

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
October 18, 2011
Approved November 1, 2011

Members Present: Tom McGlenn, Zoe Wainer, Dennis Place, Ted Bloomhardt, Greg Waples, Dick Jordan, Kate Myhre

Members Absent: none

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Planning/Zoning Director), Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator), Elly Coates, Margery Sharp, Kristi Brown, George Holoch, Bethany Ledimer, Wayne Bissonette, Tamara Orlow, Bryan Cairns, Catherine Seidenberg, Margaret Seidenberg-Ellis.

Tom M called the meeting to order @ 7:30pm.

Seidenberg, Pearce, Ellis #11-01-21.000

Sketch Plan review of a 3-lot subdivision located in the Agricultural zoning district at 2673 Silver Street. Continued from the October 4 meeting.

Greg W indicated he would abstain from discussion or voting on this application because he missed the October 4 meeting and the site visit.

Zoe W explained that a site visit was done on October 15 at 8am. It was attended by Zoe Wainer, Dennis Place, Dick Jordan, Kate Myhre, Peter Erb, Catherine Seidenberg, and George Holoch (neighbor). The following observations were made:

- Sight distance to the north and south from the existing driveway.
- Sight distance for the alternative, northerly driveway location – same sight distance to the south, but better to the north than the existing driveway.
- Proposed house site on lot 2.
- Alternate house site (lower and to the west) on lot 2.
- Location of the boundary between lot 2 and lot 3 along the field edge.
- Proposed house site for lot 3. This would likely be built into the hill, and would be protected.
- Property line for lot 3.
- Proposed new driveway cut for lots 2 and 3. Two possible driveway locations.
- Observed the proposed house site for lot 2, and noted the prominence of this site from the south along the public road.
- Noted that some brush along the bank may need to be cleared to ensure adequate sight distance to the south.

Ted B said that he preferred the alternate driveway to access lot 2, which would run along the west side of the field. This is preferable to the easterly driveway location shown on the sketch plan, which would make it awkward at night for drivers coming south on Silver Street because of the proximity to the road and headlights. **Zoe W** said that the proposed

house site on lot 2 is very visible from the road, and that the future homeowner on lot 2 might prefer to the alternate, westerly location due to the heavy traffic on Silver Street. **Ted B** said there is a lot of speeding on Silver Street, and noted that during the sight visit the Town's roadside speed indicator device showed that most vehicles were speeding, including one at 53mph (limit is 40mph).

Dick J noted the potential visual impact of the alternate, westerly building site on lot 2 with regard to the neighbor's view (Holoch) to the north. Zoe W said that the existing vegetation and lower grade of the house site would likely mitigate this.

Catherine Seidenberg liked Peter Erb's suggestion to match the lot 2, lot 3 dividing line with the proposed driveway across the field to lot 2. **Catherine S** asked about maintaining flexibility for either house site on lot 2, especially given that septic system design still needs to be done. **Zoe W** explained that the Board typically likes to work with Applicant's to settle on a single building location that best meets the regulations and the Applicant's plans. **Alex W** noted that the eventual location of the septic system probably won't make much difference for the siting of the house – especially if a mound system is utilized.

Dick J recommended keeping enough of the field with lot 3 to allow for limited agricultural use on lot 3. **Peter E** asked about getting power to the subdivision, and how it would cross Silver Street if in fact the existing poles are on the opposite side of the road (unclear which side they are on). **Tom M** clarified that the Subdivision Regulations envision entirely underground utility service. **Alex W** noted that the Board has sometimes allowed overhead power simply to cross a road, and then to go underground from there. In the past this dispensation has been based on cost issues and site/road constraints.

Tom M moved to close the sketch plan discussion, classify this as a minor subdivision, and direct staff to draft approval language. **Ted B** seconded the motion. The motion PASSED 6-0 with **Greg W** abstaining. The applicant was invited to return to revise the sketch plan if any major issues arose.

Jolley Mobil #16-20-68.000

Sign application (free standing gas price sign and a wall-mounted sign) for the Jolley gas station and convenience store in the Commercial zoning district at the corner of Commerce Street and Route 116. Continued from the September 6 and October 4 meetings.

The Applicant did not show up again. **Peter E** explained that he has been communicating with the Applicant, and is not sure why they keep missing these meetings. **Tom M** moved to continue the application to the November 1 meeting. **Zoe W** seconded the motion. The motion PASSED 7-0. **Alex W** noted that Board members could see a sign very much like the free-standing price sign proposed here, at the Mobil station at the corner of Williston Road and Hinesburg Road in South Burlington.

Champlain Oil (Jiffy Mart): #16-20-37.000

Site plan revision for the new Jiffy Mart gas station, convenience store, restaurant that is currently under construction the Commercial zoning district at the corner of Ballards Corner Road and Shelburne Falls Road.

Bryan Cairns, representing Champlain Oil, showed the revised plans and described the two basic changes:

1. Revision to the proposed diesel canopy to allow for the re-use of the gas canopy from the previous use, since it was not damaged by the fire and is still serviceable. This canopy will be 12' longer than the previously approved diesel canopy. It will be slightly lower. The colored fascia will be painted gray per the original proposal, and the lighting under the canopy will be the same as what was originally approved.
2. Two diesel pumps are proposed under the canopy instead of the one pump that was previously approved. This will not change the number of fueling positions (still two – one vehicle on either side of the island); however, it will allow Jiffy Mart to have separate pumps for the two different kinds of diesel – automobile diesel and truck diesel.

Tammy Orlow asked what the purpose of the additional pump is. **Bryan C** clarified as noted above. **Ted B** noted that the revised plan really still includes the same number of dispensers. **Dick J** noted that the number of fueling positions remains the same. **Ted B** moved to close the public hearing and approve the decision as drafted. **Dennis P** seconded the motion. The motion PASSED 7-0.

Greg Waples left the meeting at 8:25pm since he wasn't going to participate in the remainder of the meeting agenda.

Other Business:

Green Street Decision Finalization (cont'd from October 4 meeting)

The Board reviewed the second draft of the decision. **Dennis P** asked for clarification on the building height issue and the asphalt sidewalk issue. He said he was concerned about after-the-fact applications. There was some discussion on these two issues. **Tom M** moved to approve the decision (approval with conditions) as amended. **Dennis P** seconded the motion. The motion PASSED 6-0.

Rowell Sketch Plan Decision Finalization (cont'd from October 4 meeting)

Dennis P asked for clarification on Conclusion #1. He thought the Board wanted the Weed Road, Shelburne Falls Road intersection improved to provide a level area per the A-76 or B-71 standards. The Board discussed the need for the level area within 20' of the intersection, and **Peter E** explained that for a short distance beyond this area, the road grade would likely be in excess of the 10% grade called for in the road standards. Conclusion #1 was revised to help clarify this.

The Board also discussed Order #2a regarding the visual impact from Shelburne Falls Road. **Dennis P** noted that this new house site is a mile or more away from Shelburne Falls Road, so visual impact may not be a significant issue.

Zoe W said that Conclusion #6 should be revised to clarify that the proposed development density is acceptable for a variety of factors – e.g., subdivision will only

create a single lot, which will not significantly change the density or character of the surrounding neighborhood or zoning district.

Zoe W moved to approve the decision (approval) as amended. **Dennis P** seconded the motion. The motion PASSED 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50pm.

Respectively Submitted

Alex Weinhagen
Director of Planning & Zoning