



MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

1 SEPTEMBER 2026

The South Burlington Development Review Board held a regular meeting on Tuesday, 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; E. Kershner, G. Dixon, A. Gagnon, C. Gendron, L. Getz, S. Kelley, B. Precourt, B. Avery, F. VonTurkevich, A. Allen, K. Luce, E. Washburn, D. Fixette, P. Gallivan, M. Augette, M. & J. Stech, D. Boardman, A. Bergeron, G. Leech, Marshall, Mac, DC, JMMTG, T. Redicanen, M. Staton

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:

Ms. Keene advised that the Council will be interviewing candidates for the opening on the DRB at its 8 September meeting.

5. Continued Site Plan Application #PZ-SITE-2026-19 of the City of South Burlington to amend a previously approved plan for a 68-acre multi-use recreation park and athletic facility. The amendment consists of converting an existing field to turf, expanding the existing parking lot, and constructing a 3,000 sf storage & maintenance building 600 Swift Street:

The applicant noted the fields have maintenance and drainage issues. This improvement has been needed for many years. The hope is to address maintenance issues for all of the City's parks.

Staff confirmed that the application is now complete.

Mr. Johnston moved to close PZ-SITE-2026-19. Ms. Lesko seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Consider request for re-opening of appeal #PZ-APPEAL-2026-2 of Frank Von Turkevich appealing the decision of the Administrative Officer that Zoning Permit #24-436 has expired, 600 Spear Street:

Mr. Kochman was recused due to a potential conflict of interest. Ms. Keene also stepped down as a party to the appeal.

Ms. Mann noted that in re-opening the appeal, the Board would be most interested in hearing an argument regarding the 2022 Legislation to allow for approvals to last 2 years. The Board would also ask for additional information to be submitted in writing before hearing the appeal.

The applicant said it would be helpful if the City Attorney would communicate with their attorney.

Ms. Mann also noted that the appellant's attorney's memo noted that the appellant is willing to waive the 45-day decision period. The appellant confirmed their willingness to do this.

Mr. Johnston then moved to re-open Appel #PZ-APPEAL-2026-2 on 6 October 2026. Mr. Behr seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

7. Master Plan Application #PZ-MASTER-2026-2 of Beta Technologies, Inc., to establish a master plan for a 101-acre area, consisting of 3 development areas including the previously approved Beta Master Plan area plus newly acquired properties in immediate proximity to the north and south of Williston Road, 3070 Williston Road:

Mr. Gendron noted that the aerospace industry is changing quickly, and the Beta campus is expanding to meet its needs. They do not know what the exact needs will be in the next 5-10 years, but they believe this is a major opportunity for Beta and for South Burlington. It will strengthen the City as an aviation hub and provide high-value employment. The goal for this meeting is to “get it right,” to get the Board’s feedback, so the next time the Board sees the Plan, it is how they expect it to be.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

#1. Staff questioned what concerns were raised at the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Gagnon said there was a great turnout of neighbors. Their concerns centered on buffering on Shunpike Drive, green space, a parking location plan, and continued coordination with neighbors.

#2. Staff asked how the applicant will interact with other Williston Road users. Ms. Keene stressed that this is a community. Mr. Gendron said Beta buildings will be oriented to which ever road the building would be on. They will be sure they have the right elevations on Williston Road, possibly orienting toward DaVinci Drive or to Williston Road.

#3. Regarding landscaping, staff indicated that they do not support the request to apply original landscape value to removed or relocated landscaping. The applicant was OK with this.

#4. The applicant indicated agreement with staff.

#5. Regarding building types and styles, they applicant indicated they intend to maintain a cohesive architectural style, materials, elevations, and/or building forms. The Board was OK with this.

#6. Staff asked when the most recent wetland delineation was done. Mr. Gagnon said it was just done and was submitted today.

#7. Regarding civic space/site amenities, staff indicated that they need more information on how spaces will be reserved for future development. Mr. Gagnon showed a plan which indicated more than 10% of building space devoted to civic space. He added that even though a building could go in those spaces, there is still enough room for 10% civic space. Staff stressed that they will need to identify civic space areas as development occurs. Mr. Gagnon said these will be "gathering spaces" with picnic tables, etc. There will also be some spaces that are more recreational. Ms. Keene asked how the Board could ensure there is enough civic space reserved when there could be a building in the indicated spaces. Mr. Gagnon said they are OK with a condition to evaluate every time to be sure there is still enough space left. Ms. Keene said that is OK, but the Board will have to hold its ground to be sure the space does not degrade over time. Mr. Gagnon said it will be tied to square footage, almost like "a bank."

Mr. Kochman asked whether the civic space will be for the general public's use. Mr. Gagnon said that would be on a case by case basis. Some will be near a public right-of-way so it could be accessible by the public; some will not. Mr. Gendron said one beneficial this is that the civic space in area 2 can also serve the building in area 1. Mr. Johnston said he did not want to see a park in area 3 to serve area 1. Mr. Behr said he did not want to get locked into a corner; he wanted the balanced concept to continue. He wanted the Master Plan approval conditioned on continuing the balanced approach.

#9. Ms. Keene said that a building that fronts on a street must have pedestrian access and comply with types of civic space. Ms. Quinn suggested addressing each of the criteria at the next hearing. Mr. Gagnon was OK with this.

#10. Regarding renewable energy production, the applicant was asked to provide more information on potential geothermal areas. Mr. Gendron said there are various types of systems, and it is hard to identify. The plan is to use geothermal. Ms. Keene said this means that there would not be any land that is only for geothermal. Mr. Gendron said that is correct.

#11. Staff questioned how the applicant will address transportation demand management. Mr. Gagnon said there are a variety of ways in which they will do this. The key thing is that they need to meet with staff to see how specific they need to be at this time. They need to work through a strategy. Ms. Quinn said they need a holistic strategy, and there are lots of options. She asked that the applicant present the options they are considering. Mr. Gendron said most traffic

comments need them to meet with City and State. He suggested skipping over traffic.

Ms. Keene said the Board would have to authorize technical review of traffic for the revised traffic study.

Ms. Lesko then moved to authorize third party technical review of the applicant's traffic study. Mr. Kochman seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion then skipped to:

#15. Staff indicated more specific development principles need to be established around pedestrian infrastructure. The applicant should also address how the Green Tree Drive connection will be evaluated. More specific design principles are needed. Mr. Johnston noted there is not enough parking space available on campus, so this appears to be an attempt to get parking off campus. Mr. Gagnon suggested thinking about it on a square footage basis and looking for a way out of the campus. They also have to consider how traffic affects side streets. They will do their best to avoid Williston Road and get to specific intersections.

Ms. Keene noted different street types have different elements. She asked the applicant what vision the Board can hold them to in the future. Mr. Gendron said those types are a good starting point. Ms. Keene quoted the regulations indicating "all buildings shall have a bike lane, a sidewalk or a shared use path." She asked if that is going too far. Mr. Gendron said it would depend on how many people are going in/out of a building. Board members noted the "shall" element which they felt would give them "teeth" for reviewing in the future. The table with these standards was shown.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Ms. DeFisette: She stressed there is a small residential community in the middle of this development, and there is a need to maintain "our South Burlington." She said there is already a lot of negative impact with massive traffic issues. She asked that traffic be shifted away from their development.

Mr. Precourt: He is the owner of 4050 Williston Road, a multi-tenant building. He has been getting questions from tenants as to what is going on. He told the tenants they have to participate in a neighborhood meeting, but they never got a

notice about the meeting. Tenants now think he lied to them. This is the second time this has happened. Mr. Gendron apologized and said they have to notify 160 people. Mr. Kochman suggested calling another meeting and make sure everyone on Palmer Court is notified. Mr. Johnston suggested a “public notice” as well. Mr. Kochman also suggested this meeting take place before the end of September.

Mr. Precourt then asked if the individual site plans will have more specifics. Ms. Quinn said they will. Mr. Precourt noted site work going on in a building across from them. Ms. Keene said that work is below the threshold that requires a site plan.

Ms. DeFisette: Noted that they had to pay for parking to attend the neighborhood meeting. She suggested the next meeting be in a public place.

Mr. Johnston stressed that the more people who are notified the better. Mr. Kochman added that one omitted abutter “can kill you.”

Ms. Lesko then moved to continue PZ-MASTER-2026-2 until 15 September. Mr. Johnston seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

8. Sketch Plan Application #PZ-SKETCH-2026-10 of John Larkin, Inc., to subdivide an existing 3.28 acre lot developed with a long-term care facility in 2 buildings into two lots of 1.57 acres (Lot A) and 1.71 acres (Lot B) for the purpose of retaining the long-term care facility on Lot B and converting the existing building on Lot A to multifamily housing, 1530 Williston Road:

The applicant said subdivision is the first step in converting housing for the elderly to apartments. They will also have to do stormwater retrofitting.

Staff comments were addressed as follows;

#1. Staff noted the potential requirement for a master plan. Ms. Mann said the Board would determine whether this is required. The applicant said they don’t plan to develop the eastern side; they would only deal with stormwater and Potash Brook restoration. Ms. Keene said the comment is relevant to development potential on the lot. If there is a large undeveloped swath of land, it

could trigger the need for a master plan. Mr. Kochman said he didn't think a master plan should be required as it is not big enough to justify the extra hassle. Ms. Mann agreed. Mr. Kochman asked how many apartment units are being planned. The applicant said 35.

#2. Staff asked about the right of easement to the single family home. The applicant said they will discuss that. There will be a new easement for 1510 to have egress through 1530.

#3. Staff noted the minimum residential density is 14. Ms. Mann said 35 units would more than meet that requirement.

#4. Regarding access/circulation, staff asked why there would be an additional driveway. The applicant said they are willing to omit that.

#5. Staff asked about the mix of unit types. The applicant said they are planning two 2-bedroom, five studio, and 28 one-bedroom.

#6. Staff noted the discrepancy with dimensional standards. The applicant said that was their fault. They have sent up-to-date information with everything corrected. They do not anticipate asking for changes to the dimensional standards.

#7. Staff asked if the applicant has any questions regarding the need for site amenities. The applicant asked if they can meet some of that requirement with private balconies. A green space on the plan was indicated for a possible pocket park. Ms. Keene noted that patios can be in the setback but they cannot become a "porch." The applicant indicated that second-story porches are under the eaves. The applicant asked how quickly they can get an approval and whether it can be an administrative approval. Ms. Keene said staff can accommodate the applicant as soon as they submit their materials. There is room on both October meetings.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Mr. Radicanen: A Gilbert Street resident, noted that it has been very quiet with the long-term care facility, and he was concerned with there now being 35 apartments. The applicant said there will still be vegetation along the property line, and there is also a berm with trees on it. They do not intend to change any of that. Mr. Kochman said his experience is that a berm helps with noise.

Ms. Staton: Her home butts up to the right-hand building. Her major concern is with traffic noise. They now hear the trash trucks at 5 a.m. With 35 units, it will be more of a concern. Ms. Mann said the Board will consider that.

Ms. Keene noted a written comment from Mr. Bergeron who expressed concern with parking. He was also concerned with stormwater as Helen Street floods several times a year. He showed a photo of this flooding.

9. Minutes of 21 July 2026 and 4 August 2026:

Ms. Lesko noted the sentence on p.7, item #5 should be attributed to Ms. Mann. It should read "The applicant should consider a narrower street type."

Ms. Lesko then moved to approve the Minutes of 21 July and 4 August 2026 with the above amendment. Mr. Johnston seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

10. 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 9:35 p.m.

These minutes were approved by common consent on October 6, 2026.