

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)

www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz

*Andy Montroll, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Yves Bradley
Alexander Friend
Michael Gaughan
Erin Malone
Julia Randall*

Burlington Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 23, 2024, 6:30 PM

Remote & Virtual Meeting via Zoom

In person option available:

Bushor Conference Room (Room 102), 1st Floor of City Hall, 149 Church St.

To Join the Meeting on a Computer

Link: <https://zoom.us/j/97941883790?pwd=bGZBNzNyV1liL3p5NkhIL2dqUFIzdz09>

Webinar ID: 979 4188 3790

Passcode (if needed): 658929

To Join the Meeting on the Phone

Number: +1 312 626 6799 Webinar ID: 979 4188 3790

1. Agenda

2. Public Forum

3. Chair's Report

4. Director's Report

5. Proposed CDO Amendment: Inclusionary Zoning

Subject	5.1. Inclusionary Zoning
Meeting	January 23, 2024 - Planning Commission Agenda - Tuesday, January 23, 2024, 6:30 PM, Burlington Planning Commission
Category	5. Proposed CDO Amendment: Inclusionary Zoning
Department	Planning
Type	Discussion
Recommended Action	Receive presentation and provide feedback on proposed amendment

6. Commissioner Items

7. Adopt Minutes

Subject	7.1. Review and approve the 1/9 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
----------------	--

Meeting	January 23, 2024 - Planning Commission Agenda - Tuesday, January 23, 2024, 6:30 PM, Burlington Planning Commission
Category	7. Adopt Minutes
Department	Planning
Type	Action

8. Adjournment

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone: (802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7144 (TTY)

www.burlingtonvt.gov/pz

*Andy Montroll, Chair
Bruce Baker, Vice-Chair
Yves Bradley
Alexander Friend
Michael Gaughan
Erin Malone
Julia Randall*

Burlington Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 9, 2024, 6:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in the Bushor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

Members Present	Andy Montroll, Erin Malone, Michael Gaughan, Alexander Friend, Bruce Baker, Yves Bradley
City Council Present	Ben Traverse, Sarah Carpenter, Joan Shannon
Staff Present	Meagan Tuttle, Sarah Morgan, Charles Dillard
Public Attendance	Tim Barritt, Tree, Ethan Fleming, Evan Gould, Jak Tiano, Sharon Bushor, Colin Larsen

I. Agenda

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

II. Public Forum

Name(s)	Comment
Tim Barritt	About 25 Germain St: • Previous inquiries into converting a barn on property into an ADU haven't borne any positive results. Wondering why is that. • Other communities have looked at increased density on small lots in very dense neighborhoods

III. Neighborhood Code: Overview of Current Recommendations

3.1. Review Part 1 Recommendations & Part 2 Topics

Staff provided an informational presentation.

IV. Public Hearing

Name(s)	Comment
Tree	• What specific changes will be seen on the ground? <u>M. Tuttle</u>: In terms of specifics that we could anticipate in an area like Five Sisters, we have talked about just the opportunity for this to enable particularly in that area the potential for more backyard type homes. We've looked at some examples kind of like properties in the Five Sisters looked at potential that may be an expansion on an existing home, an Adua duplex, things like that on existing lots could be more feasible and easier to achieve than under our current regulations.

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.

Ethan Fleming	• Difficulties finding housing as a student • Not a lot of development geared to students outside of UVM • How quickly do you think these changes, if they're implemented, you'll start to see a positive effect for the student body at the university, both undergraduate and graduate? ▪ In our assessment of the proposed code citywide, we've estimated several 100 units over time across the whole city. in parallel, we have actually been working with UVM on some zoning changes for more scalable housing solutions on the institution's campus, which Trinity and other sites as well, which I think would bring the sort of order magnitude level new housing that you're talking about and probably on a much quicker timeline. ▪ This neighborhood code project we're working on now is 1 of what is it, 11-point action plan to address housing shortages is 1 just one of several different elements.
Evan Gould	• In favor of the proposed changes • RM city-wide. It's more equitable to put development pressure citywide to not have certain people affected by this than other places, and things can build up to reach demand. • Have reassessment threshold where neighborhoods can naturally grow and build up to an RM area.
Jak Tiano	• Broadly supportive • The Joint Committee didn't spend the time laying out to finding a goal or any metrics on how to assess the proposal. • A lack of data driven decisions in Part 1 • Hoping that phase two gives the Planning Commission a little extra time to ask better questions about what their goals are and what data they need to make their decisions • Would like to see a regional analysis, the Burlington urbanized area of historical and projected housing availability, population growth and travel patterns that give us a more grounded idea of exactly how many units the greater Burlington area needs to meet the current demand. Would like to see a set of projections of possible growth scenarios that let us know how many units we'll need in the future and a set of metrics we can use to track over time to see which path we're most likely on those growth scenarios.
Sharon Bushor	• Going back to the original intent of the NC - to generate growth, allow more housing units, but to still have the neighborhood be a neighborhood for a variety of people, whether they are people attending school, whether they are young professionals, whether they are families, whether they are retirees • Mixed neighborhoods are great • The issue of upscaling too much and how it's going to play out in the community • About Ward 1 – up zoning accelerates the process of owner occupied to investment properties in that section of the city • People should be allowed to state how they see the problem and how they see the positive and the negative of what you're proposing

Colin Larsen	In Finland almost half of residents live in apartment buildings and is often rated as the happiest country in the world
--------------	---

V. Neighborhood Code: Committee Discussion

Action: Provide feedback to staff on any additional edits, or recommend referral to Council		
Motion by the Planning Commission and the Ordinance Committee to: Refer the ordinance, the zoning changes with the technical changes made by staff over the last week or so and the report to the City Council with the recommendation of approval.		
Motion by: M. Gaughan	Second by: A. Friend	Vote: unanimous
Type: Discussion	Presented by: The Planning team	
Discuss any additional edits to Part 1 Recommendations		
J. Randall:		
• Thanked the public for voicing their opinions throughout the whole process. • Supports the idea of making the entire city RM - because of how this process and these changes will roll out incrementally and, on a parcel-by-parcel basis, it just it does make sense to let the parcels with the biggest areas, the biggest area to create new units, create those units and not limit the housing opportunity on larger lots just because they're larger and because they are located in an area that hasn't provided density in the past		
A. Friend:		
• Acknowledging that this neighborhood code process is likely to result in incremental differences to our housing that we should still push to make it make the whole city residential medium density it. • Make the process equitable to not draw artificial distinctions between neighborhoods and with the understanding that some of those neighborhoods that are now low density are not likely to change based on their current ownership and development patterns.		
E. Malone:		
• Appreciated the public comments throughout the whole process • Agrees with Alex on the RM comments highlighting the equitable impact of change all over, and the idea of having more flexibility for homeowners to make changes for their families that live on those lots. • Appreciated S. Bushor's comment regarding the fear of investors, but doesn't think we should be afraid of investors, but should support all the other types of development.		
M. Tuttle:		
• Look less at the lines on the map in terms of where RL and RL apply and think more about the standards that apply within those districts. Have come a very long way in breaking down the differences between RL and RM neighborhoods as the zoning districts, as the standards are today, we've made significant strides in making those two districts much more similar than they used to be. • The areas of the city that are zoned RL today and will remain zoned RL in this proposal. Those are some of the areas that have the greatest capacity to support new housing units. In a context where we have older neighborhoods that are more built out, that have smaller lots, that have more of a proportion of the lot that are already built on with structures. The amount of change that you need to make in order to enable the next unit to be added is much greater then in a neighborhood where there are larger lots that can easily be built on because there's already more open space, there's already more undeveloped area of the lot, there's just more room to work with and more capacity to add new housing units. We need to allow a much higher lot coverage limit in RM because there are already so many more existing structures occupying lots in RM. So, we have to let a higher degree of change occur to add those units. Where in RL areas where we see a predominance of properties that are developed way under their lot coverage limit, we don't have to move the upper limit as far for more units to be added in those areas.		

Tuesday, January 10, 2014

Hopefully that puts a finer point on what I think I've been trying to articulate in terms of like that we are enabling more to happen in those areas where there is physical space and physical capacity to enable that development.

- We have not talked as much as a committee about the other departments of the city that we've been working with and talking to over the course of developing the neighborhood code. These are the kinds of things that we have to continue to work through in order to facilitate the implementation of the code.

S. Carpenter:

- Hoping that out of the new North End Plan BT that we really will be able to drill into some of those nuances and there are at least four really significant size lots in the new North End that are neighborhood planning activity or should be neighborhood planning activity. Lots of PUD requirements will be better served by that process than the neighborhood code.

- If Part 2 will deal with the issue of ADUs

M. Tuttle: Yes.

- About Tim Barritt's example of an outbuilding and the presumption would be that they are already maxed out on lot coverage or some other reason like that as to why you couldn't build on it.

M. Tuttle: One of the specific things that he mentioned was running into the density limit. I think what probably because he's still operating under our existing zoning framework. I would imagine the property is in the RL zone and if it's a small lot that already has a duplex on it, they probably have nowhere near the lot size that would be required to add a 3rd or even a 4th unit.

- Appreciates Meagan's clarification on the differences between RL and RM under the new proposed code.

B. Traverse:

- Appreciate the Planning Commission inviting the Ordinance Committee to take part in this process, and thanks the staff for the hard work.
- About the Champlain School lot - potentially on some of the part of that lot that would be probably accessed from Shelburne Rd., that it may make more sense to allow for development even beyond what RM would permit. If we were to move this to RM, is there anything in doing that that would prohibit us from continuing to go back to it whether in phase 3 or whether through a PUD process or whether through the same process that some of these surrounding lots were flagged as neighborhood activity centers?

A. Montroll: Especially on larger lots and for ones like this, often times the developer who wants to do something there wants to do something different than what our underlying zoning for whatever it is allows in the 1st place. And they'll come and talk to us about some of that.

M. Tuttle: That's the kind of site that we keep envisioning would be a better candidate for a PUD than for the underlying standards of RM. We are thinking that that would take the form of some of our other types of zoning districts in terms of what it would enable like where we're talking more about a floor area ratio of building to land that could be developed on a site. The reason that we were landing on RM instead of RH or Corridor for that was thinking ahead to APUD and the lot coverage limit because it's one of the things that cannot be modified in APUD and felt that 60% on that site would probably be a more appropriate range than 80 in the future given its proximity to the angle speed Brook. Other than that, the PUD process would enable many of the standards to be changed and modified for more intensity.

- There's some interplay potentially between this and the UVM is whether or not any of the lots along the area that we've designated as a quarter zone is currently owned by any of the institutions and whether or not there's additional housing opportunities for the institutions that that come along with that.

The staff will follow up on this question.

Tuesday, January 10, 2024

M. Tuttle: In the corridor we still while we don't have the same sort of unit limits in terms of the amount of development that could be located on a lot. We do still have footprint limits of 3600 square feet.

M. Gaughan:

- Staff put a tremendous amount of work in terms of establishing patterns within the city and overlaying these changes that I think need to be recognized before making any last-minute changes here.

Staff went through the text of the Ordinance ZA-24-02 Neighborhood Code, Part 1.

VI. Minutes

Action: Review and Approve the 12/19 Neighborhood Code Meeting Minutes
--

Motion by: A. Friend	Second by: J. Randall	Approved: unanimous
----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

VII. Communications

Action: Review and accept the communications
--

Motion by: A. Friend	Second by: J. Randall	Approved: unanimous
----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

VIII. Adjournment

Adjournment	Time:
-------------	-------

Motion: E. Malone	Second: B. Baker	Vote: unanimous
-------------------	------------------	-----------------