Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
October 24th, 2012
Approved 11/14/2012

Members Present: Joe Iadanza, , Carrie Fenn, Maggie Gordon, , Tim Clancy, Bob Linck, Ray Mainer, Kyle Bostwick.
Members Absent: Jean Isham, Johanna White
Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator), Renae Marshall (Recording Secretary) .
Public Included: Bill Marks, Anne Donegan

Joe Iadanza chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:30 pm.

Rural Area Regulations & Town Plan Revisions

Joe I. began by asking if there were any comments from the public or if any new feedback had been received since the October 10th meeting. There were no comments or feedback received so Joe I. stated they would return to where they left off in the Zoning Administrator's comments at the bottom of page 3.

Conditional Use Review Standards Revision (Objective 1)—The Planning Commission agreed with Peter's suggestion to revise 4.2.2 #2 to reference vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and also tack on, "the impact of increased traffic on the recreational uses of the Town roads."

Zoning Definitions Revisions—Peter feels the definition for agriculture is too broad and could potentially allow anything to be defined as a farm and would have access to the newly defined agriculture accessory uses with no benefit to the community. Alex stated that the state does have thresholds (numbers) that define a farm; Hinesburg currently doesn't under this proposal. Joe I. suggested using language that states a land use that represents a accessory use vs. principal use of the land. Alex will tweak the language so it addresses accessory use vs. principal use, etc. Peter & Alex have discussed Peter's concern with the language of use and they will work together to address this concern and will bring language back to the next meeting for the Planning Commission's review.

Forest Management—This was covered in a past meeting.

Cordwood Operation—Peter feels concerned that the second sentence about incidental and accessory forest products (e.g., wood chips) as part of the business expands too much what these operations can do. He is worried about the impacts of these uses on the neighbors and the Town roads. The Planning Commission agreed to add, "By-products of the cordwood operation such as sawdust and wood chips are allowed so long as they are incidental and accessory to the cordwood operation."

Objective #2—Improving Design Standards

Conservation Subdivision Design

Identify primary and secondary resource areas—Peter feels the definition of stream needs to be changed in the regulations to reference a particular stream map/data set (National

(Vermont) Hydrological Data Set). Currently the definition of stream is essentially anything that leaves a trace on the land. It states "streams are those that are depicted on this map". Peter noted that work needs to be done on the streams that are mapped incorrectly and feels it would be beneficial to have more local control with this mapping. The Planning Commission agreed to change the definition by referencing on the map, "For the purpose of these regulations, we rely on this map to show streams for regulatory purposes. However, the Zoning Administrator has the right to determine if it is accurate. " Bill Marks noted that the Greenspace Plan has a definition of streams. Alex will review that definition.

Locate necessary vehicular and pedestrian access to the building sites—e.g., roads, driveways, paths, trails—Peter feels that subdivisions should anticipate pedestrian connections to surrounding parcels that may also have subdivision potential. He would like to see lots laid out or easements created that allow for a proposed neighborhood to be connected to a future adjacent neighborhood. He emphasized this is not a town trail system but a neighborhood-to-neighborhood connection.

Alex questioned if the Planning Commission wants to add more language simply to clarify the requirement or the desire to have trail network connectivity, or require pedestrian access in future development. Joe I. feels we should encourage trail connectivity between neighborhoods but not mandate it. Kyle B. and Ray M. suggested including some sort of incentive that would encourage developers to include trail connectivity to neighboring subdivisions. Carrie F. suggested changing #3 so it says, "Locate necessary vehicular & pedestrian access to building sites and nearby neighborhoods." The Planning Commission agreed to this so Alex will make the change.

It was also agreed to add "between neighborhoods or according to existing trail maps" to the end of the last sentence of #4 under General Standards.

Draw Appropriate Lot Line—Peter suggested adding language to require that building envelopes be either, easily located from boundary pins or separately pinned for future location. Peter also suggested replacing "boundary pins" with "survey monumentation" for locating the corners of the building envelope. The Planning Commission agreed to these changes.

Agricultural Area Standards—Peter suggested revising the text to also acknowledge that residential subdivision roads may also need to accommodate large farm equipment. The Planning Commission felt the existing language was sufficient.

Forest Area Standards—#2—2nd sentence-Bob L. suggested removing large after *Retention of,* in #2, second sentence so it reads, "Retention of tracts of forest land of 25 acres or more (27 acres if a house is on it). Current Use is the value appraisal program (current use). Joe I. stated that the intent is to tie it to the Current Use Program. Discussion continued with regard to the term "largely". Joe I. stated that the PC will have to come back to this to consider if the DRB will be able to interpret "largely " intact to make it consistent for DRB review.

General Standards—The PC agreed to the removal of "It is a goal that" in the first sentence. They also agreed to the adding in the last sentence of #4, "sidewalk connections between neighborhoods or according to existing trail maps."

Zoning Design Standards for Rural Areas

Agricultural & Forestry—The Planning Commission agreed with Peter's comments. Maggie G. suggested adding least fertile "ag" soils for agricultural or forestry uses…

Next they moved on to Peter's comments related to the Objective #3 document.

Objective #3—Defining Development Density

Determination of Allowable Density

#1—The PC agreed to Peter's suggestions with regard to a time stamp. It was decided if the PC sees a change, they would fix the density formula upon reclassification of a road. At that time, the PC could determine if they actually want to adjust the density or not.

#2—It was agreed upon to change "*applicant*" to "*interested party*" in the second paragraph, second sentence of #1 on page 2 of the Objective 3 document. Also it was agreed to change the next part of the sentence that reads, "developable areas assessment prepared at the "*applicant's*" expense to "interested party's" expense. Bill M. suggested that they state, "any interested party may challenge the G.I.S. Data mapping provided by the Town at their own expense by offering qualified evidence. Alex noted that he would make those changes and use such wording that does not allow trespass. Also, it was decided to move this part to the design standards

#3—(#2, second sentence)-Peter is concerned that averaging of development densities is not the best way to approach overall density for parcels with access to multiple road classes. He recommends simply tying density to what is proposed, based on which roads are actually used. Peter's recommended language is, "For subdivisions with access from different class highways, the density shall be determined based on the road that serves the proposed lots. Ray suggested that lots are given density based on the class of road they have access to. Alex will use Ray M.'s wording to provide more clarity for Peter's suggestion.

Planned Unit Development (PUD) Revisions—Peter feels the "by right" density bonus for PUDs only makes sense if the required master plan has some teeth, and if the greenspace is permanent. Joe I. suggests the PC thinks about this one and consider it at the beginning of the next meeting.

Minutes from August 22, 2012 meeting:
Carrie F. made a **MOTION** to **approve as written.** Maggie G. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.** Ray Mainer abstained, as he was not present at that meeting.

Other Business & Announcements:
Joe I. stated that he had received a copy of an appeal of the Hannaford Conditional Use approval via certified mail from James Dumont representing Responsible Growth Hinesburg. Joe I. stated this letter was sent to him as a representative for the Planning Commission.

Next, Alex stated that Joe I. had met with the Selectboard to report on the Rural Area Zoning as well as review the work that has been done by the Planning Commission. He

stated that the Selectboard was very impressed with the work that has been done by the Planning Commission to date.

Joe I. made a **MOTION to adjourn**. Ray M. **SECONDED the motion;** all in favor. The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Renae Marshall--Recording Secretary