Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
August 8th, 2012
APPROVED 08/22/12

Members Present: Joe Iadanza, Jean Isham, Johanna White, Maggie Gordon, Kyle Bostwick, Tim Clancy, Bob Linck. Ray Mainer arrived at 7:45pm.

Members Absent: Carrie Fenn

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Planning/Zoning Director)
Public present included: Bill Marks

Joe Iadanza chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:40pm.

Rural Area Regulation & Town Plan Revisions
Discussion on Objective 3 (Development Density)
Determination of Allowable Density: Joe brought up the issue of tracking of used subdivision/density. He was expecting that some language would be in the bylaw that stated the total density available was based on the lot size as of the bylaw inception date, such that successive subdivision at less than the total capability do not result in additional lots. This was thought to be a good idea; however, there were several points of concern:

1. The case where two lots are merged into one resulting in a lot count capability uptick. This option should be preserved.
2. The subdivision of land without site development—how is the development potential as of bylaw inception split in this case?

Alex suggested that we let the formula work but put in a note that used density was tracked when new development is proposed and that when a proposal is granted, the remaining potential will be reduced. Alex further explained that we could calculate the resulting allowable density of both parcels at the same time of the split such that both owners were apprised. Tim further added that the resulting density shall not exceed the potential of the original parcel.

Note: This does not mean the town calculates every lot's further density on day 1. Density will be calculated when the application is made based on the best facts available at the time.

Discussion on Objective 2 (Design Standards)
Significant scenic views: Conservation Subdivision #1 Identification Primary and Secondary Resources: Bill Marks voiced concerns over the present wording in the document. He suggested replacing "significant" with scenic and still restricting secondary resource designation to visible scenic views from public roads.

Tim noted that earlier discussion did not hinge on protecting what is in the view scape, but instead the intent was to protect the vantage point, i.e. to prevent a vantage point from being

walled off. Joe stated that changing significant to scenic would broaden the definition and further restrict development along public roads where we would expect the most development.

Jean stated that we should leave the language as is and take comments at the public hearing.

Alex referred back to the definition of significant scenic views which references as Map Z of the Town Plan for defined viewscapes. This seems to limit the views so that views not defined in the map don't get considered in discussion of siting. As a suggestion, Alex offered to add a statement to the page 4 definition that the views on Map Z represent the most significant scenic resources in the town that there are other scenic resources in Hinesburg that are addressed through general design standard #3. Alex stated that this would be added.

Alex stated that in looking at this section with regard to Bill's comment, he noted that we may have missed an earlier suggestion of Bill's to include slopes between 15% and 25% as a secondary resource. He referred back to the minutes of April 11th which has a discussion of slopes in this range. In these minutes, it is documented that 15% to 25% should be a secondary resource. This will be put back in the document.

The discussion continued on design standards with Bill questioning whether there was any language regarding colors, finishes, reflective windows, etc. Alex stated that there were none. Bill noted that the document is concerned only with siting, not structure. Alex noted that the board can exercise its discretion to put conditions on a siting. Jean noted that wording states that structures are to be placed to be 'visibly absorbed'. The consensus of the board was to leave the wording on siting and visual absorption as is, and not stipulate construction, colors, glass, etc.

Next, Alex displayed the hinesburg_scenic_resources_map.pdf which is going to be similar to Map Z (not fully created yet, final map will be simpler than this) which defines the scenic views designated as secondary resources. Alex stated that there will be a table accompanying the map which provides the view scape ratings from the 2011 public workshop on views. Tim asked that since the map was pretty subjective, what the mechanism for map update is. Alex's response was that it would be dealt with under Town Plan revision and the forum process leading up to the Town Plan revision.

Bill Marks was concerned that there were very few people involved in the designation of any one vista. Alex stated that this public workshop was only the beginning of the map generation process and that the information from the workshop was analyzed by David Rafael of LandWorks who rated them.

Bill suggested that we add language stating that the map was not exclusive and that other vistas could be brought up as part of the review. The consensus of the board was to leave the language as is pending a public hearing.

Moving on, Alex directed us to Town Plan maps and displayed the mapx_wildlifehabitat_080812.pdf which shows the core habitat areas (green, 700 acres or more) and interior forests (min. 100 meter buffer from edges). The brown regions on the

periphery of the smaller areas denote fish and wildlife designated areas that are not part of our zoning rewrite. The map shows the linkage/corridor regions.

Going back to the Objective 2 document, Alex directed the discussion to the core wildlife habitat and noted that we did not have a timestamp clause to prevent encroachment. Alex will add language similar to that discussed earlier.

Discussion on Revised Town Plan Language

Alex handed out revised Town Plan language for wildlife habitat (Section 4.7). This has been revised to better match our zoning discussions/revisions. This will be put on the website and be part of the September 12th public hearing. Planning Commission members should review the language as soon as possible and provide feedback to Alex as well as copy other members of the P.C.

Discussion on Objective #1

Ray brought up again the subject of the VAST trails. He reiterated his concern about new snowmobile trails on adjoining properties/residences. The P.C. quickly reviewed the discussion from the last meeting (Ray was absent) where the difficulty in determining the who/what/when of requests given VAST being present at the discretion of the landowner, transfer of land, very low development since its ephemeral over-snow. Ray asked about mountain bike trails. Alex stated that uses that contain facilities need to be a conditional use. Ray asked about situations where it only involves mountain bike trails. Alex suggested revising the wording to read, "mountain bike centers and associated trails (implying facilities) vs. trails.

Minutes from July 11th, 2012 meeting:

Jean I. **MOVED to approve** as written**.** Johanna W. **SECONDED the motion**. The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

Other Business: Feedback from Zoning Administrator on proposed changes. Alex does have some comments from Peter but he's not ready to distribute yet.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joe Iadanza, Chair