Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
June 12, 2013
Approved July 10th

Members Present: Aaron Kimball, Maggie Gordon, Kyle Bostwick, Jean Isham, Joe Iadanza, Johanna White, Bob Linck. Members Absent: Tim Clancy, Grace Ciffo.
Also present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Freeda Powers (Recording Secretary). Public included: Ken Brown.

Joe I. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:38pm. Joe I. opened the meeting by asking for any public comments on non-agenda items. Ken Brown spoke from the audience, asking about the Planning Commission's position with regards to the Official Map in the Hannaford project now in Act 250 hearings. Ken encouraged the board to continue with the issue, and said he fully supports them on their stance. Alex W. brought the board and Mr. Brown up to date on the status of the Act 250 hearings. He said Jim Dumont is a lawyer representing roughly 30 interested parties vs. the Hannaford attorney, Chris Roy. Bob L. asked who represents the Planning Commission. Ken B. suggested we engage representation to rebut the Hannaford attorney regarding the Official Map issue raised by the PC, which the Hannaford attorney argues is irrelevant. Alex W. said Stitzel, Page & Fletcher assisted the DRB and suggested engaging either with Stitzel, or with the Town Attorney, Bud Allen, who could coordinate with Stitzel. Bob L. said he was in favor of this course. Aaron K. asked if there is money available for such action. Alex W. said yes, but cautioned that hiring an attorney can get very expensive. Jean I. said it might only entail rendering a brief. Bob L. made a **motion to request funds from the budget to hire representation for the Act 250 hearings regarding the Planning Commission's stance to the Hannaford Project under Criteria #10 with regard to the Official Map.** Johanna W. **seconded the motion.** There was some discussion around what this representation and included work may cost. Jean I. suggested getting an estimate of the costs associated with such representation from either Bud Allen or Stitzel. The board agreed. Joe I. said he would like to go in with info, or an "explanation" for the Select Board, perhaps with a memo from Stitzel as back up to the request.

Rural Residential 1 Zoning District Revisions

The board resumed discussions on RR1, looking at existing densities and build out potential. The district is approximately 3600 Acres, with approximately 584 existing dwelling units. This creates an existing density of roughly 6.3 acres/unit. Built-out to maximum allowance, this would look more like 3 acres/unit (1217 dwelling units total). Alex W. said the maximum build out is simply based on lot area divided by the minimum lot size, and assumes a full build out of every privately owned parcel. He said this maximum theoretical build out is a substantial overestimate of actual build out potential, since it doesn't take any site constraints into consideration.

Alex W. provided the board with numbers for three distinct parts of the district that the board has identified as being "separate" or "unique" from one another. These areas include the upper, "Mt. Pritchard area" or *Subarea1*, the central area, to include the Richmond Road or *Subarea 2*, and

the southern portion, or *Subarea 3*. *Subarea 1* is comprised of 1,053 acres with 68 existing dwelling units = 15.5 acres/unit, with maximum build-out of 343 dwelling units resulting in density of 3.1 acres/unit. These numbers are based on the existing Minimum Lot Size of 3 acres and are *not* accounting for take-outs. Alex W. reminded the board they can separate density from the minimum lot size and set a more appropriate density. In *Subarea 2*, the existing numbers are 897 acres with 283 dwelling units (without the Triple L mobile home park this would be 218 dwelling units). The density here is 3.2 acres/unit or 4.18 acres/unit without the Triple L mobile home park units. Maximum build-out density for this area would be 380 dwelling units or 2.4 acres/unit. *Subarea 3* includes the southern portion of the RR1 district, and is 1312 acres with 170 existing dwelling units, or 118 units excluding the Mountain View Mobile Home Park (52 units). This results in an existing density of 7.7 acres/unit or 11.1 acres/unit excluding the mobile home park units. The maximum build-out of this area results in 373 dwelling units or density of 3.6 acres/unit.

Alex W. will email a table of these numbers for easy reference and visualization via email. He cautioned the board that these are theoretical numbers but he encouraged them to realize that there are some areas in which the "potential build-out" numbers are down right ridiculous (i.e., from 68-333 in the Mt. Pritchard subarea). These numbers do provide a frame of reference. Existing densities speak for themselves and do show a clear discrepancy between these three areas within RR1.

Maggie G. said it makes a lot of sense based on these numbers to split the district up. Jean I. agreed, adding that she would like to see smaller lot sizes as well.

Aaron K. asked if they can create an entirely new district. Alex W. said yes, it just means added language, but it *is* ok to do that. His question to the board is to consider *why* they would be doing so. I.E., is it different in setbacks, density, allowed uses? Aaron K. asked are there different ways to go about zoning? Alex W. said yes, there are lots of ways, including such things as previously discussed, an overlay district for example.

Maggie G. asked are there any allowed uses in RR2 that we might *not* want to see happen in RR1? Alex W. said yes, it would be good to look through those and see what would fit and what might not. Johanna W. and Maggie G. agreed to look at the allowed uses in RR2 and see what might make sense here.

Joe I. noted that *Subarea 1* appears to be bound by paved roads but has almost no town roads penetrating the area. He noted this means there is not much road-based development going on. There is good access around the edges, but the character of the land is more like RR2 in lot size and topography.

Kyle B. and Aaron K. agreed to look at the area served by Sewer & Water lines. Bob L. voiced his concern with the potential of incremental development on traffic impacts. He noted specifically the Richmond Road which goes by the Iroquois Manufacturing Co.

Tim C. and Grace C. were volunteered by the board to be the pair to examine *Subarea 3*.

Alex W. suggested the board have a site visit to see parts of the shoreline district. The board agreed to meet at the VT Wildlife Access at Lake Iroquois at 7pm on June 26th.

Joe I. suggested the board skip the third item agenda, looking at replacing interim zoning for energy efficiency standards for new homes (Zoning 5.23.2 #1). He said he does not think anything has changed with LED certification. Bob L. said the VT standard is now almost up to 2.0, and he said we should expect standards to get better, not worse. Kyle B.

said the state is closing the gap to where we held the local standard. Alex W. said that is correct and now the question before the board is, do we want to go further than the state standard. Jean I. said as she recalls, we didn't find the state standard to be adequate, and that is why we had set a different standard.

Minutes from 5/22/13: Jean I. made a **motion to approve.** Kyle B. **seconded the motion.** The board voted **5-0.** Joe I and Bob L. both abstained from this vote.

Other Business & Announcements: Alex W. updated the board on the current Selectboard discussions on RR2 zoning proposals. Revisions are requested, and the SB meets again on the 24th to continue discussions.

The board agreed to reply on Front Porch Forum to some concerns and opinions being posted regarding the Westside Road and how it relates to the Creekside homes and traffic related to Rte. 116.

Bob L. made a **motion to adjourn.** Kyle B. **seconded the motion.** The board voted **7-0.** The meeting ended at 9:45pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Freeda Powers--Recording Secretary