

“A Vision For Route 7”

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #3 - FINALIZING THE ILLUSTRATIVE PLAN
February 12, 2014

After short introductions by Jim and Kate, Jim provided an overview of the charrette for those that were not able to attend. The discussion included a quick review of the visioning plans and the illustrative plan alternatives that the participants developed by the end of the charrette. Peter then led a discussion that compared the two alternatives to find which aspects of each should be included in the first draft of the illustrative plan.

The discussion of the illustrative plan alternatives included the following points.

- The "island" at the south end of the Route 7 corridor should be left green but the middle would be a good location for a civic use, such as a new fire station. The Town could create a partnership with the owner to create an over plan for the property. It might be useful to create a municipal development corporation.
- The residential uses along the east side of Webster Road would be better in a mix of medium and small buildings. There should be a link between the area at the Webster Road corner and the Shelburne Campground Road, running through the Thunderbird Motel property. Use a new road through this area rather than create multiple driveways from Webster Road; the new road would help to create a smaller, more walkable scale. Bring the road out onto the east/west portion of Webster Road.
- Creating a central entrance to Shelburne Commons and Rice Lumber property is good. The Rice central common area on #2 is preferred. The use of the site as a conference center is a good idea. The types of buildings at Fort Ethan Allen would be good model for the types of buildings that would be good here. Encourage more residential use at the south end of the Rice property. There should be some variety in the setbacks of the buildings. Make sure the development on the Rice property as well as Shelburne Commons is accessible to more than just automobiles.
- Keep the openness of the properties north of the Bay Road intersection. Add inner connections between the properties. The campus idea looks like a good direction to go. Make buildings relate to each other as well as the street, even if the area stays as industrial. This area might be a good location to show telecommunication facilities. Can the code accommodate telecommunication facilities?
- The Dolan Farm would be a good location for a conference center/hotel or some other special use rather than residential. Pull the buildings closer to the road. Encourage continuation of the agricultural use on the property.

- The illustrative plan should show a full build out of the northern portions of the Route 7 corridor as a push towards positive change in the future. Total redevelopment could work on some properties while partial redevelopment could work on others. Having more variety in the final design along the roadway would be good.
- Use signs and banners to designate the gateway, in conjunction with art, trees and special lighting.

*Project is being conducted with financial support from, and in cooperation with, the **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**

3-18-14 Kate's Notes from Steering Committee #4

Ted: Purpose of meeting is to show where we're going with the concept plan and how that will translate into FBC. Components informing this: synthesized plan, feedback from property owners, VPS (234 responses).

Peter - general comments about the plan:

1. two plans quickly generated at the charrette
2. sought feedback on both, cherry picked from each to produce synthesis
3. IP continues to be refined, not yet endorsed but consensus on general direction
4. Plan allows for: playing out of "imaginary scenarios", allows us to ask "what rules do we need to change to make the plan possible?".
5. We want to start the "welcome to Shelburne" process at the S. Burlington line!

Peter's presentation of plan specifics:

1. started at Webster Road end and went north
2. proposal shown takes advantage of opportunities for redevelopment, deep frontage, proximity to village. Achieved by: allowing infill closer to street, more density, surround with open space
3. suspending property lines to explore how neighboring properties working together can produce over time an efficient overall pattern

Question: What about ROW? How can you do any of this (strong perception persists that State controls *everything* in Rt 7 and all resistance if futile).

Answer: Kate explained that State ROW is 100 and extends outer edge of sidewalk to outer edge of sidewalk.

Answer: **P&T** explain that using trees and building closer to road will slow traffic on highway; creating parallel interior streets will facilitate local traffic circulation; reducing curb cuts on Rt 7 will offer protection from Rte 7. These are examples of principles that can become elements in the code.

Q: from Lee Krohn (CCRPC): What are the starting points for the what's shown on the IP? Just beautiful design?

A: **P&T** explain it's much more than that. Noted are unbuildable areas (wetlands), chose to suspend lot lines strategically, ex. where two adjoining uses are compatible, but not if incompatible. Other principals at play: expand building toward corridor to create enclosure. MP doesn't dictate but recognizes opportunities such as views afforded by adjacent open lands. MP is not taking away anyone's right to develop but suggesting what would be compatible with existing reality, ex. around p2

p. 2

Dolan Farm let stormwater function and the existing open character suggest future forms/character/uses.

Q: What's going on at former Red Apple

A: charrette generated idea for welcome center, gas backwards station

Roz Graham (works at Shelburne Farms)- use of Bay Road intersection is good and will help visitors to SF. Can people rent kayaks here?

Q: School property shown with future school?

A: Ok, we will indicate

Q: Conference center on Rt 7, really? How does this compare with Woodstock or Manchester?

Peter resumes review of plan:

1. Office park at Executive Drive brings buildings up to road, create streetscape, central campus, meaningful open space, mixing of uses
2. Shelburne Bay Plaza - connectivity behind buildings, across lot lines, shared parking, lots of trees - P explains that FBC is the instrument that lets this happen.

Audience comment: likes encouraging reuse, infill, seems realistic and something market would bear

Dorothea Penar (Wild Rose Circle)-trapped by furniture store 18 wheelers; wants to have neighborhood connectivity via the railroad, as was shown earlier.

Q: Stormwater?? We have big liabilities; how can FBC help with that?

A: P said yes, the FBC can help us meet those requirements. ex. adding green space, putting standards in the code, **promised more ideas about SW next time...**

Gary von Stange (SB chair)- supports FBC, supports using ROW, wants team to be as realistic as possible, worried about money for new roads. Where will that come from?

Ted - explained that town is not responsible for that; IP just shows what's possible under a FBC.

David Webster- Even with these changes, Rt 7 is still a very vehicular oriented road. Can we get away from that?

p.3

P & T: what will help is mixing development, bringing it closer to street. Showed graphic of existing Rice Lumber area with uses you drive to vs. proposed FBC that shows in same area places that are designed for walking, walk through open spaces to destination...

- By creating more dense centers of activity you can park once, walk everywhere; to achieve you recreate scale and pattern of pre car times. This is achievable value added because everything's at a smaller scale

(summary of missing IP elements: connections b/w neighborhoods along rr?; connections b/w Rt 7 and Spear St?; paths through the neighborhoods)

Ted - progression from the IP to the RP to FBC

Peter - introduced regulatory plan

1. current=monolith, one size fits all; proposal is to change to subzones
2. Commerce and Industry changes to Business campus (new labels suggest possibility that isn't their now).
3. mixed residential- this is existing and would stay the same in future

Ted - VPS results explained

1. What's on books today and how does that differ from FBC? Ted showed very effective diagram of non PUD stand alone lot under existing zoning. **Audience seemed to me very attentive.**

- building and parking envelopes required, high parking requirements

- ex. 30,000sf building needs 280' frontage (=football field), 3 acres, 100 parking spaces

-bottom line - not easy to develop well today, tough to develop collaboratively and with future in mind (no internal sidewalk connectivity required).

- to succeed, commercial needs visibility; current set up does not support, has lots of wasted opportunity.

4. How do we enable better pattern?

- regulating plan creates distinct districts

-building types and placement standards allow flexibility about use, site design controlled by placement

-context driven standards allow you to be specific about what you accomplish = creation of place where elements relate: buildings, streets and open space

5. **Ted** showed diagram of random FBC site design and described principles inherent and what advantages are

- visual interest and interference- adding this will slow people down

- build to zone vs setback line allows activity to spill out into front yard (creating meaningful space out front in process)

- primary entrance out front (prompted complaint "it won't work, siting new FBC building in Tafts Corners); Ted countered with put entrance at corner.

- Dorothea wants "friendly" buildings on street; Ted showed how you can achieve with building standards

6. discussion moved on to what is useable open space - Ted explained this is organized differently depending on context ex. in business campus it's collectivized, not so in other contexts. Hierarchy is set up to define how elements are used - demonstrated horizontally (site plan) and vertically (site section)

7. Brian Precourt - Concerned about nonconformities, doesn't want this to create more.

8. Brian wanted to know what density is the residential that's shown?

P& T: community will ultimately decide this (ie PC); currently res. density is very low everywhere in town. Options for town to consider, ex. 2,000sf lot for row house. Feedback from charrette said more types of housing are desired. Suggest adding density bonus as tool to reward developers for providing enhancements to community.

9. Brian - Will FBC be overlay or base?

P&T will show proposals for parallel, base, hybrid. Start with parallel. A lot at discretion of PC.

Commerce and Industry? Peter said it was part of study, proposal of business park helps better integrate this district with surroundings

Visualizing density? Folks need help with this, especially change possible over time. **P&T will work on diagrams to show how this could occur in each district over time, to show how form will support development of identity and character.** Julie Campoli's book can help with this.

Post all information from this meeting online.