Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
October 9th, 2013
Approved November 13

Members Present: Grace Ciffo, Maggie Gordon, Joe Iadanza, Kyle Bostwick, Bob Linck. Jean Isham.

Members Absent: Tim Clancy, Johanna White, Aaron Kimball.

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

Public Present: Bill Marks.

Joe I. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:33pm.

There were no public comments for non-agenda items.

Rural Zoning – community outreach ahead of 11/5 town-wide vote

Maggie G. provided the Board with a memo she compiled of factual talking points in regards to their RR zoning proposal work. The Board also viewed a sample ballot to be used in the upcoming Nov. 5th town-wide vote on that work. Several Board members have submitted to local platforms (i.e., The Citizen, The Record) their backing of the factual aspects of the proposal. The Board also discussed their option of a town-wide mailing which would consolidate the "talking points" into one concise page which is clear and simple. The Board felt the mailing would be a good way to get succinct info into voter's hands and is also a good way to get the information out to a very broad base, avoiding "subsets". Bill M. voiced his opinion that the Select Board should be heard on this issue as well.

The Board agreed to have the mailing be one page, with some examples to demonstrate the proposal ideas, explanations of Objectives 1, 2, & 3 as well as the date of the town-wide vote. Bill M. suggested the flyer address the "naysayers" view of infringement on private property rights. Joe I. said he does not feel the flyer is the proper place to do that adding that the work does *not* propose the status quo and that the flyer should be purely factual. Bob L. suggested the flyer could articulate that the work has already been reviewed and passed by the Select Board. Joe I. added that the flyer should express that this work is based on the Town Plan. Kyle B. agreed, saying the flyer should answer the question of "why" so that people understand the reasoning behind the work.

Bill M. asked if early voting is possible. Alex W. said yes. Bill M. suggested the Commissioners make phone calls to locals to discuss the vote and the proposal but the Board felt this would be too time intensive and were not particularly comfortable with the idea. Jean I. said she didn't feel that was appropriate for the commissioners to do. Joe I. agreed. Bob L. agreed, saying if individual board members feel moved to make personal calls, they can do so but said it did not seem appropriate for the Commission to be doing that. The Board agreed to preview a draft of the flyer on Oct. 23rd. The members also agreed to allow printing of their individual names and phone numbers on the flyer. Alex

W. suggested board members be prepared to answer specific questions regarding the proposal and said they may want to keep a printed copy of the "talking points" handy until the vote occurs.

Stormwater Regulations (cont'd from Sept. 11 meeting)

Alex W. provided the Board with ideas and issues raised by Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator) in regards to the proposed Stormwater Regulations language. Alex W. asked the board members to consider two specific items of interest; Consider adopting stream buffer provisions town-wide in order to help preserve natural buffer areas as stormwater treatment and to require conditional use review for non-structure development in these areas (i.e. roads, driveways, parking, engineered stormwater infrastructure, etc.).

Proposed by Peter E. is the addition to Stormwater Control #4) *The plan shall include provisions for inspection and long term maintenance by a qualified professional.* This would codify with the State Standards, which require a self-report every year, and a qualified professional report every two years. The Board was in favor of this.

Jean I. suggested mentioning roads /driveways in the Purpose portion of the draft. Alex W. noted that (e.) in the Purpose does mention roads. Jean I. said it would be beneficial to have development take into consideration roads and driveways at the beginning of the project/process.

Kyle B. asked for some clarification in the LID (Low Impact Development) section. Alex W. said that piece ensures that projects <10,000 sf still need to demonstrate adequate stormwater control & treatment (any plans which require Site Plan Review). He said we don't want to miss an opportunity to have the stormwater treatment and control conversation with commercial developers or expansion projects. He added that we are not holding to the State Standards, but keeping that conversation open to keep developers doing *something* and beyond that, it will be up to the DRB to determine if that is enough or not.

Kyle B. also asked for clarification around impervious surfaces. Alex W. explained that the language tries to address newer materials and technology which uses semi-pervious instruments such as pavers etc. These materials would still be counted as impervious surface.

Joe I. suggested projects <10,000sf. Be recommended to follow the State handbook regarding stormwater control and suggested also that listing the requirements per/sf. would be a helpful guide for developers.

Among suggestions offered from Peter E. was that projects >3,000sf should not be held to the review of professional engineers as this would likely make most smaller scale projects cost prohibitive. Jean I. cautioned about the cumulative effect. Alex W. said there is not much of a cumulative effect with erosion control, but rather with stormwater control and mostly in regards to projects <10,000sf. He added that Peter E. *did* mention that they should be cognizant of the cumulative effect of all projects. Jean I. suggested a trigger, perhaps at that 10,000sf threshold. Alex W. noted the cost of tracking projects as well. Average costs to do stormwater treatment plans are around $5,000.

Alex W. said our current regulations on stormwater control and treatment is subjective and minimal. He said we can have an engineer look at this draft language to see where clarifications could be made.

Joe I. inquired on the enforcement aspect. Alex W. said mostly, neighbors reports are what get non-compliance before the DRB. Specifically in regards to grades (building on slopes), he said Peter E. has a tool that can measure this to assure compliance and said there is compliance mapping software available in the Planning & Zoning office.

In regards to the stream buffer zone portion of the regulations, (Section 2.5) which explains when projects are triggered to Conditional Use review, Alex W. suggested adding another item which says that the stream buffer provision in 5.2.2 will be extended town-wide. The Board agreed to this.

Minutes of the September 25th meeting:

Jean I. made a **motion to approve the 9/25 meeting minutes.** Kyle B. **seconded the motion.** The board voted **5-0.** Grace C. was not present at the 9/25 meeting.

Other Business:

Alex W. mentioned that the Town of Williston will have a zoning revision hearing on Oct. 15th.

Bob L. made a **motion to adjourn.** Jean I. **seconded the motion.** The board voted **6-0.** The meeting ended at 9:10pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Freeda Powers--Recording Secretary