

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**December 4th, 2012**  
Approved December 18, 2012

**Members Present:** Tom McGlenn, Dick Jordan, Ted Bloomhardt, Greg Waples, Sarah Murphy and Bill Moller

**Members Absent:** Dennis Place, Zoë Wainer, Kate Myhre

**Also Present:** Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator), Alex Weinhausen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Freeda Powers (Substitute Recording Secretary).

*Representing Applications:* David Burke (O'Leary & Burke), Alan Norris, Dave Keelty (FAHC rep), Tyler Scott (Architect), Bill Nedde, Jan & George Bedard, Joe Bissonett.,

*Public present included:* Tim Burke, Martha Keenan (NRG).

Tom McGlenn chaired the meeting, which started at 7:35 pm.

**Minutes from November 20, 2012 meeting:**

Tom M. **MOVED to approve as amended.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

**Akiko Balchiunas**—3-lot Subdivision Sketch Plan Review (Ct'd from 11/20)—The applicant is requesting a subdivision sketch plan review to subdivide her 22.3 acre parcel into three residential lots. Her property is located at 401 Butternut in the Rural Residential 2 District.

The applicant was not present. Alex W stated a site visit is planned for December 15<sup>th</sup> at 9am, formal discussion to follow at the next DRB meeting on December 18<sup>th</sup>.

Tom M. made a **Motion to continue the public hearing to the December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting following planned site visit on the 15<sup>th</sup>.** Dick J. **seconded the motion;** all in favor, the motion passed **6-0.**

**Fletcher Allen Health Care**--Conditional Use & Site Plan Review—The applicant is requesting conditional use and site plan review for the construction of a new facility to house the Hinesburg Family Health outpatient practice that is currently located on Commerce Street. Pursuant to subdivision approval of April 5, 2011, this project will also be reviewed under the subdivision regulations. The proposed facility would be built on a 2.28 acre parcel known as Lot #1 of the Bissonette Subdivision on Shelburne Falls Road in the Village NW District.

Dave Keelty (FAHC rep) explained that the current lease at the Commerce Street location will be up in two years from this coming May and that they are maxed out for space at that 2400 sq. ft. location. He calculated the parking requirements at 1 space per 150 sq. ft. of building space.

Plans for the new building were explained by architect Tyler Scott. He said the goal will be to create a building as efficient as possible and expandable. He showed floor plans which revealed a simple envelope of approximately 67'X83' featuring small rooms of equal size for easily converting office

space to exam rooms & vice versa. He described the exterior plans as straight forward with automatic entrance doors, a pitched shingled roof, simple uniform windows and vinyl siding.

Bill Nedde described the 2.26 acre lot, with Shelburne Falls Road to the North and a stream running along the south side. He said they would ideally like to strive for LEED certification and hope to utilize solar energy to some degree. He described proposed water treatment features including a detention pond with a water garden surrounded by a chain-link fence. (It was noted that the discharge point does require Conditional Use approval.)

There is existing sewer onsite to connect to. Lighting will include 20' high double-head LED street light in the parking area.

Bill N. reviewed landscaping plans, saying they are trying to use a native, sustainable design with shade trees, white pines, crabapples, spirea and others. He also said they are able and willing to accommodate staff concerns regarding parking lot landscaping (i.e. incorporation of an "island"). They are unsure of the size, color and lighting regarding signage at this time.

Greg W noted the detention pond, saying it appears large for this single project. Bill N assured the board the detention pond is adequately sized for both Phase I & Phase II.

Regarding exterior design plans, the applicant said they are looking for feedback from the board.

Ted B. reminded the applicant that pedestrian access is important and should be planned for.

Greg W. suggested the applicant explore architectural changes that won't necessarily change the floor plans of the building (i.e. a hip-roof or dormers).

Dick J. asked if the applicant plans on mounting heating/air systems on the roof. The applicant said no, they are planning to build an equipment room for that.

Bill N. discussed the proposed driveway, which will not be constructed to public road standards and said they anticipate minimum changes to traffic patterns. In regards to use of solar panels, he said they prefer to use field mounted trackers over roof-mounted panels which he said can potentially cause structural damage to the roof over many years.

Sarah M. inquired on the distance from the proposed site to the Creekside Development to the South. Alex W. said it is quite a distance (currently through a large corn field).

Ted B. voiced concerns regarding the proposed "driveway" not being constructed to public works standards and Greg W. voiced his concerns regarding parking requirements.

Martha Keenan (NRG) spoke from the audience, asking the board to consider surrounding buildings (i.e. the Library) which has a larger roof area composed of shingles (same as the applicant plans to use). She also noted that any increase in traffic will likely be from residential units to the South rather than the North. In regards to the solar panels, she said she believes they do lose gain when roof-mounted and in her opinion, they would be more beneficial off the building rather than on it. She believes they have been approved for use in wetlands so does not foresee them being an environmental concern.

Tom M. made a **Motion to continue the public hearing to the January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.** Ted B. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

**Steve Rowell:** Subdivision Sketch Plan Review—Applicant is requesting sketch plan review for a 2-lot subdivision in order to create one additional lot. This application had received prior sketch plan approval on October 18, 2011 which has now expired. This property is located at 516 Weed Rd in the Agricultural District.

The board agreed that Conclusion #1 should read: "...if the road is maintained to a minimum of 12 feet wide **plus the full width of any turnout** after snow events."

Ted B. made a **motion to approve.** Bill M. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

**George & Jan Bedard:** Subdivision Sketch Plan Review—Applicants are requesting subdivision sketch plan review to subdivide their 53-acre parcel into 8 residential lots. This sketch plan received prior DRB approval on November 2, 2010 and November 1, 2011 but has now expired. This property is located on the south side of Texas Hill Road, about a half mile west of the Hayden Hill Road intersection and directly across from Bishop Road in the Rural Residential 2 District.

Alex W. briefed the board on this application, explaining that it has twice been approved and since expired. The applicant, George Bedard, explained how a lack of funding caused him to be unable to move forward on the project and thus previously approved plans have expired. He said there are *no* proposed changes to the plans, the conditions will be exactly the same, lot lines etc.

Ted B. made a **motion to approve.** Greg W. noted that of the 6 board members present, 4 of them had previously voted to approve this sketch plan. He himself had voted against it, and plans to do the same this time. Ted B. said in his opinion, the major concerns on this have already been hashed out. Alex W. said he did not anticipate the board making a final decision on this tonight and had not provided the board with a draft decision either way at this time. Tom M. **seconded the motion to approve and asked that staff draft an approval with conditions.**

#### **Other Business:**

Jan Blittersdorf Revocable Trust: Decision Deliberation (**Public Hearing closed on Nov. 6, 2012**)  
It was noted that in the Blittersdorf draft decision for approval, Sarah M was in the audience so the board vote should reflect that with **7-0 rather than 8-0.** Tom M. made a **motion to approve as revised.** Dick J. **seconded the Motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

Norris: Decision Deliberation (**Public Hearing closed on November 20, 2012**)  
Greg W. suggested language read "*pathways that are not physically separated from roadways are discouraged.*" Ted B. suggested language be clear that pedestrian access to the road is *required* (i.e., *shall*). The board discussed interpretation of "Central Organizing Feature" (i.e., landscaping). Ted B. **moved to approve as amended.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The board voted **6-0.**

Fletcher Allen Health Care: Ted B. voiced concerns around the proposed drive way. The board discussed the importance of infrastructure to include sidewalks as well.

Tom M. made a **motion to adjourn**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The meeting adjourned at 9:22pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Freedra Powers--Recording Secretary