

Meredith Crandall

From: Kathryn Provost <kprovt7@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2023 10:15 PM
To: Meredith Crandall; katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Jack McCullough; Pelin Kohn
Subject: VCFA Application
Attachments: VCFA note to City DRB.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Ms. Crandall, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Kohn, Mr. McCullough, and Mr. Fraser,

Attached is a letter that my husband and I wrote regarding our thoughts on VCFA's recent application to change its zoning process from conditional to permitted. We hope you take the time to review our perspectives.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at 802-595-3646. Thank you, in advance, for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kathryn and Mark Provost

Mark and Kathryn Provost
7 Kemp Avenue
Montpelier VT 05602
January 13, 2023

To: The Members of the Montpelier Development Review Board cc/Zoning Administrator, City Council, Town Manager
Regarding: VCFA Development Application/Master Plan/PUD

We, as residents of 7 Kemp Avenue in Montpelier, Vermont, for over 30 years, are writing to express our deep concerns with the Development Application and Master Plan/PUD submitted by VCFA on December 5, 2022, which is to be discussed again on February 7, 2023. We feel the VCFA application is not in the interest of the greater neighborhood community and we encourage you to Vote "No" on this application.

Citing concerns from community members at previous meetings and the recent article in The Bridge, it is impossible for us to think our City would take away our rights to weigh in on highly impactful institutional changes to our residential neighborhoods and homes.

A few examples:

1. The Bridge article on page 21 of the January 11-24, 2023 issue states in paragraph five, "This particular campus development PUD does not request any changes to structures, impervious surfaces, signs, or other aspects of the built environment at this time."

This makes us think that as soon as VCFA gets their way and changes to "permitted use," the door is wide open for all kinds of change with no input from, or recourse for, any of the College's neighbors. Several past failures of the institution, whether it was Vermont College, Union University, or VCFA, to transparently notify neighbors of their plans make it hard to trust that VCFA will follow even the current process, much less a far more lenient process.

2. The Bridge article on page 21 of the January 11-24, 2023 issue states in paragraph eight, quoting David White, "The campus is going to change. No matter what, it's going to change. ... the question is not whether it changes, but... what's the process to get from today to ultimately those uses?"

That is not our question. Our question is, what, exactly, will those changes be? How will those changes affect my property value (my largest retirement asset)? How will those changes affect my neighborhood and my current neighbors? How will they affect the noise, parking, character and quality of our surroundings? The process needs to remain in its current state; conditional, with a required notification process, time and opportunity for neighbors to think about and discuss potential impacts, and public hearings, where the rights and interests of the residential homeowners /community to be heard, are upheld.

We understand change is difficult. We understand that the character and quality of our neighborhood is tremendously important in determining the value of our home and property. We understand we are fortunate to live in this lovely area of our City, with well over one hundred homes and well over many more hundreds of other neighbors and citizens. As property owners and tax payers, we should absolutely have a say in how our surroundings might change by an institution's decisions, so we can avoid any negative impact on the value of our property, surroundings and daily lives.

To preserve our current right to be informed and to have a voice in what will certainly impact the actual lives of your citizens, we urge you to maintain the "conditional use" process for VCFA by voting "No" on their application.

Meredith Crandall

From: June Kellogg <jkellogg46@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 12:43 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Subject: VCFA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I write today to voice our concerns that VCFA would attempt to proceed with developments to the former Vermont College Campus without regard to the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods as well as the people living there. We have lived here for over 40 years and realize how important the Quad or Green has been to us and the rest of our community. It would be a tragedy to see this changed irrevocably. VCFA must remain responsive to the surrounding community that it serves.

Sincerely, Roger and June Kellogg, 3 Kemp Ave. Montpelier Sent from my iPad

Meredith Crandall

From: Lloyd Richards <binky103@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 3:42 PM
To: Meredith Crandall; Binky
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Jack McCullough; Dona Bate; Lauren Hierl; Cary Brown; Jennifer Morton
Subject: VCFA Sale and the proposed Zoning Regulations change

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Montpelier Zoning Administrator Meredith Crandall,

My name is Lloyd Richards. I reside as owner of the property at 103 College Street and have done since January 1985.

In regards to the impending sale of the Vermont College of Fine Arts and its buildings and campus, I am against the proposed changes modifying the current review process under the zoning regulations from Conditional Uses to Permitted Uses.

Therefore, I ask that the Development Review Board vote NO on the VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD.

Sincerely,
Lloyd Richards
103 College Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Sent from my iPhone

Meredith Crandall

From: Cameron O'Connor <cameron103@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 4:30 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Jack McCullough; Dona Bate; Lauren Hierl; Cary Brown; Jennifer Morton
Subject: VCFA Sale and the proposed Zoning Regulations change

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Montpelier Zoning Administrator Meredith Crandall,

My name is Cameron O'Connor. I reside as owner of the property at 103 College Street along with my husband Lloyd Richards.

In regards to the impending sale of the Vermont College of Fine Arts and its buildings and campus, I am against the proposed changes modifying the current review process under the zoning regulations from Conditional Uses to Permitted Uses.

Therefore, I ask that the Development Review Board vote NO on the VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD.

Sincerely,
Cameron O'Connor
103 College Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Sent from my iPhone

Meredith Crandall

From: Justin Tease <justin.tease@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 2:38 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; Jack McCullough; Pelin Kohn; William Fraser; Justin Tease; Amy Woodbury Tease
Subject: Resident Input -VOTE NO - RE VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'm writing to request that the Development Review Board (DRB) **VOTE NO** on the VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD.

Current zoning should remain in place. The DRB should vote NO on proposed changes.

I can appreciate the flexibility that VCFA is seeking to reduce the friction in seeking sales opportunities, however, the policies related to zoning and design exist for good reason. I'm very open to repurposing the VCFA space and buildings, however, the sheer size of the footprint of the land in consideration, the value of the green space currently accessible to the community and the potential effects future changes might have on the neighborhood should absolutely be facilitated through the existing policies and agreements that currently apply to VCFA as established by the city of Montpelier.

As others in the neighborhood have expressed, why change existing zoning parameters that were carefully written, previously agreed to, and are currently working? Conditional uses provide for community dialogue and DRB review. It is a flexible system that responds to variable conditions as they arise.

There should be no reduction in the opportunity or requirement for community engagement and review over future reuse, building and/or renovation.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and I look forward to an equitable and well facilitated discussion on this matter at the next hearing.

Justin Tease & Amy Woodbury Tease
5 Ridge St.
802-505-0431

Meredith Crandall

From: Bob and Deborah Messing <tablelamp2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 2:38 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Jack McCullough; Dona Bate; Lauren Hierl; Cary Brown; Jennifer Morton

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Zoning Administrator Meredith Crandall:

Dear Meredith,

As residents of the VCFA neighborhood, but also as residents of Montpelier in general, we wish to register our vehement plea to the Development Review Board to Vote NO on the VCFA Development Application , Campus Master Plan/PUD.

We have lived on Charles Street for 22 years and have treasured the presence of the buildings, the Green and the open spaces surrounding them. Over the years, we have attended events at the gymnasium (from a Gogol Bordello concert, to winter farmers' markets, to mention just two); to poetry readings at the Library, and art and other musical events at College Hall.

I, for one, took t'ai chi classes this last summer into the fall on the Green, which successfully co-existed with a soccer game at the other end, and groups of students and families congregating in between.

In August 2017, my husband and I celebrated our 50th wedding anniversary on a beautiful summer evening on the Green, followed by dancing and an open bar in the Chapel!

So yes, a connection. And a hope for the future that the community dialogue and DRB review system that has been working to preserve the vitality of this space will be preserved.

When we read the list of "Conditional" uses that would be changed to "Permitted" use, it is so expansive that it is difficult to imagine any uses other than those listed.

So if "multi-unit dwellings" were to be changed to "Permitted", then an application for an upper-end gated community or a 5-Star restaurant could be approved solely by the Zoning Administrator.

We would like to take this opportunity to pass along our thoughts on potential uses of the property. Even if none of these make it to the finish line we would still want to have input on decisions made.:

- Mixed-income, mixed-generation housing including shelter for the unhoused and workforce housing
- Assisted living (expansion of Heaton Woods perhaps?)
- Rec Center in the gymnasium
- Makers' spaces
- Artist studios
- Community gardens
- Swimming pool

Thanks for your consideration.

Deborah and Bob Messing
10 Charles St.#1
Montpelier

Meredith Crandall

From: Sara Dean <sarahamiltondean@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 4:15 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Subject: VCFA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi,

I live at the end of 1st Ave. and am very concerned with what could happen to the buildings and the green. Please vote NO on the DRB application. Thanks.

Sara Dean

Meredith Crandall

From: Christine Lilyquist <christine.lilyquist@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 10:37 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Lauren Hierl; Jennifer Morton; mccullough@montpelier-vt.org; Cary Brown
Subject: VCFA application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Meredith,

I write for both my husband (William Barrette) and myself; we both sent separate letters to you before the DRB meeting on Jan. 3. My husband also cc'd other relevant parties.

Dear DRB members; we sincerely appreciate your service on the Citizens board that decides issues of land use.

Our chief request in the VCFA application is to continue the “conditional” requirement.

“Permitted” is frequently sought by developers to make the sale of property easier; and in fact it is the Chief Financial Officer and VP for Finance and Administration who represents VCFA, with a Real Estate adviser. From the speed that the school wants to sell, I presume that its finances are not in good order; and without knowledge to the contrary, suspect that the school would retain administrative offices here only until it could pay off debts and establish itself in Colorado.

I do not personally feel that Real Estate advisers working for a school in such a situation are the best way to come up with a master plan that will be useful to citizens and to the City; nor do I feel that Montpelier citizens and officials should spend time working with the school to shape outcomes acceptable to the school. David White has stated that the property WILL change use, his firm is only helping to suggest the best use. I would like to know, factually, whether there is or has been language that the property would remain educational. I also wonder whether schools haven't expressed interest in buying, but have not been recognized by VCFA because the “permitted” route was chosen to see how far it could go. I think the campus CAN be better taken care of and be occupied in a positive way—but development should be done with thought and continued thought: the world has changed since Covid appeared-- uses and conditions could develop that the community would readily support, what with work from home, need for daycare, or uses that fit well into the surrounding neighborhood.

Of course traffic/parking on the campus and nearby streets will always be a major factor; thank you for requiring a study from VCFA. Our neighbors Charly Dickerson and John Snell have detailed their long time experience with traffic in their letters of Dec. 15 and Jan. 2; my husband and I can attest to First Ave.'s continuous plague of infrastructure failures, with no calendar date in sight for deep solutions.

A major issue to my husband (which I second) is the commercial condominium structure proposed by White and Burke. We lived in a city of private cooperatives and condominiums; to agree prima facie for the campus to be so structured commercially is absurd. And to have a business condominium control the Green? We don't see the point of private ownership; one should consider whether the City couldn't add the plot to its parks system, as with government ownership, the public has direct recourse.

Thank you very much for your consideration; we sincerely appreciate your work for the City and its residents.

Yours sincerely,

Bill Barrette, Christine Lilyquist

15 First since 2012.

(First Ave and a few houses on streets adjoining is a varied neighborhood of young and old who contribute to the area; some have been here since the 1960s).

Meredith Crandall

From: donna.l.hopkins@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 8:32 AM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Jack McCullough; Dona Bate; Lauren Hierl; Cary Brown; Jennifer Morton; John Hopkins
Subject: Vote NO on VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Montpelier Development Review Board:

As resident owners on College Street, we oppose changing the development review process to facilitate the sale of VCFA land to benefit unidentified buyers for unknown purposes.

While we do not necessarily oppose the development or change in use of the buildings or land on the VCFA campus, we believe the review process should continue to be transparent and allow input from resident owners who may be impacted by changes.

Thank you,

John and Donna Hopkins
107 College Street, Montpelier

Meredith Crandall

From: Edisa G.R.Muller <edisagrm@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 4:39 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Cc: William Fraser; Pelin Kohn; Jack McCullough; Dona Bate; Lauren Hierl; Cary Brown; Jennifer Morton
Subject: Vote NO on VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Montpelier Development Review Board:

As resident owner on Woodrow Avenue/College Street, I oppose changing the development review process to facilitate the sale of VCFA land to benefit unidentified buyers for unknown purposes.

I am against the proposed changes modifying the current review process under the zoning regulations from Conditional Uses to Permitted Uses.

While I do not oppose the development or change in use of the buildings or land on the VCFA campus, I believe the review process should continue to be transparent and allow input from resident owners who may be impacted by changes.

In the meantime, I ask that the Development Review Board vote NO on the VCFA Development Application, Campus Master Plan/PUD.

Thank you and I look forward to discussing further.

Edisa G. Revilla Muller
26 Woodrow Avenue
Montpelier, Vt. 05602

Meredith Crandall

From: Paul Carnahan <paul.a.carnahan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 12:23 PM
To: Meredith Crandall
Subject: Comment on VCFA Master Plan for DRB

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Development Review Board members,

I have read the VCFA proposed master plan and have listened to my neighbors' comments. I think the problem with the Master Plan is that it isn't really a plan! It is really a laundry list of possible uses for the property without any specific ideas. A plan requires interaction among the parts. Since there are no details about the future uses of the college's buildings it is impossible to evaluate it as a cohesive plan. In a well-crafted plan, neighboring uses matter. While some of the college's proposed uses may be appropriate and welcomed by the neighborhood, it is not clear that all possible uses for each will all work well together simultaneously in a campus setting. Because there is no plan, neighbors are forced into the position of opposing everything.

The college is asking you to turn a list of conditional uses into a list of permitted uses without the planning this requires. The college's proposal removes the planning process from a Planned Unit Development; without planning there is no PUD.

What has been presented to you by VCFA is really a real estate marketing document, showing potential buyers the wide variety of possible uses for the campus based on the city's underlying zoning. Since the campus is for sale, VCFA has no incentive to actually make all of the pieces work together. Because there has been no planning, there is no reason for you to adopt the Master Plan. If someone buys the entire campus then they can present a proper Master Plan to the city. (A potential sale could even be contingent on your approval of the plan.) If the campus is condominiumized then there is no PUD because there is no longer an "institutional use" or a "shared or common purpose."

I urge you to vote "no" on this plan and wait until a buyer comes forth with a Master Plan for the entire campus, or individual building owners present plans for their pieces of the campus in the usual way. There is no need to shortcut the processes that are already in place.

Sincerely,
Paul Carnahan
14 Sabin Street, Montpelier

Meredith Crandall

From: June Kellogg <jkellogg46@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Meredith Crandall; katie.gustafson@vcfa.edu; Alisa Dworsky
Subject: VCFA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Vermont College has been an integral part of our community in which we have both benefitted by mutual cooperation and respect. It is with great concern that we hear that this relationship is seriously threatened by the change of a few words in the College plan. The simple change in “use” from “conditional” to “permitted” will have enormous consequences for Vermont College, the surrounding neighborhoods and the city. We have lived here for over 40 years, and never have sensed such a threat. Once opened to arbitrary development, the vision of the ‘few’ will dominate the fate of so many. Please do not allow this to happen! Please keep the lines of communication and cooperation open for the benefit of all concerned. Vermont College should remain in the community as a public trust, and should continue to benefit by community support and guidance.

Sincerely, June and Roger Kellogg

Sent from my iPad