

Burlington Planning Commission

149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401

www.burlingtonvt.gov/cityplanning

Andy Montroll, Chair
Michael Gaughan, Vice Chair
Alexander Friend
Erhard Mahnke
Erin Malone
Ryan Nick
Julia Randall

Burlington Planning Commission & City Council Ordinance Committee Collaborative Working Group on Inclusionary Zoning

Tuesday, Sept. 22, 2026, 6:00 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in City Hall's Bushor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

Planning Commissioners Present:

- ☒ Andy Montroll, Chair
- ☒ Erin Malone
- ☒ Michael Gaughan
- ☒ Julia Randall
- ☒ Alexander Friend
- ☒ Ryan Nick
- ☒ Erhard Mahnke

City Council Ordinance Committee Members Present:

- ☒ Councilor Gene Bergman, Chair
- ☒ Councilor Mark Barlow
- ☒ Councilor Sarah Carpenter

City Staff Present:

- ☒ Charles Dillard, Director, City Planning
- ☒ Kara Alnasrawi, Director, CEDO
- ☒ Kimberlee Sturtevant, Assistant City Attorney
- ☒ Scott Gustin, Zoning Division Manager, DPI
- ☒ Sarah Morgan, Principal Planner, City Planning
- ☒ Nancy Stetson, Senior Policy & Data Analyst, DFA
- ☒ Maggie Callaghan, Housing Program Manager, CEDO

Public Attendance: Eric Farrell, Jak Tiano, Sharon Bushor, Scott Newman, Julie Curtain, Michael Monte, Brenda Torpy

1. Agenda

Call to Order: 6:02pm

Changes to Agenda: Agenda adopted by both City Council Ord. Committee & Planning Commission

2. Director's Report

C. Dillard shared updates on Tier 1A Application Work Session at City Council and also shared that the Mayor will be hosting a press conference on Wednesday, Sept. 23, related to the housing strategy.

3. Public Forum #1

Sharon Bushor: Shared that some members of the public may want their concerns to be considered by the Working Group. Understands rationale for two public forums, but feels comments have less value if shared at the end.

4. Follow-up presentation & discussion on Proposals 3, 4, and 5

Large Project Threshold for Proposals 3 & 4: Staff presented four options for regulating large projects (75+ units or 3+ acres) regarding off-site and payment-in-lieu options, with option 4 (requiring on-site IZ units for projects with 75+ units or 3+ acres) being recommended. The working group discussed the approach and discussed whether larger projects (200+) should be allowed to place some IZ off-site rather than requiring all units to be on-site. While some members supported more flexibility for larger projects (200+) to reduce complexity and facilitate partnerships, the full group favored maintaining simplicity and requiring all IZ to be on-site, particularly for projects over 75 units.

Payment-In-Lieu Reconfiguration (Proposal 5): The group discussed adjusting payment-in-lieu fees for affordable housing units, with Nancy presenting analysis showing current fees would trend to \$100,000-\$113,000 using different inflation measures. The team agreed to maintain the \$80,000 base fee with automatic annual adjustments based on construction cost indices rather than requiring annual City Council approval. M. Gaughan suggested the use of a 12-month rolling average to smooth construction cost indices, highlighting the volatility in recent years, which the Working Group directed staff to include in the formula.

5. Presentation & Discussion: Proposal 6 – Allow Tenure Flexibility in Large Projects

Staff presented the proposal to allow tenure flexibility in large projects (over 200 units) by enabling IZ units to be either rental or owner-occupied, with a requirement that 20% of required IZ units be owner-occupied in projects including market rate owner-occupied units. Some members of the working group questioned why the flexibility was limited to large projects. The group agreed to lower the threshold from 200 units to 75 units for mixed tenure projects. The conversation also touched on the rarity of affordable homeownership projects and the challenges of creating conventional affordable condos.

6. Presentation & Discussion: Proposal 7 – Home Ownership Opportunities at 100% AMI

Staff shared that, after feedback received from CHT, they recommend retracting this proposal and retain existing language. Instead, non-IZ tools should be leveraged to produce middle-income ownership units.

- Michael from Champlain Housing Trust explained their shared equity program, clarifying that while units are priced at 70% of AMI, they can be sold to buyers up to 100% of median income, and emphasized the importance of permanently affordable housing through shared equity mechanisms. Highlighted the balance between affordability and wealth-building through home ownership, with Michael explaining how their program helps families build equity while remaining affordable to future generations.
- There was not a consensus on whether or not the initial proposal should be retracted, pursued, or whether a compromise should be explored. Staff was directed to continue exploring the options based on the discussion.
- S. Carpenter requested that staff explore what is meant by “permanent affordability”.

7. Public Forum #2

Jak Tiano: Representing Let’s Build Homes, emphasized that unfunded IZ requirements can increase housing costs or make projects financially infeasible, particularly for small- and mid-sized developments with limited access to outside funding. Noted that larger projects may be better positioned to leverage public funding and affordable housing partnerships, and encouraged the Working Group to use a data-driven approach to identify project thresholds where these funding opportunities become available.

Sharon Bushor: Sharon supported requiring on-site IZ for projects with 75+ units or 3+ acres, while raising concerns about neighborhood gentrification, the payment-in-lieu fee, support for smaller developers, and ensuring adequate affordable homeownership opportunities. She recommended providing educational resources on AMI and IZ to help the public offer more informed feedback.

8. Accept Communications

9. Adjournment (9:00pm)

Action: Joint motion to adjourn

Motion by: A. Montroll

Seconded by: n/a

Vote: Unanimous

