

**Burlington Planning Commission**

149 Church Street  
Burlington, VT 05401

[www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning)

Andy Montroll, Chair  
Michael Gaughan, Vice Chair  
Alexander Friend  
Erhard Mahnke  
Erin Malone  
Ryan Nick  
Julia Randall

**Burlington Planning Commission & City Council Ordinance Committee  
Collaborative Working Group on Inclusionary Zoning**

Tuesday, May 12, 2026, 6:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in City Hall’s Bushor Conference Room

**Draft Minutes**

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

- Andy Montroll, Chair
- Erin Malone
- Michael Gaughan
- Julia Randall
- Alexander Friend
- Ryan Nick
- Erhard Mahnke

**City Council Ordinance Committee Members Present:**

- Councilor Gene Bergman, Chair
- Councilor Mark Barlow
- Councilor Sarah Carpenter

**City Staff Present:**

- Charles Dillard, Director, City Planning
- Kara Alnasrawi, Director, CEDO
- Kimberlee Sturtevant, Assistant City Attorney
- Scott Gustin, Zoning Division Manager, DPI
- Sarah Morgan, Principal Planner, City Planning
- Stella Jordan, Senior Planner, City Planning
- Nancy Stetson, Senior Policy & Data Analyst, DFA
- Maggie Callaghan, Housing Program Manager, CEDO

**Public Attendance:** Eric Farrell, Jak Tiano, Liz Curry, Sharon Bushor, Nolan Rogers

**1. Agenda**

**Call to Order:** 6:30pm

**Changes to Agenda:** Councilor Bergman and Andy Montroll clarified that those in attendance are not making up a single body, and are instead two bodies that are working collectively, meaning that the two bodies will adopt the same agenda separately, so that both are happening at the same time. Andy and Gene will switch who will act as chair each meeting. Andy proposed that following the adoption of the agenda, those in the room should introduce themselves. Additionally, there would be two Public Forums held during this meeting – the first Public Forum is intended to be for members of the public to speak to things *not* on the meeting agenda, and the second is to speak on agenda items.

*Agenda adopted by both City Council Ord. Committee & Planning Commission*

**2. Adopt Minutes & Accept Communications**

**Planning Commission Action:** No minutes posted to adopt, motion to accept communications

Motion by: A. Friend                      Seconded by: R. Nick                      Vote: Unanimous

Notes or Corrections: N/A

**City Council Ordinance Committee Action:** No Action.

Motion by: N/A                      Seconded by: N/A                      Vote: N/A

Notes or Corrections: N/A

**3. Director’s Report**

C. Dillard shared that the development agreement was adopted the night before at the 5/11 City Council meeting and also highlighted the success of the planBTV 2050 Open House on 4/30, which had over 300 attendees. A. Montroll also echoed this success.

#### **4. Public Forum #1**

Nolan Rogers: Chose to speak during this first public forum due to another commitment. Thinks these proposed changes illustrate a great step forward. Likes moving the threshold at which zoning applies up to 16 units, and supports simplifying the tiers is a good step in the right direction. Thinks Burlington needs more housing, and that a lot of people feel that way. If we agree we're in a crisis, we need to incentivize building the housing. Challenged attendees to build too much housing, because that's a challenge it probably cannot meet.

#### **5. Review of Collaborative Working Group's Workplan & Process**

Staff presented on the goals and process of the collaborative working group, which aims to review proposed zoning amendments before the Planning Commission's public hearing. The working group will meet once a month during Planning Commission meetings, with meeting materials to be posted on Civic Clerk ahead of time.

**Discussion Notes:**

- No questions or comments from Working Group members

#### **6. Review of Burlington's current Inclusionary Zoning program & policies**

City staff presented a comprehensive overview of the ordinance's history, including key amendments and policy updates, highlighting that while the policy successfully produced economically integrated housing, it hasn't kept pace with Burlington's high housing demand. The discussion covered current affordability standards, development thresholds, and challenges in making the program financially feasible for developers. This presentation also noted the importance of nonprofit partnerships and the Housing Trust Fund in supporting affordable housing development, while also noting that neighboring municipalities have higher development thresholds than Burlington's current 5-unit requirement.

**Discussion Notes:**

- R. Nick asked about South Burlington's IZ threshold, which is at 10+ units.
- A. Friend asked whether staff looked into how many IZ units have been constructed in South Burlington. Staff doesn't have this data but will provide it for the next meeting, and G. Bergman requested that we have that information in relation to how much housing is or has been built. S. Carpenter requested that these numbers also be provided for Winooski.
- E. Mahnke noted that, in reference to "IZ units built by source" chart, the nonprofit developer brings the affordability significantly lower than thresholds for IZ because they are able to bring additional subsidies.
- Also, in reference to "IZ units built by source" chart, M. Gaughan asked whether the application of the IZ requirement was to the affordable housing project. Staff answered that yes, it is 15% of those affordable projects.
- G. Bergman requested that numbers being collected for Winooski and South Burlington also include land cost, so we can identify barriers that impact the construction of housing. If their land costs are significantly less, then we need to consider that. C. Dillard said staff would also look at rent across boundaries, impact fees, and other permit fees.
- S. Carpenter noted that it won't be easy to get land costs. It's a good question, but discussion will need to happen to parse that out. Asked if there is overlap with our density bonuses and other state policies. C. Dillard said that yes, if you are in a designated center, the project can be designated as a priority housing project and receive a 40% density bonus. To become a priority housing project, they need to create an additional 5% at 80% AMI. There is typically a cap on density bonuses, and the developer is typically locked in at a certain FAR or lot coverage bonus.
- S. Carpenter had questions about the three groups in the "IZ units built by source" chart and will speak with staff offline about the distinction.

- In response to the questions about statutory provisions for affordable housing, there's the lower affordability bar at 80%, and it's a higher overall requirement at 20% of the units as opposed to 15%. It can be added on top of the City's IZ bonus, so SECORD got 2 extra stories on those buildings. One for City IZ and another for the Priority Housing Project's statutory requirement. The only reference to this in the CDO is footnote 3 in Table 11.1.5-1
- S. Carpenter requested that, while she appreciates the number of units with partnerships, she would like to see what the projects are.
- E. Malone requested a document comparing our IZ policy to South Burlington and Winooski, similar to the peer city analyses that are done as part of planBTV 2050. S. Morgan responded to say that they are working on a peer city comparison matrix for the next meeting. C. Dillard added that in our research, cities that have IZ are amending their regulations every 3 years to keep up with market conditions. G. Bergman requested a link to all of the documents being referenced during this meeting, which staff assured would be posted on the amendment's online landing page.

## 7. Overview of Proposed Amendments

City staff presented the proposed amendments to inclusionary zoning and also discussed the administration's three-pronged housing strategy, which includes a more strategic use of the Housing Trust Fund, removing barriers to neighborhood code-enabled units, and pursuing public-private partnerships on city-owned land. Staff also noted that while not included in the initial report, there are additional minor technical changes and clarifications to the ordinance were also being considered.

### Discussion Notes:

- Related to Proposal #3, "Allow Off-Site Units Anywhere": A. Friend more rationale and evidence supporting some of the proposed changes, particularly regarding off-site development policies.
- Related to Proposal #6, "Allow Tenure Flexibility in Large Projects": S. Carpenter stated that 200 units is a lot for a single development, and clarified if staff was intending for this to focus on PUDs. C. Dillard replied that this proposal is intended to apply to phased projects that will take place over multiple years, rather than just one building.

## 8. Public Forum #2

**Jak Tiano:** Jak, who currently is a renter, commented that the inclusionary zoning (IZ) amendments appear to acknowledge that the current ordinance is making housing development financially difficult. He stated that IZ currently functions like a regressive affordability fee placed on new housing, with costs ultimately passed on to tenants, while existing property owners contribute little. Jak questioned whether the program delivers meaningful affordability benefits, noting he would qualify for an inclusionary unit but the savings on rent would be less than \$100 per month. He also expressed concern that IZ may reduce overall housing production and worsen broader market affordability, and emphasized that increasing housing supply is essential to lowering prices over time and expressed concern that IZ may slow the production needed to achieve that. Jak urged the city to reconsider whether IZ should remain a primary affordability tool and to explore alternatives such as preserving naturally occurring affordable housing.

**Liz Curry:** Liz provided detailed feedback on the inclusionary zoning document, emphasizing that inclusionary zoning should be viewed as one of many tools rather than a primary driver of affordable housing production. She highlighted concerns about the 5-unit threshold, data supporting claims about IZ's impact on development, and inconsistencies in defining affordable housing income levels.

