

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Planning Commission**  
**March 13th, 2013**  
*Approved 3/27/2013*

**Members Present:** Grace Ciffo, Tim Clancy, Bob Linck, Kyle Bostwick, Maggie Gordon. Ray Mainer arrived at 7:47pm.

**Members Absent:** Joe Iadanza, Johanna White, Jean Isham.

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

*Public Included:* Meg Handler.

Bob Linck chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

**Minutes from February 13<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 meetings:** Bob L. made a **MOTION to approve Feb. 13<sup>th</sup> minutes as amended.** Kyle B. **seconded the motion.** The motion **PASSED 6-0.** Ray M. made a **MOTION to approve Feb. 28<sup>th</sup> minutes as amended.** Grace C. **seconded the motion.** Maggie G. abstained from this vote as she was not present at the 2/28 meeting. The motion **PASSED 5-0.**

**Shoreline Zoning District Revisions (cont'd from 2/28 meeting)**

The board reviewed proposed VT legislation (House Bill 223) to govern shoreline setbacks, erosion protection, and vegetated buffer areas. Grace C., Tim C., and Bob L. were in agreement that the Watershed is the “bigger picture” in this discussion and is the proper place to begin to address water quality. Tim C. added that density is a concern in this discussion as well, and said he prefers the idea of expanding the district lines rather than an overlay area. Bob L. said regarding runoff impact as noted at Dynamite Hill and other areas, we do not want to see these problems repeated or worsen.

Kyle B. said he would be in agreement with the proposed idea to expand the shoreline district boundaries to include the watershed area, but suggests measuring not by distance, but rather something based on impact. He noted that the Dynamite Hill development is not technically located *in* the shoreline district and therefore would not have been impacted by such an over-lay or expanded district. Alex W. said that’s a good point, and noted that this is partially what over-lay districts are good at; small areas with a common or central impact can be covered. It seems clear that what’s good for the shoreline district will be good for the watershed. He suggested the board look at areas that would be included—lot coverage may be an issue in some areas. The board should consider, also, *how* water is managed, not necessarily just at the impervious surfaces (limited lot coverage in this district is 10%). Design Standards can address some shoreline erosion control concerns.

Kyle B. suggested the board focus now on the “nuts & bolts” of what they’re aiming for and worry about where to apply it and what to call it further down the line. Alex W. said this was a good track to take, come up with some goals now and refine the language after.

Next, the board reviewed model shoreline protection regulations written by the VT League of Cities and Towns. Tim C. said he feels the Design Standards sound rational. Maggie G. asked

about accountability. Tim C. said mostly, they have to rely on the Home Owner and Road Associations that form. Alex W. said that's true, mostly neighbors watching neighbors is how the town hears about regulation infractions or concerns. Alex reminded the board that aside from managing construction projects, vegetation preservation is the best thing they can do to address the water quality issue. Bob L. agreed, saying the board does not want to miss an opportunity to do something to minimize further incursion. He said the aim should be to simplify the goal—to help the lake. The science is obvious, they just have to put it in a context the landowners can understand. Tim C. agreed, saying these are small lakes, and informing the landowners there is not an insurmountable task. Kyle B. agreed that education is a great place to start, saying there is a tremendous amount of ignorance, and education might be a simple but effective “wake up call” to those who use/live on the lakes.

Enforcement remained a concern for the board, exactly *how* would that take place and is there time/money in the budget to address it? Bob L. suggested mainly egregious violations would be addressed and suggested perhaps someone like the town Tree Warden (Paul Wieczorek) could take on this role. Alex W. said most likely, this would fall to the Zoning Administrator (Peter Erb) as he responds to permit requests and complaints. Tim C. asked how this would be different from the current 75' Stream Buffer Zone. Alex W. agreed, saying they would be very similar in regulatory status. He said the mitigation portion of the VLCT model was very attractive. Current zoning regulations (5.10.3 #4a-d) use 4 criteria; least practicable increase, No undue adverse impact on neighbors, Maintain compatibility with surrounding structures, Upper floor may not exceed floor area of ground floor.

Kyle B. said it seems mitigation is the better long-term solution, basically a win-win for everybody. The board had some discussion around what types of vegetation result in the best erosion control/water quality improvement and Alex W. said it might be helpful if they had a site visit to at least one of the lakes to actually see *how* land owners *use* their lake access.

Meg Handler spoke from the audience, saying she feels strongly that camp conversions need more oversight.

The board agreed that education is an important place to start and a good way to make progress. Bob L. said in regards to water quality relevance to both lakes, storm water runoff is the #1 issue of concern.

Grace C. reported back to the board what she had found in researching the success story of Lake Carmi which Meg H. told them about at the last meeting. Grace said she found that Lake Carmi had a specific problem with water quality due to the large farms which surround the area. In 2006, regulations were enacted in conjunction with EPA grants to address the runoff from those farms. What she found was that grass-roots education and accessing grant funding were the two main keys to the success of cleaning up Lake Carmi.

Alex W. agreed to email the board members the Greensboro information he has. The board agreed to allow Bob L. to draft some “bones” for outreach (i.e., survey questions). They agreed it would be most beneficial to gather feedback town-wide as opposed to just from the Shoreline or Watershed areas. They will follow up with this discussion at the April 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Other Business & Announcements:** Ray M. agreed to report back to the board as he will be attending the upcoming Route 116 Corridor Study meeting. Ray M. also announced that he

did get the seat on the school board that he was running for as a write-in. He will continue to participate in Planning Commission meetings until a replacement has been appointed.

Bob L. made a **Motion to adjourn.** Maggie G. **Seconded the motion.** The meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Freeda Powers--Recording Secretary