



## Church Street Marketplace Commission

**Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room,  
Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street**

Zoom link: <https://zoom.us/j/7366336595>

### **1. Adopt the Agenda**

---

### **2. Adopt Minutes**

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>2.1. Adoption of Minutes</b>
Meeting	December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street
Category	2. Adopt Minutes
Department	Church St. Marketplace
Type	Action

### **3. Public Forum**

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>3.1. Verbal Comments</b>
Meeting	December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street
Category	3. Public Forum
Department	Church St. Marketplace
Type	Discussion

### **4. Commissioner Updates (Marketplace Updates: up to 5 minutes per commissioner)**

---

### **5. Burlington Public Private Partnership**

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>5.1. Jeff Nick Presentation</b>
Meeting	December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street

Category 5. Burlington Public Private Partnership  
Department Church St. Marketplace  
Type Discussion  
Presentation

Recommended Action

## 6. ZA-26-02: Downtown Fences Discussion

---

**Subject 6.1. ZA-26-02: Downtown Fences Discussion**  
Meeting December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street  
Category 6. ZA-26-02: Downtown Fences Discussion  
Department Church St. Marketplace  
Type Presentation  
Discussion

Recommended Action

## 7. Reports

---

**Subject 7.1. Treasurer's Report**  
Meeting December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street  
Category 7. Reports  
Department Church St. Marketplace  
Type

**Subject 7.2. Director's Report**  
Meeting December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street  
Category 7. Reports  
Department Church St. Marketplace  
Type

**Subject 7.3. Chair's Report**  
Meeting December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street  
Category 7. Reports  
Department Church St. Marketplace

Type

## 8. Adjournment

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>8.1. Motion to adjourn</b>
Meeting	December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street
Category	8. Adjournment
Department	Church St. Marketplace
Type	
Recommended Action	

## 9. Informational and Non-Discrimination Statements

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>9.1. This agenda is available in alternative formats upon request. For more information on access, call Lori Olberg, Licensing, Voting and Records Coordinator (802-865-7136)(TTY 802-865-7142). Persons with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate are encouraged to contact 802-865-7000 (voice) or 802-865-7142 (TTY) at least 72 hours in advance so that proper arrangements can be made. This meeting will also air on Town Meeting TV the Wednesday after the meeting, starting at 8:00 pm and repeating at 1:00 am and 7:00 am the following day. The City of Burlington will not tolerate unlawful harassment or discrimination on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, place of birth, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, disability, HIV positive status, crime victim status or genetic information.</b>
Meeting	December 17, 2025 - Church Street Marketplace Commission Agenda - Wednesday, December 17, 2025, 9:00 AM, Zoom/Sharon Bushor Conference Room, Ground Floor, City Hall 149 Church Street
Category	9. Informational and Non-Discrimination Statements
Department	Church St. Marketplace
Type	



**CHURCH STREET MARKETPLACE DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**November 19, 2025**

**9:00 AM**

**Location: City Hall, Bushor Conference Room, 149 Church St.**

**Attendance:**

Commissioners: Mark Bouchett, Becky Holt, Linda Magoon, Kara Tobin (Zoom), Sam Tolstoi (Zoom), Erik Monsen, Chris Haessly, and Romeo von Hermann

Staff: Kara Alnasrawi – CEDO Director, Samantha McGinnis – CSM Director, Isa Paredes – Marketing Coordinator (Zoom), Aida Washburn – Project & Event Coordinator, Andrew Bacher – CSM Coordinator, Kimberly Rojas – Community Engagement Coordinator

- I. COME TO ORDER
  - a. Meeting is brought to order at 9:01am
- II. APPROVE AGENDA
  - a. Agenda approved unanimously
- III. APPROVE MINUTES
  - a. Motion to approve minutes – Romeo von Hermann
    - i. Seconded by Linda Magoon
  - b. Minutes approved unanimously
- IV. PUBLIC FORUM – GENERAL
  - a. No one in attendance for Public Forum
- V. COMMISSIONER UPDATES
  - a. Linda Magoon: Brought the wife of a “well-known family” and walked her around the Marketplace. Brandy Melville did not greet or ask if they needed anything. Other stores did. Is there anything the Commission can do about that?

- i. Mark Bouchett: Suggested calling the store to speak to the manager.

VI. BANNER PROGRAM UPDATES

- a. Discussion between commissioners around Banner Program memo introduced by the Church Street Marketplace team. Limited concerns for revenue. Only two for-profits applied in the last three years.
- b. Motion to discuss the changes in the pricing structure – Becky Holt
  - i. Seconded by Chris Haessly
- c. VOTE ANTICIPATED
  - i. To enact the changes to the Banner Program as recommended by the Church Street Marketplace team.
    - 1. Vote in favor: Mark Bouchett, Becky Holt, Kara Tobin, Sam Tolstoi, Erik Monsen, Sarah Beal, Chris Haessly, Romeo von Hermann
    - 2. Abstain: Linda Magoon

VII. CART VENDOR PROGRAM

- a. Discussion between Commissioners and Church Street Marketplace team. Do we want to revamp the program so we're not addressing issues as they come up? Certain areas are getting more challenging to continue to address such as subleasing of spaces, menus, etc. What can we tweak to make the program more efficient and clear for those applying?
- b. Marketplace team to work on desired changes and then come to the group.

VIII. TREASURER'S REPORT

- a. Just over 40% through fiscal year. Received most of expected annual revenue.
- b. Received \$10,000 grant from the state to help with Downtown revitalization. Will go towards holiday spending and new maintenance tractor.
- c. No holiday donations or corporate sponsors at this time. Team is still on the lookout.

- d. Underbudget at this time - most expenses happen over the winter. Currently looking for new snow removal for street team.

IX. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- a. Samantha McGinnis reports that:
  - i. Many holiday activations ahead. Tree will be delivered on Friday, November 21.
  - ii. Highlighting programs found on [churchstmarketplace.com/holidays](http://churchstmarketplace.com/holidays)
  - iii. Partnering with Burlington City Arts on a winter lights initiative which should provide additional lighting in the Downtown area.
  - iv. State police are patrolling on and around Church Street when they have people able to work an overtime shift.
    - 1. Supplying more DMV traffic patrols
    - 2. Supplying additional liquor compliance
  - v. Community court has launched. City circle is launching mid-November.
  - vi. No plans low-barrier evening shelter in Burlington area at the moment.
    - 1. Emergency shelters will be operated by Fire Department and CVOEO when the temperature hits -10.
  - vii. Some bollards have been stolen. Quote for six additional bollards is \$18,000. Price increase due to material cost increases.
  - viii. Lease confirmed for old Whim space.
  - ix. Construction should be done this time next week.
  - x. All vacancies from last month stand.
  - xi. Pascolo moving into old location. Sweetwaters looking to revamp their old space in the spring.

X. CHAIR'S REPORT

- a. A sense amongst visitors and merchants that tides are turning. We need to get folks down here.
- b. Garages have been peaceful.
- c. Two multiple offenders are being held on psychiatric evaluation.

XI. ADJOURN

- a. Motion to adjourn

- i. Moved by Chris Haessly
  - ii. Seconded by Becky Holt
- b. Meeting is brought to close at 10:11 am

Next Meeting: December 17, 2025

# Public-Private Partnerships: Setting a Course for the Next Phase of the Church Street Marketplace

## National Best Practices in Downtown Management

Prepared by: **Progressive Urban Management Associates (P.U.M.A.)**

December 1, 2025



When the CSM was formed in 1981, Downtown Improvement Districts (DIDs) were a fledging concept. Since then, the number of DIDs has ballooned to more than 1,000 around the country. With this growth, the downtown management industry has matured and evolved – and today, DIDs are part of sophisticated downtown management organizations, consistently adapting and learning from each other’s successes and failures.

The following provides an overview of the preeminent structure for the management of DIDs – **a public-private partnership model**. Several DIDs in similar markets are profiled to illustrate this model. Lastly, we offer a framework for putting this model in place in Downtown Burlington.

**Nonprofit management:** Nonprofit management ensures that the district is led by a dedicated, focused organization with the flexibility to respond quickly to district needs. It also allows for strong public-private collaboration while buffering downtown management from political cycles and turnover, which can hinder a DID’s long-term planning and consistent level of service. This structure generates accountability for DID feepayers and businesses, giving them a direct voice in the organization’s operations. It also ensures staff is dedicated exclusively to the district. Lastly, unlike government agencies, nonprofits can leverage DID dollars in unique ways, via fundraising, applying for grants, building partnerships with other organizations, and so on.

**Governed by a board of directors comprised primarily of feepaying property owners and businesses within the district’s boundaries:** Simply, these are the ones directly funding enhanced services through their fee payments. This governance model promotes accountability and transparency – and reinforces the core principle that DIDs are “self-help” and “self-imposed” initiatives. Local governments remain involved in various ways, in part by maintaining fiduciary oversight of the DID and its management. Additionally, government and other civic entities will often hold one or more board seats to ensure strong public-private collaboration.

**Supplemental or enhanced services:** Even once a DID is formed, service delivery remains a collaborative effort. Core public services such as trash collection, snow removal, and capital improvements such as brick repair remain City functions. And if a DID does take over some of these services, they are typically

reimbursed for these efforts by the City to account for these added costs. The most effective practice nationally is for a DID and City to establish a *base level service agreement* that documents who does what within the district. These are foundational to an effective public-private partnership and help bolster collaboration amongst BID and City staff.

**Renewal Terms:** This best practice ensures regular accountability, performance evaluation, stakeholder engagement, and transparency. Having a defined term (e.g., 5 or 10 years) creates a natural point for feepayers and other stakeholders to assess whether the district is delivering value and whether its services need to evolve for current needs. Terms prevent DIDs from becoming complacent or misaligned. As the case studies show, once DIDs become established the terms can be lengthier, due to the time-consuming nature of a formal renewal process.

**In Sum:** The above illustrate key themes of the public-private management model for DIDs. This model helps foster **accountability, transparency, representation, flexibility, enhancement rather than replacement, and collaboration**. This is far and away the most common model, used by more than 90% of DIDs nationally. Furthermore, satisfaction is indicated by a 99% renewal rate for DIDs, most of which have required renewal as noted above.

The below offer examples of highly-functioning DIDs managed via the public-private partnership model.

#### *Downtown Asheville*

- **Management Structure:** The DID is managed by the Asheville Downtown Association, a 501c6 nonprofit organization.
- **Governance:** The DID is governed by a 20-member Board of Directors, which consists of 17 voting members and 3 non-voting members. Board members represent different geographies within the DID and different industries including hospitality, food and beverage, entertainment, retail, and office. The board includes commercial property owners, business renters, residential owners and renters, as well as representatives from nonprofit and social service providers.
- **Services:** Community Ambassadors, cleaning, hospitality, social service collaboration, small business support, special event support, and beautification.
- **Assessment Model:** DID assessment rates are based on assessed value for taxable properties (nonprofit properties are not assessed).
- **DID Term:** 10 years

#### *Downtown Berkeley*

- **Management Structure:** The DID is managed by Downtown Berkeley Association (DBA), a 501c6 nonprofit organization.
- **Governance:** The DBA is governed by a board comprised of up to 22 members representing a variety of property types, key civic and institutional partners including the City of Berkeley and UC Berkeley, and nonprofits within Downtown Berkeley.
- **Services:** Cleaning and Hospitality Ambassadors, beautification and landscaping, social services outreach, marketing and communications, events, and business support.
- **Assessment Model:** DID assessment rates are based on lot + building square footage. The rates are tiered based on location.
- **DID Term:** 10 years

*Downtown Boulder*

- **Management Structure:** The DID is managed by the Downtown Boulder Partnership (DBP), a 501c6 nonprofit organization. DBP also manages an affiliate 501c3 nonprofit foundation.
- **Governance:** The DID is governed by an 11-member board. Board members are appointed by location within the DID’s boundaries. The board makeup includes: 9 property and business owners, and 2 representatives from City Council.
- **Services:** Downtown Ambassador Program, cleaning, hospitality, addressing quality of life issues, snow removal, beautification and landscaping, holiday lighting, marketing and communications, and efforts to support the economic vitality of downtown (such as tenant recruitment).
- **Assessment Model:** DID assessment rates are based on assessed value for commercial properties (residential and nonprofit properties are not assessed).
- **DID Term:** Initial term of 10 years; subsequent terms of 20 years

*Downtown Ithaca*

- **Management Structure:** The DID is managed by the Downtown Ithaca Alliance (DIA), a 501c3 nonprofit organization.
- **Governance:** The DIA is governed by a 27-member Board of Directors, which consists of 23 voting members and 4 non-voting members. New York legislation states that more than 50% of board seats must be held by property owners, and that three City representatives be included on the board. Board makeup includes: 12 property owners, 6 tenant businesses, 4 City and County representatives, 1 residential tenant, and 4 ex officio members.
- **Services:** Downtown Ambassadors, cleaning, hospitality, business retention and development, marketing and communications, special events, beautification, placemaking.
- **Assessment Model:** DID assessment rates are based on assessed value for commercial and multi-family properties (single-family and nonprofit properties are not assessed).
- **DID Term:** No term

*Comparative Table*

	<b>Burlington (CSM district)</b>	<b>Asheville</b>	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Boulder</b>	<b>Ithaca</b>
<b>City Population</b>	45,000	95,000	122,000	107,000	34,000
<b>College student population</b>	17,000	9,000	46,000	39,000	26,000
<b>DID Size (blocks)</b>	4	60	30	49	20
<b>Annual DID Revenue</b>	\$733,000	\$1,250,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,600,000	\$650,000
<b>Approx. budget per block</b>	\$183,250	\$20,800	\$66,600	\$32,600	\$32,500

**Implementing a Public-Private Partnership Model in Our Downtown**

It is recommended that Church Street Marketplace be spun-off as a new nonprofit organization (most likely a 501c3). This nonprofit entity would oversee the District and provide or contract enhanced services desired by downtown stakeholders, such as initiatives around cleanliness and maintenance,

safety and hospitality, marketing, economic development, events, or others (see menu below). Here, we provide a framework for this model, followed by a handful of specifics that would be fleshed out as a plan develops:

**Governance:** The new nonprofit would be governed by a Board of Directors. The Board would be a self-perpetuating, independent governing board composed of a majority property/business owners within the District's boundaries – i.e., governed by those who are paying into the District. Board makeup would have requisites to ensure a varied mix representing different voices within the District, including by location, business/property type, and size. The Board would also include City and other civic/nonprofit organizational representatives, selected by City Council and/or the Mayor. (See the case study models above for specific examples of board makeup.)

The recommended board size is 9-to-13 members, including any ex officio seats. As the examples above show, there is no hard and fast rule for board size, and largely depends on District size and dynamics. That said, given the small geography of our District, a smaller board size is recommended.

Board members would serve staggered terms (3-years, for example) with a maximum number of successive terms. This will encourage new voices and ideas while maintaining institutional knowledge and continuity for the organization. When vacancies occur, an Executive Committee or Nominating Committee would initiate a call for nominations from District property and business owners.

**Services:** The nonprofit would contract with the City to receive assessment revenue and to manage services and programs within the District using these dollars. These enhanced services would be determined by an annual work program and budget developed by the Board of Directors. As part of the nonprofit's contract to manage assessment revenue, it would present this annual work program and budget to City Council to further public-private collaboration.

The nonprofit and City would also establish a **base level service agreement** that documents who does what within the District. This agreement documents "baseline" services – i.e., core level of services provided citywide – that would continue to be provided in the assessment district just as they are elsewhere. If the City and nonprofit decide its better for the nonprofit to take responsibility for some of these core baseline services, then an agreement would be made between the City and nonprofit for reimbursement of these services.

**Staffing:** The nonprofit would have its own staff. This gives the District adequate attention and focus, with full-time staff dedicated to delivery of enhanced services and programs. Staff would report to the Board.

While high-level management and operational staff would be employees of the nonprofit, there is flexibility in how field staff are hired. These could be contracted employees or remain City employees in the near-term. This would reduce disruption to Church Street Marketplace's current field staff, which could eventually be replaced as nonprofit/contract staff via attrition.

**Required Review:** A 5-year review would be required for the District. This is a new layer of accountability, common nationally, that hasn't been used in Burlington, where the current district has

been in place unchanged since the 1980s. In Year 5, the District would undergo a formal evaluation to determine that the services and assessment methods are consistent with the needs of the District. Any adjustments would be considered at that time. An updated operating plan would be developed at this time, approved by the Board of Directors and subsequently, City Council.

**City Role & Relationship:** The City primarily acts as (1) a collector of assessment fees, (2) the contracting authority, and (3) oversight and compliance reviewer. While the nonprofit is independent, accountability would flow through the service contract and annual reporting. The City and nonprofit would also collaborate to develop the base level service agreement. City would also have participation on the Board of Directors, as noted above.

**Accountability:** There are numerous checks and balances built into this model. Financial accountability is in place via annual audits of the nonprofit that are shared with the City and District ratepayers. Legal accountability is in place via the City contract, plus general nonprofit/IRS/Vermont laws. Performance accountability is in place via annual work plans and annual reports, plus a sunset clause and required renewal.

**Specifics to be addressed as details develop:** While the above offers an overarching framework for implementing this best-practice model in Burlington, several specific key details are to be determined, requiring further discussions between property owners, businesses, and the City:

- **Service Mix:** Services provided by DIDs and the nonprofits that manage them are varied, but there are some common traits around the country (as the above examples show). The following are typical “bundles” of services undertaken by these organizations. A specific service mix would be determined based on ratepayer priorities and feedback.
  - Cleaning
  - Hospitality and public safety
  - Beautification and maintenance
  - Marketing
  - Placemaking
  - Programming and events
  - Economic development
  - Capital improvements
  - Parking and mobility
- **Specific Board Makeup:** While the above gives a general construct for the Board, the specific numbers and composition would be detailed and documented – i.e., how many seats by representative type, etc.
- **Boundaries and Assessment Model:** Currently, the Church Street Marketplace’s boundaries are very confined presenting challenges in raising adequate funds and service delivery. If a larger district is proposed, this is yet to be defined. A larger district could also have a new assessment methodology, which could include a tiered assessment structure, with Church Street properties paying a higher rate given the higher level of enhanced service they would receive.

### **Summary of Advantages**

In conclusion, the Public-Private Partnership model detailed above offers numerous advantages:

- A nimble nonprofit offers the most flexible, responsive, and entrepreneurial approach
- Encourages a strong sense of ownership by ratepayers
- Easier to adapt and innovate programmatically as conditions change and opportunities arise
- Accountability and transparency are maintained in a variety of ways as discussed above
- The nonprofit can pursue diverse funding sources to leverage the required assessment fees
- Fosters collaboration between the nonprofit and City – at both the leadership and staff level



City of Burlington, VT  
149 Church Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Burlington, VT 05401  
Phone: (802) 865-7194  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov/plan](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/plan)

**TO:** Burlington Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Sarah Morgan, AICP, Principal Planner  
Charles Dillard, AICP, Director of City Planning  
**DATE:** November 25, 2025  
**RE:** Proposed ZA-26-02 planBTV Downtown Code Fence Height

---

This memo is intended to provide an overview about the proposed changes included in ZA-26-02.

### **1. Overview & Background**

Downtown business owners, their employees, and service providers are facing ongoing challenges related to substance use, hygiene, and safety, particularly in alleys, entryways, and service areas. Due to the rigidity of the planBTV Downtown Code, the Development Review Board has requested a zoning amendment that provides more allowance for taller fences in Burlington's downtown districts.

Currently, Article 14 of the Comprehensive Development Ordinance does not allow for Fences and Free-standing Walls to exceed 4 feet in height when placed in the First Lot Layer. The proposed amendment to Article 14 would create an administrative approval pathway for fences up to 6 feet in height, provided they are transparent.

Staff presented ZA-26-02: Downtown Fences to the Planning Commission during its meeting on October 14<sup>th</sup>. The Commissioners discussed the complexities surrounding this amendment, including the desire to make sure that Burlington's downtown remain welcoming while also providing more flexibility in the height and materials of fences. As originally presented to the Planning Commission, this amendment made no changes to requirements related to the material of fences, and while it would allow for taller fences, chain-link fences were still not permitted along the frontage line of a property. Ultimately, Commissioners referred to the Planning Commission Ordinance Committee (PCOC) for further discussion.

### **2. Summary of 11/24 Planning Commission Ordinance Committee Discussion**

The PCOC met on November 24<sup>th</sup> to discuss this amendment and were in agreement that it should take a balanced approach. Committee members share the goal of supporting downtown businesses and also want to prevent this amendment from negatively impacting the City's broader goal of maintaining a welcoming downtown.

During Public Forum, members of the downtown business community spoke in support of the amendment and also requested that the amendment be expanded to allow chain-link fences in certain cases. Committee members acknowledged the benefits of allowing chain-link fencing but expressed concerns about impacting the downtown experience if allowed within or along the First Lot Layer. Ultimately, the Committee agreed that chain-link fences should be permitted only when used to enclose alleyways or loading docks, and that those fences may be up to 6 feet in height.

Committee members did not reach consensus on whether 6-foot fences should be allowed elsewhere in the First Lot Layer, or whether the 4-foot limit should remain in place except in the case of enclosing alleyways or loading docks.

The Committee voted to refer the revised amendment back to the Planning Commission, with the condition that the staff memo reflect that there was and should be additional discussion among the Commission on whether the height increase from 4 to 6 feet should apply more broadly within the First Lot Layer or remain limited to alleyways and loading docks.

**4. Proposed Amendment: ZA-26-02**

**a) Amendment Type**

Text Amendment	Map Amendment	Text & Map Amendment
----------------	---------------	----------------------

**b) Purpose Statement**

The proposed change in ZA-26-02 aims to address challenges related to fence height in Downtown districts.

**c) Proposed Amendment**

**1. Amendments to Article 14: PlanBTV Downtown Code Fences**

- Amends Sec. 14.6.8 (b) v. A. Fences and Free-Standing Walls to create an administrative approval pathway allowing for fences to be up to 6 feet in height, as long as they are transparent.
- Amends Sec. 14.6.8 (b) v. B. to allow for chain-link and welded-wire fencing to be used in alleyways or loading docks.

**d) Relationship to planBTV**

This following discussion of conformance with the goals and policies of planBTV is prepared in accordance with the provisions of 24 V.S.A. §4441(c).

<b>Theme:</b>	<b>Dynamic</b>	<b>Distinctive</b>	<b>Inclusive</b>	<b>Connected</b>
<b>Land Use:</b>	<b>Conserve</b>	<b>Sustain</b>	<b>Grow</b>	

**Compatibility with Proposed Future Land Use & Density**

The proposed amendment aligns with the land use and density policies outlined in planBTV. Its purpose is to support both existing and future businesses in downtown as the city adapts to challenges related to public health and safety. This change reflects the intent of the "Dynamic" theme, which prioritizes purposeful and economically viable solutions that enable the city to meet current needs and address future challenges.

**Impact on Safe & Affordable Housing**

This amendment has no direct impact on safe and affordable housing.

**Planned Community Facilities**

This amendment has no direct impact on planned community facilities.

**h) Process Overview**

The following chart summarizes the current stage in the zoning amendment process, and identifies any recommended actions:

Planning Commission Process					
<b>Draft Amendment prepared by Staff</b> 9/18/25	<b>Presentation to &amp; discussion by Commission:</b> 10/14/25, 11/24/25*	Approve for Public Hearing	Public Hearing	Approved & forwarded to Council	
City Council Process					
First Read & Referral to Ordinance Committee	Ordinance Committee discussion	Ordinance Committee recommend	Second Read	Public Hearing	Council Approval & Adoption

\*Discussed by the Planning Commission Ordinance Committee