

HANNAFORD SITE PLAN REVIEW

Owner: Giroux Family Trusts – Bernard A., June T., Victor T., and Ramona. 9318 Rt. 116, Hinesburg, Vermont 05461	Applicant: Martin's Foods of South Burlington, Inc. (a Vermont Corporation doing business as Hannaford Supermarkets) PO Box 1000, Portland ME, 04104
Surveyor/Engineer: O'Leary-Burke Associates PLC 1 Corporate Drive, Suite # 1, Essex Jct. VT.	Property Tax Parcel: 20-50-02.100 Commerce Street Extension

OVERVIEW

Hannaford Supermarkets is requesting Site Plan approval for a new supermarket in the Commercial (C) Zoning District on Lot 15, Tax Map # 20-50-02.100, located at the end of Commerce Street Extension in Commerce Park. The subject parcel is approximately 4.6 acres (198,566 s.f.) and is accessed by a separate lot which contains the Commerce Street Extension and they have options to purchase both lots. The Applicant proposes to construct an approximately 36,000 square foot supermarket with a drive-through Pharmacy, 144 parking spaces and paved areas sufficient to serve large truck deliveries.

This is a large project fit on a relatively small lot with extensive Class III wetlands, in an area already experiencing road congestion at peak travel times. It requires a thorough review of complicated issues by various bodies which must result in several different approvals, and they must be coordinated as well.

BACKGROUND

Commerce Park originally received subdivision approval for fifteen lots in 1986. That approval contained various findings, conclusions and conditions that are relevant to these reviews and this will be included in the specific reports. Lot 15 has had various development proposals, one approved but never done, and others explored but not pursued.

The Commercial district has no upper limit on the size of structures or specific structure design requirements, which all other Village Growth districts have, and a retail business of this size is a permitted use, requiring only Site Plan Review.

Up until this proposal it had been assumed that because of the constraints of the Class III wetlands and the lack of good foundation soils this lot would be difficult to develop for large projects. The applicant has once again mapped the wetlands, and based on their mapping conclude that they are now in different areas and smaller, and if correct, it allows a project with this amount of lot coverage.

The Town recently availed itself of the Official Map regulation to identify properties where future town uses might be necessary as the Village grows to the north and east and effectively shifts its center northward. Lot # 15 was included on this map with the notation that "Future community facilities for the areas shown include but are not limited to: town Green, Community center, Fire/Police station expansion, Farmers market venue, Parks and recreation areas, library

relocation”. If the Development Review Board concludes that these uses cannot be accommodated by the final project proposal it must be denied and a town acquisition process initiated.

The Army Corp of Engineers will have to review the Class III wetlands that exist on this lot and grant their approval for the proposed filling of them contained in this application.

The original and amended Act 250 permits issued for Commerce Park will require revision and a state stormwater permit will be required. Permits from VTRANS for improvements in their 116 ROW and as well permits from the Selectboard for work in Commerce Street will be required.

REVIEW APPROACH

The Development Review Board must review a Site Plan Application for the whole project, a Conditional Use Application for extended hours, possibly one for noise discernable at property lines during nighttime hours, a lighted Sign application, and also determine if the project can accommodate the of the Official Map designations for this lot. As well you will have to determine that the LEEDS scorecard for the project qualifies it for bonus points to enable the needed additional lot coverage.

I am proposing to keep the review of the Site Plan standards and other reviews as well, separate as much as possible so that the hearing process can remain focused on very important details and not get sidetracked. The consensus here is that we should proceed and basically review the complete Site Plan before the more focused Conditional Use application for extended hours and the Sign reviews can be considered. We have been advised that the Review should be reasonably complete before the issue of the official map is addressed so that all the intricacies of the proposal are clear and understood.

The specific site plan review standards would be grouped and reviewed as follows:

- (1) Safety of vehicular and pedestrian circulation on site and on the adjacent street network; **I am proposing to separate on site and off site into two reviews and combine the onsite review with #2 below.**
- (2) Adequacy of circulation, parking and loading facilities with particular attention to safety. Provisions for refuse storage and disposal, snow removal, and emergency access shall also be addressed where applicable.
- (3) Adequacy of landscaping, screening, setbacks, hours of operation and exterior building design in regard to achieving maximum compatibility with adjacent property and with the character of the neighborhood. **I am proposing to take up the building design and landscaping design (including screening) as two separate items. The hours of operation will be addressed in the conditional use review. Setbacks are a separate issue since the determination of what is the front yard is in dispute.**
- (4) Adequacy of exterior lighting for safe circulation on the site without creating off-site glare and excess illumination. **Reviewed separately**
- (5) Adequacy of sewer and water. **No real issues – under the purview of Public Works**

(6) Adequacy of drainage and grading plan, ensuring treatment and control of stormwater runoff, control of soil erosion during and after construction, and proper design solutions for steep slopes and poorly drained areas. **This will be addressed as one item.**

(7) Consistency with the Town Plan in regards to the pattern of development, preservation of significant natural and cultural resources, and the location and nature of existing and planned roadways and other public facilities. **This will be basically addressed when the Official Map issue is reviewed.**

(8) Proper planning and design in regard to hazardous wastes and avoidance of runoff. **No issue that I can see**

(9) Conformance with design standards as stated in 5.6, where they apply. **These standards would be folded into the various reviews as appropriate**

PROPOSED SCHEDULE:

- January 4th – Begin the site plan review with a general introduction by the applicant and then specific review of the building design and then the lighting plan since they are most ready to address.
- January 18th. – There has been significant citizen comment about the existing traffic situation in Hinesburg during the peak travel times. We have asked the Chittenden County Municipal Planning Organization (CCMPO) to assist us in evaluating the traffic impact report that was included with this submission, and their input should be complete and off site traffic issues can be reviewed separately on this date. I would also suggest that the issue of the determination of the front yard should be addressed at this meeting since the design of the parking area may depend on this.
- February 1st. – Safety of vehicular and pedestrian circulation on site and the adequacy of circulation, parking and loading facilities with particular attention to safety. Provisions for refuse storage and disposal, snow removal, and emergency access could all be addressed. If time permitted the landscaping plan could be addressed as well at this meeting.
- Additional meetings scheduled as necessary to review the conditional uses, sign proposals, etc. culminating with the DRB determination if the proposal can accommodate the Official Map.
- A final decision (or decisions) would be drafted addressing the various reviews so that the applicant and the town had the complete picture.

If time allows you might want to consider deliberating on the separate reviews as they are considered so that they are fresh in your mind and as well so feedback could be offered to the applicant if changes are required.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Erb

Cc: Applicant