

**St. Albans City Council
Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, November 13, 2012
City Hall, Council Chambers**

A regular meeting of the St. Albans City Council was held on Tuesday, November 13, 2012, in the Council Chambers at City Hall at 6:30 pm.

Council Present: Mayor Elizabeth Gamache; Aldermen: Chad Spooner, Tim Hawkins, Aaron O'Grady, Richard Peters, Ryan Doyle and Jeff Young.

Council Absent: None absent.

Staff Present: Dominic Cloud, City Manager; Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning and Development; Allen Robtoy, Director of Public Works; Brad Lanute, Zoning Administrator; Tamira Martel, Downtown Manager; Josh Cox, Fire Marshal; Judy Dunn, Police Lieutenant; Gary Taylor, Chief of Police; Stephen Miller, Deputy Fire Chief; Peg strait, Director of Finance & Administration; and Sue Krupp, City Clerk and Treasurer.

Visitors: See attached sign-in sheet.

Executive Session

A motion was made by Alderman Peters; seconded by Alderman Spooner to enter into Executive Session at 5:15 pm, to consider civil matters, contracts, and labor relations, where premature disclosure would clearly compromise the City or person involved. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.

A motion was made by Alderman Peters; seconded by Alderman Spooner to exit Executive Session at 6:30 pm. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Note: Alderman Hawkins was not present for Executive Session.

Open Session

1. Pledge of Allegiance. Mayor Gamache led the Pledge of allegiance at 6:33 pm.
2. Public Comment.
Mike Gawne, a resident of Rugg Street, introduced himself. Mr. Gawne explained that he and his wife, Daphne, are supporters of the proposed Greenbelt Ordinance and are concerned about vehicles parking on the green space. He stated that he would like to see the ordinance enforced and would prefer that vehicles park on the street as many vehicles have been parking in the green space and on the sidewalks of Rugg Street. Mr. Gawne further explained that Rugg Street and Ferris Street both have a parking ban in effect from 8 am – 10 am on weekdays due to their close proximity to BFA but as a result, many residents end up parking on the green space which has led to the deterioration of the curbs and the overall appeal of the neighborhood. He understands that each street will need its own considerations and suggested that one solution for Rugg and Ferris Street would be to distribute on-street parking passes to residents only during the morning parking ban. Mr. Gawne added that one argument is that if vehicles can't park in the green space during the winter, the City won't be able to plow. He further stated that

those vehicles, however, end up placing the snow back into the street once they dig themselves out of their on-street parking space. Mayor Gamache thanked Mr. Gawne for his comments and input. Mr. Hawkins asked Mr. Gawne if he believes the issue is due to lack of adequate parking or due to households having multiple vehicles. Mr. Gawne responded that as an example, one residence on Rugg Street is a two-family house with one driveway but home to five vehicles. He added that one of the contributing factors is not only the number of vehicles per household but also the conversion from single-family residences to apartment buildings. His suggestion to the Zoning Administrator is to require that a parking plan be on file before someone is given a permit to convert from a single-family to a two-family home.

3. Mayor's Report.

Mayor Gamache reported that the City had a successful passing of ballot item # 1 with a 2:1 margin to approve the debt ceiling for the Tax Increment Finance District (TIF). She added that staff and Council worked very hard to advocate the ballot item and received positive feedback from community members in regard to how easily accessible it was to find information surrounding TIF. Mayor Gamache reminded residents that this is just one step along the way and will be coming back to the voters for each respective project. In addition, Mayor Gamache expressed her appreciation for those that organized the Veteran's Day events on November 11th and November 12th in Taylor Park. She added that Admiral Hamm led the November 11th event which included the raising of the new flags. The other event held on November 12th drew approximately 1500 City school children. Mayor Gamache thanked our veterans and community members for the tremendous turn out and added that the Festival of Trees and Running of the Bells will take place in December and encouraged residents to support our downtown merchants.

4. Recognition of Outgoing Interim Fire Chief Gary Taylor.

Mayor Gamache stated that she would like to recognize Chief Gary Taylor who has played an important role as Interim Fire Chief for the last two years. Chief Taylor provided strong leadership at the Fire Department while maintaining his duties at the Police Station. Mayor Gamache commended him for his efforts and expressed her deepest appreciation and gratitude on behalf of the City. Chief Taylor thanked his staff and welcomed Deputy Fire Chief, Stephen Miller.

5. Approval of City Manager's appointment of Steve Miller as Fire Chief (D&V).

Mr. Cloud introduced Deputy Fire Chief, Stephen Miller. He further explained that the City Charter vests the City Council with the authority to approve the appointments of the Director of Public Works as well as Fire and Police Chiefs. Mr. Cloud stated that he is asking Council to approve Mr. Miller's appointment as Fire Chief for the St. Albans Fire Department. Mr. Cloud added that Mr. Miller has served as Deputy Chief in our department since July. In addition, he previously served as Fire Chief in Skowhegan, Maine and spent 17 years as Fire Chief in Essex Junction. Mr. Cloud explained that Steve is a great fit with our department and understands how to lead a department comprised of both full and part-time firefighters. He has 30 years experience in the fire service and understands the importance of proactive measures such as building inspection and education. Mr. Miller has strong managerial skills in budgeting and personnel management and most importantly is good with people. Mr. Miller expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve the City since beginning his career in July and believes the City has an outstanding Fire Department and will continue to serve its citizens. Mayor Gamache thanked all of the volunteer firefighters in the audience for being present. Mr. Young asked each volunteer if they would kindly introduce themselves.

A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Young to appoint Steve Miller as Fire Chief. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

6. Consider appointment of Josh Cox as Health Officer and Steve Miller as Deputy Health Officer for three year term (D&V).

Mr. Cloud explained that it is helpful to have a Health Officer and Deputy Health Officer who work closely together. He added that this appointment of a Health Officer is the same as it's been done in the past but the only difference this year is that we would also be appointing a Deputy Health Officer in addition to a Health Officer.

A motion was made by Alderman Peters; seconded by Alderman Doyle to appoint Josh Cox as Health Officer and Steve Miller as Deputy Health Officer for three year term. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

7. Financial Report, Peg Strait.

- a. FY 13 First Quarter Financials.

Ms. Strait stated that she would be discussing financials through the 1/3 point of the fiscal year that ended October 30th rather than the first quarter financial position as the agenda indicates. She explained that the General Fund is doing very well due to revenue items such as the State's pilot payment and police dispatch contracts that are front-loaded at the beginning of the year. She added that the City is also doing well in the area of delinquent tax collection. In terms of expenses, Ms. Strait stated that expenses are basically on target with the 1/3 benchmark and that funds for capital items not yet purchased have been reserved and are represented in the expense totals. In terms of the Water Fund, the Admin budget is high because the dam construction has moved more quickly than scheduled, and payments are being covered by a line of credit at People's Trust. In addition, the USDA bond and water meter loan are frontloaded in September and October, and reserves were used for the telemetry item. Overall, Ms. Strait stated that the Water Fund is healthy through the end of October. In the Wastewater Fund, a \$250,000 payment for the wastewater treatment upgrade bond was made and nothing substantial has changed since last month's report.

8. Planning Director Report and Action Items, C. Sawyer.

- a. Introduction of Downtown Manager, Tamira Martel.

Mr. Sawyer explained we have a new Downtown Manager, Tamira Martel who was not present as she was facilitating the Downtown Promotion Committee meeting.

- b. First Reading of proposed revisions to Sections 202, 304, 511, 515, 705, 902 and Article 6 of the City Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Sawyer explained that the Zoning Administrator, Brad Lanute as well as Jeff Bean of the Planning Commission were both present. Mr. Sawyer stated that this is the first reading of proposed revisions to the City Land Development Regulations which have already gone through one public hearing with the Planning Commission. Council cannot approve the revisions until after a second hearing takes place. He further explained that the policy objectives that will be discussed tonight are to provide further direction to development in light of recent projects in the City and are also proposing some changes to update and clarify provisions with the latest knowledge and guidance that is available. Mr. Sawyer added that it is also an objective to provide clarification for users of the regulations. Mr.

Sawyer explained that the focal point of tonight's discussion includes the topic of fences and driveways (Sections 511 and 515.7) and the goals are to increase neighborhood beautification and to ensure a pleasant and safe pedestrian experience. Mr. Sawyer went on to show visuals of fences in the City that do not meet the goals expressed. In terms of the vision for the City, Mr. Sawyer explained that we would like to limit the height a fence can be when located near a public right of way and would like to incorporate the use of picket or iron fencing or shrubbery with visibility through the fence, which will create a pedestrian-friendly feel.

Mr. Sawyer explained that they also have some further provisions for driveways to ensure that they are long enough between a structure and a public right of way. This will guarantee that there is adequate space for vehicles to park in their driveways and deter homeowners from parking on the greenspace. Another issue pertaining to driveways is that curb cuts can widen over time and can be detrimental to a neighborhood setting. Mr. Sawyer stated that other proposals include Sections 202 and 304 which are to provide clarification and reduce redundancies in handling of medical uses: doctor's offices, hospitals, etc. In Section 515.7 it is proposed to update parking requirements with new information and studies and to reduce pressure for impervious surfaces, where possible. In regards to Article 6, Mr. Sawyer explained that the Zoning Administrator, Brad Lanute, has done a great job to make it much clearer when a permit is needed and how the process works. Other proposals include Sections 603.2, 705 and 902 which allow board flexibility in submission requirements and remove conflict in description of the Development Review Board (DRB). Mr. Sawyer stated that in terms of driveways, when someone has a use that requires a site plan, the DRB must sign off on the project. He further explained that we do not, however, have as rigorous provisions for driveways that are not required to go before the DRB but simply reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Sawyer explained that the goal is to provide further definition of a driveway to further aid the ZA with his process.

Mr. Sawyer proceeded to discuss specific revisions proposed to the City Land Development Regulations and added that changes in the definition of Land Development pertains to Article 6. Also, Land Alterations would now be included under the definition of Land Development. Change to the definition of parking lot would include off-street parking areas for multi-family dwelling units and all parking areas that fall under a site plan. Mr. Sawyer added that the goal is to make the distinction that if it is administrative, it is a driveway and would be handled by the ZA, and if it requires a site plan, it's a parking lot. Mr. Sawyer further explained that the definition of "picket fence" would be added and the definition of "Clinic Facility" would be changed to the term, "Medical Office". He added that the Permitted and Conditional Uses table must also adhere to the changes made to definitions and that the Planning Commission wishes to prohibit Medical Offices from the Low Density Residential (LDR) areas.

Mr. Sawyer explained that changes to Section 511 would be to change the title, "Fences for Excavation" to "Fences." Mr. Sawyer proceeded to read the following regulations for this section.

- A. The construction of any fence shall require a permit.
- B. The permit fee shall be exempt for fences with a height under six (6) feet as measured from a point at natural grade level to the highest point of the fence (or wall).

- C. Properties zoned within a Design Review District shall conform to the regulations in this section as well as to those in Section 706 (A) (6) of these regulations. If regulations are in conflict the more restrictive regulation shall apply.
- D. All new fences shall be at least two (2) feet from any public right of way or existing public infrastructure.
- E. The design of any new fence shall meet the following design standards:
 - 1. Fences with a height of four feet six inches (4.5 feet) and under, as measured from a point at natural grade level to the highest point of the fence, shall be permitted in all districts.
 - 2. Fences with a height over four feet six inches (4.5 feet), as measured from a point at natural grade level to the highest point of the fence, and within twenty (20) feet of a public right of way or existing public infrastructure, shall be picket fences, or comparable design as determined by the ZA, with a minimum spacing between pickets or comparable slats of 2 3/8 inches.
 - 3. Fences of any height and at least twenty (20) feet from a public right of way shall be permitted.
 - 4. The finished side of a fence shall face adjoining properties or the street if the appearance of the fence is not the same on both sides.
 - 5. The maximum height of a fence is ten feet.

Mr. Doyle asked if there was any consideration for the small, non-conforming lots, to be allowed to have a fence less than 20 feet from a public right of way. Mr. Lanute did not believe it would meet the criteria of a variance but a variance could most certainly be requested and would be up to the Development Review Board (DRB) to decide. Mr. Sawyer stated that oftentimes, residents put up a fence just to delineate their property but wondered if they wouldn't consider a picket fence which could be closer than 20 feet of the right of way because you can see through it. Mayor Gamache asked if this provision was also used to conform to certain safety measures. Mr. Sawyer responded that stockade fences could pose a safety hazard for someone backing out of a driveway. Mr. Spooner asked if a resident could erect a chain-link fence less than 20 feet from a public right of way since you can see through it. Mr. Sawyer responded that the DRB is trying to deter the use of chain link fences. Mr. Lanute confirmed that if it was beyond 20 feet from a public right of way, a resident could erect a chain link fence. Mr. Hawkins asked if a shrubbery-fence would be considered a fence. Mr. Lanute responded that he believes it would fall under a vegetative buffer. Mr. Spooner and Mr. Hawkins both agreed that a living fence could pose the same safety risks that a stockade fence would pose. Mr. Cloud asked if shrubbery or trees would fall under the definition of Land Development. Mr. Sawyer responded that a hedge, vegetative buffer or any living thing that is meant to act as a fence could be considered a structure and therefore would then fall under the Land Development Regulations and fall under the definition of a fence. He added that a provision would, however, need to be added for living structures in terms of design and appeal. Mr. Bean stated that the key component is how the shrubbery will be maintained because it will continue to grow and change over time. Mr. Young asked if under Section 511, B, the words "up to" should replace "under" in "The permit fee shall be exempt for fences with a height under six (6) feet..." Mr. Sawyer agreed. Mr. Young also commented that under Section 511, E.5., he feels the maximum height of a fence being 10 feet is too tall for a residential area and would like to see a 6 foot height maximum. Mr. Bean added that under Section 511, E.1., fences must

be measured from a point at natural grade level to the highest point of the fence so that fences are not built on top of foundations. Mr. Sawyer stated that we will look at a 6 foot height limit in residential areas and include hedges and shrubbery. Ms. Krupp asked if shrubbery in the greenbelt would also be taken into consideration as it can pose a safety issue by blocking the view of vehicles pulling from driveways. Mr. Sawyer stated that it could be taken into consideration at a future revision or possibly in future discussions of the City's Greenbelt Ordinance. Mr. Sawyer recapped the discussion thus far and stated that we will look into the topic of hedges and shrubbery and their role as a fence as well as proposing a 6 foot fence height limit versus 10 feet. Mr. Young agreed with Mr. Bean and stated that if a hedge is planted near a sidewalk or right of way, there needs to be a specific maintenance plan in place. Mr. Doyle stated that he would be adverse to a 6 foot fence height limit in residential areas with the exception of the front of a home and would recommend 7 feet to address privacy issues. Mayor Gamache agreed. Mr. O'Grady commented that he believes that an 8 to 10 foot privacy fence around the sides and rear of a home are appealing but also agrees that the front of the home could have a 6 foot height limit. Mr. Bean suggested that we could allow a stockade fence with lattice around the top of it to allow a homeowner the height that they wish without it appearing as a tall wall. Mr. Doyle added that he believes the 20 foot rule should also be subject to the plane of the house. Mr. Bean added that he is also concerned about regulating the height of trees to be used as a living fence.

Mr. Sawyer explained that some changes have been proposed to minimal parking requirements under Section 515.7 based on latest studies of parking utilization by use. Mr. Sawyer further stated that everything proposed is either recommended in the latest research of parking utilization by different use types and/or is used by comparable municipalities in the State of Vermont. Mr. Sawyer added that in some cases we are lowering parking requirements for certain uses but have justification for doing so based on studies of utilization. In other cases, parking space requirements were simplified such as with banks and bars. Mr. Spooner mentioned the parking restriction for the correctional facility which allows 1 per 10 inmates of maximum capacity and asked how that was relevant. Mr. Sawyer agreed and stated that he will look into that. Mr. Spooner also asked why it was chosen to be 4-5 parking spaces instead of 4 or 5 per practitioner at peak hour under Medical Office. Mr. Sawyer responded that we will choose 4 or 5 for the next reading. Mr. Hawkins added that there are several requirements listed for certain uses that show "half" a parking space versus whole numbers. Mr. Lanute stated that the DRB has the ability to raise parking requirements but not lower them. Mr. Doyle asked what provision we have in place to ensure landlords are being accommodating to their tenants. Mr. Sawyer responded that when you deal with averages, sometimes you are below and sometimes you are above and by and large, most people will make sure they have ample parking.

Mr. Sawyer read the following provisions made to Section 515.8, Driveways:

- A. The construction, extension, or alteration of a driveway requires a permit.
- B. The design of any new driveway shall meet the following design standards:
 1. There shall be no more than one (1) curb cut per residential lot;
 2. Driveways connecting individual lots to the street network shall be clearly defined and of the minimum width necessary to provide safe access;
 3. No driveway shall be located in the side or rear setbacks unless, as determined by the ZA, the particular circumstances of the lot prevent such conformance;

4. All driveways shall have a distance of at least twenty (20) feet, as measured along the center-line of the driveway, from the right of way to any structure;
 5. Driveways located in residential districts shall be no wider than (20) feet.
- C. IF the ZA finds that the addition or expansion of an access driveway would endanger vehicular or pedestrian safety, the use of an existing on-site or off-site access may be required.
 - D. Properties zoned within a Design Review District shall conform to the regulations in this section as well as to those in Section 706(E) (6) (f) of these regulations. If regulations are in conflict the more restrictive regulation shall apply.
 - E. Regulation of curb cuts shall be pursuant to Title 15, Chapter 1, Section 4212 of the City of St. Albans Revised Ordinances.

Mr. Spooner and Mr. Hawkins agreed that there needs to be further clarification for B.4 as the language implies that a driveway cannot be within 20 feet of a structure beginning at the center-line of a driveway. Mr. Sawyer clarified that where the driveway begins at a sidewalk or ends at a structure there must be 20 feet, but if there is a structure next to the driveway, that is acceptable.

Mr. Young asked if item "E" above could be footnoted so that Title 15, Ch.1, Section 4212 is spelled out. Mr. Sawyer responded that we want to prevent a situation where if the ordinance is changed and the zoning portion is not changed, there are not two contradicting statements. Mr. Hawkins stated that we could include in the footnote, "as amended from time to time" to avoid that from happening.

Mr. Sawyer stated that under Article 6, "Permit Applications, Review Procedures and Standards," language was pulled together from many locations to clearly state the intent of the regulations and when a zoning permit is required.

Mr. Spooner stated that under Article 6 within the section that describes what type of exterior work requires a permit (see A.12), he does not agree with the statement that reads, "Satellite dish antennae over 12 inches in diameter, wireless telecommunications facilities, or other antennae." Mr. Spooner further commented that satellite dish antennae are typically at least 18 inches. Mr. Spooner also added that the items listed as, "Installation of any Signage (see A.13) and "Site improvements" (see A.14) were very vague. Mr. Lanute stated that exemption fees for normal repair and maintenance under Site Improvements has been fluidly interpreted but would only require a \$10 recording fee. Mr. Spooner asked if that piece of information could be included in the section. Mr. Lanute further stated it is difficult to define what normal repair and maintenance is. Mr. Sawyer responded that they will check the Regulations to see if there is a definition for "site improvement." Mr. Hawkins commented that he does not feel someone should have to pay a permit fee to have a temporary swimming pool over 2 feet water depth (see A.16). Mr. O'Grady stated that he does not believe there should be a fee at all for temporary swimming pools. Mr. Sawyer stated that there is something to say about regulating the placement of pools. Mr. Hawkins agreed with Mr. O'Grady that temporary pools should be removed altogether. Mr. Spooner stated that one resolution would be to raise the depth to 4 feet. Discussion ensued surrounding the height requirement of a swimming pool which would mandate that a fence be erected around the pool. Mr. Sawyer stated that he will look into the regulations.

Mr. Sawyer explained that under Section 603.2 and 705, the DRB and Design Advisory Board (DAB) shall adopt a general protocol in an open meeting to govern the number of copies, sizes of sheets, and manner of digital files to be submitted as an application for Site Plan Review to be filed with the ZA.

Mr. Sawyer stated that under the proposed revision for Section 902, the number of seats on the DRB would be removed and instead would read, "The Development Review Board shall be appointed to terms decided by City Council. The number of members shall be set from time to time by the City Council." Mr. Spooner stated that he does not like the wording, "from time to time" and would like to see it removed. Mr. Doyle asked where the number of members on a board would be recorded. Mr. Sawyer responded that it would be documented in the meeting minutes.

Discussion ensued over whether any action would be required to approve the first reading. It was decided that no action was required.

The new Downtown Manager, Tamira Martel, joined the meeting. Mr. Sawyer introduced Ms. Martel and explained that she is focused on filling empty store fronts and was the top candidate interviewed for the position. Ms. Martel explained that she is very excited to be a part of the vision for the future of the City of St. Albans.

c. Resolution for signage exemption in the area affected by the Downtown Streetscape Project (D&V).

Mr. Sawyer briefly explained that the purpose of the Resolution for Temporary Signage during Streetscape Project is to let members of the community know that although we are under construction, we are open for business and need to be easily accessible. (See attached resolution).

A motion was made by Alderman O'Grady; seconded by Alderman Hawkins to approve resolution for signage exemption in the area affected by the Downtown Streetscape Project. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

9. City Manager Report.

a. Update on Council Appointments.

Mr. Cloud stated that many of the boards and commissions for which Council appoints members have terms expiring at the end of the year and are following the policy previously adopted to notify the public of these vacancies. Mr. Cloud provided the following update on items underway to prepare for these appointments.

- We have notified all board members with terms expiring at the end of the calendar year and invited them to reapply if they wish.
- We have posted notices in the newspaper, on Facebook, Front Porch Forum and the City website. Letters of application are due at the end of November.
- The bylaws for the Downtown Board provide that prior to Council appointment of new members; the Downtown Board may offer a recommendation for the Council to consider. This will likely occur at the December Downtown Board meeting, followed by Council consideration in January prior to the January Downtown Board meeting.
- The remainder of the appointments will occur at either the regular December Council meeting or a special meeting.

b. Budget development process and timing.

Mr. Cloud explained that the FY 14 Budget is currently under development and the general timeline is as follows.

- November: Department Head Meetings.
- December 10: Opportunity for Public Comment.
- December 30: Submission of Draft Budget to Council and CIP to Planning Commission.
- Mondays in January: Council markup and public hearings.
- January 24: Council adopts and signs warning for Town Meeting Day.

Mayor Gamache commented that what she has in mind in terms of Opportunity for Public Input is that public hearings are now being incorporated within the State legislature at the front-end of the budget planning process as opposed to the back-end and would like to include that process here in the City. Mayor Gamache added that she would like to hold this Opportunity for Public Comment on December 1st as a morning session subject to Council approval instead of December 10th. Mr. Young stated that he is concerned that there is not a Finance Committee review between the budget development process and public input. Mayor Gamache stated that this would be an opportunity to get an earlier pulse from the public. She added that she is waiting for a response from the State to find out specifically what model they use for this type of public hearing. Mr. Young stated that he believes it's much more relevant to have a proposal on the table prior to public input. Mayor Gamache responded that it does not necessarily mean that we are looking to talk dollars with the public but just looking to gage what their priorities are in general. Mr. Hawkins stated that he is fine with holding a Finance Committee meeting prior to the actual roll-out with Council because the committee will help provide key points to Council as was the case last year.

Mr. Cloud stated that he would like to incorporate a work session in December with the Finance Committee and will know more about the timing of that meeting at the end of November or early December. In addition, Mr. Cloud explained that the FY 14 budget is being impacted by a health insurance increase of 16 percent in health insurance premiums effective January 1, 2013. This can be reduced from 16 percent to 6 percent with no reduction in benefits if all employees move to the Health Savings Account plan and is currently discussing this proposal with the Union. Mr. Cloud explained that this piece is a big cost driver in the budget depending on the outcome.

c. Update on parking initiatives.

Mr. Cloud explained that additional research on the revenue projections of the parking plan previously adopted by Council have been conducted and confirm revenue projections of \$100,000 to \$200,000. Mr. Cloud provided a recap of the previously adopted plan. He further explained that Council asked staff to study the numbers on the projected revenues from the program and hired the consulting firm, Resource Systems Group, to conduct this study. The study was conducted in November 2011 and asked the following pertinent questions.

- What are the costs to be incurred by the proposed system?
- What is a realistic revenue estimate?
- Are the proposed zones sized and located correctly?

Mr. Cloud explained that their findings vary considerably depending on whether the City uses meters or kiosks on the streets. Net revenue estimates vary between \$213,325 and - \$3,301. The negative estimate is based on putting 12 kiosks in the Central Lot and 4 in the City Hall lot. Mr. Cloud added that we would never do this because 12 kiosks are way too many. One more likely scenario that RSG modeled involves meters on the streets and kiosks in the parking lots. This estimate calls for 2 kiosks in the Central Lot and 1 in the City Hall lot. In this scenario, net revenues are estimated between \$126,954 and \$213,325.

Mr. Cloud stated that since the study was conducted, the City has obtained a Tax Increment Finance District which would allow us to construct a parking garage in the Central Lot to be paid for primarily by tax increment and augmented user fees. This takes the issue of kiosks in the Central Lot off the table and focuses attention on the on-street parking with revenues varying from \$156,065 to \$242,437. Expenses vary from \$62,329 to \$167,313 depending on whether kiosks or meters are used. Mr. Cloud added that similar to the lots, we would never put kiosks in the outlying areas where we are charging only \$1 per day.

Mr. Cloud explained that the conclusions made are that by moving to a paid parking system we can manage parking more efficiently and effectively and generate between \$100,000 and \$200,000 annually and is important to remember that a prime motivator for this revenue source has been creating funds that we can use for downtown improvement projects. We cannot maintain our very low rates and use kiosks anywhere but Main Street; even there we are eating into revenues needed to subsidize very low rates in outlying areas.

In terms of timing and what steps to take next, Mr. Cloud explained that Winooski is installing paid parking on Main Street this summer and will provide us with some helpful information on parking management technology. In addition, the City is beginning the process of designing the parking garage for the downtown core (Central Lot) and has received proposals from six firms. Decisions about what to do for on-street parking will be finalized in 2013 for implementation after the Streetscape Project is complete in 2014. In addition, Mr. Cloud explained that we need more information. For example, the current study does not break out revenues between our higher priced areas such as Main Street and lower priced areas around the high school and does not adjust for the parking garage financed by TIF revenues and user fees.

Mr. Cloud stated that he would like to return to RSG and update the study with the following objectives and parameters.

- Separate the on-street parking zones so we can determine whether a particular area such as Main Street could support a kiosk and whether a particular area such as BFA is priced too low to support a meter.
- Embed the parking garage in the planning assumptions or delete the lots entirely as this is really about on-street parking at this point.

Mayor Gamache asked if someone would have the ability to pay at smaller increments in the instance that they only needed to park for 5 minutes. Mr. Cloud responded affirmatively. Mr. Doyle asked at what time of day parking would become free. Mr. Cloud responded after 6 pm. Mr. Cloud stated that one of the key decisions we need to make is whether we are going to go with meters, kiosks or a third type of system with all the numbers keyed in. Mr. Bean stated that the only concern he has is if the revenue is not

diverted into downtown improvement projects. Mayor Gamache commented on timing and said we need to focus on the Streetscape Project and take the time now to reanalyze the parking plan with the shift of new information. Mr. Doyle asked how we know at this point that there will be half of the net parking revenue left over for downtown improvement projects. Mr. Cloud responded that it is half of net revenue and downtown improvement projects could mean a lot of different things. He further explained that right now, all of the sunk costs such as parking enforcement are being paid for by parking tickets and tax payers and with this initiative, it could be paid for by the parking program. Mayor Gamache asked for a time frame of when Council could expect the results of a further review by RSG. Mr. Cloud responded that it would probably take place early next year. Mr. Young stated that he feels residents will accept the parking meters as long as they see their money going to the right place and feels strongly that the money would need to be used toward downtown initiatives. Mr. Young asked how one would pay to use the parking garage. Mr. Cloud responded that a lot of those decisions have yet to be made.

10. Discussion of Greenbelt Parking Alternatives.

Mr. Cloud explained that some of the concerns Council and staff have received over the proposed Greenbelt Ordinance are as follows.

- Residents support the greenbelt portion but do not support eliminating the parking ban.
- Concerns about emergency vehicles and school busses' ability to access homes in the winter.
- Concerns over aesthetics should not trump safety.

Mr. Cloud further stated that some possible solutions Council and staff have heard are as follows.

- Keep winter parking ban in place and prevent parking on the lawn.
- Identify areas where tenants in multi-family dwellings with insufficient parking can park when parking ban is in place (i.e. Houghton Park).
- Develop a system like Burlington that has sign with flashing lights announcing that all cars have to be off streets, otherwise they can be on the streets.

Mayor Gamache commented that she has received mixed feedback but safety has been the main concern. Mr. Spooner has heard concerns over winter parking and the ability of snow plows maneuvering around parked vehicles. Mr. Cloud proposed the possibility of leaving the winter parking ban in place and just enacting the greenbelt piece of the ordinance. Mr. Cloud added that we may need to take a street by street approach vs. trying to design a City wide program. Mr. Doyle stated that the greenbelt ban doesn't necessarily address the issue of people not having enough parking. Mayor Gamache asked Mr. Cloud what Council should expect next. Mr. Cloud stated that he would like to pull staff together and circle back with some proposals, street-specific.

11. Other Business.

In regards to Article 6, Section C of the City Land Development Regulations, Mr. Doyle stated that it is discouraging that a resident is required to pay a recording fee regardless of whether a

permit is required. Mr. Doyle explained that by eliminating this fee, more residents would be encouraged to come forward and seek permits.

Mr. Spooner asked Mr. Cloud if we can set some deadlines for the Public Safety goals that were previously set.

12. Warrants 10/17/12 and 11/7/12.

A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman O'Grady to approve warrants from 10/17/12 and 11/7/12. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

13. Regular Meeting Minutes 10/15/12.

A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Peters to approve regular meeting minutes from 10/15/12. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

14. Adjourn.

A motion was made by Alderman O'Grady; seconded by Alderman Spooner adjourn meeting at 9:08 pm. Vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristen Knoff
Administrative Coordinator

Approved by Council