

## Sabin's Pasture Working Group

### Notes from 05/27/08

5:30 PM – 7:45 PM: held at TPL, Montpelier VT.

**Present:** Todd Bailey, Katherine Cooper, Jennifer Hollar, Mary Hooper, Dave Keller, Jennifer Knauer, Rodger Krussman, Jim Libby, Neal Rodar, Roy Schiff, Leigh Seddon, Nancy Sherman.

Facilitator: Rodger Krussman

#### Topics of this meeting:

- Review “May 21, 2008 Draft of Area A/Area B Housing Goal Language.
- Have a conversation about whether to remove the area above the existing farm road (Area B, northeast) from development, given that at least one representative is no longer in favor of including it. Confirm that group is working toward consensus, and discuss options if consensus cannot be reached.
- Next Steps

#### Discussion of “May 21, 2008: Draft of Area A / Area B Housing Goal Language”

#### **Areas of agreement among those present are noted in bold print.**

- Concerned that the housing goal is based on a target number and wary about how will play out in the future. Would prefer for values to play a larger role in defining the goal. Hard to figure out how a specific figure will play out in the future—how it may be manipulated.
  - Is “it approximately 200 units?” Or “between 175 and 225.” Range at least gives a minimum and maximum.
  - “Approximately” does not give a definition, and is open to future interpretation.
  - Remember when we say units that we include commercial in there. Units are both commercial and housing; it’s a building unit goal. Would it be interpreted that way? The report seems to say residential units.
  - I think it should be housing units. We want to maximize the likelihood of meeting the housing goal in Area A so that development does not need to spill into Area B.
  - Zoning regulations allow certain types of commercial activities in a residential zone.
  - Is a fifty unit range broad enough? Is that realistic that our estimated housing goal is within 50 units of what this site can realistically handle? We don’t know. Not much information to support this number. It makes general sense—but it’s best to think of it as a value, not an engineering goal.
  - Who decides what will happen if developer says that Area A can only fit 150? This is only a recommendation. There are MANY unknowns.
  - **The group agreed to keep the housing goal articulated as a range, between 175 and 225.**

Recommended parameters for Area B**Areas of agreement among those present are noted in bold print.**

The group discussed modifying Area B to take into account concerns of some group members re impact on the park of development in this area.

- Conservation Commission would certainly prefer to keep development south of the road in order to protect views.
  - Height of land: there are power lines through there. Can you see them from the height of land?
  - Can this be settled by one row of housing north of the existing road?
  - May not be wise to use the road as the boundary—the road for a development might not end up going there.
  - This area was a source of discussion all along in this process. I believe that if this area north of the road were not in the report, this recommendation would get stronger support from the community.
  - The experience of the Upper Pasture will really change with any development north of the road (perhaps even south)—it devalues it. Anyone thinking of contributing money to Sabin's—they're not just giving it for the sledding hill, it is the upper part that is the most valuable piece of the land.
  - When you look out across the valley, you currently see sheds/roads/industrial. Would think that putting a row of housing would benefit the park by blocking some of this noise.
  - Use a line that is parallel to the existing farm road, and would allow for one row of houses.
- Will a proposal that includes some development in Area B allow this group to reach consensus and have all participants sign on? Will our recommendation stand a good chance to being accepted by the community?
    - Members of the working group represent diverse constituencies. We can't expect a unanimous voice from all of the groups we represent. Would be good to have the support of all boards and commissions that are participating, but no guarantee we will have that.
    - We are making a recommendation to our community, our city council and our constituents. We haven't been "representing" our constituents in the sense that we are negotiating for them—all of our constituents still have the opportunity to review, comment on, disagree with etc. the working group's recommendation. We are signing this recommendation as a member of various groups, not on behalf of various groups.

Next Steps:

- Neal and Rodger will speak with John, who was not present at this meeting.
- Working Group Members: Submit final edits. ONE FINAL ROUND (Katherine will send text and map) for final comments.
- Public Outreach Committee: compile final outlines for presenting. Have been reaching out individually to city counselors and to media. Had a good meeting with the Bridge last Friday—likely to be something in the Bridge this Thursday (history of Sabin's Pasture piece, process of working group).
- Rodger will coordinate presentation prep for City Council. This includes sending out an outline. Two people will present (one from conservation and one for development—and perhaps a community member?). Flow chart might be helpful (“if this, then that” to describe build-out on the map)
- **All plan to attend City Council Meeting on June 11<sup>th</sup>.** Formatting for signature page: members can swing by the office or Neal will bring it around.