

Town of Hinesburg Development Review Board

June 18, 2013

Approved 7/2/13

Members Present: Zoë Wainer, Dennis Place, Greg Waples, Sarah Murphy, Ted Bloomhardt, Bill Moller, Dick Jordan arrived at 7:40 p.m.

Absent: Andrea Bayer, Kate Myhre

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

Representing Applications: Valerie Thibodeau, Joe Colangelo (Town Administrator), Andrea Murray (Vermont Integrated Architecture), Brent Rakowski (Otter Creek Engineering)

Public present included: Margery Sharp, Al Barber, Frank Koss, Andrea Morgante, Mike Bissonette, Rocky Martin, John Kiedasch, Ed Waite

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

Minutes from May 21, 2013 meeting:

Greg W. made a **Motion to approve as amended.** Sarah M. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 5-0.** Zoë W. abstained as she was not present for that meeting.

Minutes from June 4, 2013:

Zoë W. made a **Motion to approve as amended.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.**

Palmer Thibodeau: (Site Plan Review) – Cont'd from 5/21 – The applicants are requesting site plan approval in order to construct a (2-unit) multi-family dwelling on their 0.75 acre lot with their existing house. This property is located at 62 Charlotte Road in the Village Zoning District.

Valerie Thibodeau stated that since the last meeting they have resubmitted new plans based on the feedback from the Board and staff. She stated they have removed the garages and reoriented the duplex so that it is further to the west, closer to the Clark property line. She also noted that they have reworked the parking scheme to allow parking for 6 cars on the shared driveway but are open to feedback regarding different types of screening. She stated the lighting on the exterior of the building could still be adjusted per recommendations from Efficiency Vermont. She also noted that they have added a shed to house the trash and recycling in order to keep the containers hidden from view. Valerie stated that based on recommendations from the board, they have included more green space for the tenants to gather. She also stated that drainage issues still would need to be addressed but wanted to wait until she had resolved the other issues before hiring someone to work on that piece.

Bill M. asked for clarification regarding if the fence had been be relocated so it would no longer be between the existing house and the new structure.

Alex W. discussed the issues brought up in his memo dated June 13th:

- Front yard parking – contrary to Village District standards
- Access/Intersection Width
- Landscaping Plan Details Needed
- Dumpster Placement
- Storm water/Erosion Control
- Exterior lighting

Greg W. asked the applicant how she plans to address these concerns. He commented that the green space appears to be located mostly with the existing house and not the duplex. Ideally the parking would be located in the back of the duplex.

Ted B. asked about the topography of the property. Valerie T. replied that it is rather wet in the back of the property and the footprint of the foundation is essentially on the setback. If the parking is located in the back it would create a driveway that goes through the middle of the lot. Ted B. discussed the drainage in the back of the property. Valerie confirmed that the grade would be brought up in that location for the building.

Dennis P. asked if the stacked parking was acceptable. Ted B. replied that it is, so long as the stacked parking is for the same unit. Greg W. asked for clarification regarding the parking. He questioned what the parking alternatives would be. He wondered if the existing parking would be affected based on 5.22.22 and if it might just be 4 new spaces since there were already 2 existing parking spaces. Alex W. stated that the existing parking is actually on the side, so the front parking would be new to both structures.

Sarah M. wondered if the proposed building could be moved forward and include a hammerhead driveway with green space in the back. Valerie T. stated she would be receptive to that change if the Board felt she should go that route.

Alex W. stated that if the Board feels the front yard set back is not something they would waive then they need to express that to the applicant. Dick J. questioned if the applicant would consider just going with one unit. Valerie T. replied they would not continue this application if they aren't able to get approval for 2 units.

Zoë W. felt that the applicant has created the constraint by choosing a larger building so she felt that she couldn't consider a waiver appropriate. Zoë W. opened up the floor for public comments.

Andrea Morgante questioned where the snow would go for snow plowing/shoveling. Alex replied that especially with the fence there; there is no room for snow on the western portion of the site.

John Kiedaisch commented that it seems to have been brought up several times that too much is being planned for this lot with this application. He felt the site is more appropriate for just one extra unit.

Andrea M. asked for clarification on the difference between a variance and a waiver. Alex stated that essentially you can't get a variance but you could get a waiver. Greg W. stated that the Vermont

State Developmental Law defines a variance (using 5 criteria) and our local zoning regulations define a waiver.

Dick J. questioned if, aside from parking, the proposed location of the fence is in the sewer line easement. Rocky M. (Director of Buildings & Facilities) confirmed that it is in the sewer right of way. Valerie T. assured the Board that the fence can be moved. Dick J. wasn't entirely sure that the fence could be moved without still being in the right-of-way. The Board agreed that they weren't prepared to grant a waiver at this point until they see other options that are available.

The Board decided to table the discussion of the date for continuation until after the next application this evening. Dick J. questioned if the decorative lanterns at the front door would require downcast lighting, as well, even though it is a lower level lighting. Alex W. replied that unfortunately the Town's Zoning Regulations don't distinguish between different types of lighting; all are required to be downcast. Greg W. agreed that might be a good recommendation for the Planning Commission to look at.

This application will be continued to a future meeting. The Board will discuss the date/time for this after the last application.

Town of Hinesburg: (Site Plan Review) – The applicant is requesting site plan approval for the purpose of the construction of the public safety facility which includes the new police station and the additions to the existing fire station. The bond provides funding for the design, permitting, and construction of the new police station, which the Town hopes to begin construction on this fall. Fire impact fees collected on new development since 2009 provide funding for design and permitting of the fire station additions. The timeline for construction of the fire station additions is still to be determined, and will depend on securing the necessary funding. The overall master plan includes important elements such as the Town Common, farmer's market venue, additional parking, play area, and a new public transit stop. The master plan shows a conceptual design for these elements. A timeline for final design and construction of these elements is still to be determined, and will depend on securing the necessary funding. This property is located in the Village Zoning District.

Bill M. recused himself as an abutting landowner for this application as well as the Decision deliberation for the Hinesburg Center property; he left the meeting at this time.

Joe Colangelo (Town Administrator) introduced the application. He stated that they (Town) are looking for approval of the Police Station currently (outlined in blue) as the Master Plan is a conceptual plan at this point. Joe C. stated that the bond vote had failed a year ago for a combined building which was a 2.9 million dollar project. This allowed the Town to go back and spend more time developing an improved plan. The current proposal includes two separate facilities. The police station would be built first and the proposed additions to the fire station would be built in the future.

Joe C. included a Power Point presentation detailing the year long, 5-phase approach involving the community. He stated the original plan was for a joint facility due to the fact the Fire & Police departments work closely together. The committee feels the proposed plan won't take away from that collaboration and functionality of the joint facility.

Joe showed the new plan on the projector and discussed the new million-dollar bond project with regard to the traffic circulation, parking, etc. Andrea Murray (Vermont Integrated Architecture) stated that the parking near Farmall Drive would support people using the Town Common. Greg W. questioned if that would work with the traffic issues that we already experience. Joe C. stated that based on the feedback received from the public, they felt that was a better option. Joe C. stated that the State (VTRANS) is requiring that the current curb cut to the existing police station be removed and a new curb cut will be placed between the existing fire station and the new police station. He also noted that a group is currently forming to find potential uses for the existing police station.

Dennis P. questioned where the parking would be located for the existing building if the curb cut will be removed. Joe C. stated that 3 on-street parking spaces are proposed but they will need to find additional alternatives depending upon the new use of the existing building.

Brent Rakowski (Civil Engineer, Otter Creek Engineering) referenced a number of issues that need to be considered. Brent stated that based on early conversations with VTRANS, the State wants an island included to break up the vast expanse of pavement.

- 1.) Service drive widths don't need to be 24 ft. wide; the maximum is 20 ft. wide.
- 2.) Site Utilities – providing sewer service to the new police station; as well as making accommodations for future connection to fire station. A sewer manhole would run into a separate service line to the fire station and would be capped and connected at some point in the future. The water line would be tapped and a new service line would be tied into a mechanical room inside the building. The data/telecom lines would be drilled under Route 116 and would be tied into the mechanical room.
- 3.) Drainage – storm water runoff will go down from Route 116 and will tie into existing catch basin on Farmall Drive. This is allowed due to the fact this is considered an expansion of Lot 1 of the Creekside development. We are not creating an excess of an acre of impervious surface, we are creating an expansion to an existing impervious service. Creekside development has a storm water plan; Lot 1 was intended to tie into that plan.

Zoë W. questioned if the intent is to settle storm water issues with the Creekside community; perhaps we should save this conversation for that meeting.

Andrea Murray showed the floor plans on the projector with relation to the windows, pedestrian circulation, usage of space, etc. She indicated the location of the bonus space upstairs due to the zoning requirements for the larger gabled roof. Greg W. asked if there would actually be a holding cell with bars as indicated on the plan. Frank Koss (Police Chief) confirmed that there would be one holding cell with bars.

Andrea Murray described the exterior of the building and stated the exterior would be clad with hardi-board; however, discussion hasn't occurred with regard to color of the siding or roof. Greg W. commented that the north and west elevations of the building's exterior aren't very inspiring architecturally. He questioned if the intent was to spruce it up with additional landscaping. Andrea replied that there was a comment in the staff report regarding adding a couple additional trees and the landscape engineer felt there was money in the budget to do that.

Zoë W. asked for clarification with regard to the purpose of the sally port. Chief Koss replied that is where they would pull the vehicles in and the door shuts when bringing in suspects to the station for processing for security purposes.

Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator) responded to Greg's comment with regard to the landscaping. Peter stated that we are looking at this (Police station) as a stand-alone project and as such, the current landscaping is under budget based on his calculations. So he felt it was reasonable to request some additional landscaping. John Kiedaisch stated that the committee (Public Safety Facility Committee) focused on the building and wanted to ensure there was enough money to build what was necessary within the structure. John K. felt that the landscaping was a secondary focus and we placed the landscaping where we felt it would be most effective but we can work to improve the landscaping to meet the requirements of the regulations.

Andrea Murray stated that the committee as a whole felt that we had adequately allocated the landscaping budget and didn't neglect any of the zoning regulations with regard to landscaping. Peter E. felt that some of the landscaping costs might have been adjusted to Phase 2 for the fire station. Zoë W. confirmed that there is a calculation that is used to determine the minimum amount that is necessary to spend toward landscaping costs.

Greg W. questioned if all the new parking that is proposed is necessary. Andrea Murray replied that the parking behind the fire department wouldn't be part of this application. The purpose of this future parking area would be for the Town Common, possible future CCTA Park and Ride. A total of 9 spaces will go with this current proposal.

Zoë W. opened the floor to the audience for any questions or comments from the public.

Andrea Morgante stated that she really feels the storm water issues need to be addressed such as who pays for it, where it goes, etc. It needs to be determined if storm water needs to be taken care of on site (how it will be treated), what portion we pay for now and what portion will be left for the next phase. Brent Rakowski replied that we would need to address the storm water issues and look at them more closely. Zoë W clarified that storm water issues will be addressed at the next meeting.

Andrea Morgante stated that she would like to see the islands expanded to allow more room for the tree plantings. The Town has spent a lot of money on the existing street trees along Route 116. Any trees that may need to be removed during this project hopefully will be transplanted as they are very nice trees. Dennis P. questioned if the trees located in the islands off of Route 116 would allow for safe sight distance for fire trucks leaving the fire station. Al Barber (Fire Chief) replied that these trees could be an issue and this will need to be discussed.

Andrea Murray referenced the landscape lighting plan. She stated that an issue had been brought up in the staff report that there may not be enough lighting. We currently have one pole fixture but we could split it into two pole fixtures.

Sarah Murphy asked if the sidewalk would be continued where the curb cut is being removed for the current police station. Peter felt it might be premature at this point but it should have a date set

that it (sidewalk) will be required to be in place. The curb cut will be removed from the old police station but the pavement parking area will remain for now.

Greg W. brought up the apparent change in the roof design of the fire station. Andrea M. confirmed that it did change slightly and explained the reasoning for the change. Zoë W. confirmed that we are not discussing the fire station with this application. Peter E. referenced the site plan C-10 – he wasn't aware that the further island was part of this application. Peter E. stated his concern that the sidewalk shouldn't be grade level and part of the parking lot with no separation. Andrea Murray stated that the sidewalk is not part of Phase 1 of this project.

Peter E. also addressed parking in front of the fire station with regard to the island and the area south of the island where a very narrow driveway is being created. Brent R. stated that is a service lane and didn't need to be as wide. However, if it were being used beyond a service lane then we would need to widen it. John Kiedaisch commented that a solution would be use the land to the south to widen the drive. Alex W. replied that widening the road to the south would require moving a fire hydrant, a fence and landscaping that has been utilized by the Giroux property. John K. stated that adjusting to the north couldn't happen, as it would interfere with the fire station apron.

Zoë W. stated that the Board and the applicant realize questions remain regarding if this will be a service drive or a wider drive for public access. As Peter pointed out, this island may impact the ability for Phase 2. Greg W. questioned if VTRANS has flexibility with regard to the island's size and shape. The Board and the applicant spent time discussing the island.

Zoë W. stated that at the next meeting, we would discuss storm water, islands, lighting (1 pole or 2), landscaping, service drive, etc. Zoë W. made a **Motion to continue to the July 2nd meeting**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**.

The Board discussed the future schedule in terms of when to continue the Palmer/Thibodeau application. Zoë W made a **Motion to continue the Palmer/Thibodeau application to the July 2nd meeting**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**.

Other Business:

Hinesburg Center LLC: Decision Deliberation – The Board noted edits in Order #4, #5, #6. Zoë W. **Moved to approve the Decision as amended**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**.

As there was no other business, Zoë W. made a **Motion to close the meeting**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The motion **PASSED 6-0**. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Renaë Marshall – Recording Secretary