



white + burke

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT ADVISORS

Founded in 1990
20 Years of Strategic Advice

MEMORANDUM

To: Hinesburg Development Review Board

From: David G. White

Date: June 28, 2012

Re: Adequacy of screening

At the DRB hearing on June 5th, DRB member Zoe Wainer asked whether there is a conflict between Hannaford's offer to allow the Town to design Canal Park and the zoning requirement that Hannaford adequately screen its project. As I understand the question, she essentially wants to know: If the DRB accepts Hannaford's offer of an easement and monetary contribution for Canal Park that includes the Town designing the park, the DRB won't know the final design of the area. How will the DRB have a basis to determine whether or not the design provides adequate screening?

To address this question, one must first determine where screening is needed and what screening is "adequate". It is Hannaford's opinion that with respect to the area in question (between Mechanicsville Road and the parking lot and building), the only area in need of screening is the parking lot. While there is an existing double row of trees along the existing sidewalk, these do not adequately screen the parking. Accordingly, Hannaford's landscaping plan proposes an area of substantial plantings within the first ten feet along the entire length of the south side of the parking lot. This can be seen on Sheet L1. This area has never been within the proposed Canal Park easement because

we believe these plantings are appropriate screening and we want to be sure they will be installed and maintained.

With the elimination of the originally proposed pharmacy drive-through window and elimination of all circulation along the south side of the building, it is Hannaford's opinion that no additional screening is required for this side of the building itself. This is for two reasons. First the new architectural design prepared by Bast & Rood based on ideas generated at the design charrette, with its wrap-around canopy, windows, photo-voltaics and other features is handsome and thus does not require screening. Second, there is a fair amount of existing screening in this area as can be seen in the photo below.



Be that as it may, if the DRB decides that any specific screening is required it can detail that in its decision and require Hannaford install it and to place limits on the rights it offers the town to design the park in the easement such that the required landscaping must remain.

Thus the DRB has several options that allow it to insure adequacy of screening:

- 1) If the DRB agrees the parking lot requires screening and the building does not, then the DRB can simply decide whether to accept the offer of Canal Park without reference to the question of screening because the parking lot's screening is outside the easement area.
- 2) If the DRB decides the building requires screening in addition to the existing plantings, it can place a condition on Hannaford's approval that specifies the required screening (the cost of which would be deducted from Hannaford's offered contribution to the Town for Canal Park) and require that Hannaford's draft easement be modified to obligate the Town to incorporate the specified screening (to be installed by Hannaford) in its design for the park.
- 3) If the DRB decides it does not want to accept the offer of Canal Park, the entire question is moot and the DRB can determine whether Hannaford's proposed landscaping along the south side of the parking lot and building is sufficient as proposed.