Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
January 15th, 2013
Approved January 29th

Members Present: Tom McGlenn, Dennis Place, Greg Waples, Kate Myhre, Ted Bloomhardt. Zoë Wainer arrived at 7:34pm, Dick Jordan arrived at 7:35pm.

Also Present: Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator), Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Freeda Powers (Recording Secretary).
Representing Applications: Tyler Scott, Dave Keelty, J Burke, Bill Nedde (engineers & architects for FAHC application)and Nick Bouthillette.
Public present included: Margery Sharp, Jim Ulager (doctor at Hinesburg Family Health), Sarah Murphy, Joe Bissonette and Mike Bissonette.

Tom McGlenn chaired the meeting, which started at 7:30 pm.

Minutes from December 18th, 2012 meeting:
Greg W. **MOVED to approve as written**. Tom M. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 4-0**. Ted B. abstained, as he was not present for the 12/18 meeting.

(Kate M. will not be participating in the FAHC application review.)
Fletcher Allen Health Care: (Conditional Use & Site Plan Review – Cont'd from 12/4) The applicant addressed concerns presented by staff and offered a new Conditional Use application for Stream Buffer Encroachment to install storm water treatment within a stream buffer area.

Addressing parking requirements, the board heard from Jim Ulager, a doctor currently practicing at the Commerce Street location of Hinesburg Family Health, who said in his experience an office operating with 3 doctors plus staff requires about 20 parking spaces. Dr. Ulager said when you factor in other "unexpected" trips (i.e., maintenance crew, staff meetings, additional doctors etc.) that parking becomes inadequate. He said patient access is critical to the work they do.

Bill Nedde explained to the board that "Demand" is based on 30-35% above average (i.e., if you need 20 spaces, you should have 35). He reiterated Dr.Ulagers' statements about unexpected visits, pointing out that per-diem or part time employees also effect parking requirements. He said the projected facility plans to serve 12,636 patient visits per year, employ between 14-17 workers, have square footage of 5,648 with an estimated parking need for 38 spaces (proposed 40). He also noted that future expansion would increase the building size to 8,473 sf., resulting in an increased parking need to 57 spaces.

The applicant presented a comparable facility in Colchester Family Practice, which features a similar floor plan and has 45 on-site parking spaces (currently inadequate on most days).

The applicant wanted to be very clear and upfront with the board, saying they have not "bought into" any subdivision; they chose this lot because it would accommodate their needs for this facility. Bill N. said they have no interest in building roads or developing infrastructure beyond their facility's needs. He said they are unable to make further commitments due to a financial threshold of $3M which triggers oversight and permitting obstacles for them. Greg W. asked Bill N. if they

have a purchase option with some entity. Bill N. said they are working through a realtor who is in touch with the Cairns. Greg W. said it would make sense to get the land owners' thoughts on this. Bill N. said FAHC would like to be breaking ground on this project by April 1st and restated that they do not want to be the front-end project on infrastructure for a larger future plan. He urged the board to approve the application as submitted.

Dick J. asked the applicant if they have seen the Master Plan yet, noting the large amount of residential development planned for the areas south of this lot. Bill N. said yes, they have seen the Master Plan, and said he thinks it's a good plan. He noted the residential development potential as well, saying there will be ample opportunity in the future via permit applications to address and pay for further infrastructure in the area.

Ted B. asked if the applicant has seen the subdivision for the lots. Bill N. said yes, they have. Ted B. said it sounds to him like the applicant is asking the board to change those subdivision conditions. Bill N. said no, he doesn't feel like they are asking to change those conditions, saying they don't believe this project impedes on any future development plans.

Greg W. asked for clarification from staff; are we dealing with two separate developers at this point (Haystack & Cairn)? Alex W. said yes, Cairns bought lots 1 & 3, while the Bissonettes held onto lots 2 & 4. Greg W. said he thinks the board should hear from those two land owners.

Alex W. asked the board to be clear on what is the "bulk" of their concerns from Peter's staff report. He clarified that the applicant is only responsible for impacts closest to their lot lines, and reminded the board that the applicant has stated that they are willing to address several of the concerns in Peter's report (i.e., sidewalk, crosswalk, trees).

Greg W. and Dick J. both voiced concerns about the proposed access road on what is being called the Westside Road; specifically what happens later when development to the south takes place, if the base this applicant lays for that access road is not up to state standards it will create more work when that paved road gets put in. Ted B. asked about the width and length of that access road. The applicant noted it is proposed at 24' wide and roughly 150-200' from Shelburne Falls Rd to the proposed parking lot. Bill N. addressed the board's concerns with the base of that access road, saying they are ok with building it to state standards to prevent extra work in the future when a paved road is ready to go in. The applicant also agreed to an escrow account for future planting of trees and a sidewalk to run from the parking lot to the southern lot line.

Tyler Scott spoke to the board about building design. The floor plan remains unchanged. He showed the board updated building elevations which feature overhangs, dormers (with extended sunshade) and vents. Greg W. noted the low hang of the roof, saying in his opinion it increases the roof mass which is unappealing. Tyler S. said the angle and overhang of the roof is in an attempt to provide sun screening to control energy costs as they lack large open spaces which would help with that. Greg W. asked if the north side overhang will shield the sidewalk. Tyler S. said no. He showed the board comparable buildings in the village area including the library, post office, Brookside Family Health and the small plaza on Mechanicsville Rd. The building will have asphalt shingles and the exterior color remains undecided at this time.

Tyler S. showed revised plans which have realigned the parking island, redesigned the storm water pond (he stated that the pond will not overflow in case of a 100yr storm event), replaced spruce trees with dwarf spruce, and added foundation plantings. He also explained that they have removed the solar arrays from Phase I of the building plans. He handed out a new version of landscaping plans showing the modified design of the outfall (which can go on the eastside of the existing Cottonwood tree if the board wants). They plan to increase the grade on the eastern property line to help with runoff and water sheeting. He cited Civil Detail #5 (handout and PowerPoint) which shows their plans to address velocity control using a common design.

Greg W. asked if the site is connected to town sewer and water. Bill N. said yes, there is an existing water pipe on the west side of the proposed access and there are existing stubs for sewer and water on the east side.

Peter E. asked about solar gain and other alternative energy plans, does the applicant have any commitment to this? Tyler S. said they would have liked to integrate solar into their design but decided not to in Phase I as they do not want to have roof mounted panels. He said they do plan to go for LED certification and will have very good thermal insulation and other design features which will help them meet or exceed the intent of the state standards.

Bill N. said in regards to storm water, a state permit will be required for this project and he assured the board that they will fully comply with state standards.

Tom M. thanked the applicant for the detailed presentation. Peter E. suggested the board keep this application open. Sarah Murphy spoke, noting Colchester Family Health has 36 employees, but the proposed Hinesburg Family Health will have only 14-17. Bill N. said that per-diem and part time employees at the Colchester location are what drive up those numbers. Tom M. made a **motion to continue the public hearing till Feb. 5th.** Ted B. **Seconded the motion.** All in favor, the board voted **6-0.**

Nick & Katy Bouthillette: (Conditional Use for Expansion of a Non-complying Structure) – Applicants are requesting to remove the existing second story of the current house and replace it with a full, conventional second story within the existing footprint. This property is located at 111 Shadow Lane in the Shoreline District. Staff provided the board with draft approval for this project.

Nick B. told the board they are trying to make the house more livable. He noted the structure is currently non-compliant due to being 10-12' too close to the property line with the neighboring driveway. Peter E. noted that the non-compliance is not in question in this application as the request is not to expand the structure's footprint.

Greg W. asked if the height of the home is being changed. Nick B. said yes, by about 1.5' and the new pitch will be 6.5/12. Dick J. asked if the new second story will go over the garage. Nick B. said yes, the future plans will be to have that part be a porch of some sort. Zoe W. asked if the applicant is asking for approval to build that porch at this time. Alex W. said yes, it is part of the proposed plans. Peter E. reminded the board and the applicant that once approved, that permit will be good for a year and can also be extended should the applicant need more time to complete construction.

Greg W. asked if all neighbors had been warned of this application. Alex W. said yes, and there were no complaints voiced and no one showed up at the meeting as a concerned party.

Greg W. said he agrees with the proposal and left the meeting at 9:14pm. Zoe W. noted Conclusion #3 should read "***any*** future improvements….". Ted B. **made a motion to close the public hearing and approve staff draft approval as amended.** Dennis P. **Seconded the motion.** All in favor, the board voted **6-0**.

Catamount-Malone/Hinesburg LLC: (Sign Review) – Applicant is requesting sign review for the installation of a main entry sign for The Cheese Plant (former cheese factory) listing the current tenants. This property is located at 10516 Rte. 116 in the Village and Industrial 3 Districts.

The applicant was not at the meeting and asked that Alex W. present the application on their behalf. Alex W. said the sign meets regulatory specifications and noted it will be similar in design to the Commerce Street business signage. It will be 15' high with down cast gooseneck lighting using LED lights. The sign will be located perpendicular to Rte. 116 and placed at the entrance to the old Cheese Plant. He asked the board to consider hours of illumination (all night or during business hours). The board agreed the lights should be off between Midnight-5am (condition #2). Ted B. requested staff ask the applicant about what types of LED lights will be used (bright white?).

Tom M. made a **Motion to close the public hearing and approve draft approval as amended.** All in favor, the board voted **6-0.**

Other Business: Tom M. told the board about his recent visit with the Select Board where they discussed the possibility of board members using IPads for DRB meetings, the nature of the function of the DRB (how do the board members work together), and the idea of assigning board members as "topic point person" on larger applications in which discussions on topics like Storm Water, Traffic and other concerns can become lengthy and overwhelming. Overall, Tom M. said his talk with the Select Board was short and congenial.

Tom M. made a **motion to go into deliberative session for decision deliberation on Balchiunas and Carlson applications (both closed Dec.18th).** Ted B. **Seconded the motion.** Zoe W. left at this time. The Board entered into deliberative session at 9:47 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at ***p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Freeda Powers – Recording Secretary