

**CHAMBERLIN NEIGHBORHOOD – AIRPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MEETING NOTES  
13 APRIL 2016**

**Members of the South Burlington Chamberlin/Airport Study Committee discussed committee business on Wednesday, 13 April 2016, at 6:30 p.m., in the Conference Room, City Hall, 575 Dorset Street.**

**NOTE: AS THERE WAS NO QUORUM PRESENT, MEMBERS AGREED TO DISCUSS ISSUED BUT TO TAKE NO ACTION.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** C. Sargent, Chair; P. Clemins, K. Robinson, G. Maille, L. Brakel, J. Simson,

**ALSO PRESENT:** P. Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning; L. Krohn, CCRPC; B. Chamberlin, Consultants; T. Hubbard, Deputy City Manager; J. Rabidou, Public Works Director; members of the public.

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

As there was not a quorum present, members agreed to discuss issues but to take no action.

**2. Open to the Public for items not related to the agenda:**

No issues were raised.

**3. Minutes of 16 March 2016:**

Action on the Minutes of 16 March 2016 was postponed as there was not a quorum present.

**4. Report of Noise Sub-Committee:**

Mr. Maille reported that the sub-committee continued its discussion of a committee to survive the current committee. They agreed that the committee would act in an advisory capacity and would seek participation from other municipalities and non-municipalities (Army and Air Guard, Airport, etc.). They could also seek support from organizations such as the Regional Planning Commission, GBIC, etc. The committee would be comprised of citizens selected for 2 or 3 year terms. No elected officials or Planning Commission or DRB members would serve on the committee. The Chair would come from the members and be elected annually. A possible title for the committee would be Noise Mitigation Planning Committee.

Ms. Sargent suggested the committee be considered a standing committee of the Chamberlin neighborhood.

Ms. Sargent noted that she will also ask for the larger Chamberlin/Airport Committee to continue to exist after its work with the consultant. They would deal with neighborhood issues, not only noise. She suggested the committee discuss this at a future meeting.

**5. Presentation and discussion of possible relocation of the South Burlington Dog Park; update on Jaycee Park:**

Mr. Hubbard showed the location of the current Dog Park at the end of Kirby Road Extension. He said it is a very wet area and not ideal for this use. It is also hard to get the gates open when there is ice on the ground in winter.

Because of Airport issues, the park has to be moved (the lease has already expired). The City has located a better site nearby, and the City of Burlington has discussed a longer lease on this site. The current fencing can be moved to the new site.

Mr. Rabidoux then outlined the problems with the existing site including: the expired lease, water issues, a high water table, and a low-lying site. He then showed an overhead photo of the proposed new location which consists of approximately 2 acres at Dumont and Henry Streets. There could be a paved parking area provided. Mr. Rabidoux said this is a better site, quieter, dryer, and with better access. The Airport is committed to working with the city on this site.

The next steps would include: getting community input, discussions with the Airport, securing a zoning permit for this use, and construction of the park.

Mr. Maille questioned using land acquired by the Airport for a non-Airport use. Mr. Rabidoux said that all parties were aware of the question and were working towards addressing it.

Mr. Hubbard said the previous lease was for 5 years; the city is hoping for at least 10 years on a new lease in order to make the effort worthwhile.

Ms. Sargent asked if people are picking up after their dogs. Mr. Hubbard said they appear to be policing each other.

Ms. Sargent also asked that they try to configure the new park without removing growing plants. Mr. Rabidoux said the goal is to leave the area much as it currently is. Mr. Hubbard added that the trees will provide more shade than the current site does.

Mr. Rabidoux said that after the City Manager returns from vacation next week, design work can begin. This will be shared with the CNAP Committee.

Ms. Sargent suggested some benches and amenities outside the fencing.

Regarding Jaycee Park, Mr. Hubbard noted that Dore & Whittier have been doing an analysis of city facilities including Jaycee Park and the O'Brien Center regarding maintenance issues. The Park has been used for a variety of programming over the years. The building is not, however, ADA compliant, and it would cost about \$500,000 to upgrade the building.

The city has been speaking with the O'Brien family regarding the need to take down the existing building and replacing it. It is being used regularly, but there are issues with viability. The city would like it to serve families and seniors for both indoor and outdoor uses.

Mr. Maille asked about a timeframe. Mr. Hubbard said that is hard to predict. The city hopes to meet with the O'Brien family in May when everyone is back from Florida. They will also want community input as this will be a great addition to the Chamberlin neighborhood.

A member of the audience asked about a budget for this. Mr. Hubbard said the city is not looking to bond or increase property taxes. They are anxious to see to what extent the O'Brien family will participate. After that, the city would look at impact fees and other sources of funding.

Ms. Sargent cited the need for bathrooms for outdoor users.

Mr. Hubbard said the committee would be updated on progress.

## **6. Overview & Committee Review of Transportation Scenarios (refined concepts from February meeting):**

Mr. Chamberlin said tonight's discussion will focus on "where," "who," and "how much" for improvements. He noted there are 3 categories of improvements: bike/pedestrian connectivity, neighborhood streets, and reconstruction of Airport Drive. For each case, there has been a cost estimate, a possible source of funding, an approval score (from committee

members), a priority ranking, and a potential time-frame. With regard to time-frame, a project in less than 3 years would be considered “short term,” a project within 3-7 years would be considered “medium term,” and a project taking longer than 7 years would be ranked as “long term.” Mr. Chamberlin said ideally there would be an endorsement tonight of a transportation implementation plan.

Mr. Chamberlin stressed that no funds or priority status have been allocated as yet to pay for any of the proposed projects. Some neighborhood groups may wish to advocate for these things.

Pedestrian/Bike Connectivity:

- a. Sidewalk on the north side of White Street (there was not overwhelming support for this), 3,500 feet total. The advantages would be a more convenient route for pedestrians, it would accommodate bus stops, and if the school closes, it could be replaced by another community asset. The disadvantage is that it could impact some front yard features.

The cost estimate is \$400,000-\$650,000. Funding would be through VTrans. The project had a 68% approval score. It would be a medium term project with medium priority.

- b. Overland Paths were highly supported and would require a new organization. Collaboration with homeowners would be needed, and there would have to be liability protection and trail access easements. Ms. Argent and Mr. Simson felt this would be a low-impact use of the “noise lands.” Mr. Chamberlin noted the Airport does have a multi-use plan,” and there is interest in providing pedestrian access on the “noise land.” Ms. Sargent said handicapped accessibility should be part of any discussion.

Mr. Chamberlin said one of the next steps would be to meet with the Bike/Ped Committee for information sharing.

The cost of the project would be \$2,000-\$5,000. With a bridge, the cost would rise to \$50,000-\$100,000. Funding would be local. The project would be a medium priority with a medium term.

- c. Crosswalks – Mr. Chamberlin showed a map with crosswalks that were voted on. He indicated 3 crossings that seem to work best. On Williston Rd., they are recommending a crosswalk with a small pedestrian island. On problem there is the large number of left turns. The estimated cost for crosswalks is \$10,000-\$20,000.
- d. Bicycle Accommodations- Mr. Chamberlin noted that committee members were very positive regarding on-road bike lanes. There was less support for protected bike lanes mainly because of the cost. He showed pictures of what these would look like. Ms. Emery mentioned some “missing links” on Airport Drive. These were shown on the map. There was also a possible bike lane shown on Richard Terrace.

The cost for on-road bike lanes on White/Patrick/Hanover Streets would be \$5,000-\$18,000 with funding from South Burlington Public Works and maintenance by VTrans. This was a high priority and a short term project. Protected bike lanes on White Street and/or Patchen Road were not costed out. They would be a VTrans project. The priority was low, and it was considered a long-term project.

#### Neighborhood Streets:

Mr. Chamberlin showed a map indicating where there are currently speed bumps. These did not get a lot of support. Victory Drive and Logwood Street would be possible location for street improvements such as medians, “pinch points,” and “suggestion lanes.” Mr. Maille said they are not needed on Logwood.

Pinch points would cost from \$10,000-\$14,000. A median would cost between \$8,000 and \$10,000. Both would be funded locally and both were considered medium term projects.

Mr. Chamberlin then outlined some other ideas for neighborhood streets including refuge island, whimsical crosswalks (at Chamberlin School), tightened curbs, painted streets and mini roundabouts.

Refuge islands would cost from \$8,000-\$10,000 with local funding. They would be medium priority and a medium term project.

Whimsical crosswalks with thermoplastic insets would last 3-5 years. Ms. Sargent suggested an airport theme for these. The work would cost between

\$5,000 and \$10,000 with local funding. It would be a medium priority with a medium term project.

Tightened curb radii would cost \$10,000-\$12,000, also with local funding and medium priority and term.

Ms. Sargent suggested having this information available for the community meeting.

Airport Drive:

Mr. Chamberlin said that in the short term, Airport Drive would not be reconstructed; it could be reconstructed in the long term. He showed a possible re-alignment. There are also options for reconfiguring adjacent streets though there wasn't great support for many of these possibilities.

One option (A) would be to keep White Street and Delaware St. open and close the others. Another option (B) would be to keep White Street and Delaware St. open and connect Elizabeth and Patrick Streets.

Mr. Chamberlin stressed that there would be traffic studies before anything is done with any street. Mr. Conner noted that any possible plan can be tried at almost no cost; if people don't like it, it can be undone.

A member of the audience asked the benefit of these possibilities. Mr. Maille said they would discourage through traffic from Airport Drive. Ms. Sargent noted Elizabeth Street now has greyhound buses cutting through.

The cost for Option A would be \$0-\$1,000 with local funding. It would be a short term project with medium priority.

The cost for Option B would be \$100,000-\$150,000, with funding from Regional Planning and the TIP. It would be a long term project and had low priority.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Airport held a public meeting on 24 March and showed a map of their "proposed short term program" This included their ideas on some road closures (some of which have been suggested to this committee) and 2 areas of terminal expansion. Mr. Chamberlin then showed a potential Airport Drive re-alignment with a boulevard treatment,

traffic in both directions, with a multi-use path on the neighborhood side of the road. Mr. Maille said they would need noise mitigation for traffic.

The cost for this plan would be \$12,000,000-\$20,000,000. Funding would be by Regional Planning and the TIP. It would be a long term project with medium priority. The steps involved in this project include:

- a. It is a “candidate” project on the VTrans capital program, but is not highly ranked
- b. The project must get support from BTV, South Burlington City Council (advised by CNAPC), and the public
- c. Scoping would be by South Burlington and CCRPC to update the preferred alignment, identify resources impacts, and update cost estimates
- d. It would be added to the CCRPC TIP based on its rank compared to other projects in the county
- e. The project would be ranked on a statewide ranking system in the VTrans capital program. Construction would depend on its score.

Mr. Simson said he thinks there needs to be advocacy from business, commuters, etc., and the Airport should have a high stake in it. He felt its benefit was not as great as other projects.

A member of the audience noted the proposed road goes through some people’s homes. The Airport says they can buy more properties now. She felt that if this is presented to the public, people should be prepared to answer to those homeowners. Mr. Conner said that is why this project has been on the “back burner” for the past several years.

An audience member said the Airport study indicates they will not do air conditioning, windows, etc., but they will buy more property. Mr. Conner said he would look into that.

Mr. Chamberlin said he would send members the totals for all short, medium and long term improvements with cost estimates. He asked members to get their thoughts back to him by 22 April so they can be put together for the public meeting on 28 April.

Mr. Conner noted there are opportunities to apply for grants for some of the projects. However, there isn’t a special projects budget in Public Works at this time, and it would have to be a new budget item. He also noted that Public Works can do only a certain number of projects year or find a way to increase that capacity.

## **7. Update, Conversation and Feedback regarding the Airport Re-Use Plan:**

Mr. Conner noted the City Council may want to provide input on the Plan. They want to hear first from this Committee. Mr. Conner said he would check on the time-frame.

## **8. Discuss Chamberlin School Issues, follow-up from School Board Presentation:**

Ms. Sargent noted that all the scenarios the School Board is proposing involve closing Chamberlin School. She read a letter in opposition to this which she sent to the School Board as a concerned citizen. She felt the Committee should respond as well. Nick Long sent a communication indicating that the Airport would consider noise mitigation at the school. Mr. Conner noted there will be a meeting at the school on 26 April in this regard. Ms. Sargent suggested the Committee attend that meeting. Ms. Emery said the School Board is eager to hear from the Chamberlin neighborhood.

Mr. Simson noted that there is declining enrollment at the school, and there will continue to be a decline in population to serve the school. He felt there is no reason to keep the school open unless there is an increase in school population.

Mr. Maille said there is emotion and then there is reality. The change that would be required for that learning environment is expensive.

Ms. Sargent felt that instead of "writing off" the school, people should work on the issues.

As there was no further business to be discussed, the discussion was concluded by common consent at 9:15 p.m.