

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Planning Commission**  
**December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012**  
APPROVED

**Members Present:** Joe Iadanza,, Carrie Fenn, Maggie Gordon, Johanna White, Ray Mainer, Kyle Bostwick

**Members Absent:** Tim Clancy, Bob Linck, Jean Isham

**Also Present:** Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Renae Marshall (Recording Secretary)

*Public Included:* Bill Marks

Joe Iadanza chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:46 p.m.

**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 November 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. As there were no comments, Joe I. stated they would move on to reviewing the “finalized” draft of proposed revisions beginning with the Objective 1 document.

*Objective 1 – Expanding Allowed Uses*

Joe I. noted that on pg. 2, under *New & Revised Allowed Uses*, Commercial Agricultural Operations, “Consider adding....” language should be more definitive.

Carrie noticed a typo on pg. 6 – change “medial” to medical.

Alex also pointed out that on pg. 8; he had provided several dictionary definitions for subordinate. He noted that he included the one he felt best fit, next to the word. After reviewing that definition, the Commission agreed.

Joe I. pointed out that on pg. 6, under *Function Hall*, (b.) setback needs to be changed to have a space between set and back in this case. Alex will make that change.

Alex also pointed out under *Function Hall*, (b.), he had changed 1000 to 500 per recommendation by Peter E. (Zoning Administrator). Peter felt that if 1000 feet was used, it would be such a distance that it would prevent the ability for building in many cases. Alex asked the Commission if they felt 500 feet was a sufficient buffer to be reasonable. Alex stated that it would have to go through the conditional use process and would have to meet the performance standards.

The Commission discussed how the Performance Standards and the Conditional Use Review process would ensure certain controls are in place. They also discussed various barns in Hinesburg to see if the 500 ft. setback requirement would allow a function hall to be utilized on those properties. After considerable discussion, the Commission felt that the 500 feet would be sufficient and agreed to Alex’s suggested change.

### Objective 2 – Improving Design Standards

Johanna pointed out that on pg. 2, #4, the word *be* should be inserted between the words shall and either in the sentence beginning with “Building envelopes shall....”

Joe I. stated that under General Standards #4, “Impacts on the recreational...” questioned if the word shall should replace the word should to make it stronger. The Board agreed to use shall.

Joe I. felt that General Standards #5 should be made stronger by removing the phrase, “It is a goal” and including the word *shall*. Alex stated that in this case, this sentence is simply introductory sentence. It is further explained in the following sentences. After some discussion, the Board decided to leave it as it was.

Kyle B. questioned if the use of the word *stream* in the definition of *stream* was appropriate. Carrie F. pointed out that stream and streambed were two separate words with different meanings. After some discussion, the Board felt that the wording in the definition was appropriate and decided to leave it as is.

### Objective 3 – Defining Development Density

Joe I. pointed out that on pg. 2, #1, in the second section of red-line, in the paragraph beginning with, “For subdivisions served by public highways...”, the last sentence should be changed to read, “.....9 lots/units if four lots accessed the class 3 road. Alex also noted that a parenthesis should be added at the end of that paragraph as well.

Alex also stated that Peter E. (Zoning Administrator) had noted that in these rural areas, we talk about density for residential development but not non-residential development. Alex questioned if the Commission felt the density calculation should apply in some way to non-residential development as well.

Joe I. stated that in order to address that, under *Determination of Allowable Density*, #1, in the first sentence, “for residential units” could be removed. However, he was concerned that the negative impact of this change could be that a developer proposes a development entirely comprised of non-residential lots i.e., a business park.

Ray M. suggested limiting any subdivisions to one non-residential use per subdivision. Discussion occurred regarding the issue of limiting a development to only one non-residential use could potentially be too limiting. They also discussed what types of non-residential use would require conditional use review. Alex noted only a couple. Alex suggested that rather than using a number limit, that perhaps they should include it as a percentage.

The Commission decided to remove “for residential units” and replace it with, “non-residential uses limited to a single-lot or 34% of the total developable area”. Alex will make that change.

Bill M. suggested making a change on pg. 2 #1 near the bottom—by replacing “utilizing,” with *accessed by*. The Commission agreed and Alex will make that change.

### Map X – Wildlife Habitat

A typo was noted under Sources, in the bottom right-hand corner. “Wildlife” should be changed to Wildlife.

Maggie G. suggested shrinking the size of the building labels so the text would be easier to read for the road names. Alex will make these changes.

### Planned Unit Developments

Alex noted that only one additional revision was made in this document as noted by the sentence in bold in section 4.5.1

The Commission had no further changes to suggest and so the Commission decided to leave this document as is.

### Town Plan

Alex stated this document is basically the same as you have seen for a while with the exception of the scenic resources section on page 47 under Scenic Areas. As the Commission had no further suggestions for edits, they decided to leave this document as is.

Joe I. thanked the Commission and the staff for all of the work that has been put into this over the past couple of years. Joe I. asked if someone would like to make the motion with regard to forwarding this on to the Selectboard.

Carrie F. made the **Motion to have Alex make the changes and be reviewed by Joe I. and then forward the six documents on to the Selectboard.** Ray M. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

Joe I. made a **Motion to cancel the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.** Johanna W. **seconded the Motion;** all in favor.

### **Minutes from November 14, 2012 meeting:**

Johanna W. made a **MOTION to approve as amended.** Carrie F. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

### **Other Business & Announcements:**

Alex stated that no correspondence has been received. The Village Visualization Project is a project that the Village Steering Committee is shepherding with a municipal planning grant that the Town received last year to provide more physical plans in a 2-dimensional map form as well as 3- dimensional representation of what the build-out of the village might look like. Maps will be village wide but the visualizing of buildings or streetscape will be for specific areas. A consultant was hired earlier this year and worked with the VSC over the summer. Stakeholder meetings were held in October where we invited key landowners, developers, community groups and interest groups in to discuss the vision for that, and help define the consultant’s work. The purpose is to show the public what is likely to come based on what the zoning regulations actually allow for and what development and the market says is likely to arrive. The stakeholders meeting went well

and now the consultant is working on a rudimentary form of the visualization products and hope to have a community forum sometime near the end of January. The hope is this will help us with the growth center designation application, which we will work on next year. Also this will provide us something that we can use to attract developers that have the same vision as our community does.

We just found out today that we received a \$15,000(to add to the \$7,500 in the local budget) municipal planning grant that we had applied for to help with the Growth Center Designation application. It is a very rigorous application process so we will be hiring a consultant to help us with the necessary analysis and economic forecasting, etc. Work won't begin until June of 2013.

Joe stated that Jean has passed on to him recent Act 250 notices that she had received – Sleepy Hollow is changing their lighting, adding snowmaking. etc. Hinesburgh Public House is adding decks, landscaping, sign etc. Also Joe I. added that probably everyone had received a copy of the Town's response to Vermont Gas and the interesting article on storm water.

The last item of business was to celebrate Carrie's 13+ years of service on the Planning Commission. Alex paid tribute to Carrie's dedication, not only at the meetings, but outside of the meetings as well, taking on additional work, as needed. She truly went above and beyond and helped make our Town the very special place that it is. On behalf of the Town of Hinesburg, thank you Carrie Fenn!!

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Renaë Marshall--Recording Secretary