

Neighborhood Code Joint Committee Agenda

Tuesday, November 28, 2023, 6:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in the Bushor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

Members Present	A. Montroll, E. Malone, A. Friend, J. Randall
City Council Present	S. Carpenter, J. Shannon
Staff Present	M. Tuttle, S. Morgan, C. Dillard
Public Attendance	Amelia Fannin, Joe Giallanella, Deena Frankel, Gordon Dragoon, Gabe Arnold, Sharon Bushor, Dylan Farnsworth, Evan Gould, Richard Hillyard, Donal Dugan, Phil Merrick, Harry Dorer, Chris Euan, Bob Duncan, Dan Castragano, Jake Twarog, Colin Morrison, Emily Corwin, Jak Tiano, Laura Merriam, Robert Guthrie

I. Agenda

Call to Order	Time: 6:30pm
Agenda	No changes.

II. Neighborhood Code: Recap

	Staff provided a brief recap of the current proposed Neighborhood Code Recommendations
--	--

III. Public Forum

Name(s)	Comment
Amelia Fannin	• supports much of this proposal, especially the across-the-board change to the RL zones allowing more lock coverage, Duplexes, triplexes, multifamily homes sound great. • Want to live in a community with homes for all different people • Protests the proposed residential court on Lower Pine St. ▪ low density area ▪ the water and sewer pipes struggle to keep up ▪ don't have complete sidewalks or proper bike lanes that people feel safe using for much of this road ▪ Most individual homeowners do not have the capital to build four story apartment buildings or even a smaller multi family unit on their lot ▪ It's part of the five as neighborhood and should be zoned residential or RL
Joe Giallanella	• In favor of the end goal of the commission's effort to broaden the tax base with more housing and more home ownership throughout our city • Opposed to the approach that the Commission has taken to deem Lower Pine as high-density corridor when it operates today on the other end of the spectrum as Low Density ▪ once the Connector opens, does not meet the criteria that your policy set for thoroughfares elsewhere in the city ▪ it places a disproportionate burden on current and future residents of Lower Pine

The City of Burlington will not tolerate unlawful harassment or discrimination on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, place of birth, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, disability, HIV positive status, crime victim status or genetic information. 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 (802) 540-2505.

	▪ urge the committee to review your proposal again with an updated map of the South End and an equitable application of your housing density policy
Deena Frankel	• supports the idea that the south end of Pine St is a low-density residential neighborhood • supportive of the overall work
Gordon Dragoon	• I think the great work that you all been doing deserves to be appreciated • Disagrees with the notion that the committee hasn't been forthright and open about their goals as previously stated. Thinks the committee has been receptive to what community members have said.
Gabe Arnold	• The proposal for South of Pine Street is it's really vastly out of character, scale and context for the existing St. and neighborhood that's there.
Sharon Bushor	• Thanks Meagan for providing some visuals from around the city showing a neighborhood and showing taller structures next to smaller structures • should have the capacity to have 3D so that you zoom in on a street and you can plug in the sketches that you plugged in and really see how that fits in. I don't believe sketches really do it for anybody. • when you have IZ - the institutional zone, are they going to do the changes that are being proposed along that corridor would apply to that zone also? M. Tuttle: • The recommendations that we're talking about are only in the areas of the city that are currently zoned in one of our residential districts. We have not talked about applying any of these new districts or existing districts to the institutional zones or zones that are currently in our neighborhood activity center or other commercial districts.
Dylan Farnsworth	• Misrepresentation of the lower side of Pine St
Evan Gould	• Voicing support of pending continued bus usage on Pine St. of the corridor between Flynn and Home Ave. being zoned to corridor ▪ use this to make great strides in transit-oriented development ▪ allow more mixed income function form and in our neighborhoods • Thinks the work that the Planning Commission has done is really good.
Richard Hillyard	• As far as Ward One is concerned there was a very, very strong feeling that changes need to be inextricably linked with the Memorandum of understanding with UVM. • please speak to the communities that are going to be effective in a micro way. • Explore all brownfields opportunities. • Have a look at tax exempt properties in the city. There are tax exempt parking lots not being used in every ward, so please look at that.
Donal Dugan	• Agrees with Gordon • Commends all the hard work the committee is doing. • Be cognizant of the effect that the historic preservation rules will have on implementing and densifying a lot of the areas of the city, especially in the Old North End or there's a tremendous number of listed structures and working around them or with them is often extremely difficult. There are a lot of structures that are way past their useful life

	and continue persist because the historic preservation rules make it almost impossible to take them down.
Phil Merrick	• Buildings sitting in the middle of a lot are inefficient • Get rid of setbacks. Be able to build out to the sidewalk • Walkable roads, biking lanes
Harry Dorer	• In support of increased density for housing, particularly along public transit corridors • transit oriented development is going to be really important to help fight the climate crisis as well as the housing affordability crisis • would like to see some increased transit service along these quarters as well
Chris Yuen	• Zoning is a tool to design the future we want. It's not so much about what we have right now and we really should be thinking of equity and sustainability at the forefront when we're, when we're zoning for the future. • Residential corridor zoning deserves to be at higher density because there's potential or currently good transit service, good and frequent transit service there. • if we want to really maximize the use of the transit service, we really shouldn't be just talking about the first lot that's you know on these corridors functionally transit service can reach in the second and third lots you know behind there just as well.
Bob Duncan	• I want to encourage you to think as densely as you can. • I agree with the comments about reducing front yard set back • On the page to propose changes RL and RM lot size, the 3500 square foot minimum was crossed out. Does that mean that the Commission is proposing leaving it at 6000 square feet or does that mean there's really no minimum? • wanted to commend you in the RM district to increasing the unit count to 6 units per building. • Appreciates the 4 story and not the 3 1/2 story and in the RM district. • Encourages to consider 3 stories in the RL district instead of 2.5. M. Tuttle: • The committee recommended getting rid of the minimum lot size
Dan Castragano	• Agrees with Phil to up zone more • Encourages building more densely everywhere throughout the city.
Jake Twarog	• Not really possible to build housing without changing the character of a neighborhood. No matter where you build new housing and considering that this neighborhood and all of the neighborhoods served by the higher density zoning along transit corridors will be have higher frequencies, there is no unbiased argument to keep such areas at low density. • Agrees with Gordon Dragoon
Colin Larsen	• The arguments around what looks good and what doesn't look good it's entirely subjective. • Accept that things need to change • This of the Pine St as a corridor and make a decision based on what's going to accomplish our goals here, which is to provide more housing

	stock, to get people out of cars, to provide alternative transportation modes in places that are close to downtowns and developments.
Emily Corwin	• Would like to see more density on Pine St
Jak Tiano	• Other cities and states around the country have been the union pegs for “Missing Middle” policy, and results have started coming in. Results are that missing metal isn't making much of a difference in a lot of places. Unlike California and Victoria, Minneapolis has actually been a rare housing success story despite the effectiveness of missing that will perform specifically and is largely related to its strong mobility, being one of the best cycling cities in the country and having a very strong bus network for a city of its size. Coupled with their elimination of parking minimums and having more zones, space or proper apartment buildings, Minneapolis is one of the only large cities in the US that has seen flat and even decreasing rents at a time when housing and cost of living price inflation is raging nationwide. • What does work is broadly allowing apartment buildings and providing strong, reliable, safe, and space efficient mobility solutions. • We need to be having cross departmental cross governmental conversations about how to align our goal of housing availability and affordability with our policy action. • without serious bull throated support and investment in transportation we cannot solve our housing crisis. • take Transit oriented Development as a nonnegotiable necessity for the future health and development of the city.
Laura Merriam	• Supports comments made by Amelia and Dylan and others who questioned whether the small section of Pine St really meets the criterion of being a residential corridor • In favor of increasing density in the neighborhood
Robert Guthrie	• Agrees with people that say what’s proposed for Pine St is ill advised • with these zoning changes, can you mandate that they're born occupant? • Take a look at the European zoning

IV. Neighborhood Code: Core Recommendations

M. Tuttle:

- S Meadow is RL. under our existing zoning, it would be very difficult for S Meadow to expand.
- We have not yet talked about how the changes that we are proposing as part of the neighborhood code would affect sites that are large enough to utilize our planned unit development standards.
- We've reached out to Kristam Yani, who's the one of the planners at GMT and to DPW with the question about transit service on Lower Pine St.

B. Traverse:

- Need more transit as we look at up zoning and greater density. Hearing from GMT on this proposal and their future long-term plans.
- In favor of corridor zones to the extent they're actually along the city's major thoroughfares. Have an earnest discussion around whether or not it makes sense to up zone that full section

of Pine St. to a corridor zone. Open to up zoning it to a residential medium zone as some folks have said at least between Home Ave. and Flynn Ave.

- Need to double back to the discussion on in the residential medium areas, are we going to agree to building up to 4 units or building up to 6 units.

M. Gaughan:

- Agrees with Ben. Remove the lower pine sections from the neighborhood or from the, you know the proposed RC designation.
- Matching what's on the ground and really making changes at the margins in regard to density.

J. Randall:

- Interested in looking at the plan BTV map again and just looking at those designated corridors. Identify a set criterion that in this conversation to determine what meets the corridor designation and not.
- To discuss sections of North Winooski and South Winooski. Looking at those criteria and seeing which areas of town need that designation would give us a lot of clarity as to you know what exactly we're talking about with the with these corridor destinations where they're most not only appropriate but needed and in terms of building efficiency for transit and housing along these thoroughfares throughout the city.
- Agrees with Ben about bringing GMT in the conversation.

A. Montroll:

- Looking at lower Pine St, particularly between home Ave and the end of Pine St. Explore whether RM is the right zone
- Agrees with Ben's comments
- Agrees with Julia's proposal to analyze the criteria

M. Tuttle:

- To put together the criteria for what the multimodal corridors would mean
- Try to get GMT to come and see if they can offer any additional context for what could be possible on Lower Pine St.
- The Walk Bike plan - many of the corridors are also places that are anticipated to have the sort of highest level of service bike facilities. Shelburne Rd, Pine St to Flynn Ave are both indicated as places to have fully protected bike lanes and then between Flynn Ave.

A. Friend:

- The Champlain Parkway will be a limited access road. There is not going to be development along it.
- Agrees with Andy that lower Pine St doesn't work as a corridor.
- The difference between our neighborhood code purpose of this committee and how that's a little different than the corridors because it was a scale of development and investment difference between the neighborhood code. Talking about homeowners essentially building more units in their in their yards whereas the corridors we're envisioning townhouses it's a much a bigger broader scale of development.

M. Tuttle:

- We have been focused on recently in the context of the South End Innovation District though making sure that our standards are reflective of a future condition where we want the Parkway to be much more integral with development that's along it. Our comprehensive plan talks about the southern end of the Enterprise District remaining a place that's the Enterprise District. I wouldn't envision that we would propose changes to add a residential corridor in that area for now.

E. Malone:

- Agrees with Julia's comment about defining the criteria.

J. Shannon:

- Having the criteria for the RM district. It looks more consistent with what we're doing with RL.

M. Tuttle:

- The places where we have been talking about recommending changing from RL to RM have primarily been about the fact that those neighborhoods don't really reflect the pattern of RL today. They really are more RM neighborhoods.

V. Upcoming Meeting

I. Discuss Upcoming Meeting Dates

- Tue, Dec 5
- Tue, Dec 12
- Tue, Dec 19

VI. Minutes

Action: Approve the **10/17, 10/24, 11/02** minutes

Motion by: J. Shannon

Second by: E. Malone

Approved: unanimous

VII. Communications

Action: Review and accept Written Communications

Motion by: S. Carpenter

Second by: J. Randall

Approved: unanimous

VIII. Adjourn

Adjournment

Time: 8:30

Motion: J. Randall

Second: S. Carpenter

Vote: unanimous