



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849
802.863.9094 VOICE
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

Chapin Spencer
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Hannah Cormier, Clerks Office
From: Chapin Spencer, Director
Date: July 13, 2017
Re: Public Works Commission Agenda

Please find information below regarding the next Commission Meeting.

Date: **July 19, 2017**
Time: 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
Place: **645 Pine St – Main Conference Room**

A G E N D A

ITEM

- 1 Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments
- 2 Agenda
- 3 10 Min Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)
- 4 5 Min Consent Agenda
 - A Traffic status report
 - B Cherry Street Truck Loading Zone
 - C Stop Sign on Brookes Ave and North Prospect Street
 - D No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place
 - E Parking on Overlake Park
 - F Stop Control Switch for Bike Path Project at North Avenue Extension

Non-Discrimination

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 or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.

- 5 30 Min Appeal of Code Enforcement Order -163-165 Cherry St-18-95 Means of Egress
A Communication, Appellant
B Communication, W. Ward
C Commissioner Discussion
D Public Comment
E Action Requested – Vote
- 6 20 Min PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation
- North Union St Parking Changes & One-way Except Bicycles
A Communication, N. Losch & A. Wyner
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 7 20 Min St Paul Street Parking Changes
A Communication, L. Wheelock
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 8 15 Min Driveway/Curb Cut Design Specifications Update
A Communication, N. Baldwin
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 9 20 Min Bove's Proposed Redevelopment & Pearl Street Lot
A Oral Communication, P. Mulligan
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – None
- 10 5 Min Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17
- 11 10 Min Director's Report
- 12 10 Min Commissioner Communications
- 13 Executive Session For Appeal
- 14 **Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – September 20, 2017**



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849
802.863.9094 x3 VOICE
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

Chapin Spencer
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

MEMORANDUM

TO: PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
FM: CHAPIN SPENCER, DIRECTOR
DATE: JULY 13, 2017
RE: PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION MEETING

Enclosed is the following information for the meeting on July 19, 2017 at 6:30 PM at **645 Pine St – Main Conference Room**

1. Agenda
2. Consent Agenda
3. Appeal of Code Enforcement Order – 163-165 Cherry St
4. PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation
5. St. Paul Street Parking Changes
6. Driveway/Curb Cut Design Specifications Update
7. Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17

Non-Discrimination

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 or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849
802.863.9094 VOICE
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

Chapin Spencer
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Hannah Cormier, Clerks Office
From: Chapin Spencer, Director
Date: July 13, 2017
Re: Public Works Commission Agenda

Please find information below regarding the next Commission Meeting.

Date: **July 19, 2017**
Time: 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
Place: **645 Pine St – Main Conference Room**

A G E N D A

ITEM

- 1 Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments
- 2 Agenda
- 3 10 Min Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)
- 4 5 Min Consent Agenda
 - A Traffic status report
 - B Cherry Street Truck Loading Zone
 - C Stop Sign on Brookes Ave and North Prospect Street
 - D No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place
 - E Parking on Overlake Park
 - F Stop Control Switch for Bike Path Project at North Avenue Extension

Non-Discrimination

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 or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.

- 5 30 Min Appeal of Code Enforcement Order -163-165 Cherry St-18-95 Means of Egress
A Communication, Appellant
B Communication, W. Ward
C Commissioner Discussion
D Public Comment
E Action Requested – Vote
- 6 20 Min PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation
- North Union St Parking Changes & One-way Except Bicycles
A Communication, N. Losch & A. Wyner
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 7 20 Min St Paul Street Parking Changes
A Communication, L. Wheelock
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 8 15 Min Driveway/Curb Cut Design Specifications Update
A Communication, N. Baldwin
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 9 20 Min Bove's Proposed Redevelopment & Pearl Street Lot
A Oral Communication, P. Mulligan
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – None
- 10 5 Min Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17
- 11 10 Min Director's Report
- 12 10 Min Commissioner Communications
- 13 Executive Session For Appeal
- 14 **Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – September 20, 2017**



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineering Technician *pwp 7/13/17*

CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer *DA 7/13/17*

RE: Traffic Request Status Report

Number of Requests 06/09/17 =	51
New Requests since 06/09/17 =	7
Requests closed since 06/09/17 =	1
Number of Requests 07/13/17 =	57

RFS BREAKDOWN BY TYPE*

		Last Month	Change
Accessible Space:	2	1	+1
Resident Only Parking:	6		
Crosswalks:	18	15	+3
Driveway Encroachments:	1		
Signage:	11	10	+1
Loading Zone:	4		
Area/Intersection Study:	4		
Parking Prohibition:	4		
Bus Stop:	0		
Geometric Issues:	6	5	+1
Parking Meters:	1		
Other:	0		
TOTAL:	57		



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission
FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician
CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer
RE: Cherry Street Truck Loading Zone

PWP 7/13/17

DA 7/13/17

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt:

- No vehicle other than a truck actually engaged in loading or unloading shall, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except Sunday, and for no more than thirty (30) minutes, use the following parking spaces: On the south side of Cherry Street starting three hundred (300) feet west of Pine Street.

Background:

Staff received a request in July 2016 from Elana Wood Coppola-Dyer, Manager of the restaurant Hen of the Wood, requesting the placement of a truck loading zone adjacent to the restaurant at 55 Cherry Street. The loading zone location would be on the same side of the street as this restaurant and at the eastern most end of the building next to Macy's. The truck loading zone is needed for vehicles delivering to Hen of the Wood's delivery entrance. Ms. Wood Coppola-Dyer says Hen of the Wood is a high capacity restaurant and they receive large deliveries daily. There is currently a loading zone located downhill from then restaurant, which makes deliveries take more time than needed because heavy loads are difficult to haul uphill. This forces delivery drivers to make several additional trips and blocks the road as more delivery drivers begin to arrive.

Observations:

1. **Street Characteristics:** Cherry Street is a 40-foot-wide arterial street with on-street parking on both sides of the street. Cherry Street has eight separate parking restrictions, none of which are pertinent to this situation. There is one fifteen-minute parking in front of 5 Cherry Street. There is a vehicle loading zone on the south side of Cherry Street beginning approximately 100 feet east of Battery Street and extending east for forty feet, effective between the hours of 5:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, for a maximum time limit of thirty minutes. There are forty (40) 3-hour meters on Cherry Street between Battery Street and Pine Street.
2. **Public Outreach:** Staff distributed thirty flyers to the apartment buildings, homes, and businesses on Cherry Street between Battery Street and Pine Street on June 27, 2017. Staff received five responses from local residents, all of the respondents support the proposed truck loading zone.

Conclusions:

Due to the distance, topography, and designation of the vehicle loading zone on Cherry street beginning approximately 100 feet east of Battery Street and extending east for forty feet; staff recommends the placement of a truck loading zone at the rear entrance of Hen of the Wood restaurant. Moreover, staff observed several delivery drivers parking in front of the Macy's loading dock, this is in violation of the city's driveway encroachment ordinance and drivers are receiving tickets. Additionally, other companies would benefit from this truck loading zone. Hen of the Wood, Wood Mountain Fish, Jericho Settlers Farm and Shadow Cross Farm are all in support of this proposed traffic regulation amendment.



City of Burlington
Department of Public Works

Technical Services Engineering Division
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
P 802-863-9094 / F 802-863-0466 / TTY 802-863-0450
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

Dear Cherry Street Residents,

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has received a request from “Hen of the Wood” to create a loading zone adjacent to their restaurant at 55 Cherry Street. No person would be allowed to park a vehicle at the loading zone unless the same is a truck actually engaged in loading or unloading, and for no more than thirty (30) minutes.

DPW would like to ask for your feedback regarding the possibility of this parking restriction.

Please respond via email or phone by July 7th so that your feedback may be considered during our evaluation.

Thank you!

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Desk: 802.865.5832
Email: ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

7/11/2017

Phone call with Elana Wood Coppola-Dyer, Manager of the restaurant Hen of the Wood
Hen of the Wood supports the proposed truck loading zone.

6/28/2017

Phillip

My name is Bill Laferriere and I am the Director of Policy & Planning Services for the State Vermont.

We have reviewed your request for tenant feedback with our employees on Cherry St and the State does not have a problem with your proposal to create a loading zone at 55 Cherry st, across the street from the Costello Court entrance.

I would ask that you keep in the loop as this progresses and aware of any decisions.

Thank You

Bill

Director of Policy Planning & Use
Dept of Buildings & General Services
4 Aiken Ave
Montpelier Vt 05633

Bill.Laferriere@Vermont.gov

802-828-1115 (w)
802-793-9775 (c)

6/28/2017

Phillip,

I would like to support Hen of the Woods request for a loading zone to be created in front of their restaurant on Cherry Street. This will improve the timeliness of their deliveries and allow for the trucks not to have to jockey for a space on the street.

I support this request.

Sincerely,

Joe Carton
Chief Operating Officer
Westport Hospitality (Operating Hotel Vermont and Courtyard Burlington Harbor)

email: joe@hotelvt.com
cell: 802-316-2960

6/27/2017

Good afternoon Peter,

I received the notice related to Hen of the Wood restaurant's request for a loading zone designation near the restaurant's service entrance on Cherry Street.

As a neighbor, Hotel Vermont, is supportive of this request as it will improve the delivery logistics to the restaurant. We do not see a conflict with regular parking needs as the Lakeview Garage is immediately adjacent and offers ample parking in addition to street parking.

For full disclosure: Hen of the Wood leases its restaurant space from Hotel Vermont.

If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to reach out.

Sincerely,

Hans van Wees
- General Manager

—
Hotel Vermont
41 Cherry Street, Burlington VT 05401
Ph 802 651 0080 Direct 802 651 5005
—

6/27/2017

Hi Phillip,

The Courtyard has no objections to the Hen of the Wood's request to add a loading zone in front of their restaurant.

Best,
Christian

CHRISTIAN KUZIA

General Manager
o 802-864-4700
Courtyard Burlington Harbor
25 Cherry Street
Burlington, VT 05401



NOTES:

Staff recommends the following

- No vehicle other than a truck actually engaged in loading or unloading shall, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except Sunday, and for no more than thirty (30) minutes, use the following parking spaces; On the south side of Cherry Street starting three hundred (300) feet west of Pine Street.



SCALE: 1" = 30'



CHERRY STREET
TRUCK LOADING ZONE



**BURLINGTON
PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIV.**

845 PINE STREET
BURLINGTON, VT 05401
(802) 863-9094

DESIGNED PMP	RF 12
DRAWN PMP	SC 1"
CHECKED DA	DRAW
DATE	



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician *PPW 7/13/17*

CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer *DA 7/13/17*

RE: Stop Sign on Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt:

- A stop sign is authorized at the intersection of Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street causing traffic on Brookes Avenue to stop.

Background:

Staff received a request in June 2017 from Jared Wood, a local resident in the Brookes Avenue neighborhood, requesting DPW put a stop sign at the intersection of Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street causing traffic on Brookes Avenue to stop. This stop sign would also include a stop bar on Brookes Avenue at the North Prospect Street intersection. Mr. Wood observed vehicles approaching the intersection quickly and driving over the crosswalk without stopping. A stop sign and an associated stop bar provide visual notice to drivers indicating they are approaching an intersection and should come to a complete stop prior to crossing over a crosswalk. This crosswalk is well used as it leads to UVM. Additionally, Mr. Wood believes this stop condition would be consistent with other similar intersections along the North Prospect Street corridor.

Observations:

1. **Street Characteristics:** Brookes Ave is an approximately 22-foot-wide low volume residential roadway with resident only on-street parking on the south side and no parking allowed on the north side of the street. North Prospect Street is an arterial collector street. There are no meters on Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street.
2. **Public Outreach:** Staff distributed flyers to the homes and businesses on Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street on June 29, 2017. Staff received two telephone responses from local residents, both respondents support the proposal.

Conclusions:

According to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) STOP signs should be used at an intersection if one or more of the following conditions exist:

- A. An intersection of a less important road with a main road where application of the normal right-of-way rule would not be expected to provide reasonable compliance with the law;
- B. A street entering a designated through highway or street; and/or
- C. An unsignalized intersection in a signalized area.

When a minor street intersects a major street there is an implied yield condition where the vehicle on the minor street yield the right-of-way to the vehicles traveling down the major street. According to the MUTCD, staff properly identify North Prospect Street as the major street with Brookes Avenue as the minor street. Additionally, the Brookes Avenue and North Prospect intersection is an unsigned intersection in a stop control area; the stop sign would be consistent with other intersections along the North Prospect Street corridor, with the exception of Prospect Hill and Brookes Avenue all other minor streets along this corridor have stop control. Prospect Hill is a dead end. All minor through streets intersecting North Prospect Street have stop signs except Brookes. Consequently, staff recommend the DPW Commission adopt a stop sign at the intersection of Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street causing traffic on Brookes Avenue to stop.



City of Burlington
Department of Public Works

Technical Services Engineering Division
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
P 802-863-9094 / F 802-863-0466 / TTY 802-863-0450
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

Dear Brookes Avenue Residents,

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has received a request from a local resident in the Brookes Avenue neighborhood to put a stop sign at the intersection of Brookes Avenue and North Prospect Street causing traffic on Brookes Avenue to stop. This stop sign would also include a stop bar on Brookes Avenue at the North Prospect Street intersection. This stop condition would be consistent with other similar intersections along the North Prospect Street corridor. Please see the attached drawing for further information about this project.

DPW would like to ask for your feedback regarding the possibility of this designation.

Please respond via email or phone by Friday, July 7th so your feedback may be considered during our evaluation.

Thank you!


Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Desk: 802.865.5832
Email: ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

Brookes Avenue

12'-24" WIDE
STOP LINE
MUTCD SECTION 3B.16

STOP
R4-1

North Prospect Street



Friday 7/07/2017


Phone call with local resident Colleen Holmes

Resident supports stop sign and stop bar at this intersection.

Monday 6/21/2017

Phone call with local resident Jared Wood

Customer is requesting a stop sign and stop bar at Brookes Ave & North Prospect St intersection - states it is heavily needed.



NOTES:

Staff recommends the following

- A stop sign is authorized at the intersection of Brookess Avenue and North Prospect Street causing traffic on Brookess Avenue to stop.



SCALE: 1" = 40'



STOP SIGN ON BROOKES AVENUE
AND NORTH PROSPECT STREET



**BURLINGTON
PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIV.**

645 PINE STREET
BURLINGTON, VT 05401

DESIGNED PMP	RF 16
DRAWN PMP	SC 1"
CHECKED DA	DRAW
DATE	



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician *PWP 7/13/17*

CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer *DA 7/13/17*

RE: No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt:

1. No person shall park any vehicle at any time between the driveways of 6 Isham Street and 300 Pearl Street.
2. No person shall park any vehicle at any time between the driveways of 55 Hickok Place and 300 Pearl Street.

Background:

Staff received a request in March 2017 from Phil Hammerslough, a local resident in the Isham Street neighborhood, requesting a "No-Parking Any Time" sign be placed on the south side island at the intersection of Isham Street and Hickok Place. Mr. Hammerslough believes vehicles parking at the intersection of Isham St. and Hickok Place are creating a dangerous situation for other vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Staff presented this situation to Megan Buckley, Senior Executive Director at Burlington Health and Rehabilitation Center (BHR). Initially BHR was willing to extend the curb to accommodate parking; however, BHR has since decided not to pursue this option at this time. Consequently, staff must recommend appropriate No-Parking signage on the small curb island at the Isham Street and Hickok Place intersection.

Observations:

1. Isham Street and Hickok Place are both low volume residential streets. The intersection of Isham Street and Hickok Place is adjacent to three small residential

driveways and two commercial driveways for Burlington Health and Rehab (BHR), with one driveway reserved as the BHR loading zone. BHR has deliveries that start at 7:00 AM and continue throughout the day. There are garbage & recycling pickups, food deliveries, service vehicles, and mail. The small curb island between the two commercial driveways is approximately 15 feet long.

2. Public Outreach: Staff distributed flyers to the apartment buildings, homes, and businesses on Isham Street, Pearl Street, and Hickok Place on April 24, 2017. Due to the time elapsed between the initial public outreach and BHR deciding not to construct a curb extension, staff redistributed flyers on June 26, 2017. Of the thirty flyers distributed two responses were received, one from a local resident and one response came from BHR. The respondents were split, one supporting the removal, while BHR does not want a “No-Parking Any Time” sign placed on the island; they are concerned there is not enough parking for the BHR staff as it stands and removing any parking will create more problems.

Conclusions:

The new driveway encroachment policy restricts parking at the curb island to 11 feet. The average car length in the United States is approximately 16 feet. This means that an average car could not park without encroaching on one or both of BHR’s driveways. Based on engineering judgement and existing traffic conditions there is not enough space for one vehicle to park in front of the small curb island between BHR’s two commercial driveways.



City of Burlington
Department of Public Works

Technical Services Engineering Division
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
P 802-863-9094 / F 802-863-0466 / TTY 802-863-0450
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

Dear Isham Street, Hickok Place and Pearl Street Residents,


The Department of Public Works (DPW) has received a request from a local resident, to remove parking between the driveways of 6 Isham Street and 30 Pearl Street; and to remove parking between the driveways of 55 Hickok Place and 300 Pearl Street. Please see attached.

DPW would like to ask for your feedback regarding the possibility of this designation.

Please respond via email or phone by July 7th so that your feedback may be considered during our evaluation.

Thank you!

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Desk: 802.865.5832
Email: ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov



Tuesday 06/20/2017

Phone call with BHR Senior Executive Director Megan Buckley

BHR will not pursue extending the curb at this time. Consequently, staff must recommend appropriate No-Parking signage on the small curb island at the Isham Street and Hickok Place intersection.

Friday 04/28/2017

Phone call with BHR Senior Executive Director Megan Buckley

BHR does not want a "No-Parking Any Time" sign placed on the island; they are all concerned that there is not enough parking for the BHR staff as it stands and removing any parking will create more problems. BHR will extend the curb to accommodate the parking.

Thursday 3/02/2017

Phone call with local resident Phil Hammerslough

Customer is requesting a "No Parking" sign be placed on the small curb island at the intersection of Isham Street and Hickok Place - states the intersection of Isham St. & Hickok Pl. is also the loading zone for Burlington Health & Rehab. and has two parking spaces in the center part of the corner. The impact of trucks in the loading zone and parked cars narrowing the width of the intersection creates a dangerous situation made only more difficult and harrowing for pedestrians and bicyclists.



SCALE: 1" = 20'



ISHAM STREET & HICKOK PLACE

NO-PARKING ANY TIME SIGN



**BURLINGTON
PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIV.**

845 PINE STREET
BURLINGTON, VT 05401
(802) 843-0904

DESIGNED PMP	RFS 144
DRAWN PMP	SC 1"=
CHECKED DA	DRAWN
DATE	



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician PWP 7/13/17

CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer DA 7/13/17

RE: Parking on Overlake Park

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt:

1. No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations: On the inner and outer perimeter of the cul-de-sac on Overlake Park.
2. No person shall park a vehicle for a period longer than four (4) hours between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday in the following locations: The west side of Overlake Park.

Background:

Staff received a request in October 2016 from John Sullivan a local resident on Overlake Park, requesting the placement of a no parking zone around the island at the end of the cul-de-sac on Overlake Park. Another resident of Overlake Park, Alex Stewart made the same request in July of 2016.

Observations:

1. Street Characteristics: Overlake Park is a 20-foot-wide low volume residential cul-de-sac with on-street parking restrictions on both sides of the street. Overlake Park does have parking restrictions. There is no parking on the east side of Overlake Park. There is no parking on the west side of Overlake Park between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. There are no meters on Overlake Park.
2. Public Outreach: Staff distributed twenty flyers to the homes on Overlake Park on May 19, 2017. Staff received twelve responses from local residents, nine of the respondents

support the placement of a no parking zone at the end of the cul-de-sac on Overlake Park. However, several respondents expressed concern over a lack of on street parking opportunities on Overlake Park from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This is due to the parking prohibition on the east side and the parking restriction from 8:00a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on the west side.

Staff reevaluated the issues on Overlake Park, specifically to address the need to provide additional parking opportunities. The proposed solution is to remove parking at the end of the cul-de-sac, and to allow four-hour parking on the west side of Overlake Park between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Staff received eighteen responses from local residents, twelve of the respondents support this proposed solution.


3. In November of 2014 DPW Staff investigated whether the narrow travel lane would impact emergency vehicle access to Overlake Park. The Burlington Fire Department (BFD) conducted a trial run with Engine 3 on Overlake Park and concluded the cul-de-sac was unnegotiable with or without cars parked around it; however, Staff was informed that this would not impeded their access to provide emergency services to any resident of Overlake Park.

Conclusions:

Staff recommend the DPW commission approve the placement of a no parking zone around the inner and outer perimeter of the cul-de-sac at the end of Overlake Park, primarily due to the BFD test run in November 2014. The cul-de-sac was unnegotiable for BFD with or without cars. Emergency vehicles will have more difficulty with vehicles parked around the cul-de-sac; consequently, a no parking zone around the inner perimeter of the cul-de-sac island will increase safety. Due to the loss of parking opportunities on the cul-de-sac at the end of Overlake Park, staff recommends allowing four-hour parking on the west side of Overlake Park between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.



OVERLAKE
PARK



SCALE: 1" = 40'



OVERLAKE PARK
PROPOSED PARKING CHANGES




**BURLINGTON
PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIV.**

645 PINE STREET
BURLINGTON, VT 05401

DESIGNED PMP	RFS 132
DRAWN PMP	SCA 1"=
CHECKED DA	DRAWN
DATE	



OVERLAKE
PARK



SCALE: 1" = 100'



OVERLAKE PARK
PROPOSED PARKING CHANGES



**BURLINGTON
PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIV.**

645 PINE STREET
BURLINGTON, VT 05401

DESIGNED	PMP	R
DRAWN	PMP	S
CHECKED	DA	1"
DATE		DRAW



City of Burlington
Department of Public Works

Technical Services Engineering Division
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
P 802-863-9094 / F 802-863-0466 / TTY 802-863-0450
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

Dear Overlake Park Residents,

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has received multiple requests from local residents of Overlake Park, to remove parking at the end of the Overlake Park cul-de-sac. Additionally, we have received several requests to increase parking opportunities on Overlake Park during daytime hours. Our proposed solution is to remove parking at the end of the cul-de-sac, and to allow four-hour parking on the west side of Overlake Park between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

DPW would like to ask for your feedback regarding the possibility of this designation.

Please respond via email or phone by Friday, July 7th so that your feedback may be considered during our evaluation.

Thank you!

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Desk: 802.865.5832
Email: ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

7/06/2017

Phillip,

Thank you and understood. With that context, my preference would be to eliminate parking at the cul-de-sac and keep the existing parking restrictions in place.

Br,
John

John Sullivan
Nokian Tyres, Inc.
(w) 802-662-8272|(m) 802-598-7022
www.nokiantires.com

From: Phillip Peterson [<mailto:ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov>]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 8:24 AM
To: Sullivan John <John.Sullivan@nokiantyres.com>
Cc: David Allerton <dallerton@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: RE: Overlake Park

John,

Thanks so much for the email. I understand your request. I am willing to investigate it further, however I believe we will obtain the same result from the work done in November of 2014. No unanimous agreement could be reached among the residents of Overlake Park. According to the public response DPW staff received in 2014 two suggestions evenly split the majority of residents. Those two suggestions were to maintain the current parking restrictions, that is no parking on the west side of Overlake Park from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm Monday through Friday with unrestricted parking for the balance thereafter; and the other being Resident Only Parking on the west side of Overlake Park from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm Monday through Friday with unrestricted parking for the balance thereafter. Given there was no consensus at the time, it is highly doubtful this will change.

The fundamental principle of Resident Only Parking is to create a balance between the needs of the public versus the need to provide residents reasonable access to their homes. Residents may petition to have their streets designated for resident parking only. To initiate a request to install a new Resident Parking area, please follow this link <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/Resident-Parking>.

Kind Regards,

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Burlington Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05402
802-865-5832 (phone)
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

“Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.”

From: Sullivan John [<mailto:John.Sullivan@nokiantyres.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 3:49 PM
To: Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Overlake Park

Good Afternoon Phillip,

Thank you for your efforts in addressing the parking issues on Overlake Park.

In regards to the parking at the end of the cul-de-sac, I am in support of eliminating parking in the cul-de-sac. In regards to the proposal on allowing four-hour parking between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:00 pm, I am not in support of this proposal as it would not address the issues of South Prospect rental using Overlake Park as a parking lot.

I believe the best alternative is to eliminate parking in the cul-de-sac and transition Overlake Park to resident only parking consistent with Summit St with a limitation on one permanent parking permit and one temporary parking permit per household.

Best regards,
John

JOHN SULLIVAN
NOKIAN TYRES
VP OF FINANCE AND CONTROL
PO Box 623, Essex Jct., VT 05453
1945 Main St, Colchester, VT 05446
O: 802-662-8272
C: 802-598-7022

7/06/2017

Thank you! I believe that total plan would work for us.

Best,
Mima Tipper

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 6, 2017, at 1:08 PM, Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Max of any four hours between 8am and 4pm.

From: Mima Tipper <mimatip@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 6, 2017 1:08:05 PM

To: Phillip Peterson
Subject: Re: Parking on Overlake Park

Hi again,
Just to clarify, would the four hours would be set hours, say 8am-12pm? Or a max of any four hours between 8am and 4pm?
Thanks,
Mima Tipper

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 6, 2017, at 12:58 PM, Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Ms. Tipper,

Currently, there is no parking on the west side of Overlake Park, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Parking is unrestricted at all other times on the west side of Overlake Park. We propose to allow for four hour parking , between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Parking will be removed all the way around the cul-de-sac on the inner and outer perimeter of the cul-de-sac. Feel free to call me should you have any further questions or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Burlington Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05402
802-865-5832 (phone)
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

"Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act."

From: mima tipper [<mailto:mimatip@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 11:36 AM
To: Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Re: Parking on Overlake Park

Dear Mr. Peterson,

I am curious about how the four-hour parking would work.

Thank you,

Mima Tipper, 62 Overlake Park

7/01/2017

Dear Phillip,

Thanks for your recent clarifications to us about parking on Overlake Park. We appreciate that DPW has heard our concerns--that there must be, on some level, parking on Overlake Park, in the face of what we expect are calls to eliminate parking altogether on the street. Eliminating parking on an urban street is, quite simply, unreasonable, impractical, and unjust for those who are doing legitimate business on the street and receive parking tickets for it. We support the proposed solution of M-F 8-4 4-hour parking on the whole street, with no limits on parking outside of those times, in exchange for eliminating parking on the circle.

Thank you.

Luis Vivanco and Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco
52 Overlake Park

6/29/2017

Hi Phillip -

Thanks for your notice regarding the proposed parking changes for Overlake Park.

My husband, Matt Daly, and I support the proposal to allow 4-hour parking between 8:00 and 4:00 Mon - Fri, and to prohibit parking at the end of the cul de sac all days and times.

Thanks for your efforts.

Regards,
Celia Daly

M. Cecilia Daly
Daly & Daly, P.C.
110 Main Street, 4th Floor
PO Box 0069
Burlington, VT 05402-0069
Phone (802) 658-6665 x2
Fax (802) 658-8565

6/28/2017

Hi Phillip,

Thanks for the clarification. We'll submit our comments soon.

Good luck with this whole situation. I'm afraid that some folks just don't understand that city streets are public ROW and that parked cars are not urban blight.

Best,
Peggy

On Wed, Jun 28, 2017 at 11:55 AM, Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Peggy,

Anyone may park on the street for four hours; after which time they would be required to move. Parking will be available outside the hours of 8am-4pm Monday through Friday. The parking restriction on the east side will be maintained; Adsit Court is different neighborhood with different existing conditions. Feel free to contact me should you have other questions or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician

Burlington Department of Public Works

645 Pine Street

Burlington, VT 05402

802-865-5832 (phone)

ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

"Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act."

From: Peggy O'Neill [mailto:peggyov5@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2017 11:04 AM
To: Phillip Peterson <ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc: Luis Vivanco <lvivanco@uvm.edu>
Subject: Re: Overlake Park - Clarifying questions

On Mon, Jun 26, 2017 at 8:24 AM, Peggy O'Neill <peggyov5@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Peterson,

I have a couple of clarifying questions for you before I submit my response regarding the parking proposal for Overlake Park.

In your note, you mention allowing parking on the west side of Overlake for four-hours between 8 am and 4 pm. Does this mean that a contractor will have to move his/her vehicle after 4 hours, yet still be allowed to park on the street? Also, will parking be available outside the hours of 8 am - 4 pm (M-F)? Finally, is the west side the better side for parking, or should it be moved to the east (I'm thinking of Adsit Ct. that has parking on one-side - the side that cars would drive out towards the larger street.)?

Thank you.

Regards,

Peggy O'Neill

52 Overlake Park

6/27/2017

Hello Phillip,

I live at 17 Overlake Park in Burlington. I would like to express my support for removing parking at the end cul-de-sac and to allow parking on the west side of Overlake between 8am and 4 pm weekdays. I believe this would improve the quality of life in our neighborhood.

Thank you,

Sof Dillof

Tuesday 6/27/2017

Spoke to Barbara Rouleau on the phone, she wants Overlake Park to be split into two sections. She would like resident only parking on Overlake Park.

Tuesday 6/20/2017

Hi Phillip,

thanks for the note regarding parking on OP. I think your proposed idea is fantastic. I agree with additional parking hours on the west side of the street and REMOVING parking in the cul-de-sac. One question: will you be able to monitor and enforce 4-hr parking?

Thank you for soliciting resident feedback. Very much appreciated!

Carole Hakstian
44 Overlake Park
(802) 324-7474

Thursday 6/9/2017

Dear Mr. Peterson,

Thanks so much for the update. Just to be clear. At present there is no parking on the east side of Overlake (becoming the south side around the curve) and the present limited m-f 8-4 no parking is on the west lake side. We definitely only support parking on one side of the street, if at all.

Thanks,
The Tippers

Wednesday 6/6/2017

Thanks so much for your email. Out of the twelve responses from local residents, nine of the respondents support the placement of a no-parking zone at the end of the cul-de-sac on Overlake Park. Although the majority of residents support the proposal we know there are parking problems on Overlake, those problems are associated with the decision to limit parking on the east side of Overlake Park Monday-Friday 8 AM to 4 PM.

Given the different input of all of the residents on Overlake Park, we are not going to present the cul-de-sac parking issue at the June commission meeting. We will be designing a different solution and conduct public outreach once it is developed.

Kind Regards,

Phillip Peterson, Engineering Technician
Burlington Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05402
802-865-5832 (phone)
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

Tuesday 6/6/2017

Dear Mr. Peterson,

We are writing in response to your invitation to comment on proposal to eliminate parking on Overlake Park. We *strongly* request that parking be maintained on the cul-de-sac, as the parking situation on Overlake park is already cumbersome and unwelcoming to residents (ourselves included) and guests.

As we live in an area surrounded by resident-only parking, there are no other parking options for guests, contractors, and other visitors. In our case, all events and services have to be planned in advance to occur after 4 pm, as presently parking is prohibited on weekdays from 8 am to 4 pm. If a guest or contractor does visit prior to 4 pm on a weekday and need to park on a street due to driveway-size limitations, they are often ticketed. Since our street does not allow resident parking, we cannot get a resident parking permit. The nearest legal parking is a half mile away. It is incredibly unwelcoming and embarrassing to be part of community that prohibits convenient visits guests, family, and home-service providers. By and large, Burlington prides itself on being a welcoming and generous community. Such stringent parking regulations are in direct opposition to this aim. Additionally, due to the quiet nature of the street and relatively infrequent

enforcement, some people try to "get away with it" and park on the street during prohibited times. This inevitably leads to squabbling and tattle-tailing among the neighbors, further increasing unnecessary animosity.

If parking regulations are to be changed on the cul-de-sac, we recommend changing parking to "resident-only" from 8 am to 4 pm, with open access in the evenings and on the weekends. This will prevent students and city employees from using the street during business hours, but welcome guests and family to visit in the evening.

We adamantly urge you to maintain parking on the cul-de-sac.

Best,
Alexandra Sullivan
James Lent
52A Overlake Park
Burlington, VT, 05402
(802) 734-6798

Monday 6/5/2017
Dear Mr. Peterson,

We are writing in response to your invitation to comment on the desire of some residents on Overlake Park to eliminate parking on the cul-de-sac. We request—in *the strongest possible terms*—that the city **not** take this action. The parking situation on Overlake Park is already inhospitable for residents and our visitors, and this action would bring it from bad to worse.

The current parking problems on Overlake Park stem from the city's decision in 2014 to eliminate parking during 8-4 (M-F) on the bulk of the street, which has pushed overflow parking during business hours to the circle. This decision was made in spite of the fact that the majority of residents polled requested the maintenance of parking on the street, with many suggesting designating the street as resident only parking from 8-4 (M-F) (see notes here: <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/sites/default/files/Agendas/11-12-14.pdf>).

While residents have sufficient space to park their own cars in their own driveways, a number of us do not have extra capacity for visitors, including contractors, play-dates, group meetings, etc., to park in our driveways during business hours. We note that the city's residential parking plan (<https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/sites/default/files/DPW/Publications/ResidentialParkingPlan-ES.pdf>) indicates that decisions about residential parking be made with a holistic view toward evaluating residential parking *areas*. Please keep in mind that the area in which we live is surrounded by resident-only parking streets, which prevents us from finding occasional short-term parking on neighboring streets.

Unless the parking regulations on our street change as a whole, the cul-de-sac is the only space within reasonable walking distance of our homes to suggest parking for visitors. Even then, it is not necessarily convenient for service professionals who need close access to their vehicles for tools. It is not uncommon for contractors (carpenters, plumbers, etc.) doing legitimate business on our street to receive parking tickets because they cannot find parking in a driveway, and so they park on the street. This is an unacceptable and unsustainable situation.

Eliminating the only remaining on-street parking would not only generate problems for legitimate use of

the public right of way, it would also have an impact on safety. On-street parking has an important relationship to pedestrian and motorist safety, by creating a traffic calming effect. The elimination of parking during business hours in 2014 has resulted in noticeably faster automobile speeds on the street.

Please do not further intensify the inhospitable environment here by eliminating parking on the circle. We believe **the only reasonable solution to the problems on Overlake Park is to modify the current prohibitions** by instituting resident only (M-F 8-4) parking during business hours, with the times outside of that open-access to all. It is a public right of way, after all.

Sincerely,

Luis A. Vivanco
Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco
52 Overlake Park
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 860-1704

Friday 6/2/2017

Phone call with local resident Mara Coven (92 Overlake Park)

Ms. Coven supports the removal of parking around the inner perimeter of the cul-de-sac.

Tuesday 5/30/2017

Hi Phillip -

Thank you for your notice regarding the proposed prohibition against parking around the island at the end of the Overlake Park cul-de-sac.

My husband, Matt Daly, and I support this proposed change. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or need further information.

Regards,

Celia Daly

M. Cecilia Daly
Daly & Daly, P.C.
110 Main Street, 4th Floor
PO Box 0069
Burlington, VT 05402-0069
Phone (802) 658-6665 x2
Fax (802) 658-8565

Monday 5/29/2017

Hi Peter,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the Overlake parking situation.

I would like to propose we return parking on Overlake to Resident Parking only. I have a small driveway that can not accommodate more than two vehicles. Both my husband and my daughter have been ticketed for parking on the street beside our driveway.

I would appreciate if it would be returned to the same status it was 4 years ago when I purchased the house-which was resident only vehicles.

Thank you again for considering my opinion on this.

Sincerely,

Me and Mrs Kurani

Thursday 5/25/2017

Hi Phillip,

I live at the cul-de-sac on Overlake Park. While I agree that the cul de sac is not the best place for parking, if that gets taken away we will have zero parking available on our street. When other street parking was available, people did not regularly park on the cul de sac. The restricted parking from 8 to 4 is ridiculous and unnecessary. We need parking on Overlake Park. If someone must be appeased, give back parking on one or both sides of the street and restrict cul de sac parking so children can ride their bikes around it. I stay home with my toddler and have another baby on the way. I have friends over for play dates a couple afternoons a week and our driveway can't accomodate everyone's cars, where are they supposed to park if all street parking is restricted? Where is my family supposed to park if they all come visit during the same week? They'll all be here for the birth of our baby next month and for Christmas and for vacations over the summer...my mother or my sister will get ticketed or we'll have to pick them up from someone else's street or a parking garage because all of our street parking has been taken away? Even if all restrictions were removed, we would not have parking problems here. I'm not sure where these imaginary issues came from but this is not a hot street for parking among students or folks looking to go downtown or anyone else. I support fewer parking restrictions on Overlake Park, not more.

Thank you for your time,

Julia Khamnei
82 Overlake Park

Wednesday 5/24/2017

Dear Mr. Peterson,

We live at 62 Overlake Park, and our opinion is that there should be no parking on the circle. Also, we would like to add that, though we do not want UVM parking to swamp our street, the no parking on the west side of the street seems excessive. We would like Resident Parking only with parking passes for guests or service people, or perhaps Resident Parking only during the hours of 8-4, M-F with parking passes.

Thank you,

The Tippers

Monday 5/22/2017

Phone call with local resident Maria Linkletter (74 Overlake Park)

Ms. Linkletter does not want the parking removed around the island at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Monday 5/22/2017

Dear Phillip -

We received your flyer regarding proposed changes to parking around the island. Thank you for looking into this.

As to the proposal, we are in agreement that parking should not be allowed around the

island. We believe this will help reduce the presence of commercial vehicles on the cul-de-sac and also enable emergency vehicles to access those houses around the circle.

However, we do not believe four (4) "No Parking" signs are necessary to effectuate this change. The current parking is limited to the east side of the circle. Three (3) appropriately-spaced signs should be more than sufficient.

Is it possible, while signs are being installed, to add a "Slow-Children At Play" sign near the corner of Overlake Park and Deforest? Cars continually come around the corner into the cul-de-sac at high speed, which is worrisome given that kids are often out biking and playing. If there is to be no parking there, I suspect kids will use the area for playing even more. I've asked before about this type of sign, but have not gotten a response.

Lastly, we're very curious what the plan is for the sidewalks. Last summer (I believe), part of Overlake Park got new sidewalks, but that project stopped right before our house (77 Overlake Park). The remaining sidewalk turning towards the island is in terrible shape, which also makes for more biking and scooting in the street.

Regards,

Cathy

--

Cathy Stadecker
(802) 399-1318

Sunday 5/21/2017
Hello Phillip,

As a resident of Overlake Park, I would like to comment on the parking around the island in the Overlake Park cul-de-sac.

I have a couple of concerns with cars parked in the cul-de-sac.

The first is the added difficulty for emergency vehicles and large utility vehicles to navigate around the island. Clearance on all side of the island would seem like a safer option.

The second concern has to do with safety for children riding bikes or scooters in the road. With cars parked around the island, visibility across to the opposite side of the island is impeded and a child could miss seeing a car coming up on them quickly.

For these two reasons, I would request that parking privileges around the island in the Overlake Park cul-de-sac be removed at all times.

If you have any questions, I can be reach at the address and phone number below.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this parking matter, Phillip.

Best,

Carole Hakstian
44 Overlake Park
(802) 324-7474

Saturday 5/20/2017
Dear Mr. Peterson,

Thank you for your request for feedback regarding the possibility of removing parking around the Overlake Park cul-de-sac. We are glad we live in a City where residents are canvassed and well considered in this process.

Until a couple of years ago, neighborhood children often gathered to play underneath the tall white pines that are planted in the cul-de-sac and frequently rode their bicycles around the perimeter. The area was used only occasionally for short term parking by residents or their guests.

Multiple hour/day/week parking around the cul-de-sac on our street began and has increased dramatically with the rental of rooms to multiple tenants in the homes at 74 and 82 Overlake Park.

Our street is narrow and can be difficult to navigate when there are cars parked along the curb or cul-de-sac. This would be especially difficult for an emergency vehicle. Additionally, cars parked around the perimeter of the cul-de-sac create risk for neighborhood children riding bicycles around the circle or playing on the green space by blocking visibility for traffic.

We welcome the proposed designation change and support the ban of parking around the Overlake Park cul-de-sac.

Respectfully,

Meg and Mike Huffman
55 Overlake Park
802-863-2629

Friday 5/19/2017

Dear Mr. Peterson,

We are very grateful that you have contacted us about the problem of parking around the island at the end of the Overlake Park cul-de-sac.

We have owned the home at 100 Overlake Park since 1990, and always used the property as intended, as a single family home. We raised our children in this home, and have enjoyed living in the neighborhood for the most part. However, lately we've been troubled and angered by the parking problems in the circle, associated with more homes being used as rental properties.

Our driveway opens directly into the cul-de-sac, and we used to enjoy the area for all of its benefits: relatively little traffic, quiet street with few cars, and space where service vehicles could park if houses needed services such as construction, plumbing, lawn/tree work, etc. In years past, our kids and other youngsters used to ride their tricycles and bikes around

the circle of the cul-de-sac, and the island was often used by children as play area. The cul-de-sac and island used to be more like a park (Overlake Park) than what it's turned into: a parking lot.

In recent years the cul-de-sac by the island has become a parking lot for tenants of rented rooms in neighboring homes. Fewer kids play and ride their bikes around the island because the riding space is blocked by parked cars, and parents don't have a place to stand, by the island, and watch their kids, as they used to, because the area by the island is blocked by parked cars. Cars and trucks that do drive around the circle must navigate a more congested street, and it's more difficult to see children and pedestrians who might be walking around the circle due to all the parked cars. Service vehicles, with legitimate needs for parking, often have no place to park their trucks without blocking the narrow circle. There are often 5 or 6 cars parked in the cul-de-sac every day and night. The congestion is worst from September through mid-May each year. In addition to tenants at 74 and 92 Overlake Park, one neighbor, at 82 Overlake Park, seems to be running a small business from his home, so his driveway is often filled with business vehicles, and his family members and/or employees seem to use the circle as a parking area.

We are strongly in favor of the DPW placing a sign, as noted on your letter, that would designate the cul-de-sac area east of the island as a "NO PARKING" zone.

Thank you very much for looking into this, and helping restore the Overlake Park cul-de-sac to its more proper use. Please call us if you have any questions, or if you need further testimony from us.

Sincerely yours,

Debra & Bill Gottesman
100 Overlake Park
Burlington, VT 05401
PHONE: 802-864-3714

Phone message from local resident Alex Stewart (101 Overlake Park)
Friday 5/19/2017
Mr. Stewart supports the removal of parking around the cul-de-sac island.

Phone call with local resident Chris Khamnei
Friday 5/19/2017
Mr. Khamnei is fine with the removal of parking around the cul-de-sac, however he does not want more signs put up on Overlake Park. Mr. Khamnei does not want any parking restrictions on Overlake Park.



MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician *PHD 7/13/17*

CC: David Allerton P.E., Public Works Engineer *DA 7/13/17*

RE: Bike Path Stop Signs at Little Eagle Bay and North Ave Extension

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt:

- The official adoption of stop control at the intersection of the Burlington Bike Path and North Avenue Extension causing eastbound and westbound traffic on North Ave Extension to stop.

Background:

The Burlington Parks and Recreation Department is implementing improvements recommended from the 2013 Bike Path Intersection Scoping Report. Part of the project involved improvements of the North Ave extension bike path intersections. Currently, bike traffic is supposed to stop at these intersections; however, the approved project plans included stop control causing traffic on North Avenue Extension to stop.


Observations:

North Avenue Extension is a very low volume dead-end road which provides access to a number of lakeside cottages and campsites. The road takes a sharp bend to the north just west of the crossing. The path in this area is raised up above the surrounding ground on the former railroad embankment, but the path dips down as it crosses North Avenue Extension. This dip causes path users to accelerate toward the roadway crossing. Our observation is many path users ignore the existing path stop signs so they can maintain their speed up the other side of the dip in the path. This is undesirable since sight lines are compromised on some of the corners by vegetation.

Conclusions:

The 2013 Bike Path Intersection Scoping Report solution is to eliminate the stop signs on the bike path at both intersections. It is recommended the stop signs be moved to the roadway instead. Yield signs would not be placed on the path since the roadway would be stop controlled and stop and yield signs are not placed within the same intersection per national guidance.

The very low speeds and volumes on North Avenue Extension combined with the observed bicyclist behavior through the “dip” leads us to recommend the City consider switching the stop controls to the roadway from the bike path. The sight lines do not support yield controls on the path, but creating stop conditions on the road is more appropriate for the conditions. We observed a portion of the motorists stop anyway since they have probably grown aware the bicyclists are not stopping and some are in fact accelerating to make it up the opposing incline.



REMOVING SIGNS
STA 1552+85, RT
STA 1552+94, LT (2)
STA 1600+37, LT
STA 1600+21, RT (2)

DURABLE LETTER OR SYMBOL
1552+35, RT (XING AHEAD)
1600+80, LT (XING AHEAD)


DURABLE 24 INCH STOP BAR
STA 1600+03 - 1600+11, LT
STA 1600+09 - 1600+19, RT

PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE SIDEWALK, 5 INCH
STA 1552+74 - 1600+33, RT (ALONG PARKING LOT)

VERTICAL GRANITE CURB
STA 1552+79 - 1600+12, RT (ALONG PARKING LOT)


DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE
STA 1552+95
STA 1600+21

SPECIAL PROVISION
(EXPOSED AGGREGATE CONCRETE)
STA 1552+88 - 1600+24



- NOTES:
- 1) XING TEXT SHALL BE PLACED 50 FEET BEHIND THE PROPOSED DWS. ROAD TEXT SHALL BE PLACED 5 FEET BEHIND XING TEXT. SEE MUTCD FOR TEXT LAYOUT AND DIMENSIONS.
 - 2) SEE INTERSECTION DETAILS SHEET FOR DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE INSTALLATION.
 - 3) SEE SIGNING SUMMARY SHEET FOR SIGN DIMENSIONS.
 - 4) CONFIRM VEGETATION HAS BEEN CLEARED FOR PROPER SIGHT DISTANCE.
 - 5) CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ALL EXISTING CONCRETE BOLLARDS LOCATED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE INTERSECTION.

SIGNING LEGEND
N = NEW SIGN
R = REMOVE SIGN
RET = RETAIN SIGN
R&S = REMOVE AND SALVAGE
S = SALVAGED SIGN



PROJECT NAME:	BURLINGTON BIKE PATH PHASE 2
PROJECT NUMBER:	57634.02
FILE NAME:	z57634_RINT_North.dgn
PROJECT LEADER:	E.P. DETRICK
DESIGNED BY:	W. DRUDING
INTERSECTION LAYOUT SHEET (6 OF 6)	
PLOT DATE:	3/31/2017
DRAWN BY:	W. DRUDING
CHECKED BY:	E.P. DETRICK
SHEET	56 OF 165



CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF PLANNING
645 PINE STREET, SUITE A
BURLINGTON, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY
WWW.BURLINGTONVT.GOV

CHAPIN SPENCER
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

NORMAN J. BALDWIN, P.E.
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

Date: July 13, 2017

To: Public Works Commission
From: Norman J. Baldwin, P.E. *NJB*
City Engineer/Ass't Director of Public Works

C.C. Charles Reeves, Appellant
William Ward, Director of Code Enforcement
Eugene Bergman, Assistant City Attorney/Legal Counsel to Code Enforcement Office
Andrew MacIlwaine, Legal Counsel to the PW Commission

Subject: 163-165 Cherry Street-Appeal of Code Enforcement Order requiring compliance with 18-95 Means of Egress

Mr. Reeves is the owner of 163-165 Cherry Street. Mr. Reeves is seeking to appeal Code Enforcements Order identifying the third floor rental unit at this property as lacking an adequate second means of egress. The Department received the Appellants letter of appeal received by Code Enforcement on June 28, 2017. I have attached both documents for the Commission's consideration.

Since receiving the appeal I have worked to make arrangements to schedule this appeal to be heard at the July 19, 2017 Commission meeting.

In doing so I:

- spoke to Mr. Reeves over the phone on Friday November 16, 2012 over the phone notifying of him of the upcoming meeting and verbally confirmed his ability to attend.
- Sent a Certified Letter to Mr. Reeves dated July 5, 2017, that contained appeal hearing instructions and notice of the hearing.
- In addition, Sent an email to Mr. Reeves, dated July 6, 2017 with the same instructions in an email format, seeking an email return response confirming his ability to attend, in which Mr. Reeves responded on Monday, July 10, 2017.

As such it has been confirmed both parties have been given notice of the scheduled appeal hearing and plan on being attendance. Attached is the supporting documentation for the formal record

Gene Bergman from the City Attorney's Office will be in attendance serving as legal counsel to the Code Enforcement Office, and Andrew MacIlwaine will serve as legal counsel to the Public Works Commission.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

This material is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities. To request an accommodation, please call 802.863.9094 (voice) or 802.863.0450 (TTY).

Penny Cluse Real Estate, llc
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402

William Ward, Director of Code Enforcement
802-863-0442
wward@burlingtonvt.gov

Director Ward,

I am writing to officially ask for an appeal of the finding by the Minimum Housing Inspector Ted Miles of the third floor apartment at 163-165 Cherry Street. He found that the apartment is not permissible because a lack of a second means of egress.

We zoned and built this apartment under the rules set out to us by the zoning department and the building inspectors Ned Holt and Brad Biggie. We queried about the second means of egress and were found exempt by the building code. Here is an email between Joe Fisher, architect for Bird's Eye Building and Ned Holt:

Please note that this is a copy of the code with comments by Fisher in red and Holt in blue.

"Good morning Ned.

I reviewed the two sections of NFPA101 that you recommended to address our egress issues with the potential apartment. As expected, nearly all of what I read specifies that the apartment will require two means of egress, separated enough to ensure that if one is blocked, the other is still usable. However, I also noticed a provision for exceptions to this rule, detailed in chapter 31, section 31.2.4.6. This section details an exception that I would like to discuss with you further.

The rule reads as this (my responses to these requirements are bolded and written in red):

"A single exit shall be permitted in buildings not exceeding three stories in height (**our building is three stories**), provided that all of the following conditions are met: **Roger that! A 3 story building is one of the same as "not exceeding three stories". A four story building is required to be sprinklered. hence. a new set of rules apply.**

(1) The exit stairway does not serve more than one-half of a story below the level of exit discharge. (**The current stairway discharges at ground level and has no access to any level below, it seems we meet this requirement.**) Apply as noted

(2) The travel distance from the entrance door of any dwelling unit to an exit does not exceed 35 ft (10.7m). (**This is slightly confusing, since this section is pertaining to single exits, in all cases the entrance would also be the exit, so wouldn't this condition be met in all cases?**) Apply what needs to be applied in this case.

(3) The exit stairway is completely enclosed or separated from the rest of the building by barriers having a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating. (**I am not sure of the current fire rating of the stairway, but to bring it up to a 1-hour rating is not too intensive**) Apply as noted

- (4) All openings between the exit stairway enclosure and the building are protected with self-closing doors having a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating. **(Same as (3), to switch the doors to 1-hour rated doors would not be too hard.)** Apply as noted
- (5) All corridors serving as access to exits have a minimum ½-hour fire resistance rating. **(This can be accommodated in whatever design we devise.)** Apply as noted
- (6) Horizontal and vertical separation having a minimum ½-hour fire resistance rating is provided between dwelling units." **(Again, this rating should not be difficult to achieve.)** Apply as noted

As you can see, it seems to me that we meet the conditions necessary for an exception if we can ensure that the entrance stairway has at least a 1-hour rating. If you could clarify this, that would be great. It appears that NFPA 101 will be applied to your project and that is all anyone can ask for...meeting the minimum code requirements as governed in the city. Thank you!

Thank you,

Joe"

In addition to this exemption we discussed the egress windows with the fire marshall in the presence of Brad Biggie and made design considerations based on that discussion. We also submitted a stamped architects plan for the apartment at the request of Brad Biggie before we received our building permit.

Please let me know if this letter is sufficient for my appeal or if I need to supply additional information.

Best regards, Charles Reeves

Charles Reeves
Penny Cluse Real Estate, llc
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402
(802) 238-6114
charles@pennycluse.com

IN: 337208

Inspection Detail for: 163-165 Cherry Street

Inspection Date: Jun 20, 2017 Inspector: Ted Miles

Page 1 of 1

Unit/Area

Third floor unit (Item 1 of 1)

Finding: Third floor (or higher) occupied without second means of egress

Remedy: Obtain permits and construct second means of egress to code. Building permit required, or seek appeal for variance as discussed.

Non Complied

Correct By: Jul 27, 2017

Code Section: Means of egress

18-95 Dwelling units on the third floor and above shall have at least two safe, continuous and unobstructed means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open area at grade.

18-95 Means of egress.

Each first and second floor dwelling unit shall have one safe, continuous and unobstructed means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open space or area at grade. Dwelling units on the third floor and above shall have at least two (2) safe, continuous and unobstructed means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open area at grade unless the building is protected by a fire prevention, protection and alarm system permitted and approved by the Burlington fire marshal, in which case the unit shall have the same means of egress required of first and second floor dwelling units. At a minimum, standards for the maintenance of a required means of egress shall be governed by the following:

- (a) All doors in the required means of egress shall be readily openable from the inner side without the use of keys. Exits from dwelling units shall not lead through other such units or through toilet rooms or bathrooms.
- (b) Ladders or any other exit method which does not comply with the requirements of the building code as adopted by the city in Section 8-2 are not an acceptable means of egress and shall be removed or augmented by an acceptable means of egress.
- (c) All required fire escapes shall be structurally sound and maintained safe and usable and free of snow and ice.
- (d) All required exit signs shall be maintained illuminated and visible.

(Ord. of 8-4-86; Ord. of 11-8-93; Ord. of 12-1-14(1))

Penny Cluse Real Estate, llc
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402

City of Burlington
Public Works Commission

7/11/2017

Commissioners,

I am writing to officially ask for an appeal of the finding by the Minimum Housing Inspector Ted Miles of the third floor apartment at 163-165 Cherry Street. He found that the apartment is not permissible because a lack of a second means of egress.

We zoned and built this apartment under the rules set out to us by the zoning department and the building inspectors Ned Holt and Brad Biggie. We queried about the second means of egress and were found exempt by the building code. Here is an email between Joe Fisher, architect for Bird's Eye Building and Ned Holt:

Please note that this is a copy of the code with comments by Fisher in red and Holt in blue.

"Good morning Ned,

I reviewed the two sections of NFPA101 that you recommended to address our egress issues with the potential apartment. As expected, nearly all of what I read specifies that the apartment will require two means of egress, separated enough to ensure that if one is blocked, the other is still usable. However, I also noticed a provision for exceptions to this rule, detailed in chapter 31, section 31.2.4.6. This section details an exception that I would like to discuss with you further.

The rule reads as this (my responses to these requirements are bolded and written in red):

"A single exit shall be permitted in buildings not exceeding three stories in height (our building is three stories), provided that all of the following conditions are met: Roger that! A 3 story building is one of the same as "not exceeding three stories". A four story building is required to be sprinklered, hence, a new set of rules apply.

- (1) The exit stairway does not serve more than one-half of a story below the level of exit discharge. (The current stairway discharges at ground level and has no access to any level below, it seems we meet this requirement.) Apply as noted
- (2) The travel distance from the entrance door of any dwelling unit to an exit does not exceed 35 ft (10.7m). (This is slightly confusing, since this section is pertaining to single exits, in all cases the entrance would also be the exit, so wouldn't this condition be met in all cases?) Apply what needs to be applied in this case.
- (3) The exit stairway is completely enclosed or separated from the rest of the building by barriers having a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating. (I am not sure of the current fire rating of the stairway, but to bring it up to a 1-hour rating is not too intensive) Apply as noted

- (4) All openings between the exit stairway enclosure and the building are protected with self-closing doors having a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating. **(Same as (3), to switch the doors to 1-hour rated doors would not be too hard.)** Apply as noted
- (5) All corridors serving as access to exits have a minimum ½-hour fire resistance rating. **(This can be accommodated in whatever design we devise.)** Apply as noted
- (6) Horizontal and vertical separation having a minimum ½-hour fire resistance rating is provided between dwelling units.” **(Again, this rating should not be difficult to achieve.)** Apply as noted

As you can see, it seems to me that we meet the conditions **necessary** for an exception if we can ensure that the **entrance** stairway has at least a 1-hour rating. If you could clarify this, that would be great. It appears that NFPA 101 will be applied to your project and that is all anyone can ask for...meeting the minimum code requirements as governed in the city. Thank you!

Thank you,

Joe”

In addition to this exemption we discussed the egress windows with the fire marshall in the presence of Brad Biggie and made design considerations based on that discussion. We also submitted a stamped architects plan for the apartment at the request of Brad Biggie before we received our building permit.

At this time I am very aware of the Minimum Housing Code and have read it carefully. Had I been made aware of it during the planning, zoning or permitting of this project we could have designed in a second egress. At this point in the project, with all of the building done and inspected and tenants moving back into the second floor apartment, building a second egress is going to be an unreasonable burden for us.

I ask for the commission to grant me the exception as spelled out in the building code in this one case.

Thank you for your consideration, Charles Reeves

Charles Reeves
Penny Cluse Real Estate, LLC
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402
(802) 238-6114
charles@pennycluse.com

RECEIVED

JUL 11 2017 10:26 a.m.

BURLINGTON PUBLIC
WORKS

(10)

Norman S. Baldwin
Assistant Director of Public Works

645 Pine ST

Burlington, VT

05401



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, Vermont 05402-0849
802.863.9094 VOX
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY

Chapin Spencer
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

Norman J. Baldwin, P.E.
*ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
CITY ENGINEER*

July 5, 2017

Charles Reeves
Penny Cluse Real Estate, LLC
P.O.Box 8422
Burlington, Vermont 05402

Delivery: Certified Mail

NOTICE OF HEARING

Pursuant to Burlington Code of Ordinances Chapter 18, Article III, Division 5, please take notice that the **Public Works Commission** will hold a hearing related to an appeal of a minimum housing code order regarding the fire safety division of the minimum housing code for 163-165 Cherry Street.

The item under appeal are associated with Code Enforcements Minimum Housing Inspection Report, inspected on June 20, 2017.

- Requirement BCO 18-95 Means of Egress

The appeal will be heard at the Public Works Commission Meeting, the Commission meeting will begin at approximately:

Time: 6:30 p.m.
Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2017
Location: Front Conference Room, Central Maintenance Facility
645 Pine Street
Burlington, Vermont.

Given the agenda has yet to be formalized I am not in the position to provide you with a time certain when this item will be heard.

In order to expeditiously hear this appeal, the Commission needs and hereby notifies you as the appellant to provide it with a short and concise statement outlining the specific items to be heard and addressed by the Commission. This statement must also specific the factual or legal basis of the appeal.

Each party will be given the opportunity to present the facts, as they believe them to be, and to make legal arguments. The Commission will hear testimony and take documentary evidence in support of each party's position.

You are welcome to provide supporting documentary evidence in advance of the hearing. In order to have documentation included in the packet I must have your documents no later than 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 11, 2017. **Witnesses must be present;** the Commission will not accept written statements from absent witnesses, even in affidavit form. The Commission will resolve disputed questions of fact and apply the law

governing the situation to those facts. If you intend to present documentary evidence, please bring 9 copies of each document to the hearing.

If you are the person who requested the hearing and you fail to appear, your case will be dismissed. If there are special circumstances as to why you cannot appear in person for a hearing, please call 863-9094. Postponement of your case will be permitted only for good cause. If settlement is reached, please notify the Commission immediately.

If you have any questions, please call 863-9094.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Norman J. Baldwin', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Norman J. Baldwin, P.E.
Assistant Director of Public Works


cc: Jeff Padgett, Chair of the Public Works Commission
Eugene Bergman, Assistant City Attorney
William Ward, Director of Code Enforcement
Andrew MacIlwaine, Esq. Legal Counsel to Public Works Commission
Chapin Spencer, Director of Public Works
Valerie Ducharme, Customer Service Representative

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

Charles Reeves
Penny Clause Real Estate
PO Box 5402
Burlington VT 05402

1. Article Addressed to:

2. Article Number 7015 0640 0002 3584 3802
(Transfer from service)
PS Form 3813, July 2013 Domestic Return Receipt

A. Signature  ☐ Agent
B. Received by (Printed Name) Charles Reeves ☐ Addressee
C. Date of Delivery 7-10-13

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type
☒ Certified Mail® ☐ Priority Mail Express™
☐ Registered ☒ Return Receipt for Merchandise
☐ Insured Mail ☐ Collect on Delivery

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Domestic Return Receipt

2086 4856 2000 0490 5102

Article Number 2104197 1186 wmo-9

Yes ☐ (Extra Fee)
Restricted Delivery? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Return Receipt for Merchandise ☒
Collect on Delivery ☐
Insured Mail ☐
Registered ☐
Priority Mail Express™ ☐

3. Service Type

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If YES, enter delivery address below:

C. Date of Delivery 7-10-13

B. Received by (Printed Name) Charles Reeves

A. Signature  ☐ Agent ☐ Addressee

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

COMPLETE THIS SECTION

Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

Article Addressed to:

Charles Reeves
Penny Clause Real Estate
PO Box 5402
Burlington VT 05402

Norm Baldwin

From: Norm Baldwin
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 8:33 AM
To: 'Charles'
Cc: Chapin Spencer; William Ward; Eugene Bergman; Andy MacIlwaine (amacilwaine@DINSE.COM); Valerie Ducharme
Subject: RE: Notice of Appeal Hearing for 163-165 Cherry Street

Charles,

The packet is being assembled and as staff it was my plan to include your appeal letter in the packet, along with my cover memo framing the appeal, and the documentation for providing you notice of the hearing, and your confirmation to attend.

We did get your copies and packet of information to include in the Commission packet going out today. Thank you that.

Once the commission packet is assembled I will send you a pdf of all documents submitted to the Commission.

Thank you for being responsive and attentive in organizing the appeal hearing.

From: Charles [mailto:charles@pennycluse.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 12:55 PM
To: Norm Baldwin <nbaldwin@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Re: Notice of Appeal Hearing for 163-165 Cherry Street

Hi Norm,

I think that the only additional supporting documentary evidence I wish to supply for the commissioners is original letter I sent to Director Ward stating that I wanted to appeal. If I do want that submitted, do I need provide the 9 copies or is that in the information they have already been given?

Thanks, Charles

On Mon, Jul 10, 2017 at 8:24 AM, Charles <charles@pennycluse.com> wrote:

Hi Norm,

I will be at the hearing on July 19th.

Thanks, Charles

On Thu, Jul 6, 2017 at 5:18 PM, Norm Baldwin <nbaldwin@burlingtonvt.gov> wrote:

Charles,

As a follow up to our conversation yesterday over the phone, I am sending you this formal notice of the appeal hearing along with the associated appeal hearing instructions, with the understanding from our previous verbal conversation that you will be able to attend.

Please reply to this email confirming your ability to attend the Wednesday, July 19, 2017 Commission Meeting.

Please feel free to call me if you have any further questions.

Thank you.

Norman J. Baldwin, P.E.
City Engineer/Ass't Director
Burlington Public Works Department
645 Pine Street
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Vt: [802.865.5826](tel:802.865.5826)

Ft: [802.863.0466](tel:802.863.0466)

EMAIL: nbaldwin@burlingtonvt.gov

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

--

Charles Reeves
Penny Cluse Cafe
169 Cherry Street
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402
[\(802\)651-8834](tel:(802)651-8834) restaurant
[\(802\)238-6114](tel:(802)238-6114) cell

--

Charles Reeves
Penny Cluse Cafe
169 Cherry Street
PO Box 8422
Burlington, VT 05402
(802)651-8834 restaurant
(802)238-6114 cell



CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICE

645A Pine St, PO Box 8
Burlington, VT 05402-08

VOICE (802) 863-0400

FAX: (802) 652-4200

To: Public Works Commission
From: William Ward/Director of Code Enforcement
Date: July 12, 2017
Subject Address: 163-165 Cherry Street

Property owner: Charles Reeves
Date of Appeal: June 28, 2017
Appealed items: Item 1 of 1 Means of egress

Property Description

163-165 Cherry Street is a mixed use property with a commercial business/restaurant on the ground floor and rental unit on the 2nd floor. City records indicate the building was built in 1899.



Property photo taken by Inspector Miles

Rental History

The property records document one rental unit on the 2nd floor for the last 10 years. The current property owner is listed as the owner since 2013. A zoning and building permit were issued to the property owner in 2017 to "Create a one-bedroom apartment in 3rd floor" making the total number of rental units 2. Inspector Miles' sketch of the third floor unit is attachment "A"

**CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICE**

645A Pine St, PO Box 849

Burlington, VT 05402-0849

VOICE (802) 863-0442**FAX: (802) 652-4221**

The new unit on the 3rd floor is accessed by one staircase.

Code Enforcement inspection timeline for 163-165 Cherry Street

June 20, 2017 -Minimum Housing Inspection completed. One deficiency was found

June 21, 2017 – Inspection report and inspector's order were mailed to the property owner.

June 28, 2017 – Appeal of item #1 was received from the property owner requesting

City Assessor's sketch card measurement of floor area and finished space

Card #	Area	Description	Gross Area	Finish Area
1	AUF	ATTIC UNFIN	1.104	0
1	BMT	BASEMENT	1.104	0
1	FFL	1ST FLOOR	1.059	1.059
1	OPP	OPEN PORCH	45	0
1	SFL	2ND FLOOR	1.104	1.104

Ordinance Section in question:**18-95 Means of egress.**

Each first and second floor dwelling unit shall have one safe, continuous and unobstructed means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open space or area at grade.

Dwelling units on the third floor and above shall have at least two (2) safe, continuous and unobstructed means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open area at grade unless the building is protected by a fire prevention, protection and alarm system permitted and approved by the Burlington fire marshal, in which case the unit shall have the same means of egress required of first and second floor dwelling units. At a minimum, standards for the maintenance of a required means of egress shall be governed by the following:

- (a) All doors in the required means of egress shall be readily openable from the inner side without the use of keys. Exits from dwelling units shall not lead through other such units or through toilet rooms or bathrooms.



CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICE

645A Pine St, PO Box 84
Burlington, VT 05402-084

VOICE (802) 863-044

FAX: (802) 652-422

(b) Ladders or any other exit method which does not comply with the requirements of the building code as adopted by the city in Section 8-2 are not an acceptable means of egress and shall be removed or augmented by an acceptable means of egress.

(c) All required fire escapes shall be structurally sound and maintained safe and usable and free of snow and ice.

(d) All required exit signs shall be maintained illuminated and visible.

(Ord. of 8-4-86; Ord. of 11-8-93; Ord. of 12-1-14(1))

Requested action from the Public Works Commission

Uphold the Code Enforcement order that requires a second and independent means of egress from the interior of the unit to the exterior at a street or to a public open area at grade.



MEMORANDUM

July 12, 2017

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Anna Wyner, Transportation Planning Intern
Nicole Losch, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: planBTV Walk Bike Implementation Revisited

1. Union Street Parking Changes between Loomis and Grant Streets
2. Union Street One-Way Except Bicycles between Loomis and Grant Streets
3. New parking spaces on adjacent streets

Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt:

- No person shall park any vehicle at any time on the west side of North Union Street between Grant Street and Loomis Street.
- Designate as a one-way street: North Union Street northerly from Grant Street to Loomis Street, with the exception of bicycles traveling southbound in the designated contra-flow lane
- Amend "No Parking" zones to create new parking spaces along:
 - The south side of Loomis Street beginning at the new curb line east of North Union Street
 - The east side of North Winooski Avenue beginning at the northern curb line of Grant Street and moving northerly (except "No Parking Here to Corner")
 - The north side of Grant Street between 24 Grant Street and 42 Grant Street
 - The west side of South Union Street between the City Market driveway and the northerly curb line of Bradley Street


Overview

At the June 2017 meeting of the Public Works Commission, the Old North End Greenway was introduced and the regulatory changes were approved to implement this continuous low-stress route for people bicycling. Immediately after the meeting staff became aware that there were Google form survey results that we were not aware had been submitted and were not presented at the Commission meeting. As a result, **the North Union Street parking changes and one-way street designation is being re-presented with the complete package of public input, additional information on alternatives, and a recommended mitigation measure.**

This memo contains:

- I. A summary of community outreach related to the Old North End Greenway and the North Union Street recommendation.

2. A discussion of alternatives and related improvements.
3. Conclusions
4. Attachments:
 - a. A summary of the comprehensive plan that identified this project, *planBTV Walk Bike*.
 - b. A comprehensive introduction to the Old North End Greenway, with details on the North Union Street section.



Community Outreach

planBTV Walk Bike Outreach

The Old North End Neighborhood Greenway was identified as a high-priority project during the *planBTV Walk Bike* planning process. *planBTV Walk Bike* was advanced with a clear directive for strong, varied community engagement. Over the two years of planning, staff hosted focus group meetings in the Old North End, tested concepts through weekend-long demonstration projects in the Old North End and South End, led active walking and biking surveys and workshops throughout the city, advertised online input tools and social media input, hosted

community meetings, collaborated at advisory and technical committee meetings, and informed the process through meetings with decision-makers along the way. **As a result of this input, the planning team clearly heard a need for east-west routes that are continuous, for facilities that are comfortable for all people bicycling, and that the Old North End has a high demand for this type of infrastructure.**

Old North End Greenway Outreach

As implementation began for the Old North End (ONE) Greenway, staff mailed letters and distributed flyers to properties adjacent to the project site:

- May 17th - 1st mailing/flyer: Feedback due June 7th via email/phone/Google forms survey or attend June 21 Commission meeting
- June 12th and 13th - 2nd mailing and 2nd flyer due to high turnover of rental properties in the area: Feedback due June 19th via email/phone or attend June 21 Commission meeting
- June 30th - 3rd mailing directed to property owners: Feedback due July 14th via email/phone or attend July 19 Commission meeting

At the June meeting, staff presented the feedback we received: one negative email and a concerned phone call received on June 15th and a supportive email on June 16th. Immediately after the meeting staff became aware that there were Google form survey results that we were not aware had been submitted and were not presented at the Commission meeting. Staff then checked the Google forms survey and it was not set up to receive notifications for survey results correctly. Upon going directly into the survey, staff found that there were 27 online Google form responses (summary below).

Google forms survey was a new tool that staff was testing to receive public input. We regret that we missed the initial feedback but appreciate being made aware of the completed surveys we needed to retrieve. In the future, we will only receive feedback via email or phone to gather more accurate results, or provide greater training on any new tools. If we do use another survey tool, we use all means to test the survey for responsiveness.

Summary of Responses (full details attached):

- 27 online Google Forms Responses
 - Negative responses from 2 adjacent property owners
 - Negative responses from tenants within or adjacent to project site; several were outside of the project area (Hickok Street)
 - All responses on June 6th and 7th
- Negative email from Loomis St resident – June 15th
- One Concerned Phone Call - June 16th
- Positive email from Grant St resident – June 16th
- June 21st Commission meeting – public comment was mixed
- July 7th through July 13th – 2 email from concerned landlords on North Union and 4 emails from supportive ONE residents

Alternatives and Related Improvements

As the Old North End Greenway was designed and parking challenges became a greater concern, staff evaluated several possible alternatives:

Alternative 1: An east-west route on North Street

To create a continuous, dedicated facility for bicycling on North Street, the on-street parking used by residents and neighborhood commercial activity would be replaced by either bicycle lanes or low-stress, protected bike lanes. Approximately 137 parking spaces would be replaced by bicycle lanes.

Alternative 2: An east-west route on Pearl Street

A continuous, dedicated facility for bicycling on Pearl Street would not be a low-stress facility but could be accommodated with bike lanes (some adjacent to parking and some buffered). To continue the existing/in construction bike lanes easterly to Colchester Avenue, approximately 51 parking spaces would be removed between Union Street and Colchester Avenue (some metered parking). This assumes parking could remain on one side of Pearl Street between Union and Willard Streets and the curb could be adjusted to accommodate bike lanes in each direction between Winooski Avenue and Union Street. While the long-term plans for Pearl Street do envision protected bike lanes, the design process would consider reconstruction or other roadway adjustments to retain parking where feasible. As a quick-build project, the majority of on-street parking would be removed.

Alternative 3: A 2-way protected bike lane rather than 1-way pairs

The ONE Greenway contains two one-way streets with parking that must be adjusted for low-stress bicycle connections. On North Champlain Street, the new bike facility can be installed in place of parking and can meet the minimum recommended width (8' two-way facility with 2' buffer) by narrowing the adjacent travel lanes.

North Union Street is too narrow to safely accommodate 2-way bicycle travel. The existing bike lane is 5' with a 2' buffer, the travel lane is 12', and the parking lane is 8'. The travel lane should not be narrowed since this is a bus route with left-side parking on a one-lane, one-way street. A 2-way, protected bike lane is preferred to be 10' or more with a buffer of 2' or more. At a minimum, a 2-way protected bike lane could be 8' with a 2' buffer, but North Union Street is 3' short of this minimum for a quick-build project. Also, if a 2-way bike facility were to be constructed on North Union Street, it should be continuous to the north and south (rather than only between Loomis and Grant Streets) to prevent wrong-way bicycling outside of this section.

Alternative 4: A seasonal contra-flow lane on North Union Street

The Old North End Greenway is a 1.15-mile long route with three contra-flow sections: Sherman Street, North Champlain Street, and North Union Street. Outside of these sections, the Greenway is generally a network of traffic-calmed streets with shared lane markings and wayfinding signs. The shared lane markings cannot be un-installed and re-installed each year, so removing any one of the contra-flow sections would make the Greenway discontinuous and potentially unsafe. Anyone bicycling along the Greenway and encountering a seasonal section would be faced with riding on the sidewalk or riding illegally against traffic in a shared lane with oncoming traffic.

Alternative 5: Residential Parking access on Grant Street

One property in the project area on North Union Street does not have any off-street parking and requested resident parking permits for Grant Street (currently zoned for Residential Parking). The current Residential Parking program permits parking for residents of each street, but does not grant permits for residents of adjacent streets. Following the recommendations of the 2015 Residential Parking Management Plan, residential parking areas can be evaluated as new requests for residential parking zones are submitted. If 51% of property owners complete a neighborhood-led petition for residential parking on North Union Street, staff would be able to initiate the neighborhood conversation for residential parking on North Union Street and adjacent streets.

Alternative 6: Reconstruct the curb line

By realigning the curb line, parking may fit within the greenbelt or a 2-way protected bike lane may fit while maintaining on-street parking and an appropriate travel lane width. As the one-way pair to North Winooski Avenue, Union Street has been included in the Winooski Avenue Corridor Study that will begin in 2017. Curb

reconstruction is outside of the scope of the quick-build program, and the long-term vision for the alignment of Union Street will be established through the Winooski Avenue Corridor Study.

Alternative 7: Shared parking arrangements

At the June Commission meeting, property owners spoke about the challenge of on-street parking in this neighborhood. One shared the collective parking agreements they currently maintain: where properties have excess parking, they may lease parking to other property owners who have a shortage of parking. While the Department of Public Works cannot manage these private lease agreements, it is a solution we fully support.

Alternative 8: Other parking opportunities

During site visits to evaluate *planBTV Walk Bike*, staff identified several areas for potential new parking opportunities in the Old North End. **These all require final engineering and exact dimensions may change, but based on preliminary engineering:**

Loomis Street at North Union:



The Old North End Greenway will often include curb extensions at key intersections to self-enforce slow movements for vehicles entering the Greenway. At the intersection of Loomis Street and North Union Street, a quick-build curb extension is planned at the southeast corner. With this addition, the “No Parking Here to Corner” can be adjusted and could allow **2 additional parking spaces on Loomis Street** immediately adjacent to the project site.

North Winooski Avenue at Grant Street:



One block west of the project site and adjacent to the Old North End Greenway, parking is very restricted on the east side of North Winooski Avenue immediately north of Grant Street. There is no apparent reason for this parking prohibition, a new rain garden curb extension was constructed on Grant Street at North Winooski Avenue in 2016, and adjusting this parking setback to the traditional “No Parking Here to Corner” could allow **3 additional parking spaces one block from the project site.**

Grant Street at Clark Street:

Farther west on the Old North End Greenway, parking is very restricted on the north side of Grant Street across from Clark



Street. There is no apparent reason for this parking prohibition, and adjusting this parking prohibition could allow **4 additional parking spaces on Grant Street.**

South Union Street at Bradley Street:



South of the project area, parking is restricted immediately north of the City Market driveway on South Union Street. There is no apparent reason for this parking prohibition, and allowing parking in these locations could allow at least **3 additional parking spaces on South Union Street.**

Conclusions

Public input was collected during *planBTV Walk Bike* and calm east-west bike routes in the Old North End were identified as a very high priority. Several hundred responses were collected during the *planBTV* engagement activities. Parking in the project area is highly utilized and it was not surprising to receive objections to the direct outreach regarding the North Union Street parking removal. Staff has attempted to alleviate the parking burden by evaluating alternatives, but this, like many projects, presents a difficult balance of weighing the needs of the community at large with the needs of residents directly impacted by such changes.

It is expected that more than 10 people will bicycle each day on this new facility, when compared to the 10 people who may be parked in the North Union Street parking spaces at any given time. Although not taken lightly, removing 13 parking spaces over a 1.15-mile project is greatly preferred to removing 51 to 137 parking spaces on the adjacent streets that would provide alternatives to the ONE Greenway.

For these reasons, staff recommends the Commission take the actions indicated at the beginning of this memo.

ATTACHMENTS

About planBTV Walk Bike and the Old North End Neighborhood Greenway

For more than 20 years, Burlington has made an effort to set policies that emphasize the expansion of transportation choices. These include...transportation policies that strongly support the expansion of public transit and the use of alternative modes; and infrastructure policies that ensure that the transportation system accommodates all modes and all users - regardless of age or ability - through the adoption of a “complete streets” policy. As a result, when people can avoid driving, they often do, choosing instead to walk, bike, or take the bus. Despite our cold climate, Burlingtonians take advantage of their compact inter-connected city and increasingly do their part to reduce carbon emissions and embrace an active lifestyle year-round. – planBTV Downtown & Waterfront, 2013

The Transportation Plan supports biking as a transportation choice that is non-polluting, energy efficient, and promotes good health. Burlington has some excellent off-road paths, but lacks the on-street facilities needed for biking to be a practical alternative to cars for day-to-day transportation. This Transportation Plan calls for a complete bike network. Safety is of critical importance, particularly where walkers and bikers interact with cars and trucks. – Burlington Transportation Plan 2011

Burlington residents have called for better walking and biking conditions in every transportation-related plan adopted in the past decade. On April 21st, 2017 the City Council continued to support these policies by adopting PlanBTV Walk Bike, Burlington’s road map to improve walking and biking in Burlington. PlanBTV’s two goals are to **create safer streets for everyone and to make walking and biking a safe, viable and enjoyable way to get around town.**

Safer streets and viable transportation options are vital to realize our community vision. PlanBTV Walk Bike builds upon previous Master Plans, establishing a vision where:

- ...Burlington’s Streets are safe enough that parents let their kids walk or bike to school, to the park, or to a friend’s house without worry; and that older adults comfortably walk or bike from their house to community destinations such as the grocery store, or the pharmacy.
- ...walking, biking, and taking the bus are the preferred choice for students and adults living or working in Burlington, all year round.
- ...Burlington’s transportation network continuously improves our local economy and quality of life, leading people to stay in Burlington and invest in our community.

These goals, the vision, and the related projects for planBTV Walk Bike were unanimously endorsed by the Public Works Commission at the October 2016 meeting.

As we implement this plan and consider projects that may change the balance of space, the questions to ask should not be limited to, “What will happen to traffic or parking?” but, **“What will happen if we provide attractive, low-stress options in this corridor? What are the outcomes for transportation access and choice? Will these changes reduce peak hour traffic capacity or parking demand?”** Walk / bike projects do need to be coupled with other land use and urban design policies; together these instigate a sustainable cycle of investments that reinforce the sustainable transportation investments critical for our community.

At some points, implementation of planBTV Walk Bike will require reallocation of space. This **reallocation should not be considered in isolation but in the context of our guiding principles for building safe streets:**

- » ACCESS + MOBILITY FOR ALL
- » ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- » SAFETY + SECURITY
- » LAND USE CONTEXT
- » CLIMATE CONSIDERATIONS
- » COMFORT
- » CONNECTIVITY
- » ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- » ACTION! (RAPID IMPLEMENTATION, TESTING)

Project Introduction

PlanBTV Walk Bike is both visionary and action-based. The projects were prioritized based on community input, coordination with other projects (which may include phasing to avoid several projects in the same area), and funding options. During the community outreach for PlanBTV Walk Bike, the community identified protected bike lanes and connected, continuous bicycle networks with safer and easier intersection crossings as the top priorities for bicycling improvements. **To accomplish this, new facility types have been introduced including Neighborhood Greenways.**

Neighborhood Greenways are streets with low vehicle volumes and speeds, designed to prioritize bicycling and enhance conditions for walking, while increasing safety for the road. These are streets where people of all ages and abilities feel safe walking and biking. To create this condition, Neighborhood Greenways use a variety of the calming and placemaking treatments, including traffic calming for travel speeds under 20 miles per hour, clear wayfinding for people walking and biking, pavement markings to reinforce the shared use of the street, protected crossings at major streets, and green elements as planters or rain gardens.

Neighborhood Greenways are a type of low-stress bicycle. Other low-stress facilities include protected bike lanes and separated paths. **To keep these routes low-stress, point of connection needs to be attainable for people of all ages and abilities.**



Old North End Neighborhood Greenway

The Old North End (ONE), like much of Burlington, has a fragmented network of north-south routes for bicycling but has no east-west routes. At the same time, the ONE has ideal topography, demographics, and walkable neighborhood centers to prioritize an east-west route. The ONE Neighborhood Greenway begins and ends by connecting UVM's campus with Battery Park and the Waterfront, utilizing 1.15 miles of low volume, appealing residential streets along most of its length.


The ONE Greenway will fill a need for a safe, enjoyable east-west bikeway that is parallel and in between North Street and Pearl Street. North Street and Pearl Street do provide options for continuous east-west connections,

but they are commercial / mixed use corridors with higher traffic volumes, commercial parking, extensive transit service, and many competing interests for the limited space on streets and sidewalks.

The ONE Greenway follows neighborhood streets that are not continuous: Sherman Street, Peru Street, Grant Street, and Loomis Street. To connect the ONE Greenway, crucial connections are needed along higher volume roadways: Sherman Street at its western end, North Champlain Street, Elmwood Avenue, and North Union Street. Without clear, protected facilities on these roadways the ONE Greenway cannot be implemented as a continuous low-stress route.

To achieve our vision and take action, many initial projects will be installed using fast, flexible materials and strategies. The ONE Greenway will initially be installed with quick-build materials: paint, planters, and flexible materials that can be adjusted and relocated as needed. Most Greenway components will not have a regulatory impact and will share the existing roadway. **Regulatory changes will be required for continuity at several key locations. Some changes have already been approved on Sherman Street (between Battery Street / Park Street and North Champlain Street) and on North Champlain Street (between Sherman Street and Peru Street), and are pending for North Union Street (between Grant Street and Loomis Street).**

Union Street between Grant Street and Loomis Street



Union Street

Existing

- 27' wide one-way northbound
- Parking on west side (metered near College Street and “resident only” from Buell to Pearl Street)
- 5' wide northbound bike lane on east side with a 2' painted buffer (will remain and be improved as a quick-build protected bike lane for use all seasons)
- This area will be included in the upcoming Winooski Avenue Corridor Study

ONE Greenway Integration:

Provide low-stress connections between low-volume streets

- Repurpose ½ block of parking for protected southbound contra-flow bicycle lane on west side (to be maintained through all seasons)
- Retain 12' travel lane



Public Input

Anna Wyner

From: Tim Banks <tim@tim-banks.com>
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2017 12:14 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: Parking Change Feedback

I support the removal of 10 parking spaces on Union Street (between Grant and Loomis).

I also think the new Grant Street speed bumps need to be painted, since they are not very high to begin with and cars rarely slow down for them.

thanks

Tim Banks
85 Grant Street

Anna Wyner

From: Hannah Langsdale <hannah.langsdale@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2017 11:08 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: Proposed parking change

Hello Ms. Wyner,

I am a resident on Loomis St and I am writing to discourage you from removing 10 parking spaces in our neighborhood. Parking in this area is already extremely difficult. My apartment does not have any off street parking, and during the school year it takes much, much longer to find a spot than it should. I get off of work at 7pm, and at that time I can expect it will take at least 20 minutes to find a parking spot. It wastes gas to drive in circles and it is certainly frustrating. Removing 10 of our precious parking spaces would have a negative impact on me and my neighbors on Loomis St. I hope you will reconsider this course of action.

Sincerely,
Hannah Langsdale

Phone Call – June 16th, 2017

- Resident on 20 Loomis Street, Ben Gold
- Concerned about the loss of 10 parking spots
- Believes there is already limited parking in the area
- Would like to see more parking in area

Timestamp	Name	Email	Address	Do you have any comments?	Phone number	Username
2017/06/02 10:41:14 AM AST	Diemer Properties	diemerproperties@yahoo.com	83 -85-97 N Union St 5 Loomis 86 N UNion	We 100 % disagree with taking away more parking on N Union. As it is, everyday, people who work in downtown Burlington park on N Union St (and the surrounding streets). They then proceed to walk to work (most likely due to large parking fees). This happens day and night. We can not afford to take away any more parking spots. Additionally, I would like to comment that Bikers ride the wrong way on N Union all the time.This is very dangerous, and I do not feel anything would be improved. Thank you.	8029512457	diemerproperties@yahoo.com
2017/06/06 1:03:10 PM AST	Ginny Kolbenson	loomis_properties@hotmail.com	18 River Bend lane, Westford, VT 05494	Please do not take any more parking spaces away. I manage a property on N. Union Street w/ ZERO off street parking spaces available. Their only option is to park on the street. I hear constant complaints from them - that they are parking blocks and blocks away (sometimes at 1:00 or 2:00 am - when they get off work). People who work in downtown Burlington are often seen parking on N. Union Street (Hickok, Converse Court, Loomis, Etc.) and walk to work (I assume to avoid the high fees of parking downtown - and I don't blame them). Losing additional parking spaces should not be considered as an option. Parking is VERY limited as it is in Burlington	802-343-3376	loomis_properties@hotmail.com

2017/06/06 1:23:08 PM AST	Doug	dgboyden@gmail.com	77 N Union St	This is a bad idea. parking is already tough enough around here. People have to walk blocks from parking spot to home. Young women at night, after work needing to walk blocks from their cars to their apartments is not safe anymore in Burlington. N Union is one way for bikes Northbound, N Winooski is Southbound. What is wrong with that?	802 363-8084	dgboyden@gmail.com
2017/06/06 1:24:40 PM AST	Elizabeth	lizzijanecota@gmail.com	97 north union street	Do NOT take that parking away! So unnecessary!	8029896523	lizzijanecota@gmail.com
2017/06/06 1:25:01 PM AST	John Consiglio	jconsigliowork@gmail.com	8 Loomis St	I already have to park 2 blocks from my apartment most days. Please don't take away more parking. There is barely any parking as it is.		jconsigliowork@gmail.com
2017/06/06 1:25:03 PM AST	Lindsey	lindseyrichards125@gmail.com	77 N. Union Street	Street is not ideal, especially for all of those who need to park on the street near their home. There is already a bike lane on the street that people often ride in both directions on. I have noticed that people ride each direction in the lane and I make sure to pay attention to that while I'm driving to ensure the safety of bikers. I don't see a need for a second bike lane along this road, especially if the lane will only be about 10 parking spots long, that seems wasteful.		lindseyrichards125@gmail.com
2017/06/06 1:30:01 PM AST	Jamie Panton	Jamie.panton@dealer.com	2A Hickok Place	This is frustrating as a tenant who works late during the week and has limited parking space. There is very limited parking on North Union and it's neighboring streets. I personally feel unsafe walking from my car to apartment during the evenings when i unfortunately can't find a spot near my home.	802-735-6738	jamie.panton@dealer.com
2017/06/06 1:43:49 PM AST	Lily Abrams	lgabrams@uvm.edu	86 N Union St	I believe that parking should remain on N Union St due to the limited parking at apartments and in Burlington	216-402-3053	lgabrams@uvm.edu

2017/06/06 1:54:33 PM AST	Jenna	jjanes@uvm.edu	127 north union st	I don't think there should be another bike lane as it is taking away parking spots from residents in the neighborhood, where would they park if they do not have a drive way or friends would like to come visit? I do not support the removal of the ten spots		jjanes@uvm.edu
2017/06/06 2:28:17 PM AST	Ashley Lipton	ashleyblipton@gmail.com	65 North union st #3	Please do not remove parking there is already no where for guests to park unless you plan to open up additional parking on Loomis or grant. I am a bike commuter and can emphasize with both sides but there is already a very small amount of parking for visitors in the neighborhood.	5169872380	ashleyblipton@gmail.com
2017/06/06 2:42:46 PM AST	Jordan haenel	jordan.haenel@gmail.com	6 Hickok place apt A	This is one of the only places we can find parking that isnt far away, please don't get rid of this parking!!!	18023245248	jordan.haenel@gmail.com
2017/06/06 3:04:59 PM AST	Patrick Wiencek	wiencek.patrick@gmail.com	4 Hickok Place, Burlington, VT	Removing some of the already difficult to come by parking spaces downtown would significantly hinder my desire to continue living in Burlington. I already minimize the use of personal automotive transportation whenever possible, and I don't think we should be penalized in this way when bikers already use this road without a bike lane.		wiencek.patrick@gmail.com
2017/06/06 3:47:54 PM AST	Daniela Marchione	dmmarchi@uvm.edu	4 Loomis street Burlington vt	myself and my friends and family use parking and would NOT like a new bike lane!!	617-257-1083	dmmarchi@uvm.edu

2017/06/06 4:02:49 PM AST	Jake Ermolovich	jermolov@uvm.edu	4 Hickok place	Since our parking spots are already limited, taking away any street parking would be detrimental to the residents within the area. Any potential benefit that would come from taking away these spots can be outweighed by the communities need to park within a respectable distance from their abode. If people are forced to park further away from their house that would increase the risk of being harassed or assaulted late at night after coming home from work or other responsibilities.		Jermolov@uvm.edu
2017/06/06 4:31:28 PM AST	Devon Hoar	dhoar13@gmail.com	97 N Union St	Please don't remove the parking spots. People need to park near their house for safety's sake and peace of mind. Thank you.	8026816518	dhoar13@gmail.com
2017/06/06 4:49:39 PM AST	Micaela O'Mara	momara@uvm.edu	127 North Union Street	There does not need to be two lanes for bike traffic. This takes away from the parking spaces in front of my own house.	5187918272	momara@uvm.edu
2017/06/06 4:51:56 PM AST	Lillian	seibertlillian@gmail.com	4 loomis	There is not news for an extra bike lane. We need the parking that currently is available.	8023249950	seibertlillian@gmail.com
2017/06/06 7:49:18 PM AST	Alexis Nadeau	alexis.m.nadeau@gmail.com	83 N Union st #4	I rely on having a parking space at North Union. This parking availability contributed to my reason to rent my current apartment. It will be very unfortunate if it is removed.		alexis.m.nadeau@gmail.com

2017/06/06 9:01:18 PM AST	Katie	ktnash94@gmail.com	77 N Union St	I currently live on N Union. It is very hard to find parking spots on that street and the streets surrounding it. This would really add to the problem of finding a spot to park because Burlington, especially this section of Burlington, has already few too parking spaces. I agree that bike paths are great and important for this town. But there is already a bike path on this street that is big enough for two way traffic. Please consider that many would have problems with this decision. Thank you.	5087355311	ktnash94@gmail.com
2017/06/06 9:26:39 PM AST	James Danahy	jkdanahy@gmail.com	8A Hickock Place			jkdanahy@gmail.com
2017/06/06 11:37:46 PM AST	Morgan Schwartz	mjschwartz96@gmail.com	86 N Union Street Burlington VT 05405	please do not take away the parking spots	6315604788	mjschwartz96@gmail.com
2017/06/07 1:15:01 AM AST	Nick	neddysansai@gmail.com	85 north Union Street Burlington VT	Do not take away Street parking on North Union. Burlington has limited parking as it is, and during the winter snow bans and high traffic times it is difficult enough to find a place to park one's car. Bikes are an important mode of transportation to many Burlington residents, however, allowing two way traffic for bikes on a one way street at the expense of existing parking is an unreasonable use of the limited available space.	301-356-3873	neddysansai@gmail.com
2017/06/07 1:43:52 AM AST	Tzega Malpica	tsmalpica@gmail.com	85 North Union Street, #2, Burlington, VT, 05401	While I very much respect the safety and rights of cyclists, the availability of parking options in Burlington are already very limited. To do away with parking on a one way street that already has a bike lane seems unnecessary, ill advised, and incredibly inconvenient for many of the residents on the street.	4843565178	tsmalpica@gmail.com

2017/06/07 12:21:08 PM AST	Jacob Hinsdale	hinsdaleproperties@gmail.com	93 North Union Street #2	This would severely impact myself, and my neighbors. The parking in Burlington is restrictive enough with our artificially lowering the stock in the neighborhoods. The problem of wrong way cyclists is not severe enough, by any stretch, to justify this extreme measure.	802-233-9995	hinsdaleproperties@gmail.com
2017/06/07 1:06:59 PM AST	Rebecca	romanrebb@gmail.com	118 north union st	I do not like this plan. The parking downtown for apartment is already so limited and having it available for homes on northunion and shorter side streets is important for safety at night and general convience. As a biker myself, it is not a problem having the one bike lane on the street. There is already one going the opposite direction along N Winooski, a block over which is quite conviennent itself. Please keep the parking on north union.		romanrebb@gmail.com
2017/06/07 3:07:36 PM AST	Hayley	hayley.robertson@uvm.edu	131 Buckingham Avenue, Toronto, ONT, Canada	Parking is so limited! We really don't need another bike lane, barely anyone uses the current one. Isn't one enough? Hope you keep the parking spaces!	802-922-7428	hayley.robertson@uvm.edu

Department of Public Works

645 Pine Street, Burlington, VT

www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

[802-863-9094](tel:802-863-9094)

Our Mission: To steward Burlington's infrastructure and environment by delivering efficient, effective, and equitable public services.

From: Lawrence Smith [mailto:wlbsmithvt@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 8:45 PM

To: Chapin Spencer <cspencer@burlingtonvt.gov>

Subject: N. Union St Parking

Chapin,

Thanks for taking the time to talk with me this evening. As I said in the conversation, Laura and I want very much to be supportive of improved biking in Burlington, but we are also concerned for our tenants, and our real estate investment. Our property is at 67 N. Union which is one building north from the corner of Union and Grant. We do not have any opportunity for off street parking on our property, and our tenants rely on being able to find reasonably convenient on street parking. Unfortunately the 10 spaces that are proposed to be eliminated are right in front of our property, in a neighborhood where parking is already tight.

Currently, Grant St is designated neighborhood parking and is not available to our tenants. One option would be to establish a way for our property to have access to Grant St. parking permits. I think a better option would be to create a neighborhood parking zone that would include North St. from Pearl to North, and Grant St. from Union to Winooski Ave.. This would make the local parking available to the residents who need the ability to park near where they live.

The impact of removing 10 parking spaces from this high density neighborhood is significant, and creating a neighborhood parking zone would help offset the impact of this change.

Thanks again for taking the time to look at this for us, and I look forward to hearing back from you soon.

I will follow up mid week next week if I have not heard back from you.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 11:40 AM
To: Chapin Spencer
Cc: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: Support for ONE Wiggle

FYI

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Matthew Vaughan [<mailto:vaughanmatt@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 11:27 AM
To: Justine Sears <justinesears@yahoo.com>; Tiki-Jon Archambeau <tarchambeau@burlingtonvt.gov>; Solveig Overby <soverby@burlingtonvt.gov>; Robert Alberry <ralberry@burlingtonvt.gov>; Christopher Gillman <cgillman@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jeffrey Padgett <jpadgett@burlingtonvt.gov>; James Barr <jbarr@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc: Max Tracy <maxwell.k.tracy@gmail.com>; Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jason Van Driesche <jason@localmotion.org>; Jane Knodell <janeknodell@burlingtontelecom.net>
Subject: Support for ONE Wiggle

Hello DPW Commissioners!

I heard about the ONE Wiggle re-vote. I am hopeful that the DPW Commission will continue to be responsive to the wishes of the folks who live in the ONE and support the project. West-East bicycle connectivity is a top priority for residents of the ONE.

I will be out of town on July 19 so I've asked DPW if there is a way to call in to provide public comment.

You may remember that I provided a public comment at the first ONE Wiggle vote. Here are some points I'd like to add to that comment:

- People who live and work in the ONE are overwhelmingly in support of this project in its entirety. As far as I know, we have only seen opposition from landlords who do not live in the neighborhood, and their tenants who they have rallied. As a key part of PlantBTV Walk-Bike, this project is the result of over two years of public input, public workshops, community engagement at public events, city-wide surveys, and research on successes in other cities.

- The landlords who spoke were framing the removal of free public street parking as a loss for their property. In response:

*This change may be difficult for their current tenants, but I believe future tenants will likely see it as an asset to live directly on a progressive bike route that safely connects them to neighborhood amenities, UVM campus, and the waterfront.

*While storing privately owned cars on public rights of way is a privilege may Burlingtonians enjoy, we learned from public surveys, workshops, and input that there is widespread support for a better balance between bike routes and on-street parking. The residents of ONE I represent have shown support for public streets to be used to move people safely and efficiently on bicycle, not just to store cars while they are not in use.

Thank you for your strong support on this!

Matt Vaughan
PlanBTV Walk-Bike Technical Advisory Committee - Wards 2+3 Representative
PlanBTV Walk-Bike Implementation Committee - Wards 2+3 Representative

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:33 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: Fw: Support for ONE Wiggle Project

For the project file.

Thanks.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: jbvillani@gmail.com <jbvillani@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:31:57 AM
To: Nicole Losch
Subject: Support for ONE Wiggle Project

Hello,

I live in the Old North End and I fully support the ONE Wiggle project in its entirety! Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Jessica Villani

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 7:56 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: I support the ONE Wiggle project!

I almost missed this one earlier, but this is also for the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Dana Lutters [<mailto:danalutters@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:55 AM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: I support the ONE Wiggle project!

Hello,
I live in the Old North End and I fully support the ONE Wiggle project in its entirety! Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
Dana Lutters, Pomeroy St.

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 10:30 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: ONE wiggle project

For the project file.

Thanks.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: John Oliver [<mailto:johnmiltonoliver@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 8:58 AM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: ONE wiggle project

Hello,

I live in the Old North End and I fully support the ONE Wiggle project in its entirety! Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

John Oliver
Pomeroy St.

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Paul Plunkett <paul@tiolipropertiesvt.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 8:15 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: Removal of 10 parking spots on North Union Street

Hi Anna,

I own two residential buildings on North Union Street at 76 and 80. 76 North Union Street is a 75 year old structure originally built as an 8 unit apartment building and 80 North Union Street is a 75 year old former single family home that now houses four students. The two properties combined house 30 UVM and Champlain College students.

The total number of on-site parking spots for the two properties are a total of 7. Removing 10 on-street parking spaces directly across North Union Street from 76 and 80 North Union will pose a significant impact to our tenants ability to park their vehicles anywhere close to their apartment. More than half of the tenants in the two buildings are female. This loss of parking poses not only a convenience issue for parking but a safety issue. Having to walk several blocks from your parked car to the apartment especially during the winter months will pose a walking hazard and a personal safety issue(especially after dark for our female tenants).

I respectfully request that DPW go back to the drawing board and develop a plan that will not remove the number of parking spaces currently slated to be removed and ask that you locate the spaces removed in a less densely populated rental area. We purchased 76 and 80 North Union knowing that we had limited parking spaces on-site but did not anticipate losing 10 on-street spaces as you are proposing. Your proposal is creating a significant hardship to our tenants.

I have requested the tenants of 76 and 80 North Union e-mail you directly. I hope that you will hear from them as we hear from them weekly the challenges they are having with parking on and around 76 and 80 North Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Plunkett
Managing Member
Tioli Properties, LLC
PO Box 4398
Burlington, VT 05406-4398
paul@tiolipropertiesvt.com
802-343-1939

 COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE 149 CHURCH STREET • ROOM 32 • CITY HALL • BURLINGTON, VT 05401 (802) 865-7144 • (802) 865-7024 (FAX) www.burlingtonvt.gov/cedo		
Noelle MacKay Director, Community & Economic Development Office	Chapin Spencer Director, Public Works Norman J. Baldwin, P.E. Asst. Director Public Works	David E White, AICP Director, Planning & Zoning Department

MEMO

TO: DPW Commission

FROM: Kirsten Merriman Shapiro, Senior Policy and Project Specialist, CEDO
Laura K. Wheelock P.E., Public Works Engineer
Meagan E Tuttle, AICP, Principal Planner, Planning and Zoning

RE: Great Streets Initiative – July 2017 St. Paul Street Parking Modifications

DATE: July 19, 2017

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt the following preliminary revisions to the Burlington Code of Ordinance, Appendix C:

1. Diagonal parking on the east side of St. Paul Street between Main Street and King Street shall become parallel parking.
2. The existing “No Parking” areas on St. Paul Street between Main Street and Maple Street shall be revised to accommodate pedestrian bumpouts, storm water features, and drive entrances based on the St. Paul Street Conceptual Plan and approximate distances listed as follows:
 - a. 110 feet south of Main Street on the east side of St. Paul Street.
 - b. 30 feet south of the exit drive for 111 Main Street on the west side of St. Paul Street.
 - c. 65 feet in the middle of the block for a bumpout on the east side of St. Paul Street in front of 194 St. Paul Street.
 - d. 30 feet to the north of the southernmost drive for 193 St. Paul Street on the west side of St. Paul Street.

DPW/Project Team will return to the Commission at a future date to provide final ordinance language once the design is closer to 100% to memorialize the recommendations in this memo.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

This material is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities. To request an accommodation, please call 802.863.9094 (voice) or 802.863.0450 (TTY).

BACKGROUND:

The Department of Public Works (DPW), along with the Department of Planning and Zoning, and Community Economic and Development Office have been working over the past year to advance the Great Streets Initiative. In June of 2017, the project managers presented a concept plan for St. Paul Street to the Transportation Energy and Utility Committee, the DPW Commission, and City Council for review and comment, and for an endorsement to move forward with more detailed design.

The St. Paul Street concept plan seeks to provide significant improvements to the streetscape in these two blocks of St. Paul Street, balancing pedestrian facilities, vehicular travel and parking, storm water treatment, and mature tree growth. The key design modification to achieve this balance is the change from diagonal parking to parallel parking on St. Paul Street between Main Street and King Street. According to the concept plan, the conversion of parking and creation of storm water features will result in a change from 52 to 45 on-street spaces in these two blocks.

OBSERVATIONS:

1. St. Paul Street currently experiences high pedestrian volumes for which the existing pedestrian facilities are inadequately sized to meet the level of service needed for safety and mobility. Further, the addition of Champlain College's Eagles Landing project between King and Maple is anticipated to increase pedestrian volumes on St. Paul Street.
2. Parking spaces lost throughout the two blocks under the concept plan is a net of 7 spaces.
 - a. 9 spaces are lost on the east side of St. Paul from Main to King
 - b. 2 spaces are added on the west side of St. Paul from King to Maple
 - c. No change in number of spaces on the other block faces.

St. Paul Street Parking Spaces Existing vs. Proposed	West Side of Street	East Side of Street
Main – King Existing	12	20
Main – King Proposed	12	11
King – Maple Existing	8	12
King – Maple Proposed	10	12

3. Additional public parking spaces are anticipated to be available within the project area as a result of the construction of Champlain College's Eagles Landing project. In particular, this project is anticipated to contribute a net increase of 25 parking spaces available on nights and weekends over what had previously existed at the Brown's Court parking lot.
4. Parking revenue from the change to parking is difficult to estimate at this phase of design. Within the project area the proposed parking changes would remove 9 blue meters from the east side of St. Paul Street between Main St. and King St.; and add 2 blue meters on the west side of St. Paul Street between King St. and Maple St under our existing meter designations. However with the reconfiguration of the street, and associated improvements to each block, a parking strategy for the improved blocks of St. Paul Street and surrounding area will need to be developed. The

strategy will be based on the Downtown Parking and Transportation Management plan and will look to:

- a. Balance the distribution of lost meters into the existing network within the project limits and areas adjacent to the project.
 - b. Strategize meter locations to match the demand and utilization of available parking spaces.
 - c. Minimize any potential loss of revenue into the Traffic Fund.
5. The truck loading spaces and the accessible space within the project area will be retained under the new design; with possible adjustments to their location where the design can provide improvements to these spaces.
6. Public outreach to the neighboring businesses and residents has resulted in positive feedback for the concept plan with support for the change in parking from diagonal to parallel. Outreach included:
- a. Individual meetings with key stakeholders: Burlington Business Association, Flynn Center for Performing Arts, Champlain College, Trattoria Delia/Pizza Verita.
 - b. Two neighborhood meetings were held for businesses and residents to attend, during which the team spoke with several of the other key businesses in the project area, including but not limited to: Gryphon, VHFA, Planned Parenthood, Mad River Distillery, and O'M Salon.
 - c. DPW also sent two mailings to the businesses and residents to provide notice of the neighborhood meeting, subsequent TEUC and DPW Commission meetings where the concept would be presented and discussed, as well as a following mailing seeking comments.
 - d. Feedback received from the meetings and outreach was strongly supportive of the concept plan and desire to have the improvements already been made. Concerns expressed at the public and individual meetings focused around construction impacts for businesses, access during construction, and duration of the work. The Burlington Business Association expressed concerns how this parking loss will be tracked and impact on the downtown.

CONCLUSIONS:

The parking changes included in the concept plan for St. Paul Street from Main to Maple provide significant improvements to the safety for pedestrians throughout this corridor, with appropriately-sized sidewalks and enhanced crossings. The design will provide storm water treatment for the street runoff, and adequate soil volumes for street trees to thrive in an urban environment. Parking is still accommodated on all block faces within the project area, and vehicular travel is unchanged. The modest loss of parking is outweighed by the significant improvements to other modes of transportation and the environmental benefits the concept plan provides.


If you have additional questions please contact me directly:

Laura Wheelock, lwheelock@burlingtonvt.gov or 802-540-0397

Attachments

- 1) Concept Plan
- 2) Neighborhood Meeting Attendance List

St Paul Street- Main to King- Concept B



St. Paul Street Presentation June 6, 2017

St Paul Street- King to Maple - Concept B



Neighborhood Meeting Attendance - St. Paul Street Concept Plan Presentation - June 6th 8:30am and 5:00pm

NAME	BUSINESS NAME	ADDRESS
Karen Mendes	First Baptist Church	81 Saint Paul St.
Neil Gadsberg	Mad River Distillers	
Lori Gilding	VHFA	
Steve Groulund	VHFA	
John Killacky	Flynn	153 Main St.
Don Patrick O'Connell	Owner O'Msalom	171 St. Paul St.
Serena Magnan		171 St. Paul St.
Jack Galt	Flynn	153 Main St.
Tony Redington		20 North Winooski Ave.
Alten Stringer	LCRCC	
Paige Chadwick	The Gryphon	
Steve Smith		117 St. Paul St.
Bren		117 St. Paul St.
Brad Kelley	Burlington Wine Shop	
Jack Daggitt		161 St.Paul #103



CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF PLANNING
645 PINE STREET, SUITE A
BURLINGTON, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY
WWW.BURLINGTONVT.GOV

CHAPIN SPENCER
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

NORMAN J. BALDWIN, P.E.
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

Date: July 12, 2017

To: Public Works Commission
From: Norman J. Baldwin, P.E. *NJB*
City Engineer/Ass't Director of Public Works

C.C. Chapin Spencer, Director of Public Works

Subject: Request to Repeal and Replace Access Management Driveway Standards

The Department is seeking to improve our engineering standards. As the City department responsible for the stewardship our street network, it is important to have access management standards in place to preserve the safety and flow of traffic on our street network.

At the April 2017 Commission Meeting staff presented Driveway Access Standards for their consideration which we adopted that same evening.

The current standards follow the Vermont Agency of transportation Access Management Program Guidelines, with the following exceptions

Use	Current City Standard	State of Vermont Standards
Single Family Home	12' Max	12' Min., 24' Max.
Small Apartment Complex(<10 trips/Peak Hour)	16' Max	24' Min., 40' Max.
Commercial Properties(Single Unit Vehicles<5 Trip/Peak Hour)	20' Min., 30'Max	24' Min., 40'' Max

Staff applies these standards through our:

- Excavation Inspectors process of reviewing and issuing curb cut permits.
- Or Engineering staff participating in a Development Review Process, providing technical review.

Shortly after the April adoption of these driveway standards, we had encountered an issue with a property on Staniford Road in which is a Single Family, Owner Occupied Home that a two bay garage proximal to the public right of way under construction that requires a curb cut permit to have access to their garage.

Under the current Driveway Standards the property owner would only be entitled to a 12' curb cut. With a 12' curb cut the property owner would be challenged to gain access to both bays in their newly constructed garage.

The current standard was modeled around our more dense urban areas and did not

- take into account the range of properties throughout the City,
An Equal Opportunity Employer

This material is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities. To request an accommodation, please call 802.863.9094 (voice) or 802.863.0450 (TTY).

- nor did it provide administrative flexibility for staff to take into consideration the challenges staff and the public would encounter in meeting the spirit and intent of providing safe access to our roadway network.

In revisiting this issue staff reviewed

- Vermont Agency of Transportation, “Access Management Program Guidelines”
- Vermont Agency of Transportation, “Standards for Residential and Commercial Driveways, Standard B-71”
- Town of Williston, Vermont, “Williston Public Works Standards and Specification”
- Town of Colchester, Vermont, “Colchester Public Works Specifications and Standards”

Background Information:

Town of Colchester

Only one driveway per lot is permitted unless more are approved by the Public Works Department. More than one driveway may be approved in cases where public traffic circulation patterns or safety will be enhanced. All road pavement cuts in existing roads shall be performed in accordance with Chapter 13 of the Town of Colchester ordinances entitled Streets and Sidewalks. Driveway aprons accessing paved streets shall be either Asphalt or concrete.

Any access serving five or more residential dwellings; or other residential, retail, commercial and/or industrial access deemed by the Public Works Director to benefit the public health, safety and general welfare, shall be developed and constructed in accordance with these Public Works Specifications.

Return radii and driveway width shall be minimum necessary to accommodate the Town's fire equipment and appropriate design vehicle for anticipated use.

It is the Town's intent to limit the number of traffic conflict locations and maximize safety of the traveling public by reviewing and implementing access management practices.

Unless a shared driveway is proposed, driveways shall be located as far apart as possible. Before approval is granted for the location and size of new or reconstructed driveways, the town will review and consider the following in an effort to enhance access management.

- Minimizing the number of access points
- Spacing of access points
- Potential for shared access with adjoining properties
- Size of lot and ability to provide access
- Grades of access and roadway
- Pedestrian traffic
- Speed of roadway
- Number of traffic lanes and shoulder width
- Proximity to adjacent intersection (see Figure 3.11)
- Traffic volumes
- Sight distance (see Figure 3.13)

Town of Williston

A maximum of two (2) rear lots without public road frontage may be served by a private driveway. Additionally, a private driveway may replace direct road access for two (2) abutting lots with existing public road frontage (60 foot minimum frontage).

Driveways shall comply with the requirements on the Typical Residential Drive Detail and Profile, and sight distances for a private driveway shall comply with the most recent V.A.O.T. Standard B-71.

Staff Conclusions:

It is staff's position:

- It makes good sense to adopt the States of Vermont's standards of practice given many our roadways receive State and Federal Support.
- State of Vermont's process of adopting these standards follow industry standards of practice that have had extensive technical research and public vetting.
- To ensure the rural and urban municipal context is properly represented in staff's research, Driveway and Access Management Standards were gathered from two peer communities Williston and Colchester.
- The same general technical relational framework of how driveway access has the potential to affect safety and mobility along a right of way corridor is understood and expressed by the State of Vermont, and neighboring communities.
 - The spacing of driveway and how it interrupts all modes of mobility along a roadway corridor.
 - How each access creates a point of conflict
 - Though access is necessary, access must be given judiciously with careful consideration to the effect access has on safety.
 - The sizing of driveway access points need to meet the demonstrated need to successfully active the adjacent land uses.
 - There are countless scenarios that exist and the standards adopted need to be flexible to appropriately balance the competing interests.
- Repealing the existing Driveway Standards is necessary
- Adopting the two VTRANS as reference Guidance and Design Documents will be necessary for preserving, Improving public safety, and allowing reasoned access to properties.
 - "Access Management Program Guidelines"
 - "Standards for Residential and Commercial Driveways, Standard B-71"
- A transparent, flexible, local decision making process must be in place to support the application of these general design principles. Daily decision making will rest with the Excavation Inspector, with an opportunity to appeal the decisions of the Excavation Inspector to the City Engineer.

Staff Request:

Seeking the Public Works Commission to adopt the following:

- The City will make use of the most current Vermont Agency of Transportation, "Access Management Program Guidelines", "Standards for Residential and Commercial Driveways, Standard B-71" as guiding documents in our review and permitting of driveway cuts. The reference documents are meant to assist and not bind the judgement of professional staff in their decision making. (see attached reference documents)
- The public will be provided an opportunity to appeal staff decisions related to access management to the City Engineer.

If there are any further questions please feel free to give me a call. I will be at the meeting to answer any questions you may have.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION

**ACCESS MANAGEMENT
PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Defining

*Access
Management*



“a process that provides or manages access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity needs, and speed.”

Utilities & Permits Unit
Program Development Division

July 1, 1999

Rev July 17, 2000

Rev Nov 15, 2001 (Category 4 & Table 1-1 changes)

Rev. July 22, 2005

THE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PROCESS:

Page

INTRODUCTION	3
BENEFITS OF ACCESS MANAGEMENT	4
PRINCIPALS OF ACCESS MANAGEMENT	4
CONSEQUENCES OF NOT MANAGING ACCESS	4-5
STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS	5

THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM & STANDARDS:

PURPOSE & DEFINITION	6-10
ACCESS CATEGORY STANDARDS	11-23
DESIGN STANDARDS & SPECIFICATIONS	24-33

THE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Introduction

The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VAOT) uses the process of *access management* to manage access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity, and speed. Communities have been encouraged to employ the principles and techniques of access management during site plan review. The process of access management is a cooperative effort on the part of the local zoning and planning agencies and the VAOT.

Access management balances mobility and access. As communities grow, it is sometimes difficult to get the most value from each parcel of land as it is developed. For example, property that does not abut a public street or highway is referred to as "landlocked." The value of the landlocked property is usually much lower than property with direct access to a public road or street. On the other hand, parcels with driveways too close to an intersection are not easily accessed if traffic frequently backs up and blocks the entrance. Clearly, the property has a much higher value if its driveway **locations are well planned and designed**. So the goal of access management is to achieve a safe and efficient flow of traffic along a roadway while preserving reasonable access to abutting properties. Achieving this goal requires a careful balancing act in the application of access design standards and regulations.

Where Access Management is Used

The need for better access management is most obvious in strip commercial areas where driveways are found every few feet. Too many driveways can confuse drivers, who become uncertain as to when turns into or out of driveways will be made. Their existence results in a large number of turning movements and conflicts points, increasing the potential for traffic accidents. In addition, where there are no turn lanes, each turning vehicle slows traffic and reduces the carrying capacity of the road. Unfortunately, once an access management problem is obvious, it is often too late to correct. By managing access to the highway system during project planning stages, safe access can be provided while preserving traffic flow.

Access management can benefit properties in all communities and along all types of roads. Its principles have been a part of roadway design for many years. For example, freeways function to move large volumes of traffic at high speeds for long distances because access is limited. In contrast, residential streets function primarily to provide access to homes.

The key to effective access management is linking appropriate access design to roadway function. Successful access management protects and enhances property values while preserving the public investment in our roads.

The primary design techniques used in access management focus on the control and regulation of the spacing and design of the following:

- ❑ Driveways and streets
- ❑ Medians and median openings
- ❑ Traffic signals
- ❑ Freeway interchanges

Benefits of Access Management

Transportation officials and planners are showing more interest in access management because of increasing traffic congestion, traffic safety issues, and the rising costs of road improvements. Good access management can accomplish the following:

- ❑ Reduce crashes and crash potential.
- ❑ Preserve roadway capacity and the useful life of roads.
- ❑ Decrease travel time and congestion.
- ❑ Improve access to properties.
- ❑ Coordinate land use and transportation decisions.
- ❑ Maintain travel efficiency and related economic prosperity.

Basic Principles of Access Management

Six basic principles are observed in achieving the benefits of access management.

- ❑ Limit the number of conflict points.
- ❑ Separate conflict points.
- ❑ Separate turning volumes from through movements.
- ❑ Locate traffic signals to facilitate traffic movement.
- ❑ Maintain a hierarchy of roadways to function.
- ❑ Limit direct access on higher-speed roads.

Consequences of Not Managing Access

- ❑ The efficiency of our transportation system will deteriorate, and traffic and land use conflicts will also increase.
- ❑ Poorly planned strip commercial development will be encouraged.
- ❑ The number of private driveways will proliferate.

- ❑ The existence of more driveways means more traffic conflicts, crashes, and congestion.
- ❑ The public's investment in Vermont's roadways will be diminished.
- ❑ Roads will have to be widened at great public expense to make up for capacity lost to inefficient traffic operations.
- ❑ The incompatibility of providing land service and traffic service will become more severe.
- ❑ Neighborhood streets will be used to bypass congested intersections.

Existing State and Local Access Management Programs

Good access management is frequently achieved when state and local units of government cooperate in land use and transportation management decisions. There are many examples of access management cooperation between state and local governments in Vermont, and opportunities exist for even greater cooperation.

More local governments in Vermont are developing access management programs. Many new access management efforts are being proactively adopted to head off problems before they occur. This is an important point: The **best access** management programs are launched before problems develop, thereby reducing traffic crashes and preserving existing road capacity. Local access management programs range in sophistication from simple standards that separate and reduce the number of new driveways, to requirements for shared driveways and frontage roads, to remediation programs in areas where access-related problems are severe. Most local access management requirements are embodied in zoning regulations and are based on corridor access management plans.

The VAOT has practiced the principles of access management in varying degrees since the early 1980s through the use of various access management techniques. These techniques have been used on Agency projects and through access permitting to mitigate the effects of development along various segments of highways. With renewed interest in corridor preservation as a method of reducing the need for transportation improvements to increase capacity, the Agency has developed the following Access Management Classification System and Standards. This system will allow the Agency to manage the State highway system in terms of levels of service and functional integrity in a coherent and coordinated manner.

VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION ACCESS MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND STANDARDS

- **PURPOSE & DEFINITIONS**
- **SECTION ONE - ACCESS CATEGORY STANDARDS**
- **SECTION TWO - DESIGN STANDARDS & SPECIFICATIONS**

PURPOSE. The following sections outline an access classification system and standards to ensure consistency in the permitting process. Title 19 V.S.A. Section 1111 provides for the control of vehicular ingress to, and egress from, the State Highway System. In essence, VTrans considers access permit applications and approves or denies access using location and design criteria. VTrans does not intend to deny reasonable entrance and exit to or from property abutting the highway except on limited access highways. All segments of the State Highway System shall be assigned an access category with applicable standards. The classification system and standards are intended to (1) protect and promote safety of the traveling public, (2) provide for the mobility of people and goods by preserving reasonable levels of service (LOS), and (3) preserve the functional integrity of the State Highway System by protecting the public investment in the existing highway infrastructure. The standards for each category provide VTrans with the parameters necessary to apply consistent permitting conditions based on a uniform classification system of all State Highways.

DEFINITIONS. For the purpose of the following sections, these definitions shall apply:

- (1) **"Access"** means a driveway, street, turnout, or other means of providing for the right of access to or from the State Highway System. For the purpose of this system, two one-way accesses to a property may constitute a single connection.
- (2) **"Agency"** means the Vermont Agency of Transportation.
- (3) **"Auxiliary Lane"** means the portion of the roadway adjoining the traveled-way for parking, speed change, turning, weaving, truck climbing, and other purposes supplementary to the through-traffic movement.
- (4) **"Bandwidth"** means a width of time in seconds that a percentage of traffic would flow uninterrupted through a coordinated signal system. The greater the percentage of bandwidth, the higher the roadway capacity.
- (5) **"Change-in-Use"** means a change in the use of the property that results in increased traffic volumes entering and exiting the highway system. The Agency will use the current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers "Trip Generation Manual" (or actual data), to determine projected traffic volume increases. When the proposed use increases trip generation by 25% (either peak hour or daily) and exceeds 100 vehicles per day more than the existing use the Agency may require a change in access configuration or other measures to protect and promote safety and protect the public's investment in the highway infrastructure. Where such additional traffic volumes are projected or the type of vehicles being accommodated by the access changes, the property owner is required to contact the Vermont Agency of Transportation to determine if a new permit application and modifications to existing access(es) will be required. If the Agency determines that the increased traffic generated by the property does not require modifications to the existing permitted access, a new permit application shall not be required. "Change-in-Use" also means a change from residential to commercial use, regardless of trip generation with the exception of "home occupations" as defined in Chapter 117 of Title 24.
- (6) **"Controlled Access Highway"** means a highway or segment of highway where access is allowed at intersections with public roads (at grade) and/or at points designated at the time of project development.
- (7) **"Corner Clearance"** at intersections means the distance from an intersection of a public or private road to the nearest access along the State Highway. This distance is measured from the closest edge of pavement of the intersecting road to the closest edge of pavement of the access measured along the traveled way (through lanes).
- (8) **"Corner Sight Distance"** means the distance measured from a point on the drive

15 feet from the edge of the traveled-way of the adjacent roadway and measured from a height of eye of 3.5 feet on the drive to a height of 3.5 feet on the roadway where the view is unobstructed.

- (9) **"Corridor Access Management Plan"** means a plan defining site specific access management features for a particular roadway segment, developed in coordination with the appropriate local government(s) and adopted by the Agency in cooperation with the appropriate local government(s).
- (10) **"Curb Cut"** means an access or driveway providing ingress and/or egress to or from the State highway system along a "curbed" section of highway.
- (11) **"Develop"** means the partition or division of any tract of land of any size by a person through sale, lease, transfer or any other means by which any interest in or to the land or a portion of the land is conveyed to another person which will require the construction of permanent new or enlarged points of access to a state or town highway.
- (12) **"Directional Median Opening"** means an opening in a restrictive median which provides for U-turn only, and/or left-turn in movements. Directional median openings for two opposing left or "U-turn" movements along one segment of road are considered one directional median opening.
- (13) **"FHWA"** means Federal Highway Administration.
- (14) **"Full Median Opening"** means an opening in a restrictive median designed to allow all turning movements to take place from both the state highway and the adjacent connection.
- (15) **"Intersection"** as used in this section, means an at-grade connection or crossing of a local road or another state highway with a state highway.
- (16) **"Limited Access Facility"** means a street or highway especially designed for through traffic and over, from, or to which owners or occupants of abutting land or other persons have no right or easement of access, light, air, or view by reason of the fact that their property abuts such limited access facility or for any other reason. The right of access may have been donated by the property owner or purchased by the Agency.
- (17) **"Minimum Access Spacing"** means the minimum allowable distance between conforming accesses measured from the trailing edge of one access to the approaching edge of the next access measured along the edge of the traveled way.
- (18) **"Minimum Median Opening Spacing"** means the minimum allowable distance

between openings in a restrictive median to allow for crossing the opposing traffic lanes to access property or for crossing the median to travel in the opposite direction (U-turn). The minimum spacing or distance is measured from centerline of the openings along the traveled-way.

- (19) **"Minimum Signal Spacing"** means the minimum allowable distance or distance in miles between adjacent traffic signals on a State Highway System measured from centerline to centerline of the signalized intersections along the traveled way.
- (20) **"Non-Restrictive Median"** means a median or painted centerline which does not provide a physical barrier between center traffic turning lanes or traffic lanes traveling in opposite directions. This includes highways with continuous center turn lanes and undivided highways.
- (21) **"Permitting Authority"** means the Vermont Agency of Transportation which is authorized to regulate access to the State Highway System.
- (22) **"Reasonable Access"** means the minimum number of connections, direct or indirect, necessary to provide safe ingress and egress to the State Highway System based on the Access Management Classification System, projected connection and roadway traffic volumes, and the type and intensity of the land use. The applicant shall be allowed to submit any site specific information which the applicant deems to be pertinent to the Agency's review of the access permit application.
- (23) **"Restrictive Median"** means the portion of a divided highway or divided driveway physically separating vehicular traffic traveling in opposite directions. Restrictive medians include physical barriers that prohibit movement of traffic across the median such as a concrete barrier, a raised concrete curb and/or island, and a grassed or a swaled median.
- (24) **"State Highway System (SHS)"** means the network of highways that have been functionally classified and which are under the jurisdiction of the State of Vermont, as defined in State Statutes.
- (25) **"Stopping Sight Distance"** means the distance required by a driver of a vehicle, traveling at a given speed, to bring the vehicle to a stop after an object on the roadway becomes visible. It includes the distance traveled during driver perception and reaction times and the vehicle breaking distance.
- (26) **"Traveled Way"** means the portion of roadway for the movement of vehicles, exclusive of shoulders and auxiliary lanes.
- (27) **"Urban"** means any territory within an incorporated area or with frontage on a

highway which is at least 50% built-up with structures devoted to business, industry, or dwellings for a distance of a quarter mile or more.

- (28) **"Urbanizing Area"** means any territory adjacent to an urban area, as described above, and with frontage on a highway which is at least 30-49% built-up with structures devoted to business, industry, or dwellings.

SECTION ONE

ACCESS CATEGORY STANDARDS

1.1 Purpose and Use

- (1) This section provides a six level access control hierarchy of classifications. The levels are called categories. The number, spacing, type, and location of access and traffic signals have a direct and often significant effect on the capacity, speed, and safety of the highway and are limited in a hierarchical method by this six level category system. The design standards within each category are necessary to ensure that the highway will continue to function at the level (category) assigned. Each state highway segment is assigned a category. These assignments are listed in the "State Highway & Class 1 T.H. Access Categories", shown in Appendix 1.
- (2) Traffic signals and their installation are also regulated by the (USDOT) *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* ("MUTCD"). Nothing, in these access category standards, is intended or shall be interpreted as requiring the Agency to authorize a traffic signal or left turn lane at any location. The Agency may, at its discretion, grant an access permit, require design and operational modifications as it deems necessary, restrict one or more turning movements, or deny the access as long as such action does not violate law.
- (3) The existing design of the highway is not required to meet the design standards of the assigned category at the time it is assigned. The goal of all new access permitting and other access design decisions shall be to meet the design standards in this section for the assigned category for the highway or segment of highway.
- (4) On an interim basis, these standards will be applied to sections of highway placed in categories based on Functional Class ("FC") and Average Annual Daily Traffic ("AADT"). In the long term, Access Management Categories will be assigned to segments of highways based on Functional Class, AADT, potential land development characteristics (Zoning & Land Use Plans), Regional Growth Patterns, and existing density of accesses. The Agency may consider some or all of these factors also when applying these standards on an interim basis where there is clearly demonstrated need to consider more than just FC and AADT.

1.2 Deeded Access Rights

Along some sections of federal-aid state highway, access rights may have been reserved and recorded in the legal instrument (deed or condemnation order) by which the limited access facility was established. The property owner so affected may inquire with the Agency about changes or purchase of such rights. The acquisition of access rights by deed or through condemnation is regulated in Title 19 V.S.A. Where the land records recognize a break in access, an access permit consistent with the requirements contained herein is still required for the physical construction and use of a driveway.

1.3 Access to Limited Access Highways

The limited access statute (19 V.S.A. 1703-1708) controls public way access to State highways that are designated "Limited Access" by the Agency. Access permits for public way access to these highways shall not be issued unless prior authorization is obtained pursuant to 19 V.S.A. 1708. Any restrictions or conditions placed on such approvals may be reflected in the access permit.

1.4 Urban Section of Highways

Access to a property, from a State highway, will be denied if the proposed land use is not in conformance with an "Approved" Town Plan.

1.5 Category One

- *Functional Characteristics*

- (1)(a) Purpose: These highways have the capacity for high speed and high volume traffic movements over long distances in an efficient and safe manner, including interstate, interregional, inter-city, and, in larger urban areas, intra-city travel.
- (b) Examples: Federal-aid interstate highways and other limited access highways that have no "at-grade" intersections are typical of this category. These highways have a functional class as Principal Arterials.

- *Design Standards*

- (2) All opposing traffic movements shall be separated by physical constraints such as grade separations and median separators. Access, consisting of directional ramps, shall be suitably spaced and designed to provide the minimum differential between the speed of the through traffic stream and the speed of the merging or diverging vehicles. Location and design of access shall be determined on an individual basis by the Agency in accordance with its authority and federal regulations governing federal-aid highway and design construction. Access to interstate highways must comply with federal regulations and receive Federal Highway Administration approval. Temporary access may be allowed during official emergencies or where directly related to an "interstate type" construction project.

1.6 Category Two

- *Functional Characteristics*

- (1)(a) Purpose: These highways have the capacity for high speed and high volume traffic movements in an efficient and safe manner, providing for interstate, inter-regional, and inter-city, travel needs and some intra-city travel needs. Direct access service to abutting land is subordinate to providing service to through traffic movements.
- (1)(b) Examples: Category two is the highest category that permits any at-grade intersections. Some highways typical of this category are VT 313 in Sunderland, VT 62 in Berlin and Barre, VT 63 in Berlin and Barre, VT 191 in Newport, Wilder State Highway in Hartford, Putney State Highway in Putney, and US 7 between Rutland and Wallingford. These highways are "limited" or "controlled" access highways, and generally fall in the categories of "Other Principal Arterials" and "Major Collectors" for functional classification.

- *Design Standards*

- (2) The design of category two highways should be capable of achieving a posted speed limit of 35 to 45 MPH where signals are present, and 45 to 55 MPH in undeveloped areas. Typical spacing of intersecting streets, roads, and highways shall be planned on intervals of one mile. One-half mile spacing should be permitted only when no reasonable alternative access to the general street system or town highway exists.
- (3) Unless otherwise specifically categorized, all ramps and access roads to the "interstate system" are category two (2).
- (4) Private direct access shall not be permitted unless access to the property was reserved when the limited access facility was established.
- (5) All access provided to a category 2 highway shall be subject to the condition that if the highway is reconstructed to a category one, alternative access may be provided by a frontage road or other means.
- (6) Opposing roadway traffic movements should be separated by physical constraints such as grade separation or a median separator of sufficient design to physically prevent illegal movements.
- (7) Junctions with heavy intersecting traffic volumes should have either grade separations or interchanges.
- (8) Traffic signals should be programmed to allow speeds of 35 to 45 MPH and a desirable bandwidth efficiency of at least 50 percent. Signals at intersections with major cross streets may be programmed to optimize traffic on both streets equally. The efficiency of the signal system should be analyzed including volume, capacity, and level of service calculations.

- (9) When a traffic signal is proposed, the Agency will specify the following:
- (a) The Segment Length.
 - (b) Signal locations (existing and anticipated) by the Agency.
 - (c) Various combinations of cycle length, progression, and speed to be used in achieving minimum band width.
 - (d) Any other conditions the Agency may consider relevant.
 - (e) Analysis/model to be used.

1.7 Category Three

- *Functional Characteristics*

- (1)(a) Purpose: These highways have the capacity for medium to high speeds or medium to high volume traffic movements over medium and long distances in an efficient and safe manner, providing for interregional, inter-city, and intra-city travel needs.
- (b) Examples: Some highways typical of this category are; US 7 (Pownal-Burlington), US 4 (Rutland-Hartford), VT 103 (Rockingham-Rutland), US 2 (Montpelier-Guildhall, VT 100 (Jamaica-Derby), and VT 30 (Brattleboro-Castleton). Direct access is generally allowed, however, the Agency may deny or restrict access. The Agency may permit access without Transportation Board Action except on certain segments of these highways that are designated as "limited access." These highways generally fall into the functional category of "Other Principal Arterials" and are generally NHS routes also. (Other Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials (with greater than 5000 AADT), and Major Collectors on State Highways and Class 1 Town Highways with greater than 5000 AADT are also in this category.)

- *Design Standards*

- (2) The design of all category three highways should be capable of achieving a posted speed limit of 35 to 45 MPH on urbanized signalized segments and preferably 50 MPH in undeveloped areas. A posted speed limit of 35 to 45 MPH in urbanized areas is acceptable where there is little or no possibility of achieving higher speeds.
- (3) Private direct access to the state highway system may be denied when the property in question has other reasonable access or reasonable opportunity to access the general street or town highway system. If the Agency determines that denial of direct access to the state highway would cause unacceptable traffic operation or safety problems at the alternative access location(s) and to the overall traffic flow of the general street system; or the proposed location is consistent with the spacing and public intersection requirements, direct access may be allowed. When direct access is allowed, such access shall continue until such time that some other

reasonable access to a lower function category street or highway is available. The access permit should specify under what circumstances the change would be required, and if known, the future access location and the date the change will be made. No more than one such access shall be allowed to an individual parcel or to contiguous parcels under the same ownership.

- (4) Where local regulations require a secondary access to provide for emergency services, the Agency may allow an emergency access. Such an access shall not be open for non-emergency uses and shall be maintained by the permittee as a closed access except during emergencies and shall be so conditioned in the access permit.
- (5) One or both left turn movements at the access may be permitted if the applicant establishes to the Agency's satisfaction that, (a) the left turn movement would not create unreasonable congestion or safety problems or lower the level of service below Agency policy, and (b) alternatives to the left turn would cause unacceptable traffic operation and safety problems on the general street system. Right turn movement may be restricted if, in the determination of the Agency, the movement creates an unacceptable operational problem or safety hazard.
- (6) Left turns shall be prohibited if a non-traversable median is already established and the proposed opening in the median does not provide the general public any significant benefits to highway traffic operations and safety or would be counter to the purpose of the median
- (7) No additional access rights shall accrue upon the splitting or dividing of existing parcels or contiguous parcels under the same ownership or control. All access to newly created properties shall be provided internally from the existing access or a new access determined by permit application.
- (8) Since intersecting public ways may in time warrant signalization, the Agency requires that all intersecting streets, roads, and highways that allow left turns meet the Agency's signal spacing criteria. Those that do not meet these requirements may be limited to right turns only. [See exception in (10) below.]
- (9) The standard for the spacing of all intersecting public streets, roads, highways, and other accesses that are or may become signalized, shall be at one-fourth mile (urban) and half mile (rural) intervals. For the purpose of achieving good arterial capacity and efficiency and to minimize delays to the traveling public, the desirable bandwidth efficiency for traffic signal progression is 60 percent and the minimum is 40 percent, and can generally be achieved when signals are optimally placed.

- (10) Exceptions to the one-fourth and one-half mile standards shall not be considered or permitted unless the proposal documents that there are no other reasonable alternatives to achieve one-fourth and one-half mile intervals, there is a proven necessity for the intersection, and a study acceptable to the Agency is completed. Where topography and existing conditions make these intervals inappropriate or not feasible, location of the access shall be determined with consideration given to topography, property ownership, unique physical limitations and/or unavoidable or pre-existing historical land use patterns and physical design constraints with every attempt to achieve the one-fourth and one-half mile spacings. The final location should serve as many properties and interests as possible to reduce the need for additional direct access to the State highway.
- (11) Any access that would reduce the optimum highway bandwidth if a traffic signal were installed may be limited to right turns only.
- (12) When a traffic signal is proposed, the Agency will specify the following:
 - (a) The Segment Length.
 - (b) Signal locations (existing and anticipated) by the Agency.
 - (c) Various combinations of cycle length, progression, and speed to be used in achieving minimum band width.
 - (d) Any other conditions the Agency may consider relevant.
 - (e) Analysis/model to be used.
- (13) When an existing access meets the warrants for a traffic signal as defined in the MUTCD and the location does not meet the Agency's requirements for signal spacing, a median separator may be installed or the access designed to direct vehicles into right turns only. These design solutions may not be practicable or feasible where there are physical constraints such as curbs, sidewalks, and lack of rights-of-way. The access may be required to be reconstructed, or relocated, to conform to the signal spacing requirements.

1.8 Category Four

- Functional Characteristics

- (1)(a) Purpose: These highways have the capacity for moderate travel speeds and moderate traffic volumes over medium and short travel distances providing for inter-city, intra-city, and intra community travel needs. There is a reasonable balance between direct access and mobility needs within this category.
- (1)(b) Examples: Highways in this category are generally Minor Arterials, Minor Arterials on Class 1 Town Highways, and Minor Collectors on State highways. Non-limited Access Major Collectors on State Highways and Class I TH's with less than 5000 AADT.

- Design Standards

- (2) The design of all category four highways should be capable of achieving a posted speed limit of 30 to 50 MPH. The posted speed limit shall be used to meet the requirements of this section unless an approved access control plan to improve the highway requires that a higher speed limit be used.
- (3) One access may be allowed from the state highway system to an individual parcel or to contiguous parcels under the same ownership or control where such access will not be unreasonably detrimental to the safety and operation of the highway. Additional access may be provided when the Agency determines that an additional access would not be detrimental to the safety and operation of the highway, and is necessary for the safety and efficient use of the property and additional access would not knowingly cause a hardship to an adjacent property. Where the property has a primary access to the general street or town highway system, any access to the State highway shall be considered as an additional access.
- (4) Where local regulations require a secondary access to provide for emergency services, the Agency may allow an emergency access. Such an access shall not be open for non-emergency uses and shall be maintained by the permittee as a closed access except for emergencies and so conditioned in the access permit.
- (5) Where local regulations require a secondary access to provide for other operational purposes, the Agency will work with the community to determine the extent of need.
- (6) Since intersecting public ways may in time warrant signalization, the Agency requires that all intersecting public ways that allow left turns, meet the signal spacing criteria.
- (7) The standard for the spacing of all intersecting public streets, roads, highways, and other accesses that are or may become signalized shall be at one-fourth mile (urban) or one-half mile (rural) intervals. For the purposes of achieving good arterial capacity and efficiency and to minimize delays to the traveling public, the desirable bandwidth efficiency for traffic signal progression is 60 percent and the minimum is 40 percent. To attain bandwidth efficiency it is often most important to equally space traffic signals as a part of an existing coordinated signal system.
- (8) Exceptions to the one-fourth and one-half mile standards shall not be considered or permitted, unless the proposal documents that there is no other reasonable alternative to achieve the spacing intervals, there is a proven necessity for the intersection and a study acceptable to the Agency. Where topography and existing conditions make one-fourth and one-half mile intervals inappropriate or not feasible, location of the access shall be

determined with consideration given to topography, property ownership, unique physical limitations, and/or unavoidable or pre-existing historical land use patterns and physical design constraints with every attempt to achieve the spacing intervals. The final location should serve as many properties and interests as possible to reduce the need for additional direct access to the State highway.

- (9) Access will generally be allowed in this category and will only be denied when, (a) access spacing cannot be achieved and the property has other reasonable access or, (b) sight distance is severely restricted such that mitigation efforts will not sufficiently reduce the safety hazard created by the access or, (c) the access does not meet acceptable geometric design standards.
- (10) Accesses for adjoining commercial properties will meet access spacing requirements contained herein.
- (11) Turning movements will not be restricted if, (a) the access meets sight distance requirements, (b) auxiliary lane designs are met or, (c) no restrictive median is present.
- (12) The Agency (by permit condition) may restrict turning movements in the future when turning volumes, at the access, significantly increase or volumes of mainline traffic increase such that they cause a change in access category. Left turns shall be prohibited if a non-traversable median is already established and the proposed opening in the median does not provide the general public any significant benefits to highway traffic operations and safety or would be counter to the purpose of the median.

1.9 Category Five

- Functional Characteristics

- (1)(a) Purpose: Category five shall be assigned only to roadways that are designated as frontage or service roads where there is no intended purpose of providing for long distance or high volume traffic movements.
- (1)(b) Examples: Some highways typical of this category are; Norwich State Highway (River Road), Coventry State Highway (Airport Road), and Berlin State Highway (Airport Road). Access needs will take priority over through traffic movements without compromising the public health, welfare, or safety. Providing reasonable and safe access to abutting property is the primary purpose of this access category.

- Design Standards

- (2) One direct access may be allowed from the State highway system to an individual parcel or to contiguous parcels under the same ownership or control where such access will not be detrimental to the safety and operation of the highway.
- (3) Additional access may be allowed when the Agency determines that (a) there will not be any significant safety or operational problems created by the additional access, (b) the spacing meets the Agency's access spacing requirements, and (c) additional access would not knowingly cause a hardship to an adjacent property.
- (4) All turning movements including left turns may be allowed provided adequate safety and design standards are met.
- (5) The existing posted speed limit shall be used in any access permit and design decisions.
- (6) Minimum spacing between signals (300 feet minimum) shall be that which is necessary for the safe operation and proper design of adjacent accesses. Preference in traffic signal timing and operation shall be given to highways and cross-streets of a higher access category or function.

1.10 Category Six (Urban)

- Functional Characteristics

- (1)(a)Purpose: These highways have the capacity for moderate to low travel speeds and moderate to high traffic volumes over medium to short travel distances providing for inter-city, intra-city, and intro-community travel needs. There is a reasonable balance between direct access and mobility needs within this category. Highways in this category may have any functional classification, however, are strictly "urban" in nature.
- (1)(b)Examples: The typical urban section of highway in this category has an existing access density of 40 accesses per mile or greater (total both sides) and a posted speed of 25-40 MPH.

It is within this access category that it often becomes necessary to provide for multiple left turning movements by construction of a section of highway allowing two-way left turn lanes, dedicated left turn lanes for high volume

access or intersections, or median barriers to control the location of left turns. Through the application of the following design standards and the design standards and specifications contained in Section Two, the need for projects to manage left turns will be minimized or controlled by mitigation methods such that favorable levels of services can be preserved.

- Design Standards

- (1) The design of all Category Six highways should be capable of achieving a posted speed of 25-40 MPH and there is little or no possibility of achieving higher speeds.
- (2) Private direct access to the state highway system may be denied when the property in question has other reasonable access or reasonable opportunity to access the general street or town highway system. If the Agency determines that denial of direct access to the state highway would cause unacceptable traffic operation or safety problems at the alternative access location(s) and to the overall traffic flow of the general street system; and the proposed location is consistent with the spacing and public intersection requirements, direct access may be allowed. When direct access is allowed, such access shall continue until such time that some other reasonable access to a lower function category street or highway is available. The access permit should specify under what circumstances the change will be required, and if known, the future access location and the date the change will be made. No more than one such access shall be allowed to an individual parcel or to contiguous parcels under the same ownership.
- (3) Where local regulations require a secondary access to provide for emergency services, the Agency may allow an emergency access. Such an access shall not be open for non-emergency uses and shall be maintained by the permittee as a closed access except during emergencies and shall be so conditioned in the access permit.
- (4) Where local regulations require a secondary access to provide for other operational purposes, the Agency will work with the community to determine the extent of need.
- (5) One or both left turn movements at the access may be permitted if the applicant establishes to the Agency's satisfaction that, (a) the left turn movement would not create unreasonable congestion or safety problems or lower the level of service below Agency policy, and (b) alternatives to the left turn would cause unacceptable traffic operation and safety problems on the general street system. Right turn movement may be restricted if, in the determination of the Agency, the movement creates an unacceptable operational problem or safety hazard.

- (6) Left turns shall be prohibited if a non-traversable median is already established and the proposed opening in the median does not provide the general public any significant benefits to highway traffic operations and safety or would be counter to the purpose of the median.
- (7) No additional access rights shall accrue upon the splitting or dividing of existing parcels or contiguous parcels under the same ownership or control. All access to newly created properties shall be provided internally from the existing access or a new access determined by permit application.
- (8) Since intersecting public ways may in time warrant signalization, the Agency requires that all intersecting streets, roads, and highways that allow left turns meet the Agency's signal spacing criteria. Those that do not meet these requirements may be limited to right turns only.
- (9) The standard for the spacing of all intersecting public streets, roads, highways, and other accesses that are or may become signalized, shall be at no less than 500 foot intervals. For the purpose of achieving good arterial capacity and efficiency and to minimize delays to the traveling public, the desirable bandwidth efficiency for traffic signal progression is 50 percent, and can generally be achieved when signals are optimally placed.
- (10) Any access that would reduce the optimum highway bandwidth if a traffic signal were installed may be limited to right turns only.
- (11) When a traffic signal is proposed, the Agency will specify the following:
 - (a) The Segment Length.
 - (b) Signal locations (existing and anticipated) by the Agency.
 - (c) Various combinations of cycle length, progression, and speed to be used in achieving minimum band width.
 - (d) Any other conditions the Agency may consider relevant.
 - (e) Analysis/model to be used.
- (12) When an existing access meets the warrants for a traffic signal as defined in the MUTCD and the location does not meet the Agency's requirements for signal spacing, a median separator may be installed or the access designed to direct vehicles into right turns only. These design solutions may not be practicable or feasible where there are physical constraints such as curbs, sidewalks, and lack of rights-of-way. The access may be required to be reconstructed, or relocated, to conform to the signal spacing requirements.

- (13) On these sections of highways, it will be most critical to apply access control measures such as: (a) Requiring access on collector streets; (b) Applying minimum spacing standards; (c) Optimizing spacing; (d) Providing for combination of accesses; (e) Requiring opportunities for future connection between properties; (f) Denying access to small frontages; and (g) Limiting turning movements. Existing access densities proposed driveway volumes and the AADT of the highway play an important part in access decisions for these urban sections.
- (14) Access proposals, that fall between two signalized intersections or accesses (500 feet or less apart), will result in one of the following decisions:
- a) Denial of access (purchase access rights)
 - b) Turning movements restricted to right-turns only
 - c) Full service access only when the proposal does not reduce the optimum bandwidth of the existing signals.
- (15) When other reasonable access exists on a side street and the proposed access location on the main highway does not meet spacing standards, access may be required on the side street. When the proposed use is "moderate to high," the access will be required on the side street. When existing access density exceeds 60 per mile, access will be required on the side street.

Access Category	Highway Functional Class (AADT)	Degree of Access Control	Direct Property Access	Driveway Controls	Traffic Operations Allowed	Design Features
1	Principal Arterials (Interstate)	Full	No	NA	Access at Interchanges Only with Public Hwys	Grade-Separated Interchanges
2	[1] Principal Arterials (Non-Interstate – LA) [2] Other Principal Arterials (LA) [3] Limited Access (LA) Major collectors	Full to Partial	No-Except by Access Rights	NA or Location	Access at Intersections with Public Highways	At-Grade or Grade-Separated at 1/2 to 1 Mile Intervals
3	[1] Principal Arterials (Non LA) [2] Other Principal Arterials (Non LA) [3] Minor Arterials (>5000 AADT) [4] Non-Limited Access Major Collectors on State Hwy & Class I TH's (>5000 AADT)	[1] Mandatory Restrictions to operations [2] Design Features [3] Land Use Issues	Deny, Restrict or Allow	NA or Number, Spacing and Location	NA or May Limit Turning Movements	[1] Physical Barriers [2] Signal Spacing Requirements [3] Left and/or Right Turn Lanes Required [4] Spacing of Public Hwy Intersection (1/4 to 1/2 Mile)
4	[1] Minor Collectors [2] Minor Arterials on State Hwy or Class I TH's (<5000 AADT) [3] Non-Limited Access Major Collectors on State Hwy & Class I TH's (<5000 AADT)	[1] Design Features [2] Land Use Issues	Yes	Number, Spacing and Locations	[1] All Turns In & Out [2] May Limit Turning Movements	Spacing of Public Highway Intersection (1/4 to 1/2 Mile)
5	Frontage or Service Roads	[1] Design Features [2] Land Use Issues	Yes	Number & Location	All Turns In & Out	Signal Spacing (No Less Than 300 Feet)
6	“Urban” Sections of Highways	[1] Design Features [2] Land Use Issues	Deny, Restrict or Allow	Number, Spacing & Location	[1] All Turns In & Out [2] May Limit Turning Movements	Signal Spacing (No Less Than 500 Feet)

Table 1-1 Access Category Standards

SECTION TWO

DESIGN STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS

2.1 Purpose

The Vermont Agency of Transportation ("Agency") has developed the following design and construction standards and specifications to preserve the public investment in the highway infrastructure, protect levels of service, protect public safety, and preserve the functional integrity of public highways.

2.2 Use of this Section

- (1) When the Agency has determined that an application for access meets the requirements of section one, section two shall be used to precisely locate, design, and construct the access within the limitations, if any, set forth in section one. When local governments have established by ordinance or resolution more stringent design standards than required in this section, the local standards may govern. This information is used in conjunction with and supplements VAOT Standard Drawings B-71 and A-76.
- (2) If an access application meets section one criteria and is unable to comply with section two criteria, an access permit should be denied. When an application has been denied by the Utilities & Permits Unit, the applicant may appeal the decision to the Secretary of Transportation as provided for in Title 19 VSA § 7a.

2.3 Reference Sources and Data Requirements

- (1) *Trip Generation*. Current edition. The *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)* is hereby adopted and shall be used as a reference in estimating average Peak Hour values of an access. The *ITE Trip Generation Manual* will provide a reasonable estimate of trip generation, in the absence of a traffic analysis by a qualified traffic engineer or actual collected data.
- (2) For the purposes of this section, the Design Hourly Volume (DHV) for the access location may be considered synonymous with the term "average peak hour volume" often used for traffic analysis. The Agency requires the use of DHV information for the adjacent street traffic.

- (3) Generally, the average peak hour traffic volume estimates for any access shall be based upon the anticipated total build out of the development to be served and a fifth-year prediction for highway volumes. In the case of a public access, a reasonable prediction of the fifth-year access volume shall be made based upon predicted growth, zoning, and any comprehensive plan. In urbanized or urbanizing areas, volume generation analysis shall include the anticipated full build out of the study area to a one-mile radius.
- (4) Speed, as used in this section, refers to the posted legal speed limit at the access location at the time of permit approval. A higher design speed shall be used if the section of highway is presently being redesigned or reconstructed to a higher speed or an approved access control plan requires a higher speed. Where a traffic signal will be installed as part of the initial access construction, the speed limit after signal installation may be used for the overall access design at the discretion of the Agency.
- (5) The applicant shall submit an estimate of the volume and type of traffic to use the access. The Agency shall assist any applicant requesting traffic estimates for the purpose of obtaining an access permit. To determine the average peak hour volume of the proposed access in lieu of a traffic study prepared by a transportation professional, or in the evaluation of such a traffic study, the Agency shall refer to the ITE *Trip Generation* manual, as well as site condition and other information that may apply. In determining the traffic generation, the average peak hour factor in the *Trip Generation* manual may be used. If local or special generation rates are used, all documentation for rate development shall be submitted. For mixed use developments reference is made to "ITE" for allowable trip reductions. The Agency does not conduct traffic studies for individual applicants, however, is a source for ITE figures and highway traffic counts.
- (6) When the land use will generate traffic contributing 75 or more peak hour trips (comparing build and no-build conditions) or when deemed necessary or desirable by the Agency, the applicant shall provide a traffic analysis completed and signed by a transportation professional which shall include directional distribution, level of service, design considerations, and capacity determinations unless exempted in writing by the Agency. Reference is made to the Agency's "Traffic Impact Evaluation Study and Review Guide" (July 1995) for further reference.
- (7) The distance between accesses is measured from the trailing edge of one access to the approaching edge of the next access.
- (8) Other information is provided in the "Vermont Agency of Transportation Guidelines for Traffic Engineering Issues," dated August 1995. The Agency's Level of Service Policy, Traffic Signal Warrants, and Volume Warrants for left and right turn lanes are contained in this document.

2.4 Access Width

- (1) Access width for any rural type access without curbs shall be measured exclusive of the radii or flares. Access with a street style curb return entrance and driveways with curb cuts, shall be measured exclusive of the flared sections or transitions.
- (2) Twenty-four (24) to thirty (30) feet of width shall be used for any two-way access (commercial) when the single unit vehicle volume does not exceed five in peak hour.
- (3) Thirty (30) to forty (40) feet of width shall be used for any two-way access when any one or more of the following apply to the access:
 - a. Multi-unit vehicles are intended to use the access.
 - b. Single unit vehicles in excess of 30 feet in length will use the access.
 - c. Single unit vehicles volume exceeds 5 in the peak hour.
- (4) A one-way access shall have a width of 18 feet to 24 feet. If two one-way accesses are adjacent to each other, a physical barrier of at least 4 feet wide shall divide them.
- (5) When a public street, road, highway, or any access intended to become a public roadway intersects with a state highway, the design criteria of the local government and the Agency shall be used to select an appropriate access width subject to the approval of the Agency. It is recommended that no two-way public roadway access which produces ten turning vehicles in the peak hour should be less than twenty-four (24) feet in width (exclusive of turning radii).

2.5 Access Radii

- (1) No access, except a curb cut, shall have an equivalent turning radius of less than 20 feet (see Standard Drawing B-71).
- (2) Up to a 50 foot equivalent turning radius should be used for an access when multi-unit vehicles or single unit vehicles exceeding 30 feet in length are intended to use the access on a daily basis.
- (3) The access equivalent turning radii shall accommodate the turning radius of the largest vehicle using the access on a daily basis. It is permissible to use three-centered compound curves or spiral curves rather than simple radii when designing for larger vehicles.
- (4) If the frequency of multi-unit vehicles or single unit vehicles over 30 feet in length is such that two such vehicles may be reasonably anticipated to use the access at the same time, one entering and one exiting, radii should be adequate to accommodate both vehicles with no turning conflicts.

- (5) The Agency shall determine if a curb cut or radius curb returns are required in accordance with existing or planned conditions. The determination is normally made by the presence of curb on the main highway. Where the main highway is not curbed, any proposed curbing on an access will be offset a minimum of 6 feet from the main highway edge of traveled-way.
- (6) When a public street, road, highway, or any access intended to become a public roadway intersects with a state highway, the design criteria of the local government and the Agency shall be used to select appropriate radii, corner and intersection design, subject to approval by the Agency. The final design should not be less than the minimums contained in these standards or Standard Drawing A-76.
- (7) Where large numbers of multi-unit vehicles will use the access, the access width or radius may be increased, as approved by the Agency, to ensure safe turning movements without encroachment on to opposing highway traffic lanes.
- (8) Where there are numerous accesses such as along an established city street, it may be desirable to reduce the radii in order to improve visual and physical separation of accesses. Where feasible, access should be combined or closed to reduce the frequency of accesses and increase the spacing between accesses.
- (9) Where a private access will have high traffic volumes, the access may be designed with curb returns and at a width and design as to adequately provide for the level of activity.
- (10) To minimize pedestrian conflict and total access width at the roadway edge, radii shall not be constructed larger than required to accommodate the volume and types of vehicles using the access on a regular basis.
- (11) Where access channelization islands are installed, a larger radius may be required for the channel lane. Traffic islands should be 80 square feet in size or larger. All islands must be offset at least four feet from the edge of the highway travel lane to face of curb. To ensure one-way operation of directional islands, the 4-foot offset is recommended by AASHTO. All other islands are offset between 6 and 12 feet.

2.6 Access Surfacing & Pavement Markings

- (1) Surfacing material may be defined as gravel, concrete, or bituminous pavement.
- (2) The access shall be surfaced upon completion of earthwork construction and prior to being used. A delay in installation of hot bituminous pavement due to seasonal restrictions may be allowed provided adequate temporary gravel surfacing is substituted.
- (3) The surfacing of the access shall extend at least from the highway edge of pavement to the right-of-way line, or to the end of the turning radius as a minimum.
- (4) Surfacing material shall be specified according to the Agency's standard design specifications and the conditions and future use of the access and the highway. Gravel or crushed stone will be permitted for individual residential access or field entrances where conditions allow, and where curbs are not required.
- (5) Off roadway surfacing improvements (such as parking areas) shall not be allowed within the highway right-of-way unless a curbing or other physical barrier, such as a drainage ditch, is constructed and maintained to limit access movements to permitted locations. Use of the right-of-way for parking may be prohibited unless approved by permit or lease with the Agency.
- (6) Reference is made to the Agency's Pavement Marking Guidelines for further guidance on this subject.

2.7 Speed Change Lanes

Speed change lanes, also called auxiliary lanes, are required according to the subsections that follow.

- (1) *General Criteria for Speed Change Lanes*
 - a. An auxiliary lane shall be parallel and immediately adjacent to the through lane for its entire required length.
 - b. When public safety so requires, due to site specific conditions such as limited sight distance, a turn lane may be required even though the lane may not meet the warrants for relieving traffic congestion.

2.8 Corner Sight Distance (CSD)

These sight distances apply to vehicles approaching an access and to vehicles exiting an access. These distances are measured from a point on the drive 15 feet from the edge of traveled way of the adjacent roadway and measured from a height of eye of 3.5 feet on the drive to a height of 3.5 feet on the roadway. Corner Sight Distance is a function of posted speed and applies to all access categories. When the minimum values below cannot be obtained, refer to Standard Drawing B-71 for minimum Stopping Sight Distance required and the necessary actions to mitigate an unsafe condition. If an unsafe condition cannot be mitigated, it may be necessary to deny access for the specific use.

Table 2-1 - Corner Sight Distance

POSTED SPEED LIMIT (mph)	MINIMUM CORNER SIGHT DISTANCE (ft)
25	280
30	335
35	390
40	445
45	500
50	555
55	610
60	665
65	720

(Please note that the CSD values above are less than those currently in AASHTO. However, they are more reflective of actual driver behavior than the AASHTO model, and will produce designs more appropriate for Vermont, where attainment of the generous AASHTO values is often difficult to impossible. Standard Sheet B-71 will be revised when time permits to reflect the above values.)

The CSD values are based on an assumption of a gap of 7.5 seconds in the traffic stream on the highway mainline based on the highway design speed. This allows a stopped passenger vehicle to enter the mainline from the side road or drive without unduly interfering with the highway operations. The conceptual approach of gap acceptance and the value of 7.5 seconds are based on a Midwest Research Institute study which, when published, will recommend a replacement of the overtaking vehicle conceptual model currently in the AASHTO Green Book.

2.9 Access Spacing

Current research and practice identify much greater access spacing requirements for unsignalized intersections including driveways. These may not be practical for Vermont considering existing terrain features and, vertical and horizontal roadway alignments that often control access locations. Traffic operational factors suggesting

wider spacing of driveways (especially along highways with medium and higher volume driveways) include weaving and merging distances, stopping sight distance, acceleration rates, and storage distance for back-to-back left turns. From a spacing perspective, high volume driveways should be treated the same as public streets.

For unsignalized access spacing standards, the Agency uses the lower limit of the AASHTO stopping sight distance approach. The resultant spacing standards, shown in Table 2-2, would enable a driver traveling at the design or posted speed to monitor only one driveway at a time and, if necessary, to stop.

Table 2.2 - Unsignalized Access Spacing (ft)

POSTED SPEED or DESIGN SPEED (mph)	UNSIGNALIZED ACCESS SPACING* (ft)
20	115
25	155
30	200
35	250
40	305
45	360
50	425
55	495

(*Spacing shown is based on level terrain: adjustment factors are required for segments with grades)

Source: Derived from Exhibit 3-1(Pg.112) (Stopping Sight Distance) from AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 2001

As these standards are applied, especially along highways with considerable amounts of existing development, in many cases it will not be possible to achieve the defined standard. Rather, it is important to "maximize" spacing achieving the "best possible" driveway spacing given the property limits and physical constraints.

The minimum spacing requirement between any access and any entrance or exit ramp, providing access to any limited access highway, will be 500 feet in rural areas, and 250 feet in urban areas. When this spacing requirement cannot be obtained due to property limitations, the Agency will consider the purchase of access rights or the maximum attainable distance will be provided between the ramp and the access.

2.10 Corner Clearance at Intersections

- (1) Corner clearances for accesses shall meet or exceed the minimum access spacing requirements (in Paragraph 2.9).
 - a. If, due to property size, corner clearance standards of this Section cannot be met, and where joint access which meets or exceeds the applicable minimum corner clearance standards cannot be obtained with a neighboring property or, in the determination of the

Agency, is not feasible based on conflicting land use or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics, then the following minimum corner clearance measurements can be used to permit accesses. Such properties, for the purpose of this section, will be called "isolated corner properties."

- b. In cases where accesses are permitted under the criteria of the following minimum corner measurements, the permit will contain the following additional conditions:
 - i) There will be no more than one access per state road frontage.
 - ii) When joint or alternate access that meets or exceeds the applicable minimum corner clearance becomes available, the permittee will close the permitted access. Exceptions may be allowed when the permittee shows that such closure is not feasible because of conflicting land use or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics or existing structures that preclude a change in the existing access.
- c. The minimum corner clearance measurements for these "isolated corner properties," set forth in a. above, shall be used for isolated corner properties, as defined in this section.
- d. **Corner Clearances for "isolated corner properties"** are as follows:

**Corner Clearance at Intersections
With Restrictive Median**

Position	Access Allowed	Minimum (Feet)
Approaching intersection	Right In/Out	115
Approaching intersection	Right In Only	75
Departing intersection	Right In/Out	230
Departing intersection	Right Out Only	100

**Corner Clearance at Intersections
Without Restrictive Median**

Position	Access Allowed	Minimum (Feet)
Approaching intersection	Full Access	230
Approaching intersection	Right In Only*	100
Departing intersection	Full Access	230
Departing intersection	Right Out Only*	100

(*Right In/Out, Right In Only, and Right Out Only accesses on roads without restrictive medians shall, by design of the access, effectively eliminate unpermitted movements.)


2.20 Other Design Elements

- (1) Access specifications shall ensure that the access is designed and constructed in a manner that will encourage proper use by the motorist. Access for one-way operation shall be approved only when design conditions ensure one-way operation.
- (2) An access that has a gate across it shall be designed so that the longest vehicle using it can completely clear the traveled-way, shoulder, and sidewalk when the gate is closed.


- (3) The access shall be designed to facilitate the movement of vehicles off the highway to prevent vehicles from forming and/or waiting in a line (queuing) on the traveled-way. An access shall not be approved for parking areas that require backing maneuvers that encroach on the traveled-way of the highway. All off-street parking areas must include on-site maneuvering areas and aisles to permit user vehicles to enter and exit the site in forward drive without hesitation other than that required by official traffic control devices.
- (4) Access design shall provide for the safe and convenient movement of all highway right-of-way users including, but not limited to, pedestrians, bicyclists, and the physically handicapped including those in wheelchairs. Sidewalks may be required where appropriate and when requested by local authority.
- (5) Where necessary to remove, relocate, or repair traffic control devices or public or private utilities for the construction of a permitted access, the relocation or removal shall be accomplished by the permittee without cost to the Agency, and at the direction of the Agency or utility company. Any damage to the State highway or other public right-of-way beyond that which is allowed in the permit shall be repaired immediately.
- (6) Further details of access construction and design, including pavement thickness and specifications, curb design and specifications, roadway fill design and compaction, pavement markings, and other specific details, shall be provided by the Agency based on the Agency's Standard Specifications for Construction, the General and Special Provisions, and the Roadway Design Manual.
- (7) Installation of any traffic control device necessary for the safe and proper operation and control of the access shall be required pursuant to the M.U.T.C.D. Where the access may warrant signalization in the future, phasing of the installation (turn lane work and signal work) may be required. All traffic control devices within the highway or other public right-of-way or access that serve the general public shall conform to the M.U.T.C.D.
- (8) An access that crosses or otherwise affects pedestrian, bicycle, or handicapped accessible facilities, shall have the necessary modifications to ensure the safe crossing of the access and the safe use of the facility by pedestrians, bicyclists, and the handicapped.
- (9) When an access permit requires the widening or reconstruction of the roadway, the design of horizontal and vertical curves, super-elevations, transitions, and other specifications, shall be no less than those necessary to meet the minimum posted speed of the highway or the constructed design speed of the existing highway, whichever is greater and shall not be of a lesser design than the current design.

- (10) Physical separation and delineation along a property frontage such as curb and gutter or fencing may be required where necessary to ensure that access will be limited to permitted locations.
- (11) A clear zone is a relatively clear and flat area beyond the edge of the roadway and is important for the recovery of errant vehicles. The access permit may require that roadway hazards in the clear zone such as fixed objects or steep embankments be removed, reconstructed, or shielded by a proper barrier. In urban areas with speeds of 40 MPH or less and vertical barrier curbs, a clear zone of at least 1.5 feet minimum should be provided. Where there is no curb in urban and rural areas and the speed is 40 MPH or less, a ten-foot clear zone should be provided. At speeds of 45 MPH or greater, a 30 foot clear zone is recommended. Every attempt will be made to adhere to the clear zone requirements.
- (12) Landscaping may be allowed within the rights-of-way and within the "clear zone;" reference is made to the Agency's guideline on this subject for more detailed information.
- (13) Each access shall be constructed in a manner that shall not cause water to enter onto the roadway, and shall not interfere with the existing drainage system in the right-of-way.
- (14) The permittee shall provide, at his/her own expense, drainage structures for his/her access which will become an integral part of the existing drainage system. The type, design, and condition of these structures must meet the approval of the Agency.
- (15) The highway drainage system is for the protection of the State highway right-of-way. It is not designed or intended to serve the drainage requirements of abutting properties beyond that which has historically flowed to the State right-of-way. Drainage to the State highway right-of-way shall not exceed the undeveloped historical flow. The use of controlled flow detention ponds shall be considered to control this flow from developed property. Any requests to attach drainage pipes to the Agency's drainage system must be approved by the Agency after review by the Agency's Hydraulics Unit.
- (16) The permittee, his/her heirs, successors-in-interest, assigns, and occupants of the property serviced by the access shall be responsible for meeting the terms and conditions of the permit, the maintenance of the access beyond the edge of the traveled-way, and the removal or clearance of snow or ice upon the access even though deposited on the access in the course of the Agency snow removal operations. The Agency shall maintain the highway drainage system, including those culverts under the access, which are part of a closed drainage system within the right-of-way.


DETAIL B DUAL COMMERCIAL DRIVE TO BE USED ONLY
UNDER SPECIAL CONDITIONS




DETAIL E RIGHT TURN LANE FOR COMMERCIAL DRIVE
(UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS ONLY)




DETAIL H




DETAIL C TWO-WAY UNDIVIDED COMMERCIAL DRIVE FOR SINGLE STORES, BUSINESSES, SMALL HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS



DETAIL F
MINIMUM HORIZONTAL SEPARATION BETWEEN
DRIVEWAYS AND INTERSECTING SIDEROADS



DETAIL I PROFILE OF DRIVE INTERSECTION (FILL SECTION)



DRIVE SIDE SLOPES	
LOCATION OF SLOPE	SLOPE RATE
V > 40 MPH	1:6 OR FLATTER
URBAN AREAS, OR V ≤ 40 MPH	1:4 DESIRABLE 1:2 ALLOWABLE
OUTSIDE CLEAR ZONE	1:2 OR FLATTER

STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL
AND
COMMERCIAL DRIVES

REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS	APPROVED
THIS STANDARD SUPERSEDES 8-717/23/90R; 6-714 13/12/90I, and B-13 10/24/71. - REDESIGNED, WITHOUT CHANGE, UNDER NEW SIGNATURES. - CHANGES MADE TO CONFORM WITH LANGUAGE AND DIMENSIONS IN ACCESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM GUIDELINES. - CHANGES MADE TO SIGHT DISTANCE CHART TO CONFORM WITH NEW MATERIAL. - CHANGE MADE TO SELECT MOCHLY TO CONFORM WITH NEWEST AASHTO CRITERIA.	APPROVED

THIS SHEET IS INTENDED FOR USE BY DESIGNERS IN HIGHWAY PROJECTS AND IN CONNECTION WITH A PERMIT FOR WORK WITHIN HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY. THE USER OF THIS SHEET SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING A PERMIT AND INDICATED ON THIS SHEET SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT AND IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATOR. THIS SHEET IS INTENDED FOR A HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR A GUIDE FOR THE DESIGNER CONCERNING DRIVE MOTIFS, HORIZONTAL, VERTICAL AND GEOMETRIC CHARACTERISTICS.

ALL COMEHAILED TRUCKS SHALL BE PAVED FROM THE EDGE OF THE FARTHEST POINT OF CURVATURE ON THE DRIVEWAY EDGE ON, AS INDICATED BY THE DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATOR. THIS PAVEMENT IS INDICATED IN DETAILS BY THE 10110.01 BY MATCHING.

DEPTH OF SUBBASE AND PAVEMENT TO BE THE SAME AS INDICATED IN DETAILS BY THE 10110.01 WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY.

VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM PARKING JUNCTIONS TO THE RIGHT-OF-WAY AT OTHER THAN APPROVED ACCESS POINTS WILL BE PRESENTED BY THE CONSTRUCTION OF CURBS OR OTHER SUITABLE PHYSICAL BARRIER.

IF CURB IS PRESENT, SEE APPROPRIATE CURB DETAIL STANDARD OR MATCH 10100.01 STANDARD CURB TREATMENT.

WHERE TRAFFIC VOLUME FOR A PROJECT IS SUBSTANTIAL THE AGENCY SHALL CONSIDER THE NEED FOR TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND OTHER MODIFICATIONS, BASED ON TRAFFIC STUDIES, SIGNALS AND OTHER DETERMINING SPECIFIC TREATMENT TO BE USED, ON DEVELOPER REQUEST, TO THE STATE. WORK WITH THE AGENCY TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES TO THE STATE WORK WITH THE AGENCY TO IMPLEMENT

LOCALITY. DRIVEWAY CULVERTS UNDER DRIVES SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM INSIDE CROSS-SECTIONAL AREA OF 10.0 SQ. FT. USED UNDER DRIVES SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM INSIDE CROSS-SECTIONAL AREA EQUIVALENT TO THAT PROVIDED BY A 15" CIRCULAR PIPE.

THE OFFSET BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE AND THE EDGE OF THE DRIVEWAY MAY BE GOVERNED BY LOCAL ZONING LAWS.

DRIVEWAY WIDTH RESTRICTIONS SHOWN PERTAIN ONLY TO THE AREA WITHIN THE HIGHWAY R.C.M. OR THE END OF THE TURNING RADIUS WHICHEVER IS GREATER.

DRIVEWAY GRADES STEEPER THAN THOSE SHOWN MAY BE ALLOWED AS LONG AS A 20:1 APPROACH AREA IS ACHIEVED FOR THE DRIVEWAY. WHERE CURB OR SIDEWALKS EXIST, SEE STANDARDS C-2A & C-2B).

D. SIGHTING SLOPE DISTANCES EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN THOSE SHOWN BELOW SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR ALL DRIVES ENTERING ON PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED BY A SIGN OF TRANSFORMATION.

INTERSECTIONS MUST BE LOCATED AT A POINT ON THE DRIVE AT LEAST 15 FEET FROM THE EDGE OF TRAVELED WAY OF THE ADJACENT ROADWAY AND MEASURED FROM A HEIGHT OF EYE OF 3.5

SIGHT DISTANCE CHART			
POSTED SPEED DESIGN SPEED (M.P.H.)	MINIMUM STOPPING DISTANCE (F.T.)	MINIMUM SIGHT DISTANCE • (F.T.)	MINIMUM SIGHT DISTANCE • (F.T.)
25	185	280	350
30	200	335	400
35	220	380	450
40	240	425	500
45	260	470	550
50	285	515	600
55	305	560	650
60	330	605	700

NOTE: ADVANCE WARNING SIGNS WILL BE REQUIRED IF OBTAINABLE
INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCES ARE BELOW MINIMUM STOPPING

- ASSUMES A GAP OF 7.5 SECONDS IN THE TRAFFIC STREAM ON THE HIGHWAY MAINLINE BEYOND THE MAXIMUM DESIGN SPEED IN MPH. THIS ALLOWS STOPPED PASSENGER VEHICLES TO ENTER THE MAINLINE FROM THE DRIVE WITHOUT UNDESIRABLE INTERFERING WITH THE HIGHWAY OPERATIONS.

Burlington Department of Public Works Commission Meeting
Draft Minutes June 21, 2017
645 Pine Street

Commissioners Present: Robert Alberry, Jim Barr, Solveig Overby, Jeff Padgett (Chair), Justin Sears

Commissioners Absent: Tiki Archambeau (Vice Chair), Chris Gillman (Clerk)

Item 1 - Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments

Chair Padgett calls the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Item 2 – Agenda

Commissioner Overby requests to remove Consent Agenda Item B to Agenda Item 4.5 and seconded by Commissioner Barr.

Action Taken: motion approved

Ayes are unanimous

Item 3 – Public Forum

Max Tracy Ward 3 Councilor speaks to Walnut Street No Parking Zone, plan BTV Walk Bike implementation and the Great Streets Design

Bobby Riley Principal at Integrated Arts Academy speaks about Walnut Street No Parking Zone

Item 4 – Consent Agenda

A. Traffic Status Report

C. C.P. Smith Crosswalk Parking Prohibition

D. Parking Limits for Lakeview and College Street Garages

Commissioner Barr makes motion to accept altered Consent Agenda and is seconded by Commissioner Alberry.

Action Taken: motion approved

Ayes unanimous

Item 4.5 No Parking Zone on Walnut Street

A. Staff Communication

B. Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Overby, Commissioner Padgett, Commissioner Alberry

C. Public Comment

D. Commissioner Discussion

E. Motion by Commissioner Overby to remove this from the agenda and send it back to staff for further staff discussion and assessment. The motion is to table it. Commissioner Barr seconded the motion.

Action taken: motion approved

Ayes unanimous

Item 5 – Campus Bike Share Presentation

A. Oral Presentation – J. Barr and A. Bleything

B. Commissioner Discussion

C. Public Comment

D. Action Requested – None

Item 6 – Plan BTV Walk Bike Implementation

North Champlain Street parking changes and one way except bicycles

North Union Street parking changing and one way except bicycles

Sherman Street one-way except bicycles

A. Oral Presentation – Nicole Losch and Anna Weimer

B. Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Barr, Chair Padgett, Commissioner Overby; Commissioner Sears

C. Public Comments

Two landlords of apartment buildings discuss the loss of parking on North Union Street

Action: Commissioner Solveig makes a motion to accept staff's recommendation to: 1) enact parking changes on North Champlain St between Peru and Sherman streets, 2) designate North Champlain St between Peru and Sherman streets one-way except bicycles, 3) enact parking changes on North Union St between Loomis and Grant streets, 4) designate North Union St between Loomis and Grant streets one-way except bicycles, and 5) designate Sherman St between Park and North Champlain streets one-way except bicycles.

Commissioners discussed public engagement, parking policy, transportation demand management approaches and traffic safety. Discussion. Chair Padgett, going in under this pilot program right? Quick install but extensively paint, ballards, stuff that can be removed right away.

All in favor of motion?

Ayes unanimous.

Item 7 – Great Streets Conceptual Design for St. Paul Street (Main St to Maple St)

A. Oral Presentation L. Wheelock, N. Baldwin, M. Tuttle

B. Discussion: Commissioner Alberry, Commissioner Overby

Recommendation vote on Concept B.

Commissioner Barr makes a motion to accept staff's recommendation of concept B and to support staff advancing the design contract amendment for St Paul Street to City Council.

Commissioner Alberry seconded.

Decision: Ayes unanimous.

Item 8 – Demonstration Project Permit Ordinance

A. Communication, N. Losch

B. Commissioner Discussion - Commissioner Overby and Commissioner Barr, Chair Padgett
Commissioner Alberry motioned to approve.

Commissioner Barr seconded

Unanimous approval

Item 9 – Approval Draft Minutes of 5-17-17

Commissioner Barr motioned to approve minutes

Commissioner Alberry seconded

Unanimous approval

Item 10 – Director's Report

Director Spencer updated Commission that department had started first round interviews for Public Information Manager position; North Avenue Pilot; Hired for Assistant Director of Parking and Traffic Patrick Mulligan starting this coming Monday.

Item 11 – Commissioner's Communication

Commissioner Barr – sidewalk improvement going great; road repairs; calls about Colchester Avenue hill section still potholes and bumps.

Commissioner Overby – 2 foot parking restrictions around driveways – Walnut Street school area. City Engineer Baldwin answers.

Commissioner Padgett – Public outreach important. Hiring the Public Information Manager will help enhance Department's capacity..

Item 11 – Adjournment

Commissioner Barr motioned to adjourn

Commissioner Alberry seconded

Ayes unanimous

Meeting ended 9:00 p.m.



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05401
802.863.9094 VOICE
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

To: DPW Commissioners
Fr: Chapin Spencer, Director
Re: **Director's Report**
Date: July 12, 2017

WELCOME PATRICK MULLIGAN!

I am pleased to announce that Patrick Mulligan, our new Assistant Director overseeing Parking & Traffic Division, has officially started as of June 26. Pat most recently served as the head of the Reading PA Parking Authority and he is excited to return to Vermont where he has family.

PERMIT REFORM

As reported last month, Norm and I joined representatives from Planning & Zoning, the City Attorney, Code Enforcement and the CIO in a follow up meeting with the City Council on June 5. The Council decided to establish an ad hoc committee to delve further into the report and host another public meeting. The public meeting will give the public an opportunity to learn about the report's findings and implementation plan. It will take place on Wednesday July 26th, 2017, 5:30-7:30pm at the Burlington Electric Department (585 Pine Street, Burlington). More information is at: <https://burlingtonvt.gov/PermitReformForum>.

WATER MAIN RENEWAL

Our greatly expanded relining and replacement efforts will get fully underway late this month. It includes work on Pine St, St. Paul St and Ethan Allen Parkway. Additional relining information is at: <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/Water-Main-Relining-Projects-for-2017>

NORTH AVENUE PILOT SURVEY

The City presented the results of the traffic, crash and public survey data to the City Council on July 10 along with staff's recommendations. Our recommendation included retaining the current configuration and contracting with an engineering firm to design additional intersection improvements at the Ethan Allen Parkway and Route 127 intersections. The City Council passed a resolution supporting staff's recommendation by a 10 to 2 vote. The complete packet can be found here: <http://www.boarddocs.com/vt/burlingtonvt/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=ANZMVW5867F6>

PUBLIC INFORMATION MANAGER

The department is continuing the hiring process for our first Public Information Manager. With the increased number of capital projects within the public right of way, this position will better enable the department to engage stakeholders, educate the community and work to minimize disruptions. We hope to have additional updates at the July Commission meeting.

OTHER PROJECTS

DPW's technical team is working on an extensive list of projects. Below is a partial list of projects in planning or design. For more info: <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/Projects>.

-) Great Streets (focusing initially on St. Paul St between Main and Maple)
-) Champlain Elementary Pedestrian Improvement Project
-) Shelburne Street Roundabout

-) Champlain Elementary Pedestrian Improvements
-) Colchester Avenue Crosswalks
-) Colchester Avenue Sidepath
-) North Avenue Unsignalized Crosswalks
-) Winooski / Howard / St Paul Intersection Scoping Study
-) Champlain Parkway
-) Railyard Enterprise Project

Don't hesitate to contact me with any questions prior to Wednesday's meeting.



**CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849
802.863.9094 VOICE
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

Chapin Spencer
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Hannah Cormier, Clerks Office
From: Chapin Spencer, Director
Date: July 14, 2017
Re: Public Works Commission Agenda

Please find information below regarding the next Commission Meeting.

Date: **July 19, 2017**
Time: 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
Place: **645 Pine St – Main Conference Room**

A G E N D A – A M E N D E D

ITEM

- 1 Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments
- 2 Agenda
- 3 Election of Chair, Vice Chair, & Clerk
- 4 10 Min Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)
- 5 5 Min Consent Agenda
 - A Traffic status report
 - B Cherry Street Truck Loading Zone
 - C Stop Sign on Brookes Ave and North Prospect Street
 - D No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place
 - E Parking on Overlake Park
 - F Stop Control Switch for Bike Path Project at North Avenue Extension

Non-Discrimination

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 or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.

- 6 30 Min Appeal of Code Enforcement Order -163-165 Cherry St-18-95 Means of Egress
A Communication, Appellant
B Communication, W. Ward
C Commissioner Discussion
D Public Comment
E Action Requested – Vote
- 7 20 Min PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation
- North Union St Parking Changes & One-way Except Bicycles
A Communication, N. Losch & A. Wyner
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 8 20 Min St Paul Street Parking Changes
A Communication, L. Wheelock
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 9 15 Min Driveway/Curb Cut Design Specifications Update
A Communication, N. Baldwin
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – Vote
- 10 20 Min Bove's Proposed Redevelopment & Pearl Street Lot
A Oral Communication, P. Mulligan
B Commissioner Discussion
C Public Comment
D Action Requested – None
- 11 5 Min Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17
- 12 10 Min Director's Report
- 13 10 Min Commissioner Communications
- 14 Executive Session For Appeal
- 15 **Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – September 20, 2017**

COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

Date: 19 July 2017

NAME - (PRINTED)	ITEM #	EMAIL ADDRESS	PHONE #	WARD
Bethany Whitaker	07	bwhitaker@waterloo	922-8178	1
David Snell	7	davidtds@legmail.com	(202) 376-6159	5
Phil Hammerstough	67			2
Alexander Friend	07	alex@m2friend.com	8(825-8644	1
Eileen Magnini	4	Roger.Wiberg@Dum.Fr	802 862-7409	7
Roger Wiberg	4	" "	" 864-5866	8
ARLEEN BENNETT				7
Debra Gottesman	5	debraalopez@comcast.net	373-1946	-
Jacob Hinsdale	7	Hinsdale Properties@gmail.com	802-862-1148	5
Jon P...	7	jon.p...@gmail.com	802.578.2825	-
Jim Diener	7			-
LAURIE SMITH	7	wls3.smith117@GMAIL.COM	363-8010	-
Laura Waters	7	WatersLT@gmail.com	734-1235	
MAXINE HOLMES	7	HOLMES_MAXINE@YAHOO.COM	862-5909	2



City of
Burlington, Vermont
149 Church Street

Zoning Permit - COA Level I – Conditions of Approval

ZP #: 17-1157CA

Tax ID: 044-4-030-000

Issue Date: May 24, 2017

Decision: Approved

Property Address: 163-165 CHERRY STREET

Presented
CODE for
appeal

Description: Create one bedroom apartment in 3rd floor. Replace exterior door.

Standard Permit Conditions:

1. **Other City, State or Federal Permits.** The owner is solely responsible for obtaining all other required City, state and federal approvals. Failure to do so may invalidate this Zoning Permit and result in enforcement actions.

Note: All projects receiving a Zoning Permit also require a Construction Permit or written confirmation that a Construction Permit is not required from Department of Public Works-Inspection Services Division (DPW-ISD). All construction permits must be closed out by way of approved inspection by DPW-ISD before issuance of a Unified Certificate of Occupancy (UCO) by the Code Enforcement Office as per Condition 3, below.

2. **Time Limits.** This zoning permit shall become invalid unless work or action authorized by the permit is commenced by **May 24, 2018**. The owner shall complete the approved project and obtain a UCO (combined Zoning and Building certificates of occupancy, still applicable even if a zoning or building permit was not required) by **May 24, 2019**, or be subject to enforcement actions.

These time limits are binding upon the owner unless one of the following apply: a) longer or shorter time limits are specifically imposed by a condition of approval; or b) the time limits are tolled by additional state or federal permitting for the project or by an appeal; or c) an extension of time has been granted. An extension of time must be requested in writing PRIOR to the expiration of the permit. If the owner has enacted the permit and it lapses, the owner may be responsible to obtain a new zoning permit, if required, which shall be subject to the current Comprehensive Development Ordinance (CDO).

3. **Unified Certificate of Occupancy (UCO):** It shall be unlawful to use or occupy (or allow the use or occupancy of) any land or structure or part thereof which has been created, changed, converted, or wholly or partly altered or enlarged in its use or structure without a UCO.

If the project is partially completed, meets “prior to issuance of a UCO” conditions of approval, meets all health and safety standards, and all municipal fees for the project are paid, a Temporary Zoning CO may be requested and issued. **Upon completion of the project**, applicant shall request and obtain a Final UCO from the Code Enforcement Office (located at 645 Pine Street). Additional information on how to request and obtain this UCO is available at this office. **Failure to obtain a certificate of occupancy** places the property in violation of the CDO and is subject to enforcement.

In addition, **Failure to obtain a UCO within the time limits above is subject to** “after the fact” fees ranging from \$75 - \$1500 (in addition to the UCO fee).

4. **Project Modifications.** The project shall be completed as shown on the plans, which have been stamped “approved” and dated by the administrative officer. The project shall not deviate from the approved plans or conditions of approval without prior written approval from the administrative officer.

5. **Property Inspection.** By acceptance of this permit, the owner authorizes City Officials and/or their authorized representatives, access to the subject property for the purpose of observing work in progress, inspecting and/or measuring the property or improvements until such time the project has been issued a Final UCO.
6. **Completion and Maintenance of Improvements and Landscaping.** Owner or successor in interest is responsible for completing all improvements shown on approved plans. By acceptance of this permit, Owner agrees to maintain all improvements in a satisfactory condition. Any landscaping installed according to the approved plan which becomes diseased or dies shall be replaced by similar species and size no later than the first available planting season.
7. **Off-Site Drainage.** Issuance of this permit does not authorize the discharge of stormwater runoff or other surface drainage from the subject premises onto adjoining property or properties including but not limited to the public Right of Way.
8. **Errors.** The owner is solely responsible for the accuracy of all information contained in the Zoning Permit application. Any errors contained therein may invalidate the Zoning Permit and may result in enforcement action by the City.
9. **Transfer of Ownership. All zoning permits run with the land.** In the event of a transfer of ownership, partial or whole, of the subject premises, the transferee shall become permittee and subject to compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit.
10. **Violations/Penalties.** A violation of any of the conditions of this permit or of any provision of the CDO may result in enforcement actions, including but not limited to a penalty of up to two hundred dollars (\$200) per day, municipal tickets, and/or additional permitting fees.
11. **Incorporation and Reference of All Plans Presented.** This approval incorporates by reference all plans and drawings presented and all verbal representations by the applicant on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions or regulations.
12. **For Properties Involved in Boundary Disputes.** Boundary disputes are not within the jurisdiction of the administrative officer or the Development Review Board. When an application is submitted and the boundary of the subject property is called into question, the boundary will be determined based upon the best evidence available, for instance a survey or other official document. If a permit is issued and contrary evidence is presented to the City after the fact, such as a survey or Superior Court ruling with respect to the boundary lines, the permit may be amended or revoked by the City.
If the permit is amended or revoked, owner shall bear all costs to remedy the situation, including removal of the structure(s) if necessary, that is if the structure(s) is/are unable to meet the requirements of the CDO and receive an amended permit in light of the actual boundary line.
13. **Damage to City Property.** The Owner is responsible for any damage to the City of Burlington's property, including but not limited to its right-of-way, sewer/water lines, etcetera, that occurs during the site improvements authorized by this permit. If damage occurs, the Owner shall restore the property to a condition equal to or better than the condition of the property prior to such damage.
14. **City Rights-of-Way and Ownership.** Permit approval does NOT authorize any work to be undertaken within the public ROW. Any work in the ROW can only occur with prior authorization by DPW and City Council, as required. Any work or improvements that are taken within the City's right of way does not diminish the City's ownership or authority regarding said right of way.
15. **Liquor License Required.** An approval of any use that includes the sale of alcoholic beverages is contingent upon the receipt of a liquor license from the City of Burlington or the State of Vermont, whichever is applicable.



DISCLAIMER: This permit summary may not be an accurate reflection of all permits and/or the permit status on the property. A visit to the specific office to review the physical copies of any permits for the property should ALWAYS be undertaken to ensure accuracy of information. The full permit document can be found by contacting the department identified at the head of the document group. This permit summary is drawn from the records of The Departments of Planning & Zoning, Public Works, Code Enforcement and Clerk/Treasurers Office. The permit status reflects the actions of these departments only. The Assessor's Office conducts an independent review of permit activities for property use and data changes

Property Activity Summary Report as of

7/19/2017 5:25:16PM

Report generated at: property.burlingtonvt.gov

Grantee: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
DOC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Contact: Code Enforcement	Address: 645 Pine Street	Phone: (802)863-0442	Status
	Document Type: Code Billing Folders							
	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	172916	08-139046	Gregory T. Chioffi				Cancelled
9 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	180607	09-104070	Gregory T. Chioffi				Cancelled
10 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	194963	10-118252	Gregory T. Chioffi				Cancelled
11 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	208280	11-131415	Gregory T. Chioffi				Cancelled
12 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	226644	12-148817	Gregory T. Chioffi				Cancelled
13 Rental Billing Property Sold and Transferred - Jul 1 2013	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	240241	13-162170	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC				Cancelled
14 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	265866	14-183042	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC				Cancelled
15 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	288948	15-204253	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC				Cancelled
16 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	308867	16-222127	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC				Cancelled
17 Rental Billing	Code Enforcement Billing Folder	329885	17-241039	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC				Open
	Document Type: Construction Permits							

Presented by
CODE for
appeal

Grantee: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
COC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Status
12/12/1988	Mechanical Permit	31865	9861	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	New Gas Furnace with duct work and a cond.				
05/09/1989	Building Permit	19763	10781	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	Roof Platform For Air Conditioning Equipment =====Close-Out Permit 11/18/99, J.A. Rasys=====				
03/10/1995	Electrical Permit	4642	26585	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	Replacing Wiring And 3 Receptacle Outlets				
03/10/1995	Building Permit	24399	26583	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	Oil Spill Repair To Basement Structure				
10/03/2000	Mechanical Permit	35787	2001639	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	Install 1 Rinnai" Space Heater				
10/13/2000	Plumbing Permit	14096	2001706	Steven Bouchard	Closed
	Install (2) Hair Wash Sinks To Serve New Salon.				
04/28/2004	Plumbing Permit	117124	04-106616	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Install 1-40 gal HWH				
08/08/2008	Electrical Permit	172316	08-138446	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Install new wiring for newly installed ac/dc interconnected smoke and co detectors per city code of ordinance in 1 apt. and add a bath vent fan				
04/03/2013	Building Permit	246227	13-166078	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Demo only in preparation for space remodel				
	Building Permit	248075	13-167898	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Work was completed under BP#13-167913 -Building Permit was not required for this project per Chapter 8 of the Burlington Code of Ordinance sect 8-28(d) or as approved and noted by the City of Burlington Building Official.				
04/18/2013	Building Permit	248090	13-167913	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Interior remodel of existing space for new LUCY NEXT DOOR to uinclude new ADA Entry. No change in use of the existing structure and no increase of living space.				
04/19/2013	Electrical Permit	248105	13-167928	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	DEMO ONLY - Remove existing wiring to prepare for remodel of space for "Lucy Next Door".				
05/09/2013	Plumbing Permit	248106	13-167929	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	DWV,water piping and fixtures to serve ADA bath room, pot sink, mop sink, hand sink, scrub sink, Rinnai Continuum water heater.				
05/09/2013	Mechanical Permit	248107	13-167930	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Installation of (1) Rinnai space heater, (2) Fujitsu Ductless split systems, (1) bath room fan, and reconfiguration of existing gas piping.				

Grantor: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
OC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Status
09/2013	Reconciliation of Permit Fees	248109	13-167932	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
Reconciliation on the final construction cost of the project as results of change orders, etc., to the original (parent) permit estimated cost respective to the City Code of Ordinances Chapter 8 section 8-28.					
09/2013	Electrical Permit	248717	13-168489	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
All new wiring for an interior remodel of existing space for new LUCY NEXT DOOR, including new lighting, recepts, bathroom exhaust fan and outside lighting (pending approval). Per NEC 2011					
	Building Permit	248930	13-168702	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
Building Permit was not required for this project per Chapter 8 of the Burlington Code of Ordinance sect 8-28(d) or as approved and noted by the City of Burlington Building Official.					
	Building Permit	248933	13-168705	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
Building Permit was not required for what is in the description on the attached Zoning Permit respective to Chapter 8 of the Burlington Code of Ordinance sect 8-28(d) or approved and/or noted by the City of Burlington Building Official.					
	Building Permit	248934	13-168706	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
Building Permit was not required for this project per Chapter 8 of the Burlington Code of Ordinance sect 8-28(d) or as approved and noted by the City of Burlington Building Official.					
09/2013	Plumbing Permit	250846	13-170611	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
All new plumbing system to serve ADA toilet and sink, 4 bay pot sink, w/grease trap, hand wash sink, food prep sink, rough in PVC drain and domestic to 3rd floor re bath.					
	Building Permit	251543	13-171308	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
Building Permit UNDER BP 13-167913 & EP 13-168489 - Building Permit was not required for this project per Chapter 8 of the Burlington Code of Ordinance sect 8-28(d) or as approved and noted by the City of Burlington Building Official.					
09/2013	Mechanical Permit	251828	13-171593	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
All two ductless split systems, install a Triangle Tue boiler and DHW tank, intsl Bosebook heat for 2nd floor and rough in only for heat for third floor.					
09/2017	Reconciliation of Permit Fees	333166	17-244318	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
Repective to The City of Burlington Code of Ordinances chapter 8 section 8-28(a); this document reflects the correct statement of total actual cost of construction as ults of change orders, etc., over and beyond the original permit estimated costs.					
03/2017	Electrical Permit	333167	17-244319	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
Invert 3rd floor to habitable space, bedroom, living room, kitchen, bathroom. New sub-panel to feed branch circuits, relocate 2nd floor panel, Wiring for new bathroom, dry room, washer dryer. All work to be per the NEC and the BCO.					
04/2017	Plumbing Permit	333168	17-244320	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
All new plumbing system to serve: 2nd floor bath remodel and adding laundry connection. 3rd floor plumbing for new bath , laundry and kitchen....					

Grantee: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
COC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Status
03/14/2017	Mechanical Permit 3rd floor: add BBR heating zone and Fujitsu split system w/2 heads.	333169	17-244321	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
03/08/2017	Building Permit Interior demo only of 2nd floor apt. for exploratory evaluation for design. No new fitup is approved with this permit.	333143	17-244295	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Pending Approval
03/13/2017	Building Permit Phase 2: Specific to VT Fire & Building Safety Code: Convert 3rd floor into habitable space to expand existing apartment to include new interior stairs from 2nd to 3rd floor, dormer on west elevation, new kitchen, bathroom bedroom, living and dining on 3rd floor, new windows and roof cover with approved materials.	333318	17-244470	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Deficiencies Exist
06/13/2017	Building Permit Create one bedroom apartment in 3rd floor. Replace rated exterior door.	336924	17-248072	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Pending Approval
	Plumbing Permit	337146	17-248294	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Application
07/10/2017	Plumbing Permit Install limited area sprinkler system (max 2 heads) per NFPA 101 to protect heating units.	338071	17-249219	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Closed
Document Type: Right-of-Way					
05/08/2013	Obstruction Permit Obstruction location: Activity permitted: TEMP WALL FOR BUILDING PROJECT, REMOVAL OF EXISTING STORE FRONT PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNAGE AS REQUIRED	248987	13-168759	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
03/13/2017	Obstruction Permit Contractor will be blocking sidewalk to access a third floor window in the building.	333314	17-244466	City Of Burlington - Department of Public Works	Closed
Document Type: Routine Inspections					
	Minimum Housing Inspection	172912	08-139042	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Minimum Housing Inspection	249841	13-169612	Gregory T. Chioffi	Closed
	Minimum Housing Inspection	337208	17-248356	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Inspection Due
Document Type: Zoning Review					
Contact: Planning and Zoning Address: 149 Main Street Phone: (802)865-7188					

Applicant: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
DOC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Status
4/1989	Zoning Permit - Historic	254572	89-003	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	Review Complete
Installation of condensing unit at rear of existing optical shop to be screened with diamond shaped metal mesh, painted to match. Amended location 5/8/1989.					
5/1994	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	42111	95-092	Tim Seagroves	Final CO Issued
Change of use from an optician with a retail component to enterley retail for the video rental. No exterior changes proposed.					
5/1994	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	42141	95-103	Ivan Sutlief	Final CO Issued
Installation of a parallel externally illuminated sign, Measuring 10'X 4' For the existing video rental establishment.					
5/2001	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	46371	02-211	Heather A. Beal	Final CO Issued
Installation of a parallel externally illuminated sign for consignment boutique.					
5/2013	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	245218	13-0708CA	Gregory T. Chioffi	Final CO Issued
Change use of entire ground floor from retail to cafe. No change to residential above.					
5/2013	Zoning Permit - Signs and Awnings	246986	13-0835SN	Gregory T. Chioffi	Final CO Issued
parallel sign for Lucky Next Door.					
5/2013	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	246987	13-0836CA	Gregory T. Chioffi	Final CO Issued
Change use from retail to restaurant. Storefront renovation to bring storefront forwards to line up with front facade, eliminating angle. New doors and windows with decorative metalwork in front. Installation of exterior door on side, two exterior heat pump units, and two vents (heater and bathroom).					
1/2013	Zoning Permit - Signs and Awnings	250455	13-1218SN	Gregory T. Chioffi	Final CO Issued
parallel sign on side for LND with external gooseneck light, new external lighting fixtures for existing sign on front for Lucky Next Door (approved under 13-0835SN).					
7/2017	Zoning Permit - COA Level II	328928	17-0758CA	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	FCO Pending
Apartment renovation to expand habitable space with dormer; replace a window and re-shingle, or install slate, roof.					
4/2017	Zoning Permit - COA Level I	335794	17-1157CA	Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC	FCO Pending
Convert one bedroom apartment in 3rd floor. Replace exterior door.					

Grantee: City of Burlington
Parcel: 044-4-030-000
Owner: Penny Cluse Real Estate LLC
Location: 163-165 Cherry ST
Land Use: C
COC Exp: 02/20/2017

Issue Date	Permit Type / Description	Folder No.	Permit No.	Grantor	Status
------------	---------------------------	------------	------------	---------	--------

Key to Permit Status

Below is a list of common permit states and what they may mean for you:

- **Application** - A permit application has been made that has not been processed yet.
- **C of O Requested** - A Zoning Certificate of Occupancy has been requested but not processed. Contact the Code Enforcement Office to enquire.
- **Closed** - A Construction Permit requires no further action.
- **Closed with Final** - A Construction Permit has had its Final Inspection, is complete and no further action is required.
- **CO Noncompliant** - A Zoning Certificate of Occupancy (CO) has been requested but cannot be completed due to issues. Contact the Code Enforcement Office to enquire.
- **CSD Passed** - The Construction Start Deadline (CSD) for a Zoning Permit has passed (generally 1 year from issuance). The permit is still valid. Request a Final Zoning Certificate of Occupancy from the Code Enforcement Office to proceed.
- **Final CO Issued** - A Zoning Permit has been issued a Final Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and is complete. No further action is required.
- **Issued** - A Construction permit has been issued by the City but has not received a Final Inspection. Final Inspections are required.
- **Permit Expired** - The Expiration Date for a Zoning Permit has passed and the project was never undertaken. This was verified by the Code Enforcement Office, and no further action is required.
- **Permit Indeterminate** - The Expiration Date for a Zoning Permit has passed (generally 2 years from issuance). The permit no longer valid, but the property owner has not asked the City to verify and document what happened. Request a Final Zoning Certificate of Occupancy from the Code Enforcement Office to do this. There may be additional After the Fact fees.
- **Permit Relinquished** - The Expiration Date for a Zoning Permit has Not passed and the project was never undertaken. The owner gave up his/her right to act on the valid permit as documented by the Code Enforcement Office. No further action is required.
- **Ready to Release** - A Zoning Permit is ready to be picked up at the Planning and Zoning office. Release requires signing the permit and payment of any outstanding fees. A Zoning Permit is not valid until this step is completed.
- **Released** - A Zoning Permit has been Released by the Planning and Zoning office and is valid. Neither the CSD Deadline or Permit Expiration Date have passed. Request a Final Zoning Certificate of Occupancy to proceed.
- **Review Complete** - Review of a Zoning Permit application is complete and the permit was Released. No further action is required.
- **Superseded** - A Zoning Permit has been replaced by a subsequent permit. No further action is required.

<< End of Report >>

Anna Wyner

From: Samuel Hartman <samuelhartman802@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2017 6:02 AM
To: Maxwell Tracy; Jane Knodell; Anna Wyner; Fusion Property Management
Subject: Concern regarding the removal of 10 parking spaces

Good Morning,


My name is Samuel Hartman and I am a tenant at 76 North Union Street. As you are aware, there is a significant lack of parking for residents currently living on North Union Street, becoming increasingly difficult closer to the intersection with North Street and starting after the intersection of Pearl Street. While I am an enthusiastic proponent of a more biker-friendly Burlington, I have grave concern for the removal of any parking spaces in areas with an already difficult and frustrating lack of parking. Most of the tenants who live in apartments close to the 10 parking spots that are proposed to be removed already have a difficult time finding parking and are often forced to park far from their apartment.

It is with my sincerest hope that I ask you to reconsider the removal of these 10 parking spots. The removal of these spots would significantly harm the livability of many apartment units near this area.

I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Samuel Hartman
SamuelHartman802@gmail.com
(802) 324-9195



Presented by
Nicole & Anna
for item 7

Anna Wyner

From: Eli G <e.gitels@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 9:54 PM
To: Maxwell Tracy; Jane Knodell
Cc: Anna Wyner
Subject: City of burlington parking plans

Dear Councilors,

My name is Eli Gitelman and I live at 76 North Union Apt 2. Currently at 76 N. Union we are struggling to find a parking solution that ensures a parking situation that works harmoniously for all the tenants. Currently that does not exist because there is not ample room on the driveway for 1 car from 6 of the apartments and 2 cars from 80 N. Union. Apartments 7 & 8 of 76 N. Union already have offsite parking due to this problem. Thus, we, the tenants of 76 and 80 N. Union, rely heavily on the 10 parking spaces this plan intends to remove. If you are to remove these 10 parking spaces know that you are heavily impacting the livelihood of many of Burlington's citizens. It is already a struggle to often find parking on North Union, the removal of those 10 spots would be catastrophic to our ability to park what I consider a reasonable distance from our home. It is also not just us you effect. If the tenants at 76 and 80 North Union are forced to park on the surrounding streets we would then be forcing our problem onto our neighbors which in turn means this plan will create a systemic problem throughout the neighborhood. Please do not enact this plan.

Sincerely,
Eli Gitelman

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 4:32 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: ONE Wiggle - N Union

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: jj vandette [<mailto:jjvandette@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: ONE Wiggle - N Union

Hello!

I live in the Old North End and I fully support the ONE Wiggle project in its entirety! More specifically, I'm a homeowner on N Union St, and I am very pleased that the Wiggle will be so close to my house! Losing a few parking spots will have a negative impact on my guests parking experience, but the net positive that will come from this bike infrastructure is much more important!

I would love to join the conversation in-person on July 19th, but I am currently visiting Portland, OR. The biking experience in this town is amazing, and while Burlington has a lot to be proud of, we have a lot to aspire to when it comes to bike infrastructure!

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

JJ (Joseph) Vandette

173 N Union St

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 5:03 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: ONE Greenway/Wiggle

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Damon Lane [<mailto:damon.andrew.lane@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2017 12:01 PM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Fwd: ONE Greenway/Wiggle

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Damon Lane" <damon.andrew.lane@gmail.com>
Date: Jul 14, 2017 9:28 AM
Subject: ONE Greenway/Wiggle
To: "Nicole Losch" <nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us>, <cspencer@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc:

Hi Nicole and Chapin,

I heard the DPW Commission will be discussing this on the 19th. Unfortunately I will be out of town then but wanted to write to support the ONE Greenway/Wiggle as a resident of Peru St, where I live in a four-unit building and rent the other three apartments. I use a part of the wiggle in my current commute, a different part when I go for a run, and used to use almost the whole thing when I commuted to UVM. I have noticed the light traffic and that cyclists often use it. Not necessarily aggressive or experienced cyclists, but more casual cyclists who apparently prefer winding through quiet streets over straight, busy streets.

As a landlord who lives on-site, I have seen how various tenants use or don't use the on-street parking over my 9 years here. And how some people are flexible and feel that downtown parking is a shared resource and they won't always get to park right in front of their house. I have seen others who feel entitled to park directly in front of their house. Yesterday, I noticed the on-street parking on North Union relatively full while around the corner on Grant, it was relatively empty. Perhaps a solution to the loss of parking on North Union is to make those neighboring properties eligible for Grant street resident-only parking.

Urban parking is shared. Parking on public roads is a secondary use after transportation. In this location, a block from the urban core, it makes sense to me to improve non-motorized transportation and shift a small percentage of the on-street parking off of the route.

Best regards,

Damon

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Date: July 17, 2017
To: Members of the Public Works Commission
From: Jane Knodell, Central District City Council
Re: Old North End Greenway

I am submitting these comments in writing, as I am unable to attend the July 19 Public Works Commission meeting.

I am writing as a councilor who recently voted in support of the PlanBTV WalkBike Master Plan. I support the direction that this Plan proposes. Now that we are in the implementation phase, we are reminded once again that "the devil is in the details." The Commission has a very important role in ensuring that as we make these changes, we do not impose excessive or undue costs on some members of our community. We need to judiciously weigh the benefits and the costs. I want to raise two issues here: parking and safety.

Parking

The original plan for the Old North End Greenway called for the loss of 10 parking spaces on North Union between Grant and Loomis, and 3 spaces on North Champlain between Sherman and Peru. I have checked with residents and business owners on North Champlain, and have heard no concerns about the loss of these spaces. My comments here focus on North Union.

I want to commend the Commission for not voting at the June meeting, waiting to review the Google survey results, and creating additional opportunity for affected members of our community to weigh in. Councilors Tracy and I have received emails from residents, homeowners, and apartment owners expressing their concern. We have also received emails from constituents and others who are strong supporters of these changes.

As you know, the Google survey results show that, indeed, residents in that area are very concerned about the loss of parking in an area where parking is already in short supply. It has to be acknowledged that the feedback from people who live in that neighborhood to the removal of 10 parking spaces is strongly negative. (A minor point: a survey respondent on Hickok Street is described as "outside the project area." I beg to differ: people on Hickok Street and other nearby streets ARE part of the project area as the demand for parking will be pushed onto nearby streets.)

The report says that so long as more than 10 bicyclists use the Greenway on a given day, the benefits to these individuals outweighs the cost to the 10 people who lost access to parking close to their homes. I fundamentally disagree with this calculus, which vastly undervalues the loss to residents who will have to park farther away from their homes, sometimes late at night, walk further distances with children, groceries, and so forth. I would like to see Public Works staff and Commission come up with a better way of acknowledging and evaluating the very real costs imposed on some members of our community associated with these changes to our streets.

Clearly, the original plan has to be adjusted. I am glad to see that staff has generated some alternatives for the Commission to consider. (I think it is disingenuous, though, to present North Street and Pearl Street as alternatives, as the sheer number of lost parking spaces makes these alternatives non-starters.) Staff recommends Alternative 8, which removes the 10 spaces on North Union but then restores 13 spaces within a 2-3 block radius of this stretch of North Union. I commend staff on their good work to offset the loss of parking by identifying these opportunities to restore parking spaces in the general area.

If the Commission agrees that on balance Alternative 8 offers the best option (and I agree it is better than the original plan), I suggest that you:

- Seek input from residents in the affected area on this solution before adopting it;
- Keep Alternative 6 alive as a long-term way to balance the costs and benefits from the Greenway;
- Monitor the use of the Greenway, particularly in the winter, when the cost associated with the loss of proximate parking is greater. If usage is light, reconsider Alternative 4 (the seasonal Greenway idea).

Safety

I am trying to understand how the Loomis-North Union-Grant Street stretch of this Greenway is safe. A person on a bike on Loomis, headed west, will have to cross one-way northbound car traffic on North Union to get to the proposed southbound segment of the bike path. Similarly, a person on a bike on Grant Street, headed east, will have to cross one-way northbound car traffic on North Union to get to the northbound segment of the bike path.

How will this comingling of cars and bikes be made safe? Presumably, the person on the bike whether headed west or east, will have to stop at North Union and wait for a safe break in the car traffic. Since they will almost always have to stop their bikes anyway, would it be reasonable to have westbound bicyclists cross in the crosswalk on foot and walk their bikes a short distance on the sidewalk (southbound on North Union) to resume their trip on the Greenway? This solution (which I'm sure has some problems I have not considered, but am throwing it out there anyway) would not require the removal of any parking spaces at all, and, combined with the restoration of parking spaces identified in Alternative 8, would be a true win-win for all.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: Greenwya in Old North End

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Phil Hammerslough [<mailto:phil.hammerslough@me.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 10:51 PM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc: Chapin Spencer <cspencer@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Greenwya in Old North End

Hi Nicole, Please share this with the board.best,Phil Hammerslough

Sent from a mobile device. Apologies for brevity and typos.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Phil Hammerslough <phil.hammerslough@me.com>
Date: July 17, 2017 at 10:01:04 AM EDT
To: Jason Van Driesche <jason@localmotion.org>
Subject: Greenwya in Old North End

Dear Jason & Local Motion,

As a property owner, landlord, and one of the founders of ISGOOD, (Isham Street Gardening and Other Optimistic Dongs), I strongly support the Greenways route through the Old North end. Here are some of my reasons:

1. It calms traffic in neighborhoods making our roads safer for walkers, bicycles and people of all ages.
2. It makes our streets more of a public space rather than just another road for the sole use of automobiles
3. It brings people together by making our roads public spaces where children can play in the streets .
4. It makes our neighborhoods safer by having more eyes on the street
5. Green Streets make our neighborhoods friendlier and more conducive to neighborhood building such as creating green space gardening by reducing noisy and polluting traffic
6. Greenways, like bike paths increase property values.
7. Greenways promote people walking to local businesses, restaurants and cafes

All of the above points help make our city a better place to live for people of all ages, as well as attracting businesses and employment.

Best,
Phil Hammerslough
Bicycle/Pedestrian Instigator
Founding member of ISGOOD

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 11:41 AM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: ONE Greenway phone call

Anna, here is some additional feedback on the Greenway and related concerns:

July 18, 2017

Maxine Holmes

23 Converse Court

- Resident for 50 years, parking has been challenging for many years – not enough parking for residents – 2' driveway encroachment has helped a lot
- ONE Greenway concern for residents having to park far away and walk alone at night – seems unsafe
- Glad to hear Loomis won't be one-way with Greenway – heads east by turning from Hickok to Isham to Loomis to Mansfield because turning left onto Pearl Street is very difficult – suggests adding a signal at Greene / Pearl
- Adding parking near City Market driveway will make visibility difficult – already is difficult – suggests signal or stop sign for City Market driveway
- Downtown parking is too expensive so sometimes people need to park in the neighborhoods to get to work
- Resident parking may be needed in their neighborhood but having neighbors complete the petition would be difficult
- May come to Commission meeting to speak as well

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 1:59 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: I support the Old North End Wiggle!

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Kate Spence [mailto:Kate_Spence@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 12:11 PM
To: Robert Alberry <ralberry@burlingtonvt.gov>; Tiki-Jon Archambeau <tarchambeau@burlingtonvt.gov>; Christopher Gillman <cgillman@burlingtonvt.gov>; Justine Sears <jsears@burlingtonvt.gov>; Solveig Overby <soverby@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jeffrey Padgett <jpadgett@burlingtonvt.gov>; James Barr <jbarr@burlingtonvt.gov>; Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: I support the Old North End Wiggle!

Hello all,

I live in the ONE and work at UVM. I would LOVE a quiet route to ride to work. While I highly value green transportation alternatives, I am not a super confident biker on city streets, and a route such as the one being contemplated would make a huge difference in my comfort with riding to work.

Thanks very much,
Kate Spence
999-7787

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 3:39 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: Old North End "Wiggle"

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: mary manghis [<mailto:mmanghis@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 2:57 PM
To: Robert Alberry <ralberry@burlingtonvt.gov>; Tiki-Jon Archambeau <tarchambeau@burlingtonvt.gov>; Christopher Gillman <cgillman@burlingtonvt.gov>; Justine Sears <jsears@burlingtonvt.gov>; Solveig Overby <soverby@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jeffrey Padgett <jpadgett@burlingtonvt.gov>; James Barr <jbarr@burlingtonvt.gov>; Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Old North End "Wiggle"

To Burlington Public Works Commission

I am writing in support of the proposed bike route going through the Old North End. As a resident of an adjoining street (Murray St), this route would be a much safer alternative to the busy streets that are currently used to make the east-west crossing of the city. I often travel through many of the dangerous intersections (ex. Pearl & Elmwood, Elmwood & Grant, etc.) that this route would bypass or provide safer amenities to.

I have seen this sort of "wiggle" used in other cities to great advantage. The improvements to the route would also enhance the adjoining neighborhoods by slowing traffic and making the streets more friendly to children, pedestrians and residents in general.

I cannot make the meeting tomorrow evening but would greatly encourage the commission to let this project proceed. I look forward to the outcome of tomorrow's meeting.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Mary Manghis
28 Murray St
Burlington

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 3:41 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: Support for "Wiggle"
Attachments: IMG_0445.jpg

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: TONY Redington [<mailto:tonyrvt99@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 2:45 PM
Subject: Fwd: Support for "Wiggle"

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: TONY Redington <tonyrvt99@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 18, 2017 at 2:36 PM
Subject: Support for "Wiggle"
To:

Good Day DPW Commissioners:

Am writing because a conflict does not allow me to personally attend your meeting tomorrow evening and just wish to add my voice in support of the basic wiggle corridor improvement.

Am a regular user of the section between Battery Park and North Willard. Sherman/N Champlain/Peru/Elmwood/Grant/N Union/Loomis features fairly low vehicle traffic as a good part of it is local street along with some collector.

Please be aware the wiggle as proposed does little to address difficult intersections--particularly Elmwood/Grant and Elmwood/Peru, Grant/N Winooski, Grant/N. Union and N Union/Loomis.

Some of these are naturals for a mini roundabout which would for the first time offer some safety and comfort for all modes; As you are well aware, N Union is problematic as the narrow 25 feet curb-to-curb cannot host cycle track, parking and anything more than an unsatisfactory 9 foot wide vehicle travelway--some day those cars gotta go, at least a one way cycle track added or maybe a two-way bikeway plus one lane traffic.

As you are well aware, there is little to offer a cyclist or pedestrian looking for safe travel in the current DPW annual work program. Right now we have to wait until 2020 for the first safe intersection outside the

Marketplace at the "intersection of death" (the "rotary" roundabout), and who knows when some significant cycle track will connect two locations with trip potential.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Yours truly,

Tony Redington
20 N Winooski Ave
Burlington

cc Walk Bike Council Steering Committee
Councilors Jane Knodell and Max Tracy

PS While not trying to belabor a point, have attached a photo taken yesterday from the Middlebury Planning Department window at the new Municipal Building. Too bad we cannot look out the DPW Conference Room window and see the same after just spending a half million on an ugly, poorly performing in all areas traffic signal!

--

Champlain Parkway: Stop! Re-Evaluate! Re-Imagine!
Pine Street

Coalition: https://www.facebook.com/groups/861721857283979/?inviter_id=842495720&is_new_user=0

SafeStreets Burlington.com
TonyRVT.blogspot.com @TonyRVT60

--

Champlain Parkway: Stop! Re-Evaluate! Re-Imagine!
Pine Street

Coalition: https://www.facebook.com/groups/861721857283979/?inviter_id=842495720&is_new_user=0

SafeStreets Burlington.com
TonyRVT.blogspot.com @TonyRVT60

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 3:42 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: resident support for Old North End "Wiggle"
Attachments: ONE Wiggle list of endorsers.pdf; ONE wiggle -- map of endorsers.pdf

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Jason Van Driesche [<mailto:jason@localmotion.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 3:12 PM

To: Robert Alberry <ralberry@burlingtonvt.gov>; Tiki-Jon Archambeau <tarchambeau@burlingtonvt.gov>; Christopher Gillman <cgillman@burlingtonvt.gov>; Justine Sears <jsears@burlingtonvt.gov>; Solveig Overby <soverby@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jeffrey Padgett <jpadgett@burlingtonvt.gov>; James Barr <jbarr@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>; Maxwell Tracy <mtracy@burlingtonvt.gov>; Brian Lowe <brian@burlingtonvt.gov>

Subject: resident support for Old North End "Wiggle"

Dear Public Works Commission members,

I am writing to you in advance of Wednesday's meeting to share with you evidence of support for the Old North End Wiggle, which is on your agenda for consideration and a vote. Attached you will find the following documents:

- **A list of 149 people who endorsed the Wiggle project through Local Motion's website.** The document includes the name of each endorser and the comment (if any) that each person submitted with their endorsement. It also includes the text that was presented to potential endorsers for their consideration, which highlights the fact that creation of the Wiggle necessitates the removal of 13 on-street parking spaces.
- **A map showing where Wiggle endorsers live.** Of the 149 endorsers, 127 (85%) are Burlington residents, and 86 (58%) live within a four-block radius of the Wiggle.

Many of these supporters will be at Wednesday's meeting. You have likely already heard by email from a number of others. As you can see, there is strong local support for this project.

This is the first of many projects where, in order to create a truly bikeable city, there will be trade-offs and hard decisions to be made. On behalf of these 149 individuals—as well as the many, many more people who have expressed their support for better biking in Burlington through the development of PlanBTV Walk-Bike—we call on you to support the Wiggle and allow it to move forward.


Thank you.

Best,
Jason

--

I check my email twice a day, at noon and at 4 PM. If you need to reach me urgently, please contact me at the mobile number below. Thank you.

Jason Van Driesche
Interim Executive Director
Local Motion
1 Steele St., Burlington, VT 05401
o: 802-861-2700 ext. 109
m: 802-735-7271



Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

BTV Bike Network: Old North End Wiggle

We, the undersigned, call on the City of Burlington to fully build the Old North End Greenway—also known as the "Wiggle"—to provide a safe, easy-to-navigate east-west route on quiet streets through the Old North End. We understand that the project will result in the removal of 10 on-street parking spaces on Union Street between Loomis and Grant as well as 3 spaces on Champlain Street, and we feel that this loss of parking is reasonable and appropriate. We ask the City to complete this important project in 2017.

In 2018, we ask that the City identify and implement opportunities for additional "neighborhood greenway" routes on low-volume, traffic-calmed streets across the Old North End.

Total endorsements: 149

Name	Comment
1. Christine Hill	
2. Manya Gordon	
3. Mellisa Cain	
4. Glenn McRae	
5. Gil Livingston	
6. Don Welch	
7. Cameron Keitel	I appreciate Burlington's commitment to safe biking, walking, and other non-motorized forms of transit. Connecting the city in such a way is vital.
8. Heather Danis	
9. John Leddy	The addition of this on Street bike infrastructure will bring more use and value to our transportation system than 10 -13 publicly funded parking spaces clogging our streets.
10. Sean Melinn	
11. Chris Bullard	Excellent idea
12. John Ware	
13. Chris Chappa	Christopher Chappa
14. Kerry Swift	This is my route to UVM! Would love to see it bike safe!
15. Siobhan Donegan	
16. Kevin Kelley	
17. Mary Manghis	
18. Margaret Sherman	I totally, support this bike route. Get the bikes onto the street and off the sidewalks in a safe way.
19. Lisa Hughes	
20. Adam Wager	
21. Francesca Werenko	
22. Margaret Turvey	
23. Matthew Vaughan	
24. Thora Chadwick	
25. Sharon Panitch	This is badly needed! There is no safe route right now between the east ONE and the waterfront, which discourages many people from using their bikes as alternative transportation. I fully endorse this project.
26. Stephen Bailey	
27. Linda Bowden	
28. Sam Standard	
29. Daniel Scheidt	
30. Nicky Kumerow	
31. Kathlin Bibens	
32. Damon Lane	I live on Peru St and support slower travel, more bikes, and stormwater features on these streets!

33. Julia Curry As well as making Burlington more bikeable, this will improve the flow of traffic on busy streets such as Pearl and North by drawing bikes away from them.
34. Kara Yelinek Denying bicycle facilities to allow for on-street parking (aka dormant vehicles) is counter productive, our city needs to continue to grow and prosper- but we cannot do so on the reliance of vehicles- there are already far too many parking and driving on our streets. Lets encourage people of all ages and abilities to seek alternative methods for short trips, let's build more bicycle facilities.
35. Ryan Freebern
36. Erin O'Neill
37. Ali Kenney
38. Andrew Frost
39. Torin La Liberte
40. Alicia Taylor
41. Mack Roark
42. Jean Waltz I'll continue to wish we had a North St. bike lane option...and/or Pearl St. I realize with the businesses and residents "needing" parking, the idea of this route has been disputed and dismissed, but I foresee many people still using these streets for their commute via bike, as it is a logical
43. Luke Knisley
44. Rachel Weston
45. Scarlett Duncan
46. Mark Cline-Lucey Please don't let cars continue to trump bike safety. Please pass and develop "The Wiggle!"
47. Bethany Whitaker More biking helps everyone!
48. Jeff Weeks
49. Bill Fox
50. Paul Bierman Please do this for the safety of cyclists, especially young ones. Going east/west on Pearl is too dangerous.
51. Paul Bierman Please do this for the safety of cyclists, especially young ones. Going east/west on Pearl is too dangerous.
52. Mary Beth McNulty Currently I have to bike on the sidewalks with my kids because the traffic in the ONE isn't safe for them.
53. Christopher-Aaron Felker
54. Adam Maxwell Let's wiggle!
55. Amy Demarest
56. Whitney Feininger
57. Margaret Paul
58. Carol Yablonsky
59. Ian Pfeiffer I'd also love to see north st made safer for bikers since I use it every day! Perhaps sidewalk, bike lane, parked cars, then traffic?? Seen it work in other cities.
60. Janine Jacobs
61. Daniel Brown Parked metal boxes are not part of a livable city!
62. Sophie Cassel
63. Austin Smith More bicycles, less cars, less need for parking.
64. Amber Pollak-bruce
65. Charlie Quavelin
66. Linda Sukop
67. Tom Bisson This is really needed. Thanks for pushing for it.
68. Stephen Furkay
69. Doug Viehmann
70. Louis deRosset
71. Kate Stormfield We desperately need safe and designated bicycle routes through Burlington! Please support this plan.
72. Kate Stormfield We desperately need safe and designated bicycle routes through Burlington! Please support this plan.

73. Sonia DeYoung
74. Drew Pollak-Bruce
75. Erik Brotz
76. Eric Stormfield
77. Shay Totten I am happy to endorse this, but my only concern around the loss of parking spots is making sure that people with mobility issues - seniors and the disabled in particular - are not impacted by the street parking space losses. Has there been an analysis to factor that in?
78. Nate Marshall
79. Marika Massey-Bierman
80. Matthew Minor
81. Martha Hull
82. Phil Hammerslough
83. Scott Connolly
84. Jeanne Keller I live in Bilodeau, off East Ave, and regularly use Loomis to get back from downtown (we're senior citizens and the gentle slope is great), but getting from Church to S Union to get over to Loomis is dangerous! Especially at night. This Wiggle would provide us with a safe, calm route for biking downtown and back. We are not students. This would benefit so many Hill residents!
85. Cindy Cook
86. Merrick Gillies
87. Susan Ames
88. Patricia Seelan
89. peg boyle single
90. Charlotte Norris
91. Gwendolyn Causer Looks like a great plan!
92. Ben Emery Safe
93. Sam Damphousse
94. Cindy Wolkin
95. David Felson
96. Alice Murphy
97. Jeremy Bull
98. Sharyl Green
99. Lisa Lax
100. Jonathan Chapple-Sokol Make 'livable city' more than a platitude!
101. David Amato Support biking!
102. Zak
103. Emily Vayda
104. Sarah Wittman
105. Susan Eisenstadt
106. Melissa Seib
107. Tom Buck Fully in agreement!
108. Kit Andrews
109. Rachel Jolly
110. Nancy Hellen Safe biking options are important for our communities.
111. Phyllis BristowJohnson
112. Dale Azaria
113. Molly Langan This is so needed! Thank you for pursuing it.
114. Kiera Sauter

115. Andy Sebranek
116. Emma Cook
117. Sarah Camille Wilson As a daily bicycle commuter who lives in the O.N.E. I am one hundred percent in favor of anything that will make travel by bicycle safer and more accessible. This will also reduce congestion from vehicular traffic, which I hope everyone can agree is a good thing for the neighborhood!
118. Sophia Donforth
119. Elizabeth Dyer
120. Arthur Chukhman
121. Dory Cooper
122. Gabe Jackson
123. Talon Drown
124. David Jacobowitz I have reason to visit the ONE often and would like a quiet, safe way to navigate east-west.
125. Tyler Van Liew
126. Susan Wertheimer
127. Paco Defrancis Free street parking is waste of taxpayer investment and should be changed to transit use. This parking is economic waste. Let the private-sector build parking on private land if there's demand for parking.
128. Mike Wierzbicki
129. Colin Burch
130. Christine Staats
131. Brian Perkins
132. Ronald Meunier
133. Dana Lutters
134. Jj Vandette This is an awesome project!
135. John Oliver I support!!
136. Holly Pedrini
137. Andy Murphy
138. Wayne Senville
139. Maea Brandt The Wiggle is an important addition to amenities Burlington can offer its citizens and students.
140. Bethany Whitaker
141. Greg Fanslow
142. Greg Hancock
143. Kari Hancock
144. Skye Ellicock As a biking family living in the eastern part of the O.N.E., we would truly love a safer way to bike to the lake, friends' houses, etc.
145. Lyn Severance
146. Don Schramm
147. Brian Tremback
148. Daniel Albert
149. Mark Hall

BURLINGTON RESIDENT SUPPORT FOR OLD NORTH END "WIGGLE"

Each small dot represents one individual who endorsed the Wiggle via Local Motion's website. Larger dots with numbers represent multiple individuals living at the same address or in close proximity to each other.



July 18, 2017

Dear DPW Commissioners,

RE: Removal of 10 Parking Spaces on N. Union Street for Bike Lane

BACKGROUND

My partner, Laura Waters, and I own the building at 67 N. Union Street. We apologize for entering this conversation at what may seem like the 11th hour, but unfortunately we were not made aware of this proposal until we received a mailing that was sent out on June 30th. Apparently, there were mailings and flyers distributed on May 17th and June 12th, but for some reason, we, as property owners, were not included in those efforts. As a result we were unaware of the June 20th meeting and were unable to participate in the early stages of this planning process.

Just to be clear, we are avid bicyclists and strong proponents of creating improved cycling corridors within our city. I have been involved in discussions regarding the removal of cars from our city streets since the mid 70's and would love to see Burlington's streets cleared of parked cars. I can imagine how much more open and livable our neighborhoods would be without all the parked cars, but they are our current reality. Until we develop alternate transportation systems and lifestyles car-centric living is all of our reality and removing 10 parking spaces from a densely populated residential area will create hardship and less safety for the residents who are impacted by the removed parking.

Over many, many years North Union Street has been developed as a high density housing area. The housing is very well maintained and provides high quality housing to young professionals and students. Between Grant and Loomis Streets alone, there are approximately 50 apartment units and more than 100 bedrooms surrounded by already limited parking (including Grant Street which is Resident Only Parking).

COMMENTS & DISCUSSION OF PROPOSALS

I requested and received a copy of the Commission Packet from Chapin last Friday. We have had an opportunity to review the materials and would like to address the following:


1. We recognize that there has been significant review and planning that has gone into this proposal, and while we support the development of the ONE Greenway, we strongly urge the Commission to not adopt the recommendation to remove vehicle parking between Grant and Loomis Streets, at least not at this time. We believe that there are opportunities for alternate designs that can support the development of the ONE Greenway without displacing this parking. We hope that the Commission will consider postponing approval of this plan to provide time for those of us who have not yet had the opportunity to participate to do so; to provide for the needs of the affected residents; and to encourage staff to revisit and develop alternate proposals that support the ONE Greenway.

2. The 27 Google survey results that were discovered after the June 2017 meeting clearly indicate the concerns, including safety, which the affected residents have with regard to the loss of parking in this very congested neighborhood. Out of the over 34 responses included in the DPW packet, only 4 responses were positive and none were from residents who live in the impacted area. Also note that the negative responses are not against the ONE but rather only reacting to the loss of critical parking.
3. Alternatives 3 & 4 in the report - Creating a 2 way protected bike lane and/or reconstructing the curb line are discussed as possibilities but are rejected either because they are “Outside the scope of a Quick Build Project” or part of the long term vision for the area. While we support the development of the One Greenway our hope is that the city does not take away parking for the sake of expediency or cost. This decision has a major impact on residents’ lives and should only be implemented if there are no viable alternatives. This is not a last resort situation and I will outline but a few possible alternate solutions that support both the One Greenway and the neighborhood it goes through.
4. Alternative 6 in the report - While reconstruction of curb lines is not within the “Quick Build” framework, this option should be considered as part of the planning for this bikeway. With this in mind, a short term compromise solution that works until curbing work can be implemented can help move this project forward positively.
5. Alternative 7 in the report - Shared parking arrangements are a great option but off street parking spaces in this neighborhood are also very limited and unless the city is prepared to allow greater lot coverage there is no room for additional off street parking. Additionally, creating new off street parking will contribute as much or more storm water runoff as widening the street would.
6. Alternative 8 in the report - Other parking opportunities have been identified by staff. This is fantastic! Parking is sorely needed and if there is the opportunity to implement the One Greenway AND add some parking that is a WIN WIN instead of a WIN LOOSE. Please act on this opportunity.

ALTERNATE PROPOSALS


Alternatives not discussed in the packet:

- a. Have the west bound bike lane on Loomis Street (the Downhill Path) turn left on Green St, right on Hickock Place, and then right on North Union St. This would enable the One Greenway to utilize the existing north bound bike lane on N. Union St and eliminate the need for any counter flow travel. While this adds approximately 600 feet of additional travel to the path, both Green St and Hickock Pl are lightly traveled residential streets and are very pleasant to bike on. See map below.




Alternate west bound bike path utilizing existing N Union St bike lane.


- b. Between Grant and Loomis merge the north bound vehicle and bike lanes to provide room for the south bound bike lane. Merged bike travel exists effectively in the north bound travel lane of Pine St., one of the busiest streets in Burlington. Below are 3 possible configurations that could accomplish this. If properly marked it could also be a traffic calming feature on the street. This option could be implemented as a short term solution which would fit within the “Quick Build” framework and allow the project to move ahead while the long term issues mentioned above are addressed and worked out.



N. Union St looking north at Grant St. Travel and Bike lanes share north corridor (like Pine St.) to Loomis. Parking provides a buffer between south bound cyclists and north bound traffic.



N. Union St looking north at Grant St. Travel and Bike lanes share north corridor (like Pine St.) to Loomis. South bound cyclists adjacent to north bound traffic.



N. Union St looking north at Grant St. Parking moved to the East side of N Union providing traffic calming. Travel and Bike lanes share north corridor (like Pine St.) to Loomis. South bound cyclists adjacent to north bound traffic.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we urge the Commission to postpone final approval of the recommendation to remove 10 parking spaces on N. Union Street and encourage staff to work with the neighbors directly impacted by this parking loss to try to develop a mutually acceptable bikeway solution.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lawrence Smith and Laura Waters
67 N. Union Street

Anna Wyner

From: Nicole Losch
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 12:44 PM
To: Anna Wyner
Subject: FW: O.N.E. "Wiggle"!

For the project file.

Nicole Losch, PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
ph 802.865.5833 :: f 802.863.0466 :: nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401 ::
www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

From: Amy Cudney [<mailto:amyc@gearx.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 9:55 PM
To: Nicole Losch <NLosch@burlingtonvt.gov>; James Barr <jbarr@burlingtonvt.gov>; Jeffrey Padgett <jpadgett@burlingtonvt.gov>; Solveig Overby <soverby@burlingtonvt.gov>; Justine Sears <jsears@burlingtonvt.gov>; Christopher Gillman <cgillman@burlingtonvt.gov>; Tiki-Jon Archambeau <tarchambeau@burlingtonvt.gov>; Robert Alberry <ralberry@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: O.N.E. "Wiggle"!

Dear members of the Public Works Commission,

I am sorry I will not be able to join you Wednesday, July 19th to share my excitement about the proposed O.N.E. "Wiggle."

I live in the O.N.E. on Walnut Street and so appreciate that this bike route will therefore allow me and my children to have a safer way to bike either to Battery Park (for concerts or Beansies!) or up the hill toward UVM (or the very fun playground at Mater Christi).

When biking alone, my kids still often opt to ride on the sidewalk in many parts of the city due to their uncertainty about whether cars will welcome them on the road.

I am delighted by each new section of bike path we carve out of our busy city streets.

Thanks in advance for your support of this terrific little piece of bike thoughtfulness.

Yours,

Amy Cudney
116 Walnut Street
802-865-7667

Please note that this communication and any response to it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Burlington Department of Public Works Commission Meeting
Draft Minutes, 19 July 2017
645 Pine Street

Commissioners Present: Robert Albergy (*departs at 9:10pm*); Tiki Archambeau (Chair); Jim Barr (*arrives at 6:33pm*); Chris Gillman (Clerk); Solveig Overby; Jeff Padgett; Justine Sears (Vice Chair).

Commissioners Absent: None.

Item 1 – Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments

Commissioner (*and outgoing Chair*) Padgett calls meeting to order at 6:30pm and makes opening comments.

Commissioner Barr arrives

Item 2 – Agenda

DPW Director Chapin Spencer requests removing Agenda Item 8 and moving Agenda Item 10 to Agenda Item 7.5. Commissioner Archambeau makes motion to accept Altered Agenda and is seconded by Commissioner Gillman.

Action taken: motion approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 3 – Election of Chair, Vice Chair & Clerk

Commissioner Padgett nominates Commissioner Archambeau for Commission Chair and is seconded by Commissioner Albergy.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous. Newly elected Chair Archambeau acknowledges the service of past Chair Padgett and runs the remainder of the meeting.

Commissioner Padgett nominates Commissioner Sears for Commission Vice Chair and is seconded by Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Commissioner Barr nominates Commissioner Gillman for Commission Clerk and is seconded by Commissioner Albergy.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 4 – Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)

Bethany Whitaker, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
David Small, Ward 5, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Phil Hammerslough, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Alexander Friend, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Eileen Mansini, Ward 7, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Roger Wiberg, Ward 8, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Arleen Bennett, Ward 7, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Debra Gottesman, Ward 6, speaks on Consent Agenda Item E.
Jacob Hinsdale, Ward 5, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Maxine Holmes, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Dave Hartnett, Ward 4, speaks on on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln and Agenda Item 7.
Thomas Dunn, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Item 5 – Consent Agenda

- A. Traffic status report
 - B. Cherry Street truck Loading Zone
 - C. Stop Sign on Brookes Ave and North Prospect Street
 - D. No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place
 - E. Parking on Overlake Park
 - F. Stop Control Switch for Bike Path Project at North Avenue Extension
- Commissioner Alberry makes motion to approve Consent Agenda and is seconded by

Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: motion approved.

“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 6 – Appeal of Code Enforcement Order – 163-165 Cherry St – 19-95 Means of Egress

Senior Assistant City Attorney Gene Bergman introduces the parties of the appeal

- A) Oral Communication by Appellant Charles Reeves who presents his appeal.
- B) Communication by Code Enforcement Director William Ward, Attorney Bergman, and Code Enforcement Inspector Theodore Miles who introduce “Zoning Permit – COA Level 1 – Conditions of Approval” for 163-165 Cherry St and “Property Activity Summary Report” for 163-165 Cherry St for the record while presenting the city’s case.

C) Commissioner Discussion

Chair Archambeau, Vice Chair Sears, Clerk Gillman, and Commissioners Barr, Overby, and Padgett engage in a discussion over Item 6 with Director Ward, Attorney Bergman, and Appellant Reeves responding.

D) Action Requested: Commission will deliberate on this matter after the regular meeting.

Item 7 – PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation – North Union St Parking Changes & One-way Except Bicycles

A) Staff Communication by Director Spencer, Senior Transportation Planner Nicole Losch, and Planning/Engineering Intern Anna Wyner who introduce the city’s supplemental packet of recent public input concerning the PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation for the record while speaking on the proposed changes to North Union St and surrounding streets.

B) Commission Questions

Chair Archambeau and Commissioners Alberry and Barr ask questions on Item 7 with Planner Losch answering.

C) Public Comment

John Pizzagalli, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jill Diemer, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Laurie Smith, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Laura Waters, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion Interim Executive Director, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Mark Furnari, Ward 1 landowner, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jane Knodell, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Kurt Wright, Ward 4, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

D) Commissioner Discussion

The Commission engages in a discussion over Item 7.

E) Motion made by Commissioner Padgett to table the item and delay a vote on staff’s recommendation: approval of plan implementation.

Seconded by Commissioner Alberry.

Discussion

Action taken: motion failed;
Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Chair Archambeau: Aye
Commissioner Barr: Nay
Clerk Gillman: Nay
Commissioner Overby: Nay
Commissioner Padgett: Aye
Vice Chair Sears: Nay

Motion made by Commissioner Overby to accept staff's recommendation: approval of plan implementation (with the addition of language offered by Commissioner Alberry and accepted by Commissioner Overby).

Seconded by Vice Chair Sears.

Discussion

Commissioner Alberry offers a friendly amendment: directing staff to continue to evaluate design adjustments including curb and route modifications before and during the Winooski Avenue Corridor Study process. Chair Archambeau sees if there are any objections. There are not so the resolution is amended. Commissioner Overby and Director Spencer respond.

Action taken: motion approved as amended;

Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Chair Archambeau: Nay
Commissioner Barr: Aye
Clerk Gillman: Aye
Commissioner Overby: Aye
Commissioner Padgett: Aye
Vice Chair Sears: Aye

Commissioner Alberry departs

Item 7.5 – Bove's Proposed Redevelopment & Pearl St Lot

A) Staff Communication by Community Economic Development Office (CEDO) Director Noelle MacKay and Assistant Director for Parking & Traffic Patrick Mulligan who speak on the proposed redevelopment of the Pearl St parking lot.

B) Commission Questions

Chair Archambeau and Commissioner Overby ask questions on Item 7.5 with Director MacKay and Director Spencer answering.

C) Public Comment

D) Commissioner Discussion

E) Action taken: none requested.

Item 8 – St Paul Street Parking Changes

A) Staff Communication by DPW Engineer Laura Wheelock who speaks on the changes to St Paul St.

B) Commission Questions

Commissioners Barr and Padgett ask questions on Item 8 with Director Spencer, City Engineer and Assistant Director for Technical Services Norm Baldwin, and Engineer Wheelock answering.

C) Public Comment

D) Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Padgett seeks to remove "preliminary" from the first line of the recommendation.

E) Motion made by Commissioner Barr to accept staff's recommendation with Commissioner Padgett's language removal: approval of changes to type of parking (with removal of "preliminary" from the first line of the recommendation).

Seconded by Clerk Gillman.

Discussion

Action taken: motion approved;

"Ayes" are unanimous.

Item 9 – Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17

Commissioner Barr makes motion to approve draft minutes of 6-21-17 and is seconded by Vice Chair Sears.

Action take: motion approved;

Commissioner Alberry: *absent*

Chair Archambeau: *abstains*

Commissioner Barr: Aye

Clerk Gillman: *abstains*

Commissioner Overby: Aye

Commissioner Padgett: Aye

Vice Chair Sears: Aye

Item 10 – Director's Report

Director Spencer reports on the new Assistant Director for Parking & Traffic, the July 26th Permit Reform meeting at Burlington Electric (B.E.D.), the City Council resolution on the North Avenue Pilot Project, the hiring process for the department's Public Information Manager, and the possible need for an August 2017 Commission Meeting for Burlington Town Center related items with the Commission engaging in a discussion on this with Director Spencer responding.

Item 11 – Commissioner Communications

Vice Chair Sears comments on Ward St traffic calming with Planner Losch answering; Commissioner Overby comments on an individual she's been contacted by concerning a certain sidewalk issue and the sidewalk repair list with Director Spencer and Engineer Wheelock answering; Commissioner Padgett comments on Public Information Manager position and relinquishing the Commission Chair position; Commissioner Barr comments on Colchester Avenue's placement on the paving list, the addition of the stop sign on Brookes Ave, and seal coating.

Item 12 – Deliberation For Appeal (*after adjournment*)

Item 13 – Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – August meeting TBD, September 20, 2017

Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Barr and seconded by Clerk Gillman.

Action taken: motion approved;

"Ayes" are unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 10:07pm.

Burlington Department of Public Works Commission Meeting
Final Minutes, 19 July 2017
645 Pine Street

Commissioners Present: Robert Alberry (*departs at 9:10pm*); Tiki Archambeau (Chair); Jim Barr (*arrives at 6:33pm*); Chris Gillman (Clerk); Solveig Overby; Jeff Padgett; Justine Sears (Vice Chair).

Commissioners Absent: None.

Item 1 – Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments

Commissioner (*and outgoing Chair*) Padgett calls meeting to order at 6:30pm and makes opening comments.

Commissioner Barr arrives

Item 2 – Agenda

DPW Director Chapin Spencer requests removing Agenda Item 8 and moving Agenda Item 10 to Agenda Item 7.5. Commissioner Archambeau makes motion to accept Altered Agenda and is seconded by Commissioner Gillman.

Action taken: motion approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 3 – Election of Chair, Vice Chair & Clerk

Commissioner Padgett nominates Commissioner Archambeau for Commission Chair and is seconded by Commissioner Alberry.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous. Newly elected Chair Archambeau acknowledges the service of past Chair Padgett and runs the remainder of the meeting.

Commissioner Padgett nominates Commissioner Sears for Commission Vice Chair and is seconded by Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Commissioner Barr nominates Commissioner Gillman for Commission Clerk and is seconded by Commissioner Alberry.

Action taken: nomination approved;
“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 4 – Public Forum (3 minute per person time limit)

Bethany Whitaker, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
David Small, Ward 5, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Phil Hammerslough, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Alexander Friend, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Eileen Mansini, Ward 7, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Roger Wiberg, Ward 8, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Arleen Bennett, Ward 7, speaks on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln.
Debra Gottesman, Ward 6, speaks on Consent Agenda Item E.
Jacob Hinsdale, Ward 5, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Maxine Holmes, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.
Dave Hartnett, Ward 4, speaks on on parking in cal-de-sac at Lori Ln and Agenda Item 7.
Thomas Dunn, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Item 5 – Consent Agenda

- A. Traffic status report
 - B. Cherry Street truck Loading Zone
 - C. Stop Sign on Brookes Ave and North Prospect Street
 - D. No-Parking Any Time Sign at Isham Street and Hickok Place
 - E. Parking on Overlake Park
 - F. Stop Control Switch for Bike Path Project at North Avenue Extension
- Commissioner Alberry makes motion to approve Consent Agenda and is seconded by

Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: motion approved.

“Ayes” are unanimous.

Item 6 – Appeal of Code Enforcement Order – 163-165 Cherry St – 19-95 Means of Egress

Senior Assistant City Attorney Gene Bergman introduces the parties of the appeal

- A) Oral Communication by Appellant Charles Reeves who presents his appeal.
- B) Communication by Code Enforcement Director William Ward, Attorney Bergman, and Code Enforcement Inspector Theodore Miles who introduce “Zoning Permit – COA Level 1 – Conditions of Approval” for 163-165 Cherry St and “Property Activity Summary Report” for 163-165 Cherry St for the record while presenting the city’s case.

C) Commissioner Discussion

Chair Archambeau, Vice Chair Sears, Clerk Gillman, and Commissioners Barr, Overby, and Padgett engage in a discussion over Item 6 with Director Ward, Attorney Bergman, and Appellant Reeves responding.

D) Action Requested: Commission will deliberate on this matter after the regular meeting.

Item 7 – PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation – North Union St Parking Changes & One-way Except Bicycles

- A) Staff Communication by Director Spencer, Senior Transportation Planner Nicole Losch, and Planning/Engineering Intern Anna Wyner who introduce the city’s supplemental packet of recent public input concerning the PlanBTV Walk Bike Implementation for the record while speaking on the proposed changes to North Union St and surrounding streets.

B) Commission Questions

Chair Archambeau and Commissioners Alberry and Barr ask questions on Item 7 with Planner Losch answering.

C) Public Comment

John Pizzagalli, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jill Diemer, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Laurie Smith, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Laura Waters, Ward 2 landlord, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion Interim Executive Director, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Mark Furnari, Ward 1 landowner, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Jane Knodell, Ward 2, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

Kurt Wright, Ward 4, speaks on Agenda Item 7.

D) Commissioner Discussion

The Commission engages in a discussion over Item 7.

- E) Motion made by Commissioner Padgett to table the item and delay a vote on staff’s recommendation: approval of plan implementation.

Seconded by Commissioner Alberry.

Discussion

Action taken: motion failed;
Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Chair Archambeau: Aye
Commissioner Barr: Nay
Clerk Gillman: Nay
Commissioner Overby: Nay
Commissioner Padgett: Aye
Vice Chair Sears: Nay

Motion made by Commissioner Overby to accept staff's recommendation: approval of plan implementation (with the addition of language offered by Commissioner Alberry and accepted by Commissioner Overby).

Seconded by Vice Chair Sears.

Discussion

Commissioner Alberry offers a friendly amendment: directing staff to continue to evaluate design adjustments including curb and route modifications before and during the Winooski Avenue Corridor Study process. Chair Archambeau sees if there are any objections. There are not so the resolution is amended. Commissioner Overby and Director Spencer respond.

Action taken: motion approved as amended;

Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Chair Archambeau: Nay
Commissioner Barr: Aye
Clerk Gillman: Aye
Commissioner Overby: Aye
Commissioner Padgett: Aye
Vice Chair Sears: Aye

Commissioner Alberry departs

Item 7.5 – Bove's Proposed Redevelopment & Pearl St Lot

A) Staff Communication by Community Economic Development Office (CEDO) Director Noelle MacKay and Assistant Director for Parking & Traffic Patrick Mulligan who speak on the proposed redevelopment of the Pearl St parking lot.

B) Commission Questions

Chair Archambeau and Commissioner Overby ask questions on Item 7.5 with Director MacKay and Director Spencer answering.

C) Public Comment

D) Commissioner Discussion

E) Action taken: none requested.

Item 8 – St Paul Street Parking Changes

A) Staff Communication by DPW Engineer Laura Wheelock who speaks on the changes to St Paul St.

B) Commission Questions

Commissioners Barr and Padgett ask questions on Item 8 with Director Spencer, City Engineer and Assistant Director for Technical Services Norm Baldwin, and Engineer Wheelock answering.

C) Public Comment

D) Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Padgett seeks to remove "preliminary" from the first line of the recommendation.

E) Motion made by Commissioner Barr to accept staff's recommendation with Commissioner Padgett's language removal: approval of changes to type of parking (with removal of "preliminary" from the first line of the recommendation).

Seconded by Clerk Gillman.

Discussion

Action taken: motion approved;

"Ayes" are unanimous.

Item 9 – Approval of Draft Minutes of 6-21-17

Commissioner Barr makes motion to approve draft minutes of 6-21-17 and is seconded by Vice Chair Sears.

Action take: motion approved;

Commissioner Alberry: *absent*

Chair Archambeau: *abstains*

Commissioner Barr: Aye

Clerk Gillman: *abstains*

Commissioner Overby: Aye

Commissioner Padgett: Aye

Vice Chair Sears: Aye

Item 10 – Director's Report

Director Spencer reports on the new Assistant Director for Parking & Traffic, the July 26th Permit Reform meeting at Burlington Electric (B.E.D.), the City Council resolution on the North Avenue Pilot Project, the hiring process for the department's Public Information Manager, and the possible need for an August 2017 Commission Meeting for Burlington Town Center related items with the Commission engaging in a discussion on this with Director Spencer responding.

Item 11 – Commissioner Communications

Vice Chair Sears comments on Ward St traffic calming with Planner Losch answering; Commissioner Overby comments on an individual she's been contacted by concerning a certain sidewalk issue and the sidewalk repair list with Director Spencer and Engineer Wheelock answering; Commissioner Padgett comments on Public Information Manager position and relinquishing the Commission Chair position; Commissioner Barr comments on Colchester Avenue's placement on the paving list, the addition of the stop sign on Brookes Ave, and seal coating.

Item 12 – Deliberation For Appeal (*after adjournment*)

Item 13 – Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – August meeting TBD, September 20, 2017

Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Barr and seconded by Clerk Gillman.

Action taken: motion approved;

"Ayes" are unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 10:07pm.