

**The South Burlington Development Review Board held a regular meeting on Tuesday, 7 July 2020, at 7:00 p.m. via Go to Meeting remote technology.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** M. Cota, Chair; B. Sullivan, J. Wilking, M. Behr, D. Philibert, J. Langan, E. Portman

**ALSO PRESENT:** D. Hall, Administrative Officer; M. Keene, Development Review Planner; A. Demetrowitz, A. Gill, B. Sirvis, C. Minadeo, D. Roy, D. Read, E. Langfeldt, J. Killacky, M. O'Brien, M. Collins, N. Gonzalez, R. Batterson, J. Hodgson, L. Lackey, S. Dooley, H. Head, M. Clark, C. Orben, S. Homsted

**1. Additions, deletions, or changes in order of agenda items:**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**2. Announcements:**

Mr. Cota explained the process and opportunity for public participation. He also advised attendees to sign the virtual sign-in sheet which would be needed for party status for a future appeal. Mr. Cota also noted the public comments can be submitted in writing.

**3. Comments and questions from the public not related to the Agenda:**

No issues were raised.

**4. Continued Site Plan Application #SP-20-023 of Burlington International Airport to pave an approximately 62,000 sq. ft. area for the purpose of creating an overnight aircraft parking area south of the existing terminal apron and adjacent to the north hangar, 1200 Airport Drive:**

Mr. Lackey explained that the apron area will be enlarged to house aircraft overnight. He also noted that the storm drainage issue has been resolved.

Mr. Cota noted there will be a stipulation that the applicant must maintain all stormwater infrastructure. Mr. Lackey said they are OK with that stipulation.

Public comment was then solicited. There was no public comment.

Mr. Cota moved to close SP-20-023. Ms. Philibert seconded. Motion passed unanimously via a rollcall vote.

**5. Preliminary and final plat application #SD-20-20 of Heritage Aviation, Inc., to amend a previously approved plan for an airport complex. The amendment consists of constructing a 24,674 sq. ft. addition to an existing 17,660 sq. ft. hangar, reconfiguring the adjacent parking area, and related site improvements, 1130 Airport Drive:**

Mr. Cota explained the nature of preliminary and final plats and the opportunity for public input.

Mr. Reed said they applicant is proposing an expansion to the west side of the hangar and re-configuration of parking. There will be on-site stormwater treatment. Landscaping will be in conjunction with the Landscaping Master Plan.

Mr. Roy said they will be building 100 feet to the west to create an area for shipping, offices, and a reception area. 100 feet in length will be added to the hangar space. Mr. Reed noted that Heritage repairs private aircraft, and they will be expanding that use. They also provide ground support maintenance.

Ms. Keene noted the applicant provided additional exhibits to address staff comments.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

1. Re: FAA approval, Mr. Reed said they have a crane permit for the construction and are comfortable they will be receiving the construction permit.
2. Re: pedestrian circulation – Mr. Reed noted there is a bus stop directly across from the city sidewalk. There is no crosswalk. Board members did not anticipate people would be walking onto the site from Williston Road and were OK with what the applicant is proposing.
3. Re: dumpster screening and FAA approval for the site of the dumpster, Mr. Reed said the dumpster is basically where it is today. They need to move the screening fence a little way from the security fence. Mr. Lackey said that distance needs to be at least 5 feet. Ms. Keene asked if the screening can be opaque. Mr. Lackey said it can. This and FAA approval will be a condition of approval.

4. Regarding landscaping, staff is questioning whether grasses and perennials meet the purpose of landscaping. Mr. Cota noted this is the first plan received under the new Landscape Master Plan. Ms. Keene noted that \$9000 of landscaping against the building is not visible from Airport Drive. She said the Board should decide whether additional landscaping should be added based on the approved overall landscaping plan. Ms. Philibert asked about “exposed aggregate concrete” and whether that is part of the landscape budget. Ms. Orben said it has a “pebbly” look, similar to that at the Davis Center. It is for walking onto the entry terrace. She also noted there will be 7 shade trees planted along Airport Drive which will eventually form a barrier and block the view of the building. The grasses will remain year-round. The perennials will be at the entry plaza and employee terrace along with shrubs which will have winter berries. Mr. Cota asked if this is what Heritage desires. Ms. Orben said it is. Mr. Cota noted they are still \$1000 short. Ms. Orben said that is a tree that was inadvertently left off. Mr. Wilking said grasses have been allowed in the past as have things such as benches. Ms. Keene said typically “landscaping” should be “green stuff,” and it seems there is not a proportional amount of green to hardscape. Mr. Cota asked if it will be OK if they add landscaping elsewhere on the airport site. Ms. Keene said it would. Members were OK not to count the pavers and gravel edge as landscaping. Mr. Lackey said they will provide landscaping consistent with the approved overall plan. Mr. Roy asked if ornamental fencing along Airport Drive count toward the landscaping budget. Ms. Hall said if it was part of the approved plan, it would count.
5. Re: snow storage area, Mr. Reed showed a location on the west side of the parking lot between trees and on the southwest corner. This was also shown on a supplemental plan. Members were OK with this.
6. Re: maintenance of stormwater infrastructure, Mr. Lackey said they are OK with a stipulation to that effect.
7. Re: compliance with CWD conditions, Mr. Reed said they are OK with this. An updated plan showed the plan for this. Ms. Keene noted this would be owned by CWD.
8. The applicant needs to show they have secured a water allocation. They will do this before permit.
9. The applicant must secure a wastewater allocation before permit. They will do so.

10. Regarding bicycle parking, Mr. Reed said they have included a bike rack and locker facilities in the receiving area and another area for staff. He showed these on a supplemental plan.

11. Signs must be removed from the plan.

Mr. Cota then asked for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Cota moved to continue SD-20-20 until 1 September 2020. Mr. Wilking seconded. Motion passed unanimously via a rollcall vote.

**6. Continued preliminary plat application #SD-20-16 of O'Brien Farm Road, LLC, for the next phase of a previously approved master plan for up to 458 dwelling units and up to 45,000 sq. ft. of office space. The phase consists of six multi-family residential buildings with a total of 342 dwelling units, of which 48 are proposed inclusionary units, and an additional offset of 48 market rate units, for a total of 390 dwelling units and underground parking, and 3,500 sq. ft. of commercial space, 255 Kennedy Drive:**

Mr. Cota reminded member and the public that this is the second hearing on this application, and there will be more. He then asked the applicant to provide an overview of the project.

Mr. Langfeldt said the project is part of a large mixed use project. He also noted that a height waiver was not granted during the Master Plan hearings though it was supported by the DRB. He then asked the Board to grant support for the height waiver even though some "small details" may not be possible at this time. He stressed that the project is not viable without that waiver. He also asked if the Board had any idea how many hearings it will take before a decision is made. They need this information for financing.

Mr. Cota said the Board is set up to accommodate the new meeting format and stressed that they need to be sure every applicant has access to the process. He was sure there would be at least one more hearing. Regarding the height waiver, Mr. Cota said he does support this, but the Board needs to be sure the buildings are built to comply with other stipulations.

Ms. Keene said that space has been reserved on the 21 July schedule, and she anticipates that will be mostly a "listening" meeting. Following that, she anticipated one, maybe two, more meetings. All buildings will be reviewed by 21 July. Then in September the Board could review any new information submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Behr said that unless a particular building blocks a view shed, he is supportive of the height waiver. Mr. Wilking also said he has no issue with the height waiver as a whole as long as it comes in as planned.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows and with the use of a powerpoint provided by the applicant:

1. Staff recommends support of the setback waiver on lot 14. Mr. Gill showed the plan and noted this is the only setback waiver being requested. The Board had no issue with this.
2. Regarding the height waiver for each building, staff feels the Board should determine the buildings are of high quality and varied architecture. Mr. Gill showed a rendering of proposed architecture and the details of door treatments at the underground garage level. He noted the addition of doors at this level and other decorative elements. Mr. Gill then showed a view of the character of the neighborhood, indicating the progression from single family homes to multi-family buildings. Mr. Cota said he liked the texture and glazing and felt the buildings meet his need for the height waiver. Mr. Behr said he would like to see an overall aerial view of the area. Mr. Gill provided that view and noted it also included the next phase of the project. Mr. Behr then said he supports the height waiver in general and was fine with what he had seen so far.
3. Regarding Inclusionary Zoning, Mr. Cota noted the City Council passed 2 inclusionary zoning amendments at its most recent meeting. He then noted that the Board had asked to hear from Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) as to whether what is proposed meets the requirements of the ordinance. Ms. Demitrowitz of CHT applauded the city for the Inclusionary Zoning amendments. She then cited the benefits of having the inclusionary units in one building. It allows them to expand who is included and allows for much deeper affordability. She noted that they are proposing to include 3 and 4 bedroom units to allow for larger families and also will provide housing for some homeless people. There will be a broad spread of income in the one building. Mr. Cota asked how they will manage access to amenities, especially the pool. Ms. Demetrowitz said the rents for other units include pool management. They are talking about making the pool available at an affordable additional rate on a voluntary basis. Mr. Cota said he understood the City Attorney is working on that. Mr. Langfeldt said their intention is to be inclusive regarding amenities. The question is how to afford them, and they are discussing this with CHT. Mr. Sullivan said he sees this as a legal issue and noted an Attorney from Vermont Legal Aid is present and will weigh in on this. Mr. Sullivan also questioned how people could not

- tell which units are inclusionary if all the units in a building are inclusionary. Ms. Dimetrovitz said the requirement is for 48 inclusionary units and there are over 50 units in the building. Mr. Gill said he felt they can get up to 51 units and he believed 47 are required. He noted that a 3 or 4 bedroom unit is counted as more than one unit. So 4 units would be market rate.
4. Regarding staff's concern with entry towers and lack of common space to foster a sense of community, Mr. Gill said they have added some conceptual areas for outdoor common amenities. Mr. Hodgson showed areas near buildings 14 and 12 for outdoor grilling and room for tables and chairs. Across the street, they may relocate the entry drive to lot 15 and create a patio for a parking space for a food truck, a place for tables, and an area good for events. Off lot #15, they are looking to create an expansive deck at the upper level, a sidewalk and boardwalk overlooking the wetland, with a concept like a series of "outdoor rooms." The walkway would extend around north of the building. A third of that area is pool area, a grilling area, and a hot tub. Mr. Langfeldt said the pool is being conceived of as a "plunge pool." Mr. Hodgson then showed pictures of types of amenities (e.g., benches, fire pits, grills, etc.). He also showed another outdoor area on the hillside which would lead to a bocce court with an overhead pavilion and lighting. On another hilly site there would be a terraced area with grilling options close to the building entrance. He also showed slides of play/park areas, forested area with walking trails, large open spaces, playgrounds, etc. The glass stair towers could have public art and lighting to be illuminated at night. Ms. Keene felt they have addressed the outdoor common space issue. She questioned interior common spaces. Mr. Hodgson showed plans for interior common areas in different buildings including a first floor common area in the CHT building.
  5. Re: creating an engaging street presence on Kennedy Drive, Mr. Hodgson pointed out the jog in the building right near the stair tower and the bumpouts in the buildings. Ms. Keene noted that the architectural plans are different. Mr. Gill said that could be an oversight. Ms. Keene asked about the garage that faces Kennedy Drive on lot 15 and asked how that will look. Mr. Gill said they will use accent and screening features for the garages. They can specify these at final plat. He showed a slide of screening types. There will also be plantings at the edge of the gravel wetland. Regarding lighting, they do not have specifics on garage lighting as yet. They will be more downcast, sensitive and won't bleed onto the street. There won't be more lighting than needed for safety.
  6. Regarding the "meadow" concept, Ms. Keene asked if this will be to walk on or to look at. Mr. Hodgson said parts could be walked on. It provides visual contrast and

- wildlife habitat. Mr. Cota said he likes it, though he wasn't sure "meadow" was the right word. Mr. Hodgson said they are working on taller grass to blend into the shorter grasses. This usually takes 2-3 seasons to establish.
7. Staff asked the applicant to discuss additional accommodations for pedestrians at parking entrances. Mr. Gill showed a separate pedestrian entrance.
  8. The applicant was asked to describe how an engaging appearance with Kennedy Drive will be achieved. Mr. Gill said they will probably rough-in a stormwater area here. There would be additional wetlands and a meadow area with additional landscaping. He showed a rendering of how the street could be livened up with seating, etc.
  9. Regarding a street presence on Two Brothers Drive, Mr. Gill noted the plaza for a food truck (described before). Mr. Hodgson added they have a brick sidewalk where the Kennedy sidewalk crosses and a stone wall on both sides, creating a "gateway." Mr. Gill said there could also be a power hookup there. He also noted that the garage access for lot 15 is challenging from a construction point of view. Mr. Homsted explained the grading issue and said there is only so much they can do.
  10. Staff feels the Board should not allow parking on lot 17 without addressing a fully developed site plan as installation of curbing will make it hard to modify. Mr. Gill noted the expansion of the Master Plan to include expanded building areas but not to include parking areas. He said they understand that commercial parking is a conditional use in the C1-LR zoning district where this land is located. If they can get a temporary access without curbing it would accommodate parking until other plans are constructed. Ms. Keene asked if there is a plan showing what temporary parking would look like. Mr. Gill said they can come up with a plan for that. He felt it would be a great solution. They could design it in a low impact manner. They could propose the entire area as "finalized" but could change it if it doesn't work out. Members were OK with that.
  11. Mr. Gill said they will look at relocating the sidewalk so it isn't in that parking area.
  12. Staff questioned whether there is a surplus of parking and whether it detracts from providing other features. Mr. Gill said they have 1-1/2 spaces per unit; below that, there is a risk that would make the project unmarketable. Ms. Demitrovitz said that is what they would like for parking as well. Mr. Cota noted that gets to 625 parking spaces. Mr. Gill said the on-street spaces are presumed unusable in winter. Ms. Keene asked if there will be reserved parking. Mr. Gill said they will guarantee a

- space in the garage but not assign spaces. There would be some regulations. Mr. Gill added that they would remove the 2 spaces that Ms. Keene noted are not inline with regulations. Ms. Keene said if they are ADA compliant, they can stay.
13. This was covered in #12.
  14. Regarding compact parking spaces and how to control them, Mr. Gill said they are showing 18'x8' instead of the 19'x9' standard. He felt they could accommodate the larger spaces. He added it is probably a good spot for an electric charging station now required by Act 250. He said he was OK with making the parking spaces larger.
  15. Staff is asking that the 2 doors opening inward be brought to code. Mr. Gill said that was an error. No door will open into a parking space.
  16. Regarding the transition to a more urban area on lot 14, Mr. Gill noted that building is only 3 stories, not 4. There is a "step" to the 4-story building. He showed an aerial rendering of transitions. Members were OK with this.
  17. Staff asked about architectural gateway features on lots 14 and 15 toward the corner of 2 Brothers Drive. Mr. Gill showed renderings with glass stair towers. Members liked this feature.
  18. Staff asked how to break up the large building presence with height waivers to 56.5 feet. Mr. Gill acknowledged it is a large building and said they've been working to make it attractive. He noted that a large part of the building bends away from Kennedy Dr. It also has features such as the glassway, art work, a street presence, etc. Mr. Langfeldt said they tried to have handsome architecture and felt they have achieved that. He added it is also a gateway to a more commercial area of the city. Members were OK with this.
  19. Regarding pedestrian connectivity from the garage entrance to the remainder of the building on lot 14, Mr. Gill said they have connections to both lot 14 and 15 from the parking garage. On lot 14, they have added a 'go-round.'
  20. Regarding pedestrian access to the solid waste disposal areas. Mr. Gill said they will provide that at the next stage of review.
  21. Staff is looking for a more "urban feel" instead of rows of shrubs. Mr. Hodgson said they can address that.



22. Staff recommends bringing the buildings closer to the street instead of having a 14-foot area without functionality. Mr. Gill noted they have done this to address grading issues between the sidewalk and building foundations. Mr. Cota suggested the applicant see what they can do with some of those spaces.
23. Already addressed.
24. Create usable open green spaces around the building with strategically placed shade trees in lieu of dense hedges. Mr. Gill felt that sounded good and achievable.
25. Re: issues with the surface parking lot on lot 14, Ms. Keene indicated a space and questioned how a driver can see what is coming. Mr. Gill said they will look at it.
26. This is a final plat issue.
27. Re: parking lot issues. These can be addressed at final plat.
28. The applicant will provide details of snow storage areas and/or plans for removal.
29. Regarding parking, roadway and circulation standards, Mr. Gill said the road network was approved with the Hillside final plat. It included a rec path and bike lane on Two Brothers Drive. He showed a plan of the approved roads and noted the addition of 2 parallel parking spaces on the road which seems to be allowed (LDR 15.12M) as long as Public Works has no objection. If there is an objection, they will go back to the original plan. Mr. Gill also showed a concept of "tree wells" on the path and showed photos of the look they are going for...an urban look. Mr. Cota noted staff wants a 5-foot grass strip between the road and sidewalk for snow storage. He felt that looked more suburban, but he understood DPW's concern. Ms. Philibert said she would like the more urban look. Mr. Gill said he would talk with Public Works and come up with something.
30. Regarding a rec path along this section of roadway, Mr. Gill said Two Brothers Road was previously approved and he didn't recall a request for a rec path on that spot., just a connection from the Kennedy Drive path to the newly proposed project rec path. Ms. Keene said that will be clarified before the next meeting.
31. The applicant will provide an updated lighting plan at the next review.
32. Regarding bike racks, this will be addressed at the next stage of review.

33. Regarding long-term bike storage, this will also be addressed at the next stage. Mr. Gill said they have 2 bike rooms (he showed the location on the plans) and will work through details.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Mr. Killacky: He questioned whether there are enough ADA parking spaces in each building. Mr. Langfeldt said he will confirm this.

Mr. Killacky: Also felt the pool is such a minor thing but to exclude people from the CHT building is a major thing. If it's a minor pool, let everyone in.

Ms. Dooley: Loved the towers. She was also concerned about the pool usage and wanted this to be an inclusionary neighborhood.

Ms. Batterson: She is a lawyer with Legal Aid and focused on housing issues. She was concerned with the Inclusionary units all in one building as well as access to all amenities (e.g., the pool). She felt that one building set apart doesn't seem to address the "inclusionary" language. She also asked that there be enough parking for the disabled and that those spaces be large enough for those who need them.

Following the public comments, Mr. Cot moved to continue SD-20-16 to 21 July 2020. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

Mr. Gill said he would provide the City Attorney with something in writing regarding what they propose for the pool.

- 7. Continued Master Plan Application #MP-20-01 of O'Brien Farm Road, LLC, to amend a previously approved master plan for a planned unit development to develop 39.16 acres with a maximum of 458 dwelling units and 45,000 sq. ft. of office space. The amendment is to add 0.60 acres to Zone 2A without changing the approvals or use for that zone and to remove 0.60 acres from Zone 7, 255 Kennedy Drive:**

Mr. Cota asked if the applicant still wishes to continue this item. Mr. Gill said they do.

Mr. Cota moved to continue MP-20-01 to 21 July 2020. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

- 8. Minutes of 16 June 2020:**

Mr. Cota moved to approve the Minutes of 16 June 2020 as written. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

**12 Other Business:**

No other business was presented.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned by common consent at 11:22 p.m.

*These minutes were approved by the Board on July 21, 2020.*