



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

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District

Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7

Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, April 26, 2016

6:00 – 7:45 PM

Fletcher Free Library

Community Room

Proposed Draft Agenda

1. Review Agenda
2. Public Forum (20 minutes)
3. Approval of Minutes – 3/16 (5 minutes)
4. Introduction to Neighborhood Revitalization Plan– Gillian Nanton (15 minutes)
5. Review CDBG Advisory Board Recommendations – Marcy Esbjerg (15 minutes)
6. Tiny Homes Discussion – 20 minutes
7. Next meeting – May 24, 2016 – Fletcher Free Library



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

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District

Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7

Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

6.00 - 8:00 PM

Robert Miller Center

130 Gosse Court, Burlington

Draft Minutes 03.22.16

1. Review Agenda

Chair Selene Colburn opened the meeting at 6:08 p.m. with a review of the agenda. The Chair moved a Motion to amend that agenda, interchanging item #4: Update of UVM off-campus housing tracking – and item #5: Review of revised RFP for Inclusionary Zoning, so as to allow sufficient time for presentation and discussion of the latter. The Motion to amend the agenda was seconded by Councilor Roof.

2. Public Forum (20 minutes)

Florence Becot and **Joy Dublin Grossman**, graduate students at the University of Vermont, presented a policy brief on gentrification. Entitled, **Gentrification: Risks, Assessment and Policy Interventions**, the presenters opened their presentation with three takeaways. These were: (i) gentrification is a process and once started is impossible to reverse (ii) housing should be available for all and be affordable at different levels and (iii) gentrification can be assessed through two tools – the gentrification risk assessment tool and the drill down approach. The gentrification risk assessment tool relies on GIS technology to produce maps that include measures such as median income, educational levels and changes in housing prices. The drill down approach, complementary to the mapping tool, addresses questions related to how neighborhood changes and gentrification can affect communities, including changes in culture, racial and ethnic environments.

Regarding gentrification, the various policy measures adopted by Burlington were highlighted. These included, inclusionary zoning, affordable housing through the work of Champlain Housing Trust and efforts by the Housing Trust Fund to provide affordable housing.

Chair Colburn noted that gentrification had long been a topic discussed in Burlington, including in the Housing Action Plan and PlanBTV South End. She also noted that rent control was one tool used in the past to keep housing affordable in Burlington.

Councilor Roof queried whether gentrification was impossible to reverse.

Dublin Grossman responded that gentrification can be slowed down with appropriate policy tools and when the city is aware that “it has legs.” While reiterating again that gentrification is hard to reverse, she added that people can return to an area in which they once lived, but there has to be a cultural shift.

Chair Colburn pointed out that a critical question regarding gentrification that must be answered is: “Where are we in Burlington?”

Keith Pillsbury said that the issue of gentrification is an interesting one for Burlington. According to him, houses are purchased as investment property and being rented to students; the prices were out of reach of residents. He opined too, particularly in Wards 1 & 8, there wasn’t a good mix of residents and those areas tipped towards students. The city has a social responsibility to ensure that low-income, lower-income and young families are not displaced, he said. Pillsbury also noted that UVM has a responsibility to house its students.

Sue Reardon provided an update on the proposed development at 451 Ethan Allen Parkway. According to her, none of the homeowners on Moore Drive or Moore Court had received written notification. Planning and Zoning confirmed that homeowners had been written to, she said, although this could not be proven. While Reardon was unsure of the next steps, she opined that homeowners had until April 6, to file an appeal. Alternatively, the city could vacate the preliminary plat approval. Reardon sought the Committee’s help to redress the situation.

Councilor Ayers offered to follow-up and determine whether or not certified letters were sent to homeowners. He noted that preliminary plat approval had been granted by Planning & Zoning, and final approval is contingent on several factors. He also observed that the situation was a difficult one, given that Vermont Wetlands Conservation Board had already granted renewal of the permit and had made a similar recommendation to the Development Review Board (DRB). In his view, the developers appeared to have met most of the hurdles and the process seemed well advanced.

Chair Colburn queried whether or not an appeal had been made to DRB, who had granted preliminary plat approval on March 7, 2016. She proposed sending a communication to DRB and Planning and Zoning, indicating there are concerns regarding preliminary plat approval which appeared to have been done prematurely and without proper notice.

Keith Pillsbury opined that some homeowners had received letters from the DRB, but they had not been certified.

The meeting was informed that a third party assessment was being done of the area and agreement on the engineering firm was yet to be reached.

3. Approval of Minutes – 23/16 (5 minutes)

Councilor Roof moved a Motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Councilor Ayers.

4. Update on UVM off-campus housing tracking (25 minutes)

Following an introduction from **Joe Speidel** of UVM, **Gail Champnois**, UVM – Community Coalition, noted that the Coalition is engaged in mediating in lots of areas that build community safety. In addition to tracking when students are given tickets, she opined that the Coalition intervenes early regarding problem properties. According to her, when this occurs, the incidents don't continue. Champnois said too that, officers from the Burlington Police Department had been increasing their overtime patrols and even though alcohol tickets had increased, noise pollution ticketing had declined. She informed that the number of responses from officers had increased while the number of calls from neighborhoods had in fact dropped.

Joe Speidel said that, in accordance with the 2009 Agreement between the City and UVM, the university had complied with a number of issues. He explained that UVM has heightened its tracking of off campus under-graduate students in terms of the numbers and their locations. This is being done through the Registrar's Office website visited by 95% of students who go there to check on schedules. Speidel elaborated that since 2009, despite a pop-up box in which students could enter their address and contact information, UVM observed that the number of students updating their information was declining. Maps with estimates of where students lived were made of wards 2, 6 and 8, he said. In fall 2014, the university saw its lowest response rate and the view was taken that student information was not accurate. In 2015, a survey was initiated to all off-campus students to more accurately capture the number and location of where students are living. According to Speidel, the survey yielded a 44% response rate. He also said that of the 65% of off-campus students live on 24 streets.

Lisa Kingsbury of UVM discussed the UVM Master Plan. According to her, even though the data is not perfect, the university has a "good idea where students live." She mentioned that a change was instituted in relation to the pop-up box which now required students' local address before being able to move forward to the next screen. Since this change had been made in June 2015, 83% of all UVM students had updated their information. She also said that, once the current registration period was over, the university would have better data. Another survey was being sent out to all off-campus students.

Councilor Roof queried as to the remainder – 17% - of students.

Kingsbury pointed out that 17% of students had not yet logged onto the system. She expected that 90% would do so.

Keith Pillsbury questioned the utility of the 'UVM Spring 2015 Off-Campus Student Address Survey' map that had been distributed at the meeting. He opined that while 55 undergraduate students live on University Place, the map did not indicate any students living on that street.

Lisa Kingsbury noted that the map only reflected those locations where at least 1% or more of students live.

Councilor Ayres enquired about the relationship between UVM and major landlords.

Joe Speidel said that the university had worked hard to develop a strong relationship with landlords.

Gail Shampnois noted that the Coalition works closely with Code Enforcement, tenants and landlords. When incidents occur, house visits are made to tenants and landlords are communicated with through Code Enforcement. She added that her office also engages in conflict resolution.

Joe Speidel explained the 'Smart Party' program that had been adopted by the University of Colorado. According to him, any student throwing a party on Friday or Saturday night is encouraged to register the event with Off Campus Housing, and provide their student ID, address and two phone numbers. If there's a noise complaint, dispatch will call and give a warning, after which there's a 20-minute window to shut the party down and avoid the cops. The 'Smart Party' program allows students to take responsibility before the cops arrive. He suggested that the city and university might want to consider introducing a similar program in Burlington.

He informed that off-campus workshops had revealed the reason why students want to live off-campus was largely due to privacy and having independence and freedom. While cost was a factor in students' deciding to live off-campus, it wasn't the most important issue. The vast majority of students turning 19 or 20 years desired to live on their own, he said. About 10% favored living on-campus.

Lisa Kingsbury, citing 2011 data, noted that most students pay between \$560-\$800 per month, per bed, to live on campus. There is an additional \$380 per month for meals. She added that, while on-campus accommodation comes in higher than off-campus, which could range from between \$550 to \$1,000 per month, UVM on-campus students had the benefits of utilities, common area usage and safety measures, among others. Kingsbury also noted that 70% of off-campus students signed 12-month leases.

Selene Colburn suggested that it would be useful for the university to determine the cost of on-campus housing according to square footage so that a useful comparison might be made with off-campus housing.

Councilor Ayres queried whether the university had looked into the purpose-built campus housing model. He cited state college in New Jersey where four students shared accommodation in a single unit, which had a kitchen.

Lisa Kingsbury observed that the UVM Master Plan goes through a developmental progression and that the university was open to the idea of third party relationships.

Troy Headrick, UVM Conduct Officer, explained that his office responds to any incident from which reports originate, whether from campus police or Burlington Police Department (BPD). He observed that citations fall into three categories, from minor incidents (Tier 1), such as noise complaints where there's no history or prior complaint to alcohol violations (Tier 3) where there could be a formal hearing, due process and sanctions or fines. Headrick reported that in fall 2015, there had been 202 referrals from BPD, the vast majority (127), falling into the Tier 1 category. He also opined that citations usually decline in the winter months, but as spring approaches, these could be in the range of 150 to 200. The key was to reach students before incidents occurred, he said. This year was a great one not only because the data was trending in the right direction, but there had been lots of feedback from neighborhoods.

5. Review of revised RFP for Inclusionary Zoning (25 minutes)

Gillian Nanton introduced the revised Inclusionary Zoning Request for Proposals (RFP), observing that the current draft represented a major overhaul of the previous version that had been presented to the CDNR Committee on December 14, 2015.

She pointed out that several features had been introduced into the current draft RFP, including a 'Background' section which she viewed as important to set the context for the proposed work to be undertaken. Nanton opined that the revised RFP takes on board public comments and observations made in a memorandum from the CDNR Committee to CEDO dated January 20, 2016. Most importantly, the evaluation of the IZ Ordinance commences with looking at the intent of the regulations enacted some 25 years ago, she said. In this regard, language from the existing IZ Ordinance as laid out in Article 9, Part 1: Section 9.1.1., Burlington Comprehensive Development Ordinance, was used in crafting the Scope of Work of the revised RFP.

Nanton also noted that a section 'Proposal Requirements' which includes qualifications required by prospective consultants and far more robust sections pertaining to how proposals will be evaluated and selected, have been introduced in the current draft RFP. 'Deliverables' and 'Timelines' sections, matters on which the CDNR Committee wished to see more rigor, had also been included. She also opined that an additional \$5,000 for travel expenses had been introduced so as not to limit prospective consultants to the local area, and as recommended by some members of the public and the CDNR Committee in the meeting on December 14, 2015.

Nanton concluded by observing that she had tried to reflect all of the concerns raised in this current version of the draft IZ RFP and particularly, the feedback given by Chair Colburn who had provided input on the revised version before the meeting.

Members of the public and CDNR Committee expressed their appreciation for the work that had been undertaken on the revised Inclusionary Zoning RFP. The view was broadly shared that the timeline to conduct the consultancy was too tight. It was suggested that more time should be allowed between presentation of the draft report and the final document. Although implied, it was also recommended that the RFP specifically require prospective consultants to submit resumes along with names and contact information of references.

Ted Wimpey, commenting specifically on the penultimate paragraph of the 'Background' section said, while all of the statements regarding downtown housing were true, there had been a spurt in market-rate housing development in Burlington over the last two years. He proposed that the language be tweaked so as to eliminate any bias and allow for exploration of all potential reasons for the dampening of market-rate housing over the past decade.

Noting that potential consultants would be ranked, in part, based on their knowledge of Burlington, Wimpey expressed the view that this ought not to exclude out-of-state consultants who are skilled and knowledgeable on inclusionary zoning.

Chair Colburn suggested that beneficiaries of inclusionary zoning housing programs should be interviewed by the consultant/firm undertaking the consultancy. She also said that while the language in the penultimate paragraph of the 'Background' section of the revised RFP could be tweaked, she could live with what had been written.

Councilor Roof, commenting on the 'perceived' bias issue, also said he was happy to live with the existing language in the revised draft RFP.

Gillian Nanton, responding to the issues said, it was not clear there was bias in the revised draft RFP, but she could tinker with the penultimate paragraph in the 'Background' section. She also said the time schedule would be extended between presentation of the draft and final reports. A sentence would be inserted in the 'Proposal Requirements' section of the RFP, requesting prospective consultants to submit their resumes and at least three references. Nanton also clarified that requiring proposers to have knowledge of the local area was not meant to exclude out-of-state consultants. Instead, consultants submitting proposals should demonstrate their knowledge of the area through their submissions, she opined.

Chair Colburn proposed that the Inclusionary Zoning RFP be finalized, along the lines recommended, and the process moves forward.

6. Next Meeting – April 26th at 6:00 p.m., Fletcher Free Library

Chair Colburn, while observing that, there's no shortage of agenda items for the CDNR Committee, suggested one agenda item for the next meeting might be an update on the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

A Motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Councilor Tom Ayres and seconded by Councilor Adam Roof at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gillian Nanton
Assistant Director
Sustainability, Housing & Economic Development
CEDO

CDBG Award Recommendations for the Mayor and City Council

2016 CDBG Applicants - Public Service				
Proj #	Project/Program	Organization	Amount Requested	Recommended Award
	Homeless & Housing Services			
PS1	Expanding Housing First Services in Burlington, VT*	Pathways Vermont, Inc.	\$50,000	\$30,740
PS2	Safe Tonight*	Women Helping Battered Women	\$38,546	\$26,992
	Hunger/Food Security			
PS3	FRESH Food*	Vermont Works for Women	\$30,000	\$16,000
	Seniors & Persons w/Disabilities			
PS4	Complex Case Management for At-Risk Seniors*	Champlain Valley Area Agency on Aging	\$20,000	\$10,000
PS5	Homesharing: People Helping Each Other*	HomeShare Vermont	\$25,000	\$13,000
	Equal Access			
PS6	Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program	Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity	\$12,000	\$12,000
	Health			
PS7	Rapid Intervention Pre-Natal/Parenting Project	Vermont Parent Representation Center, Inc	\$127,000	\$0
PS8	Safe Recovery Opioid Recovery Case Manager	Howard Center	\$47,250	\$0
	* Two-Year	TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$349,796	\$108,732
		TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE	\$108,732	
		DIFFERENCE	(\$241,064)	
	Canceled Project from 2015-unallocated	Dept. of Health	\$42,570	

2016 CDBG Applicants – Development				
Proj #	Project/Program	Organization	Amount Requested	Recommended Award
	Housing			
D1	Affordable Rental Development and Preservation	Champlain Housing Trust	\$130,000	\$130,000
D2	YouthBuild Energy Efficiency and Housing Rehabilitation Project	ReSOURCE	\$70,584	\$70,584
	Economic Development			
D3	Women's Small Business Program	Mercy Connections	\$21,000	\$21,000
	Neighborhood Development			
D4	Westview House Kitchen Renovation	Howard Center, Inc	\$66,000	\$66,000
D5	Community Emergency Food Shelf	Chittenden Emergency Food Shelf - CVOEO	\$29,450	\$29,450
D6	Lower Floor Remodel	Chittenden County Senior Citizens Alliance, Inc.	\$44,800	\$44,800
D7	Westview House Bathroom Remodel	Howard Center, Inc	\$14,200	\$14,200
		TOTAL DEV. AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$376,034	\$376,034
		TOTAL DEV AMOUNT AVAILABLE	\$430,173	\$430,173
		DIFFERENCE – Unexpended Funds	\$54,139	\$54,139

2016 CDBG Applicants - Development (CEDO)				
Proj #	Project/Program	Organization	Amount Requested	Recommended Award
	CEDO			
C1	Sustainable Economic Development	City of Burlington Community and Economic Development Office	\$31,000	\$31,000
	Public Facility Project Delivery	City of Burlington Community and Economic Development Office	\$10,000	\$10,000
		TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED (CEDO)	\$41,000	\$41,000
		TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016		\$579,905
		TOTAL AMOUNT RECOMMENDED 2016		\$525,766
		DIFFERENCE – Contingency Funds		\$54,139



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

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District

Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7

Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

6.00 - 8:00 PM

Robert Miller Center

130 Gosse Court, Burlington

Draft Minutes 03.22.16

1. Review Agenda

Chair Selene Colburn opened the meeting at 6:08 p.m. with a review of the agenda. The Chair moved a Motion to amend that agenda, interchanging item #4: Update of UVM off-campus housing tracking – and item #5: Review of revised RFP for Inclusionary Zoning, so as to allow sufficient time for presentation and discussion of the latter. The Motion to amend the agenda was seconded by Councilor Roof.

2. Public Forum (20 minutes)

Florence Becot and **Joy Dublin Grossman**, graduate students at the University of Vermont, presented a policy brief on gentrification. Entitled, **Gentrification: Risks, Assessment and Policy Interventions**, the presenters opened their presentation with three takeaways. These were: (i) gentrification is a process and once started is impossible to reverse (ii) housing should be available for all and be affordable at different levels and (iii) gentrification can be assessed through two tools – the gentrification risk assessment tool and the drill down approach. The gentrification risk assessment tool relies on GIS technology to produce maps that include measures such as median income, educational levels and changes in housing prices. The drill down approach, complementary to the mapping tool, addresses questions related to how neighborhood changes and gentrification can affect communities, including changes in culture, racial and ethnic environments.

Regarding gentrification, the various policy measures adopted by Burlington were highlighted. These included, inclusionary zoning, affordable housing through the work of Champlain Housing Trust and efforts by the Housing Trust Fund to provide affordable housing.

Chair Colburn noted that gentrification had long been a topic discussed in Burlington, including in the Housing Action Plan and PlanBTV South End. She also noted that rent control was one tool used in the past to keep housing affordable in Burlington.

Councilor Roof queried whether gentrification was impossible to reverse.

Dublin Grossman responded that gentrification can be slowed down with appropriate policy tools and when the city is aware that “it has legs.” While reiterating again that gentrification is hard to reverse, she added that people can return to an area in which they once lived, but there has to be a cultural shift.

Chair Colburn pointed out that a critical question regarding gentrification that must be answered is: “Where are we in Burlington?”

Keith Pillsbury said that the issue of gentrification is an interesting one for Burlington. According to him, houses are purchased as investment property and being rented to students; the prices were out of reach of residents. He opined too, particularly in Wards 1 & 8, there wasn’t a good mix of residents and those areas tipped towards students. The city has a social responsibility to ensure that low-income, lower-income and young families are not displaced, he said. Pillsbury also noted that UVM has a responsibility to house its students.

Sue Reardon provided an update on the proposed development at 451 Ethan Allen Parkway. According to her, none of the homeowners on Moore Drive or Moore Court had received written notification. Planning and Zoning confirmed that homeowners had been written to, she said, although this could not be proven. While Reardon was unsure of the next steps, she opined that homeowners had until April 6, to file an appeal. Alternatively, the city could vacate the preliminary plat approval. Reardon sought the Committee’s help to redress the situation.

Councilor Ayers offered to follow-up and determine whether or not certified letters were sent to homeowners. He noted that preliminary plat approval had been granted by Planning & Zoning, and final approval is contingent on several factors. He also observed that the situation was a difficult one, given that Vermont Wetlands Conservation Board had already granted renewal of the permit and had made a similar recommendation to the Development Review Board (DRB). In his view, the developers appeared to have met most of the hurdles and the process seemed well advanced.

Chair Colburn queried whether or not an appeal had been made to DRB, who had granted preliminary plat approval on March 7, 2016. She proposed sending a communication to DRB and Planning and Zoning, indicating there are concerns regarding preliminary plat approval which appeared to have been done prematurely and without proper notice.

Keith Pillsbury opined that some homeowners had received letters from the DRB, but they had not been certified.

The meeting was informed that a third party assessment was being done of the area and agreement on the engineering firm was yet to be reached.

3. Approval of Minutes – 23/16 (5 minutes)

Councilor Roof moved a Motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Councilor Ayers.

4. Update on UVM off-campus housing tracking (25 minutes)

Following an introduction from **Joe Speidel** of UVM, **Gail Champnois**, UVM – Community Coalition, noted that the Coalition is engaged in mediating in lots of areas that build community safety. In addition to tracking when students are given tickets, she opined that the Coalition intervenes early regarding problem properties. According to her, when this occurs, the incidents don't continue. Champnois said too that, officers from the Burlington Police Department had been increasing their overtime patrols and even though alcohol tickets had increased, noise pollution ticketing had declined. She informed that the number of responses from officers had increased while the number of calls from neighborhoods had in fact dropped.

Joe Speidel said that, in accordance with the 2009 Agreement between the City and UVM, the university had complied with a number of issues. He explained that UVM has heightened its tracking of off campus under-graduate students in terms of the numbers and their locations. This is being done through the Registrar's Office website visited by 95% of students who go there to check on schedules. Speidel elaborated that since 2009, despite a pop-up box in which students could enter their address and contact information, UVM observed that the number of students updating their information was declining. Maps with estimates of where students lived were made of wards 2, 6 and 8, he said. In fall 2014, the university saw its lowest response rate and the view was taken that student information was not accurate. In 2015, a survey was initiated to all off-campus students to more accurately capture the number and location of where students are living. According to Speidel, the survey yielded a 44% response rate. He also said that of the 65% of off-campus students live on 24 streets.

Lisa Kingsbury of UVM discussed the UVM Master Plan. According to her, even though the data is not perfect, the university has a "good idea where students live." She mentioned that a change was instituted in relation to the pop-up box which now required students' local address before being able to move forward to the next screen. Since this change had been made in June 2015, 83% of all UVM students had updated their information. She also said that, once the current registration period was over, the university would have better data. Another survey was being sent out to all off-campus students.

Councilor Roof queried as to the remainder – 17% - of students.

Kingsbury pointed out that 17% of students had not yet logged onto the system. She expected that 90% would do so.

Keith Pillsbury questioned the utility of the 'UVM Spring 2015 Off-Campus Student Address Survey' map that had been distributed at the meeting. He opined that while 55 undergraduate students live on University Place, the map did not indicate any students living on that street.

Lisa Kingsbury noted that the map only reflected those locations where at least 1% or more of students live.

Councilor Ayres enquired about the relationship between UVM and major landlords.

Joe Speidel said that the university had worked hard to develop a strong relationship with landlords.

Gail Shampnois noted that the Coalition works closely with Code Enforcement, tenants and landlords. When incidents occur, house visits are made to tenants and landlords are communicated with through Code Enforcement. She added that her office also engages in conflict resolution.

Joe Speidel explained the 'Smart Party' program that had been adopted by the University of Colorado. According to him, any student throwing a party on Friday or Saturday night is encouraged to register the event with Off Campus Housing, and provide their student ID, address and two phone numbers. If there's a noise complaint, dispatch will call and give a warning, after which there's a 20-minute window to shut the party down and avoid the cops. The 'Smart Party' program allows students to take responsibility before the cops arrive. He suggested that the city and university might want to consider introducing a similar program in Burlington.

He informed that off-campus workshops had revealed the reason why students want to live off-campus was largely due to privacy and having independence and freedom. While cost was a factor in students' deciding to live off-campus, it wasn't the most important issue. The vast majority of students turning 19 or 20 years desired to live on their own, he said. About 10% favored living on-campus.

Lisa Kingsbury, citing 2011 data, noted that most students pay between \$560-\$800 per month, per bed, to live on campus. There is an additional \$380 per month for meals. She added that, while on-campus accommodation comes in higher than off-campus, which could range from between \$550 to \$1,000 per month, UVM on-campus students had the benefits of utilities, common area usage and safety measures, among others. Kingsbury also noted that 70% of off-campus students signed 12-month leases.

Selene Colburn suggested that it would be useful for the university to determine the cost of on-campus housing according to square footage so that a useful comparison might be made with off-campus housing.

Councilor Ayres queried whether the university had looked into the purpose-built campus housing model. He cited state college in New Jersey where four students shared accommodation in a single unit, which had a kitchen.

Lisa Kingsbury observed that the UVM Master Plan goes through a developmental progression and that the university was open to the idea of third party relationships.

Troy Headrick, UVM Conduct Officer, explained that his office responds to any incident from which reports originate, whether from campus police or Burlington Police Department (BPD). He observed that citations fall into three categories, from minor incidents (Tier 1), such as noise complaints where there's no history or prior complaint to alcohol violations (Tier 3) where there could be a formal hearing, due process and sanctions or fines. Headrick reported that in fall 2015, there had been 202 referrals from BPD, the vast majority (127), falling into the Tier 1 category. He also opined that citations usually decline in the winter months, but as spring approaches, these could be in the range of 150 to 200. The key was to reach students before incidents occurred, he said. This year was a great one not only because the data was trending in the right direction, but there had been lots of feedback from neighborhoods.

5. Review of revised RFP for Inclusionary Zoning (25 minutes)

Gillian Nanton introduced the revised Inclusionary Zoning Request for Proposals (RFP), observing that the current draft represented a major overhaul of the previous version that had been presented to the CDNR Committee on December 14, 2015.

She pointed out that several features had been introduced into the current draft RFP, including a 'Background' section which she viewed as important to set the context for the proposed work to be undertaken. Nanton opined that the revised RFP takes on board public comments and observations made in a memorandum from the CDNR Committee to CEDO dated January 20, 2016. Most importantly, the evaluation of the IZ Ordinance commences with looking at the intent of the regulations enacted some 25 years ago, she said. In this regard, language from the existing IZ Ordinance as laid out in Article 9, Part 1: Section 9.1.1., Burlington Comprehensive Development Ordinance, was used in crafting the Scope of Work of the revised RFP.

Nanton also noted that a section 'Proposal Requirements' which includes qualifications required by prospective consultants and far more robust sections pertaining to how proposals will be evaluated and selected, have been introduced in the current draft RFP. 'Deliverables' and 'Timelines' sections, matters on which the CDNR Committee wished to see more rigor, had also been included. She also opined that an additional \$5,000 for travel expenses had been introduced so as not to limit prospective consultants to the local area, and as recommended by some members of the public and the CDNR Committee in the meeting on December 14, 2015.

Nanton concluded by observing that she had tried to reflect all of the concerns raised in this current version of the draft IZ RFP and particularly, the feedback given by Chair Colburn who had provided input on the revised version before the meeting.

Members of the public and CDNR Committee expressed their appreciation for the work that had been undertaken on the revised Inclusionary Zoning RFP. The view was broadly shared that the timeline to conduct the consultancy was too tight. It was suggested that more time should be allowed between presentation of the draft report and the final document. Although implied, it was also recommended that the RFP specifically require prospective consultants to submit resumes along with names and contact information of references.

Ted Wimpey, commenting specifically on the penultimate paragraph of the 'Background' section said, while all of the statements regarding downtown housing were true, there had been a spurt in market-rate housing development in Burlington over the last two years. He proposed that the language be tweaked so as to eliminate any bias and allow for exploration of all potential reasons for the dampening of market-rate housing over the past decade.

Noting that potential consultants would be ranked, in part, based on their knowledge of Burlington, Wimpey expressed the view that this ought not to exclude out-of-state consultants who are skilled and knowledgeable on inclusionary zoning.

Chair Colburn suggested that beneficiaries of inclusionary zoning housing programs should be interviewed by the consultant/firm undertaking the consultancy. She also said that while the language in the penultimate paragraph of the 'Background' section of the revised RFP could be tweaked, she could live with what had been written.

Councilor Roof, commenting on the 'perceived' bias issue, also said he was happy to live with the existing language in the revised draft RFP.

Gillian Nanton, responding to the issues said, it was not clear there was bias in the revised draft RFP, but she could tinker with the penultimate paragraph in the 'Background' section. She also said the time schedule would be extended between presentation of the draft and final reports. A sentence would be inserted in the 'Proposal Requirements' section of the RFP, requesting prospective consultants to submit their resumes and at least three references. Nanton also clarified that requiring proposers to have knowledge of the local area was not meant to exclude out-of-state consultants. Instead, consultants submitting proposals should demonstrate their knowledge of the area through their submissions, she opined.

Chair Colburn proposed that the Inclusionary Zoning RFP be finalized, along the lines recommended, and the process moves forward.

6. Next Meeting – April 26th at 6:00 p.m., Fletcher Free Library

Chair Colburn, while observing that, there's no shortage of agenda items for the CDNR Committee, suggested one agenda item for the next meeting might be an update on the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

A Motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Councilor Tom Ayres and seconded by Councilor Adam Roof at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gillian Nanton
Assistant Director
Sustainability, Housing & Economic Development
CEDO

Tiny house communities to end homelessness

Second Wind Cottages (Newfield, NY)

- 2014
- 18 residents/18 houses
- \$12,000 per unit
- Land and many building materials donated, homes built by volunteers
- Private fundraising covered costs

Quixote Village (Olympia, WA)

- 2013
- 29 residents/30 houses
- \$87,500 per unit
- Sponsored by Panza, a non-profit organization with volunteers from faith-based organizations
- Began as a 2007 protest encampment in a city-owned parking lot; moved over several years to sites at different area churches following eviction
- Panza worked with city council to secure county-owned land for a permanent site
- Camp staffed by hundreds of volunteers, now has full-time staff member/program manager
- Funding came from private donors, state funding, local community grants, Native American tribes, CDBG and a grant from the state legislature.
- Land is leased for \$1 a year
- Architects contributed services pro-bono

OM Village/Occupy Madison (Madison, WI)

- 2013
- 10-15 residents/11 houses
- \$5,000 per unit
- Non-profit formed to develop housing solution following encampments associated with Occupy movement
- Funding from private donors, crowd-funding campaign
- City retains oversight through permitting process, city council approval led to development
- Neighbors opposed out of concerns for property devaluation and incidents, but fears unrealized within first year.

Dignity Village (Portland, OR)

- 2004
- Average of 60 residents (capped by city); residents pay \$35 per month
- Started in downtown Portland as a “tent city” protest against Portland’s ban on homeless encampments in 2000.
- City-sanctioned permanent campsite in 2004 on city land, near airport on outskirts of city.
- A non-profit with elected governance board of nine residents.
- Social worker three days a week

Sanctuary (Nashville, TN)

- 2015
- 7 initial homes
- Green Street Church of Christ began offering sanctuary behind church to homeless campers in 2012, had 20 tents, converted to micro-homes.
- Private crowd-sourced fundraising produced \$50,000
- Homes cost about \$7,000 to produce
- Residents use the church bathroom, shower outside and eat donated food.

Sources:

Doug Erickson. "One year in, Madison's village of tiny houses wins over many critics. *Wisconsin State Journal*. September 27, 2015. Available: http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/one-year-in-madison-s-village-of-tiny-houses-wins/article_6d1a54cc-343a-5775-b3de-5fa341677580.html

Lisa Fletcher and Lisa Binns. "Tiny Homes Provide Shelter for Nashville's Homeless." *Al Jazeera America*. December 17, 2015. Available: <http://america.aljazeera.com/watch/shows/america-tonight/articles/2015/12/17/tiny-homes-provide-shelter-for-nashville-homeless.html>

Marcus Harrison Green. "In a Tiny House Village, Portland's Homeless Find Dignity." *YES! Magazine*. January 28, 2016. Available: <http://www.yesmagazine.org/peace-justice/-in-a-tiny-house-village-portlands-homeless-find-dignity-20160128>

Erika Lundahl "Tiny Houses for the Homeless: An Affordable Solution." Charter for Compassion. Available: <http://www.charterforcompassion.org/index.php/problem-solving/tiny-houses-for-the-homeless-an-affordable-solution-catches-on>

Alana Semuels. "Tiny Homes for the Homeless." *The Atlantic*. October 30, 2015. Available: <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/10/tiny-homes-homeless/413212/>



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

Councilor Selene Colburn, Chair, East District
Councilor Tom Ayres, Ward 7
Councilor Adam Roof, Ward 8

Tuesday, April 26, 2016
6:00 – 7:45 PM
Fletcher Free Library
Community Room

Approved Minutes

Chair Selene Colburn called the meeting to order at 6:00PM. She started the meeting by asking for introductions. Committee members are listed above. Other attendees include: Ilnar Avilex, Caryn Long, Sarah Giannoni – Councilor, Keith Pillsbury, CiCi – student, Alex Brang – student, Joe Speidel, UVM, Marcy Esbjerg - staff, Gillian Nanton – staff, Todd Rawlings , staff

1. Review Agenda

Chair Colburn reviewed the agenda. She stated the agenda includes both a time for public comment and also invited public comment around the table during specific topics. Tonight would feature initial discussions on the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and also Tiny Homes.

Councilor Ayres moved to accept the agenda. Councilor Roof seconded. Motion carried.

2. Public Forum

Caryn Long spoke about the four unrelated ordinance. She stated the City must be more consistent with its enforcement. If the City enforced the ordinance it would make housing more affordable. She noted that the ordinance was changed in 2000 but in her opinion, still not enforced. Renting by the bedroom to college students makes housing unaffordable for a family. She mentioned that the Pearl Street new apartments, tenants are paying \$1500 for a one bedroom.

The programs and services of the City of Burlington are accessible to people with disabilities.
For accessibility information, call 865-7144. For questions about the meeting,
contact Marcy Esbjerg at mesbjerg@burlingtonvt.gov

Councilor Roof – He is looking to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program as a way to recapture our neighborhoods; creating new opportunities for places to live; price points won't change overnight. He hopes to incorporate more home ownerships.

Chair Colburn – We will devote an entire meeting to this ordinance. We will get an update on what has been done so far, what still needs to be done and how to strategize.

Keith Pillsbury referenced the previous meeting when representatives from the colleges were talking about how good they are doing. Keith emphasized that it was not about student behavior. It is about being responsible to house their students. Colleges say it's too expensive but still pay high salaries to athletics.

Councilor Ayers asked if he sees a difference with purpose built student housing.

Mr. Pillsbury said that he objects that students are displacing families and young professionals.

Ms. Long said her point is about affordability. Some houses are considered as ghetto; students are living in dumps. She thinks the housing stock is being destroyed.

Ms. Brang noted that students will tolerate things that other residents won't. It's too expensive to live in the dorm (\$1300) per month.

Joe Speidel from UVM noted that landlords are making more money on housing. He feels that the problem is more that few houses have been built in the last 20 years. He does not agree with categorizing communities as 'ghetto' and the colleges are doing some community policing. The number of students living off campus has gone down. The University is trying to make more beds available and, trying to be a good community partner.

Chair Colburn asked what are the actionable items for CDNR? We will have a meeting on the 4 unrelated ordinance. We will ask UVM about their role in housing their students re: MOU with City. For the May meeting, we will follow up with UVM on campus housing.

3. Approval of Minutes – Councilor Ayres made a motion to approve the minutes from March 2016. Councilor Roof made a second. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Introduction to Neighborhood Revitalization(Stabilization) Plan– Gillian Nanton

Ms. Nanton introduced the Neighborhood Stabilization Plan as one of 22 Housing Action Plan initiatives. She explained it was part of the settlement agreement that required the local colleges to come together to develop an RFP for hiring a consultant. The scope of work will look at examples of successful student housing in other communities. The first step in the process will be to bring together key players along with councilors to discuss what is happening and gather input that will help to inform the development of the RFP. That meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 27. The following topics will be investigated: 1. What are the most important neighborhood quality of life concerns? 2. What is being done or can be done to expand student housing? 3. Geographic areas – where is the focus? 4. What are the wide range of strategic and financial commitments? Is it homeownership or other goals? The timeline for the process includes fall of 2016 with the scope of work and RFP; winter 2016 – hire the consultant team – winter 2017 – tool kit and strategies.

Mr. Speidel suggested bringing in young professionals like those at dealer.com and asking is the need for more housing?

Chair Colburn reminded the group that this one strategy in the Housing Action Plan is specific to students and then reconvert housing stock to non-student/residential use.

Mr. Pillsbury referred to Mr. Speidel's statement being advised that UVM has been told by consultants students don't want to be housed on campus for more than two years. Mr. Pillsbury believes that is a faulty business plan and it is not generating our economy.

Chair Colburn noted that this plan will seek to find ways to get students out of neighborhood housing and then renovate the houses for conversion. She would like to discuss grants for owner occupied duplex.

Staff member Todd Rawlings explained that CEDO does have a grant program for owner occupied duplexes.

However, it requires a second, no interest mortgage and that has become difficult to execute after 2008 with changes in banking industry.

Ms. Long expressed her opinion that she is not sure hiring a consultant is the way to go. She thinks that if we enforce the laws we already have that would solve the problem.

Councilor Giannoni likes the idea of bringing your professionals who are working in Burlington to be a part of the discussion and also suggested that designated agencies (who employ people in the social service field) be invited as well. She suggested to invite not just those who make money; she also suggested we find ways to promote condo conversions.

Mr. Avilix stressed the importance of good facilitation and conversation. It is important that all voices are being heard. How will the plan ensure public participation?

Mr. Pillsbury noted other communities have homes that are divided up into condos or quality apartments. Students won't have a commitment as they leave after 2 years.

5. Review CDBG Advisory Board Recommendations

Marcy Esbjerg presented the CDBG Advisory Board recommendations. She explained the funding of the Community Development Block Grant and how applications and projects are sought through an RFP process. The Advisory Board reviews the proposals and makes recommendations. There is funding leftover from 2015 because of a cancelled project and funding leftover from this year because the requests were limited. She explained that the next step is to complete the HUD Action Plan and then present these recommendations to both BOF and City Council. There will be a public hearing on May 16th and will ask Council for approval on June 6. Will the CDNR committee like to sponsor the resolution for approval?

Councilor Ayres asked if applicants are given feedback as to why they don't get funded. Ms. Esbjerg said there were comments to that effect in the minutes.

Councilors were concerned about other funding that was not used with the depth of need in the opiate crisis; there was surprise that the HowardCenter project was not funded. Ms. Esbjerg explained that the Advisory Board did have a backup plan to fully fund the highest scoring projects. She also noted that the administration of grants is fairly complicated.

6. Tiny Homes Discussion

Chair Colburn began a presentation of the idea of tiny homes to end homelessness by sharing a handout of resources, models/ projects around the country. She noted that she had been approached by local business owners who are very interested; costs range from \$5k to \$87500. She discovered mostly simple fundraising for the projects and some are on municipally owned land. Sometimes the villages are self-governing and others have case managers on site.

Councilor Ayres expressed that tiny homes are not just for homelessness but also for

affordable housing, micro apartments. The City of Burlington might need to redefine ancillary/accessory dwelling unit.

Councilor Roof expressed the Committee's commitment to address homelessness. He also mentioned housing in other countries that use shipping containers. Tiny homes might also impact senior housing.

Chair Colburn asked about zoning and said we will invite David White to a meeting to discuss the zoning challenges.

Ms. Esbjerg reminded the Committee that also the Continuum of Care would like to be a part of the conversation and also UVM Medical Center who is playing a key role in permanent supportive housing.

Councilor Roof believes that the best way to introduce concept is through the homeless lens and asked where to put it in the City on limited land.

Mr. Speidel likes the idea of neighborhoods including elder housing and services provided.

Mr. Avilix said there might be benefits to a homeowner with a tiny home in their backyard – tax benefits and homesharing possibilities.

Chair Colburn noted that the advocacy of Mr. Aviliz, Councilor Ayres and others had ensured an investigation of micro-housing as part of the accessory dwelling review called for in Burlington's Housing Action Plan

Chair Colburn listed the following partners to include in a discussion: Continuum of Care, Vermont Interfaith Association, David White, and the business community. She also mentioned the idea of a forum or event that CDNR would sponsor on microhousing. Yestermorrow Design School was mentioned as a potential partner/presenter.

7. Next meeting – May 24, 2016 – Fletcher Free Library – is in conflict with upcoming City of Burlington budget meetings. After checking schedules, the Committee decided to change the next meeting to the date of May 31st at 6 pm. A meeting location will be found. Councilor Roof made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Councilor Ayres seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcy Esbjerg

Assistant Director

CEDO