32 • 149 Church Street • Burlington, VT 05401
802-865-7144 VOX • 802-865-7024 FAX • www.burlingtonvt.gov/cedo

Councilor Adam Roof, Chair, Ward 8
Councilor Sara Moore, Ward 3
Councilor Karen Paul, Ward 6

Attendance: Chair Adam Roof, Councilors and Committee Member Sara Moore and Karen Paul, Councilor Sharon Bushor, Council President Jane Knodell; CEDO staff Noelle MacKay, Gillian Nanton, and Ian Jakus; Jonathan Chapple-Sokol, Caryn Long, Stephen Marshall, Kirby Dunn (HomeShare VT), David Porteous (HomeShare VT)

Thursday, January 25th, 2018

5:30 –6:30 PM

Fletcher Free Library, Fletcher Room (Upstairs)

Draft Meeting Minutes

1. Review Agenda (5 minutes)
 - Meeting called to order at 5:34 P.M.
 - Councilor Moore moved to approve the agenda, Seconded by Chair Roof
2. Public Forum (10 minutes)
 - No Comments
3. Approval of Minutes - 11/16 (5 minutes)
 - Councilor Moore moved to approve the minutes, Seconded by Chair Roof
4. Housing Action Plan item III.3 – Neighborhood Project Update – Gillian Nanton, CEDO (15 min)
 - Gillian Nanton provided an update on the Neighborhood Project efforts to-date including a [presentation on neighborhood project](#)
 - Sharon Bushor asked if initial results show how much support there is for certain actions, and why it seems there is only some support for rental housing conversion
 - Ms. Nanton responded that the final analysis will include all comments

- Caryn Long stated that previously the Municipal Development Plan encouraged the conversion of rental housing to single family housing. She believes she has an antagonistic relationship with Bill Ward, Director of Code Enforcement and is concerned the survey for the Neighborhood Project is not user friendly. Ms. Long felt code enforcement is allowing landlords to continue to rent when the housing doesn't meet the minimum housing standards, and that the money for this project could have been better spent on enforcement
- Ms. Long continued that her primary concern is that rental housing needs to be well maintained. She stated that one of the reasons that students live off campus is because it is relatively cheaper than on campus housing. Her greatest concern is rental housing that isn't safe – there are houses with broken windows in the extreme cold. She stated that she is a landlord and does rental inspections, but does not like the code enforcement ratings system, because less inspections for some landlords may allow for run-of-the-mill safety violations. She stated that there are a lot of properties with paint chipping, and are likely lead paint, but are not receiving violations. Her husband is surprised that some of the homes are not in compliance with the state regulations i.e. you aren't allowed to have more than a 1 square foot area with lead paint chipping.
- Chair Roof responded that the funding partnership for this project was specifically for a consultant and that the code enforcement office is working really hard to improve their processes. He continued that he represents thousands of people in this area, and has lived in ward 8 in very problematic housing situations himself. The solution is ensuring respect between student tenants and landlords.
- President Jane Knodell asked how we move forward on these housing strategies, and maintain momentum
- Ms. Nanton explained that the survey deadline is February 16th, and the consultant is available to undertake additional work with regard to identifying potential sources of funding in support of housing conversion. She is hoping we will be clearer in the summer in terms of financing sources and structures
- Noelle MacKay added that there is also the Inclusionary Zoning Working Group that is currently looking at funding streams for similar housing issues and will be looking at what funders, such as banks, that have similar goals that we can raise money on
- Councilor Bushor stated that she had envisioned a report, with the potential actions, timelines, and a tracking mechanism
- Ms. MacKay responded that there will be a report similar to the IZ report that has a range of options and we will determine the implementation
- Councilor Bushor said that if some items don't have a timeline, we don't want to lose that idea. How is a resident going to determine what we will act on first
- Chair Roof said that the team will prioritize actions once we get all the public input. There are some things we can handle in ordinance committee, but there is more work in raising large amounts of capital
- Ms. Nanton added that there will be a matrix that has what the action steps are and timelines
- Jonathan Chapple-Sokol asked if we should expect a vote by City Council on this issue
- Chair Roof responded that there is no vote required at this time
- Councilor Paul asked if the requirement to give your name discourages people from completing the survey. She continued that the survey questions are very broad and is concerned the hot or cold rating system doesn't allow people to respond in words
- Councilor Paul asked how many online responses have you gotten in actual numbers. If you haven't got a lot then we need to determine how to get it out. She will continue to post on front porch forum, and get out the word at the NPA meeting
- Ms. Nanton responded we have so far 96 responses, we have 58 at the open house and another 38 online. We did receive a number of comments through this process. The hot cold methodology, and

it is intentional to have open-ended nature of these questions. Regarding the requirement for names on the survey, there will be no attribution. She apologized for the confusion on the Linked-In portion of the survey that would not allow for comments, but there has always been a note with contact information for submitting comments. There is an upcoming Front Porch Forum post that will be released.

- David Porteous: There should be a dedicated area on the website to allow for participation.
- Chair Roof stated that the number of city councilors here shows how important this project is. This is an opportunity to engage the institutions, and if we let this opportunity pass, then we risk losing the momentum. The funding partners were intent on doing this public participation process well, by frontloading tours, focus groups, etc... but the public participation is still lacking

5. Housing Action Plan item I.6 – CEDO has worked on a draft whitepaper along with HomeShare VT, reviewing their program and considering different ways to continue to support home sharing as a way to provide affordable housing without the expense of development while also allowing low-income residents or seniors to age at home. – Ian Jakus, CEDO ; Kirby Dunn, HomeShare VT (20 min)

- Ian Jakus presented findings of the white paper that CEDO developed in response to the Housing Action Plan Section 1.6: [Presentation on Home Sharing](#)
- Councilor Giannoni asked why there are some younger hosts?
- Kirby Dunn responded that there are people who may have other needs, such as disability
- Councilor Paul asked what the average length of a match is?
- Ms. Dunn responded that the majority of hosts will ask for another match once their first one is complete on average about one to one and a half years
- Mr. Porteous Hosts typically will do it again once they get in the door
- Ms. Long asked why are there so many more people age 65+ in 2030, is this due to an influx of people or just demographic change?
- Ms. Dunn responded that yes it was primarily the aging of the existing population
- Mr. Marshall asked what is the capacity of home sharing?
- Ms. Dunn said that maintaining a pipeline of interested guests and hosts ensures the most matches. People want to live in Burlington- our focus is the urban core, and the demand is huge. It is a form of affordable housing because rent averages only \$254 a month.
- Councilor Bushor stated that she is concerned about targeting a group like students because from her own experience, for some older people its difficult to invite someone in their home, and she worries about people moving out quickly.
- Chair Roof reminded the group that recently the Housing Trust Fund awarded HomeShare VT \$7,500 for marketing. Since 50% of people are willing to consider home sharing there are some promising things in the white paper to try including the potential for an incentive program.

6. Plans for February Meeting (5 minutes)