



Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM 7/25/2022**

City Council Ordinance Committee – Monday, July 25, 2022

Via Zoom & In Person at Bushor Conference Room

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present: Councilor Traverse (Chair), Councilor Hanson, Councilor Hightower

Staff Present: Kim Sturtevant (Acting City Attorney), Meagan Tuttle (Director, Office of City Planning)

Others in Attendance: Sharon Bushor, Brian Leet, Randy Burnett

Meeting called to order at 5:05 PM.

1. Agenda

1.01 Motion to adopt/amend agenda

Motion to adopt agenda as written.

Motion by Councilor Hightower, Seconded by Councilor Hanson.

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Councilor Traverse, Councilor Hanson, Councilor Hightower

1. Public Forum

2.01 Public Forum

No one spoke at the public forum.



Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM 7/25/2022**

Closed public forum at 5:05 PM.

1. Minutes

3.01 Approval of Minutes of 7/11/22

Motion to approve minutes by Councilor Hightower, seconded by Councilor Hanson

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Councilor Hanson, Councilor Traverse, Councilor Hightower

1. Committee Discussion/Possible Action

1.

4.01 CDO—ZA #22-05 Burlington High School Zoning

Director Tuttle: Tentative to warn Wednesday for public hearing on Aug. 15th Council meeting. Left last meeting with understanding to revisit lines 79-81 with outcome that the District participates in TDM and multi-model. We followed-up with District team and talked through issues—what the effect would be on property plans if rezoned to multi-model and make sure of TDM requirements which may be applicable because pending zoning amendment may be applicable city wide.

District prefers to maintain status quo as to district change. Does seem could work for current project. But still a lot to work out with events and other users. Most concern with max limit for peak time. Less a classroom concern, more those projects. Understanding where project is and where they are. Two options—take out lines 79-81, just maintain status quo. Other map article 8, effect reducing max by several hundred spaces. Maintain status quo. TDM. Map change for parcels. Lower max applicable now, could use proposed map if want to change. Two options.

Councilor Hanson: so if passed citywide changes, only change would be max allowed at BHS. Strong proponent to include in multi-model. Think should be trying to promote in other modes. Should participate in what asking for developers. So many opportunities to do different means of transportation.

Councilor Hanson moved to include entire high school area in multi-model district.

Seconded by Councilor Hightower.



Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM 7/25/2022**

Councilor Hightower asked the difference between options? Director Tuttle explained that the current school is approx. 80 classrooms. Under existing stnds. today, max 9 per classroom = 720, lower to multi-model, lower to 5 per, so 400. District not go as far as 400, but 400 may be too low.

Brian Leet: the main parking that is planed is very similar to what it was, within a dozen. Under 400, 360 in current designs but does not include area of reinforced lawn that include in overflow. How would zoning evaluate overflow in parking. How respond to large events. Historically, park wherever. Don't want frustration and people parking all over. TDM strategies for those events would involve other school district involvement. Don't want to start process and have to come back.

Director Tuttle: currently waiver process. Unless issue during review, would be an option for BHS.

Councilor Hightower noted that Councilor Hanson seems reasonable with this info. Also remember permeable parking from past? Director Tuttle responded that she thought that was just residential. Also meeting next week between DPI and school next week and may discuss. Parking garage?

Sharon Bushor: daughter went to BHS and not sure if 400 spaces will cut it for the regional events. It is a high school, want to support athletics and the students. Community space people go and gather, auditorium events. Unless have a way to bus citizens to site and allow space for visitors then can do harm.

District (Joe): strong preference not to rezone whole property, want to keep status quo. Larger building, designing to student enrollment number, trying to accommodate space to growth. With larger design and students. Still trying to keep number of spaces, adequate to keep for students, but want reinforced green space, not sure how dpi will react to that. By keeping status quo lets us keep it, and be adequate. Never know if get approved. Status quo will allow them to do TDM requirements. Status quo strikes right balance.

Randy Burnett: not uncommon for 3,000-4,000 people at sport events at school. Ave. day 1300-1500 in building. 4-5 or half dozen events a year cans see 4000 occupy a field. Peek events, not uncommon.

Councilor Traverse: outside parking, a number of permitted uses, performing arts center. Whether in considering parking a secondary school contemplate going to have an auditorium, stadium, etc. so many for school and then plus parking for auditorium or all inclusionary with school?

Director Tuttle: good questions, part of reason put uses in, as depending how project can be seen as part of school. There



Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM 7/25/2022**

could be other ways that could be done. Reason here to see part of school. Did think if could be parsed, depend on project. In prior talks could be under one as school but how come together could impact analysis.

Councilor Hanson: yes talking about changing status quo, agree how do status quo is not okay, infrastructure sitting around all year rather than deal with those places. Played sports, but never in solo vehicle going to sports event. Always norm. If create infrastructure for all to drive there alone than will do it. If coming same time to same place then can coordinate. Part of thinking for TDM coordinators. Not massive undertaking.

Councilor Hightower: agree with jack, not need to build all.

Councilor Hightower: any other changes than parking? Director Tuttle responded she didn't think so

Motion for amendment to include entire high school area in multi-model district passes unanimous.

Councilor Traverse: hear concerns of district, will be open to hearing thoughts on this going into public hearing. Comfort for waiver provision. Many times in city have large events.

Councilor Hightower: setback-since allows more development in future, 20 foot setback concerning, but given historic nature, would be more comfortable with honoring larger setback—40 feet.

Director Tuttle: when looking at future use looking at similar uses along corridor and how others interact. Also look at Cambrian rise, 60 feet tall buildings and 20 setback, looking at continuity. Looking at trying to encourage development to be closer to the road. Also could bring into multi-model, but irrelevant now. Existing setbacks currently 15 feet today. When looking at different options settled on 20 foot as a minimum, still can be set further back, not a max.

Councilor Hightower: I think people have different opinions on Cambrian rise, this may be a precedent for future. Concern what look like if truly across whole corridor without breaks. Not sure what would look better, 20 along versus further setbacks on some lots. Do you think 40 or 45 inappropriate here?

Director Tuttle: would ask district to weigh in. Know current part of site that are trying to target, but happy to have district weigh in. Difference if goal green space or if want more urban street scape. Having near road good if not just a wall against avenue but if have some interaction. Trying to think of consistency/continuity along road, both sides. Does building height play into perception. I don't think change to 40 feet at this point, intent lost. Historically building almost been 300 feet setback.



Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM 7/25/2022**

Councilor Hightower: don't think it effects current plans?

District (Joe): don't think change. Preference would be to stick to 20 for design flexibility as we don't know what we will be asking for in the future. From urban planning point of view see muni brining up to street. In a design review overlay district, so go in front of advisory board. If ever put something that close would need to be designed not to over impose.

Brian Leet: not substantive to design as presented now.

Councilor Traverse: not agree to put further back than 20 as when think about Burlington and future think of closer to road. Councilor Hanson agreed.

Councilor Hightower: swayed, will stick with current.

Director Tuttle: precedent to other areas of city, understand thinking, in general when we think of bigger lots opportunity to bring closer to road generally, but each area nuanced to road.

Councilor Hightower: not part of Trinity discussion.

Motion by councilor Hightower to refer the amendment as amended to the full City Council for public hearing and a recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Councilor Hanson.

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Councilor Hanson, Councilor Traverse, Councilor Hightower

1. Any Other Business

Next mtgs. TBD

1. Adjournment





Burlington City Council Ordinance Committee Meeting *In-Person and Remote*** - Monday, July 25th at 5:00 PM
7/25/2022**

Motion to Adjourn by Councilor Hightower, seconded by Councilor Hanson, unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.