



DRAFT MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

21 JULY 2026

The South Burlington Development Review Board held a regular meeting on Tuesday, 21 July 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium, City Hall, 180 Market Street, and via Go to Meeting interactive technology.

MEMBERS PRESENT: O. Mann, Chair; M. Behr, F. Kochman, J. Lesko, T. Lenski, C. Johnston

ALSO PRESENT: M. Keene, Development Review Planner; A. Levin, Planning Department; S. Kirschner, G. Dixon, D. Heil, S. Beall, A. Martin, C. Snyder, A. Rowe, B. Davis, D. Boardman, E. Davant, M. Kehoe, E. Sigrist, Em, S. Hoffman

1. Instructions on exiting the building in case of an emergency:

Ms. Mann provided instructions on emergency exit from the building.

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

No changes were made to the agenda.

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

No issues were raised.

4. Announcements:

There were no announcements.

5. Site Plan Application PZ-SITE-2026-19 of City of South Burlington to amend a previously approved plan for a 68-acre multi-use recreational park and athletic facility. The amendment consists of converting an existing field to turf, expanding the existing parking lot, and constructing a 3000 sq. ft. storage and maintenance building, 600 Swift Street:

Ms. Kirschner said the plan includes installing a new field of synthetic turf and expanding the parking lot to full size. The storage building will be on the north side of the Cairns Arena. There will be infrastructure to support the project.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

#1 Staff asked that the plan be revised to add curbing around the park area to increase the parking islands to meet the 10% standard. Mr. Dixon said they have added the curbing to the plan. Stormwater will flow north, so they prefer no curb on the north side of the parking lot. He showed a plan with the calculations of parking lot space. Ms. Keene read the standard regarding curbing. She noted the DRB can allow for no curbing for stormwater management. Mr. Dixon said they will be putting a fence in one area to protect plantings. Mr. Johnston asked how water will shed from the south side. Mr. Dixon said it will go to the north.

Members were OK with no curbing to the north.

Ms. Keene noted the plan is not consistent with how the size of interior islands is calculated. Mr. Levin noted there are 2 areas they did not recognize to be parking islands. Ms. Kirschner said they can square off the islands. She asked that this be a condition of approval. Ms. Mann stressed the need to be specific about where the islands are being placed. Mr. Behr suggested the applicant come back with the calculations.

#2. Staff noted the need for a new location for the transplanted crabapple tree. Mr. Dixon said they were not sure the tree can be moved, but they will try. It is not included in the tree calculations. He showed that tree's current location.

#3. The applicant was asked to provide a 25-year storm report including updating Sheet C-1 to show the full length of the outfall pipe. Mr. Dixon said they are working on this.

Ms. Kirschner noted that the City Arborist has weighed in on the tree selection.

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

Mr. Johnston moved to continue PZ-SITE-2026-19 to 4 August 2026. Ms. Lesko seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

6. Sketch Plan Application #PZ-SKETCH-2026-6 OF Neagley & Chase Construction Co. to construct a new 12,975 sq. ft. building and a new 8,640 sq. ft. building on an existing 20.2 acre undeveloped lot for group home use, 596 Meadowland Drive:

Ms. Hoffman, Commissioner of the Department of Children & Families, explained that the new buildings will be a secured youth facility for those 12-18 years old. It will be a 2-tiered model: for pre-adjudicated youth and post-adjudicated youth.

Mr. Heil then provided of overview of the site and showed the plan. It will encompass 20 acres in the I-O zone within the Airport approach and river corridor overlay district. An ecologist has delineated the Class 2 wetland on the west side of the parcel which has a 50-foot buffer. There is also a Class 2 wetland that bisects the parcel as well as a Class 3 wetland on the east side.

Mr. Heil showed a concept of the development and noted that the building on the east site will be the residential building with 14 beds; the building on the west site is the administration building. There will be a curb cut off Meadowland Drive. The project will be served by municipal water and sewer. Stormwater will be managed on the west side of the lot.

Mr. Heil said it is their understanding that the new LDRs will allow 2 buildings owned by the same operator on one lot. If that LDR doesn't pass, they would be asking for a waiver to allow the 2 buildings.

Ms. Mann explained that the goal of a sketch plan review is to identify potential issues. Mr. Kochman asked if there is a lot coverage issue. Ms. Keene said there is not.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

#1. Staff asked the applicant to address the scale of the development and explain the grading and grade changes. Mr. Heil said the elevation at the entrance is 344 feet. It then slopes down to the parking area. The wetland buffer is at 338 feet.

To make the site work, they are trying to balance with fill material on the western part of the site and possibly cut on the eastern side. The residential building will be 3-4 feet higher than the administration building. Each building will be single-story.

#2. Regarding pedestrian orientation, staff suggests relocating it from its present location as it is for "recreation" not "transportation." They suggest beginning it where it is today and then locating it as far from Meadowland Parkway as possible. It would be an unpaved trail. Mr. Heil showed the existing easement on the plan. They would relocate that easement closer to Meadowland Drive, away from the wetland. The 10-foot trail can go through the wetland buffer according to the LDRs. Ms. Keene cited the need to connect the same end points. Mr. Heil said they can do that.

Ms. Lesko expressed concern with having a path on a treatment site. Ms. Hoffman said there will be a security fence at the end of the facility.

#3. Regarding solar gain, Mr. Heil noted the eastern building is oriented north/south so it gets good morning and afternoon light.

#4. Regarding a site amenity requirement, staff noted the proposed courtyard amenity will need a minimum of 20 seats. Ms. Keene noted the DRB can modify this requirement. Mr. Kochman said this seems to be more than they would need. Mr. Heil agreed and suggested 10-12. The Board was OK with modifying that standard.

#5. The Deputy Director of Capital Projects has asked the applicant to speak to the crosswalk on Meadowland Drive and also to the radius of the driveway. Mr. Heil said they have no concerns with the crosswalk and will decide on a location. They will also look at the driveway radius to see if it will accommodate trucks. It was also suggested that they look at sight lines in order to stay away from the Bowdoin Street intersection. Mr. Heil said they will look at that.

#6. Regarding wetland protection, the applicant said they will include the wetland report.

#7. The applicant was asked to consider “natural communities” and to provide an inventory done by a qualified person. Mr. Heil said they are OK with that.

#8. Staff noted that under the old LDRs, the 2 buildings will not be an issue; under the new LDRs, if they are approved, there is a question of the buildings being 13 feet apart. Ms. Mann said she did not feel the buildings were too far apart and would have no concern with granting that waiver, should it be necessary. Mr. Kochman asked if it was deliberate to have no connection between the buildings. The applicant said it was as they are looking for more of a “home” feeling than a treatment facility. The architecture will be distinct. It was also noted that the wing on the administrative building will house the school. Members were OK with the waiver, if it is needed.

#9. Staff noted that the EV spaces and solar ready zone must be shown. Mr. Heil said they will do that. Ms. Keene encouraged the application to have a conversation with the Fire Marshall regarding his wanting a 20-foot road.

#10. Regarding bicycle parking, Mr. Heil suggested calculating this based on office use. Staff is suggesting having this for both uses. Mr. Behr said it would probably not be used by the residents because of the use. Ms. Keene said they are looking for flexibility because of the multiple buildings. Mr. Kochman asked if the residents will be allowed visitors. Ms. Hoffman said they will. There will be a visiting room inside; they will not meet outside. Members were OK with having bike parking only at the administrative building.

Mr. Johnston noted the need for a conditional use approval for the height of the fence because it will be over 8 feet. The applicant confirmed that the fence will be 14 feet high, “no-climb” design with a clear view through it.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Em asked if the doors in the residence building will be locked or if the youngsters can leave at will. Ms. Hoffman said the building will be secure. Ms. Keene noted the definition of a “group home” in the LDRs and of a “therapeutic group residence” in State Statutes. It provides treatment to 3 or more individuals with problems. The facility must be licensed.

Em also asked if the zoning allows this use. Ms. Keene said this use is allowed in this area.

Ms. Mann noted that what the applicant has presented is conceptual. There will be more details in the next review, and the DRB will then determine whether the project meets the LDR requirements.

Regarding the ecological assessment, Mr. Heil said they met with the State who confirmed the wetland. They will address the ecological requirements at the next phase submittal.

7. Master Plan Sketch Plan Application #PZ-SKETCH-2026-7 of the Snyder Residential Building Company, LLC, for an undeveloped 7.02 acre lot. The Master Plan consists of creating 6 lots, of which 2 are proposed as conservation lots, and 3 as development lots to be constructed in phases, with the first phase consisting of 32 dwelling units in a multifamily building and associated site improvements, 25 Larkin Way:

Mr. Snyder said this will be a subdivision to create definite lots. One lot will have a 32-unit, 4-story building with rental or for sale units.

Mr. Rowe then explained that one lot will have a lot of natural resources on the perimeter of the property. 2.3 acres are developable. Resources will be preserved on the conservation lots. Nothing is envisioned at this time for 2 undeveloped lots.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

#1. Staff asked about building and lot coverages. Mr. Rowe said they will comply on an individual lot basis.

#2. Staff asked about phasing and timing. Mr. Rowe said they will be doing design-build and will not be keeping ownership of anything. They would begin development as soon as all the permits are in place. Ms. Keene reminded the applicant that a development plan is required for the Master Plan which should be well thought out. Mr. Rowe asked what the Board wants on Lots 1 and 3. Ms. Mann said they can discuss that at the end.

#3. Staff questioned how the submission will be planned. Mr. Rowe said they will ask for Master Plan and Preliminary and then for Site Plan and Final.

#4. Regarding existing conditions, staff noted there is a 150-foot wide habitat connector overlay and indicated this on the map. It includes the river corridor. Ms. Keene noted that habitat connectors exist in only a few places in the City. She showed the LDR language regarding these connectors. Mr. Johnston noted that the applicant can ask to waive this requirement. Mr. Snyder said the river corridor is not in straight lines. More of the habitat is on that parcel. It can't be equidistant.

#5. Staff asked for a street plan, rec path, and streets for public dedication. Mr. Rowe said there will be nothing for public dedication. Larkin Way will remain private. There will be a 5-foot wide sidewalk on one side. There will also be a green belt except in the wetland buffer adjacent to the conservation area. They are going for a "local neighborhood" street design with a 50-foot right-of-way and two 11-foot travel lanes. Mr. Rowe noted that are trucks that access the hotels on the lower property. Ms. Keene said it is not typical to have a green belt in the wetland buffer. Ms. Lesko Quinn said she would something narrower. Ms. Lesko said there may be public comment on this, and more information may be needed. Mr. Rowe said it is a neighborhood street but it is also a support street for what is below it. Members suggested that the applicant pick a different street type. Ms. Keene noted that a larger street type would require parking on both sides. Ms. Mann suggested that the applicant be prepared to "sell" the Board on any change to a street type.

#6. Staff reminded that applicant that a development plan is required and noted what is missing from the current submission including: land for a renewable energy product, a recreation path, proposed transition areas (areas that go from one building type to another). Staff stressed that they will want to see a development plan for all 3 lots.

#7. Staff noted that with regard to inclusionary zoning, they are not sure whether these units will be rental or ownership.

#8. Staff reminded the applicant that a management plan is required for each phase of development and on-going management. Mr. Rowe said they will stay under the same ownership, managed by the same entity.

#9 Future plans for additional subdivision will be required. Mr. Rowe said they will provide that.

#10. The applicant was asked to describe the review process. Mr. Rowe said they will do Preliminary/Master Plan, then Site Plan and Final.

#11. Staff reminded the applicant that development plans for the 2 lots with no plans will be needed.

#12. Regarding required civic space, staff said the applicant must identify the type of civic space they will provide. It must be safely connected to Lot 2. Mr. Rowe said they are proposing a pocket park. He showed this on the plan. It is mostly lawn area for "low impact activity" with benches and mature trees and a connection from the crosswalk.

#13. The applicant was asked about phasing and timing. Mr. Rowe said they will do Lot 2 and Larkin Way first, then Lots 1 and 3 in the future.

#14. The applicant was asked to identify applicable site features (e.g., significant trees, etc.). This may not be needed on the 2 conservation lots. Mr. Rowe said they will indicate trees of 6-inch caliper or more.

#15. Staff asked about the management of the conservation lots. Mr. Rowe said they will be under the same management/ownership and will be covered by covenants.

#16. Regarding the street network, staff noted potential issues with sidewalks, crosswalks, etc., along Larkin Way. Mr. Rowe said there is an electrical cabinet in front of the building, and they would shift the sidewalk to avoid it. This will be discussed with Green Mountain Power. Ms. Mann said she didn't see an issue with going around the junction box (this was identified on the plan).

#17. The applicant was asked to address comments of the Deputy Director of Public Works. Mr. Rowe said they have had that discussion.

#18. Regarding building lots, the applicant was asked to reduce the complexity of the rear lot lines. Mr. Rowe said they are requesting a reduction of the rear yard setback so they can reduce the property lines segments to be more regular. Mr. Behr said this is OK as long as the building isn't growing. Mr. Rowe said they will agree to language to that effect. Ms. Keene asked why not have the building bigger as resources are already protected in the covenant lots.

#19. Regarding site amenities, staff noted that balconies cover 50% and garden space the other 50%. The question is whether there is enough space for the garden. Mr. Rowe said they were told the civic space would count for that 50%.

#20. Ms. Mann said she was open to the above proposal.

#21. Staff asked about a plan for the existing swimming pool. Mr. Rowe said they have no plan to change anything. It is a grandfathered use on the conservation lot. Ms. Keene said she would need to do more research on that as it was not clear it had been approved.

Mr. Rowe asked if it would be OK to use some of the habitat protection area as part of the landscape budget. There are some unwooded areas. Ms. Mann said that if the area is adequately landscaped, the Board could allow some hardscape. She said the applicant should make it clear what areas warrant this.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Mr. Davis: He is the President of the Association at the 33-unit condo building which is managed by Property Associates in Williston. He noted that until recently Larkin Way was a dirt road. It was paved when the "Suites" became apartments. There are no curbs and the road sees a lot of traffic, including trucks. It is also the main access to the extended-stay suites/apartments. Mr. Davis also noted that the conservation areas border all of their property, and their Association has a 100-year lease on the pool. There is lawn on their side which surrounds the pool, and the proposed conservation area would include that lawn.

Mr. Davis also asked the Board to consider traffic, the transit zone, lighting, and privacy (regarding the balconies). He expressed willingness to show the Board around their property.

Ms. Davant expressed concern with the loss of privacy with a 4-story building looking down on their 2-story building. The river area is great to walk by, see animal tracks, etc. There is a path adjoining the neighborhood which leads to the health care facility. Harbor View Rd. has businesses on it, and employees park along the road. One business is a trucking business. There is also concern with a building so close to the wooded area. The resident questioned whether the buffer could be public land. Ms. Mann said it can.

Mr. Davis asked if the protected corridor can include the landscaped, mowed area. Ms. Mann said it can.

Ms. Davant was concerned with increased population and safety of “random people” walking through the area.

Mr. Behr suggested looking at the fenced in pool from the point of view of blocking the wildlife corridor. Mr. Rowe said they met with staff on this in March.

8. Minutes of 7 July 2026:

It was noted that on p. 3, 4th paragraph, the word “issues” should be “issue.”

Mr. Lenski moved to approve the Minutes of 7 July 2026 with the correction. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

9. 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 9:46 p.m.

These minutes were approved by common consent on _____.