

# Town of Hinesburg Development Review Board

May 7, 2013

Approved May 21, 2013

**Members Present:** Zoë Wainer, Dennis Place, Greg Waples, Dick Jordan, Sarah Murphy, Ted Bloomhardt, Bill Moller

**Absent:** Kate Myhre

**Also Present:** Peter, Erb (Zoning Administrator), Alex Weinhausen (Director of Planning & Zoning)  
Renaë Marshall (Recording Secretary)

*Representing Applications:* Andrea Morgante, Dennis Place, Audrey Horton

*Public present included:* Margery Sharp, Russell Robinson, Laurie Barnett, Steve Gladstone

Zoë Wainer chaired the meeting, which started at 7:36 pm.

## **Minutes from April 16, 2013 meeting:**

Zoë W. made a **Motion to approve as amended.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.** Bill M. abstained as he was not present for that meeting.

**Andrea Morgante:** (Conditional Use Review for an Accessory Apartment in an Accessory Structure) – The applicant is requesting conditional use review to build an accessory apartment above a detached barn/garage on her property. This property is located at 56 Mechanicsville Road in the Village Zoning District.

Andrea Morgante introduced the application. She stated that the existing shed on her property is over 50 years old and has been leaning for a while. She noted that when Randy & Jenny Volk renovated the building next door; they worked together to clean up the property line, as a result this shed became more visible. She stated she recently built a new barn/garage, to replace the shed, that was designed to reflect the history of the surrounding property as it once was part of a large farm.

Andrea M. stated that her plan is to now build a 680 sq. foot apartment on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the new barn/garage. Greg W. asked what the floor area of her house is. Andrea replied that the footprint of the main structure is 26 x 38 and it is 1 ½ stories high. She also noted that there is an additional wing that is 17 x 36. Peter noted that he had inadvertently put the square footage of the proposed apartment in the Finding of Fact rather than the square footage of the house. He will put the correct figure in Finding of Fact 5c. He also stated that he had the correct square footage calculated but didn't have that information with him at the meeting.

Based on the dimensions of the footprint provided by Andrea, Alex estimated the total square footage of the house to be 2588 sq. feet. 30% (maximum allowed of total square feet of primary home for an accessory apartment per zoning regulations) of that would be 776 sq. ft. Therefore the apartment (680 sq. feet) would be well under the allowed amount for an accessory apartment.

Bill M. asked if the site plan was to scale. Andrea M. replied that it was. Greg W. asked what the status of the existing shed was. Andrea M. stated that the shed would be coming down. Greg W.

asked if she (Andrea M.) had any objection to having that stated as a condition. Andrea M. stated that she did not object to that. Zoë W. clarified that they would want a simple finding of fact that the shed would be removed to make the garage accessible.

Greg W. questioned if the new barn/garage meets the setback requirements. The Board again discussed the square footage of the existing house. Peter stated that he has the most accurate number for the calculation of the total square footage and confirmed he will use that correct # in Finding of Fact 5c.

Zoë W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to amend the DRAFT Decision as discussed.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 7-0.**

**Dennis Place/Audrey Horton:** (Final Plat Review) – The applicants are requesting final plat review for a 2-lot subdivision on a 47.6 acre parcel located on the north side of Place Road East in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District.

Dennis P. recused himself from the Board during this application.

Dennis introduced this application. He stated that, as Alex had noted, all conditions from the sketch plan Decision have been addressed.

- 1.) Building envelope for Lot 1
- 2.) Easements/Rights of Way
- 3.) Road Association Language

Ted B. asked for clarification that no new development is proposed with this application. Dennis confirmed that was the case. Alex stated that the DRB had also asked at sketch that Dennis speak with the Road Foreman regarding any plans for upgrading the road and Dennis did do that. Dennis P. stated that Mike Anthony (Road Foreman) plans on finishing ditching of Place Road East and widening the road.

Russ Robinson (lives on Place Road East) stated that many residents have requested over the years that this road be upgraded but nothing was ever done. He (Russ R.) feels it is odd that suddenly upgrades would be done now. Russ R. also questioned if Lot 2 could be accessed from Place Road West. Steve Gladstone (lives on Place Road East) asked if this property has frontage and access to Place Road West.

Alex W. stated that the plat does show where the end of Class 3 section of the road is and pointed out where a developed turnaround is located at the end of the Class 3 section of the road. Alex W. also stated that it wasn't clear from the DRB at sketch that Place Road East would need to be improved at this point.

Dick J. noted that at sketch, there was a question with regard to the actual location of the property line. Alex W. stated the plat shows the boundary line does follow the brook as Russ R. stated during sketch. Therefore Lot 2 is smaller than the 12 acres originally shown; actually 10.4 acres.

Ted B. commented that he wasn't sure Conclusion #4 (with exception of first 3 sentences) belonged in this Decision. He felt density information would be more relevant in the future subdivision decision for Lot 2. Perhaps this could be included just as a Finding of Fact at this point

Peter E. noted the building envelope was 2 ½ acres which is larger than the typical building envelope. He stated that he was not sure a building envelope was necessary. He did note that the front yard setback was close to the shared road (Robinson driveway). Peter stated that if this becomes a corner lot when this property is eventually built-out, it would need to be adjusted at least 10 feet to meet the require 60 foot setback from the center of the road.

Alex W. replied that the reason the building envelope was made so large was to identify the buildable part of the property. Alex W. also stated that given Peter's catch regarding the setback, we should include a Finding of Fact about the building envelope in relation to the Robinson driveway. He will add as Order #2 that the building envelope needs to be adjusted to allow for future build-out. Bill M. stated that rather than state *additional 10 feet*, it should be read *at least a 60 foot setback*.

Ted B. made a **motion to close the public hearing and approve DRAFT Decision as amended**. Bill M. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 7-0**.

**Other Business:**

Dennis P. returned to the Board at this time. Bill M. left the meeting prior to the deliberative session as he was not present for the April 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

As there was no news or announcements, Zoë W. **moved to close the public hearing and go into deliberative session to discuss the Weis & Jolley applications**. Sarah M. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**.

The Board came out of deliberative session. Ted B. made a **motion to approve the Weis sketch plan Decision**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**. Zoë Wainer, Dennis Place, Greg Waples, Dick Jordan, Sarah Murphy and Ted Bloomhardt participated in this Decision.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Renaë Marshall – Recording Secretary