

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Planning Commission**  
**January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013**  
*Approved 01/23/2013*

**Members Present:** Joe Iadanza, Grace Ciffo, Johanna White, Ray Mainer, Kyle Bostwick, Tim Clancy, Bob Linck, Jean Isham.

**Members Absent:** Maggie Gordon

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

*Public Included: None*

Joe Iadanza chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:38 p.m.

**Storm water Regulation Revision Project & Shoreline and Rural Residential 1 Zoning Revision Project**

Alex W. provided the board with regulation excerpts of the existing Subdivision and Zoning Regulations addressing storm water as well as Zoning regulation excerpts showing the purpose and allowed uses of the Shoreline and RR1 districts. He reminded the board that at some point, they might want to discuss the possible re-shaping of RR1 district boundaries and development design standards as well.

Alex W. brought the boards' attention to pg. 23 of the current Subdivision Regulations, Section 6.6, which define one's water treatment responsibilities essentially as to pipe water off site quickly which is not how we now understand proper water treatment should work. As we have come to learn, proper and effective water treatment should work to infiltrate as much water as possible on site and to manage remaining runoff to result in lower levels than predevelopment. As they stand, our current regulations regarding this topic are dated and behind state standards. He cited pg. 43, under existing Zoning Regulations, Section 4.3.4, which lacks specific language. He said this often leads to a lot of questions arising at DRB reviews where applicants are left to rely on the state permits to suffice as adequate "coverage" for projects. He said this becomes an issue for a couple of reasons; the state standards only go up to a 20 yr. storm event, not 50 or 100 yrs. Also, state standards only apply to relatively large projects impacting one acre or more with impervious surface; in a town such as Hinesburg, many projects that come before the DRB are small enough that they do not face this review standard.

Bob L. said he is surprised to hear how lax the state standards actually are. Alex W. clarified that the state water treatment standards basically break down into two parts; 1. Quality (addressing topics such as infiltration/detention, etc.) 2. Flood Prevention (addressing how the water leaves a site). Alex W. said the quality side is more flexible, while flood control can be more difficult.

Jean I. voiced her concern that the town might be held responsible in the event of a failure to regulate development which results in serious issues (i.e. property damage etc.). Alex W. said in most cases, that responsibility would likely fall on the homeowners associations. He also noted that largely, the water quality issues that come up are a result not of current development, but rather from projects that took place prior to the current standards (i.e., Lantman's, the Cheese Plant). He reminded the board that not all projects trigger that state standard (smaller than 1 acre impact do NOT trigger the state standard) and noted it is this cumulative effect of smaller, unregulated projects that the board should be considering. Jean I. agreed and added it is the cumulative effect both within a specific project as well as the overall town-wide effect.

Alex W. suggested it might be beneficial to have someone from the state come in to talk about the current regulations and standards, as well as an engineer, a developer, etc. The board agreed.

Joe I. suggested it might be a good idea to have some developers check the town's drafts, too, to see if there are any unintended consequences the board members might not have considered. Alex W. said this was a good idea, suggesting Sterling Construction (a local developer named Bart Frisbie who did the Thistle Hill neighborhood).

Tim C. said the state is a good resource but also wanted to know if any other towns have deviated from that state standard, and suggested the board consider what role Hinesburg wants to play in this field. Do we want to be the "best of breed" so to speak, to be the leader in water quality, or just enough to keep ourselves out of liability trouble? Joe I. asked are the state standards enough to cover our liability? After all, a 20 yr. storm no longer looks like it once did.

Kyle B. also noted the state has a large back-log of pending cases for review, and that might be a problem for some local projects. Alex W. noted that was a good point to consider; does the town have the expertise, time and resources to manage this? It is a lot of work.

Johanna W. asked, if the town does chose to adopt more rigorous standards than the state's, does the state back our regs? Alex W. said no, they would only enforce up to the state standards, not beyond to our own. Johanna W. said the board should consider that; it means that the town would be responsible for enforcing and follow-through of any standards that we set beyond the state standards.

Joe I. noted that when discussing the cumulative effect, it is also important to remember that the impact on streams etc. is often not a product of what is going on on-site but rather what has happened "upstream" or within the watershed.

Grace C. said Williston would be geographically similar and she would be interested to hear from them as to how they have handled a lot of development in a relatively short time.

The board moved on to discuss the [Shoreline and Rural Residential 1 Zoning Revision Project](#). Tim C. stated he would like to get some land owner's voices in on this before they get a great deal of work done on it.

Jean I. said Williston is looking at revamping its' Shoreline District regulations and suggested the board might look to see what they're doing for some ideas. Alex W. said that the Williston discussion did not get very in depth but said the board certainly can look at what they've come up with.

Bob L. said he'd like to see if the board can make any difference given the current development around the lake. Alex W. said there have been some expansions around the lake and uses have changed.

Johanna W. said she sees this as a multifaceted problem, citing Dynamite Hill as well as other development right on the lake. Alex W. said Design Standards could address some current development concerns.

Joe I. said he feels that some stats and visualization would be good on this discussion (i.e., # of unused lots around lake, lot sizes, conversions done, # of non-conforming camps, etc.)

Bob L. suggested the Lake Iroquois Association would be good to hear from for a history overview. Jean I. asked if there is a Sunset Lake Association. Alex W. said no, there is not, it is mostly a series of private road associations but that none exists for the lake itself. Johanna W. suggested hearing from Nancy Baker, a homeowner on Lake Sunset and a member of the Conservation Commission.

Alex W. asked the board to consider their process; how do they want to proceed? Do a survey? The board felt this was a good idea and agreed to discuss specific questions for the survey at a future meeting. The board was in consensus that they would like to prioritize the discussion around Storm Water Treatment.

The board briefly discussed the possibility of re-shaping the RR1 district boundaries; roughly laying out 3 "districts" (Pritchard Rd area, Richmond Rd area and Buck hill Rd area).

### **Minutes from December 12th, 2012 meeting:**

Ray M. made a **MOTION to approve as amended**. Kyle B. **seconded the motion**. Tim C. and Jean I. abstained having been absent at the 12-12-12 meeting. The motion **PASSED 5-0**.

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

Alex reminded the board that a public meeting will be held on Wednesday Jan. 16<sup>th</sup> to discuss the VT Gas pipeline; project proposes to lay transmission line through town to serve residents in Addison County.

February 21<sup>st</sup> will be the first meeting of the newly formed Economic Development Board.

Joe I. made a **Motion to adjourn.** Bob L. **Seconded the motion.** The meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Freedra Powers--Recording Secretary