

# Town of Hinesburg Development Review Board

April 7, 2015

Approved 4/21

Present: Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, Zoe Wainer, Dennis Place, John Lyman. Sarah Murphy arrived at 7:43pm.

Absent: Andrea Bayer, Greg Waples.

Representing Applications: Jan Bloomstrann, Jeff Glassbery, Bill Maclay, Kevin Worden. Jean & Jeff Davis.

Public Present: Katrina & Dan Woodworth, John Kiedaisch<sup>[fp1]</sup>, David Blittersdorf, Mary Beth Bowman, Nancy & Alan Norris, Bart Frisbie, Jamie Carroll.

Zoe W. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:32pm. There were no agenda changes. There were no public comments for non-agenda items.

Zoe W. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 3/17/15**. Ted B. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **5-0**.

**Wind Energy Associates/Renewable NRG Systems:** PUD Sketch Plan Review. Jan Bloomstrann (landowner) briefly described the proposal for a 9-lot subdivision and PUD on the property that includes and surrounds the Renewable NRG Systems facility; approximately 66 acres total. Bill Maclay (architect) described the parcel, which makes up about 90% of the VNE district. Significant natural features were noted, including a steep hillside and the ridge of the hillside, substantial wetland areas, a small stream in the NW corner, Patrick Brook in the SE corner, prime ag soils for much of the parcel, and some archeological significance noted in the flat area in the SW portion of the parcel. A brief layout of the 9 lots was reviewed, including the make-up of mixed uses; Single Family Homes, Multi-Family Homes, Town Houses, Senior Housing, Office Space, Light Ind. & Mfr. Bill M. said density numbers for this parcel go from 34 units without bonuses and max out at over 200 units with full bonuses; this project proposes 101 units 36 of which are slated for senior housing. The flatter, open space portion of the parcel located to the south and closer to Rte. 116 will be the site of office use, light industrial and light manufacturing buildings with single-story structures, possibly with mezzanines. There is sub-ground parking included in this proposal. The Applicant will participate in the future Riggs Road intersection design and construction as well. The Applicant is willing to discuss road cuts from CVU Road also. The proposal includes walking trails which will be open to the public.

Ted B. asked about elevation changes on this site. Bill M. acknowledged the elevation change and said both traffic concerns and elevation impacts on the site prohibit internal road connectivity between the proposed town houses and office/light industrial portion of the project.

Regarding the energy efficiency of this project, the applicant demonstrated that many of the residential structures have been oriented to increase their solar potential. The Applicant said they did look at the expense of Net Zero homes and found that with the individual solar potential included, the project

would take an additional 1.5 acres for solar arrays to achieve the Net Zero status for the residential portion of the project. They have identified two places on the site which could potentially accommodate that array but the Applicant noted that would need to go through a PSB review; they have simply demonstrated its feasibility to the Board. The Applicant said their goal is to make achieving Net Zero for the residences as easy as possible but not to require it. Dick J. noted the elevation of one of the identified 1.5 acre sites and asked the Applicant to be cognizant of visibility from Rte. 116.

Bill M. noted several areas on the parcel that have the potential for use as flat play areas, usable green space. Parking areas (for public trails use) were also noted on the plans. The Applicant showed an example of the proposed street scale (18' wide streets) with sidewalks and porches demonstrated.

The proposal includes 2 one-way streets as well.

Zoe W. voiced her concerns with the water and wastewater capacity issues as they may impact this project. Alex W. said there is currently adequate wastewater capacity for the Residential portion of this project; possible uses would determine the availability or lack thereof for capacity adequate to cover the Office/Light Mfr. & Ind. Portion of the project. Jeff Glassbery said they would be seeking businesses that would not have intensive water/wastewater demands. Peter E. reminded those present also that the capacity allocation has not yet been determined. Alex W. explained the Select Boards' decision to implement a 12 month "pause" on waste water allocations made, with a few exceptions for specific cases. The intent, he said, is to look to the State and the EPA lake clean-up plan and the following report this autumn. Final revisions will determine allocation decisions. He went on to say that the Select Boards' temporary provision to the Ordinance does not apply to nonresidential development. This led Ted B. to ask if the nonresidential portion of this project could stand alone. Jeff G. said in theory, yes. He said they are seeking to implement the Town Plans' call for mixed-use. Sequentially, he said, it might be the way it happens, but they feel that the overall plan is comprehensive and coherent.

Dick J. asked if congregant housing counted as residential or nonresidential. Alex W. said this project does not call them out as congregate; the senior housing element of this project is likely to be independent senior housing rather than congregate.

Zoe W. said regarding the Net Zero status of the residential portion of this project; the language for this (VNE) district clearly states that the project *shall* implement renewables. Bill M. agreed, but noted that the language does not define what percentage of renewables should be achieved, it simply states '*substantial*'.

Zoe W. asked about the soil stability of the site. Alex W. said that due to the existing wetlands in many portions of the parcel, the best, most stable soils are located in the upland area near the hill. This is why the applicants have proposed single story industrial and manufacturing buildings nearer to Rte. 116. Zoe W. said while she understands that, she notes that the NRG building works because it was built into the hillside; her concern is with visibility and scale of the large buildings in an open area. Bill M. said once again, they are attempting to implement the Towns' zoning and noted that if the structures were scaled much smaller they would not be viable for manufacturing or industrial uses. They have attempted to address the concerns with these buildings by putting parking in the rear and noted that one of the two buildings is given a very good setback from Rte. 116.

Dennis P. voiced his concerns of the visibility of the 12 duplexes & 14 townhomes and asked the Applicant if those structures would actually be on the ridge of the hill. The Applicant said no, they will actually be set below the ridge. Dennis P. noted a trail on the plans that goes along Rte. 116 to the south. He asked if this would be a path or a sidewalk. Alex W. said that will be a sidewalk and explained that the Town has received a grant and that the Mobil gas station project will be participating in the construction as well. The first portion of sidewalk along the eastern side of Rte. 116, he said, will go from Riggs Road to the Commerce Street intersection. This will be considered Phase 1. Phase 2, he said, will likely go from Riggs Road up to CVU Road at a future date.

Sarah M. asked if the Applicant had discussed with staff the importance of this project as it will be seen as the “gateway” into the village, per Section 5.22. Alex W. said yes, noting the larger road setback requirements etc. He said the Applicant is aware of this aspect of the project.

Peter E. encouraged the Board and the Applicant to consider the safety and livability of larger residential developments such as this regarding single-entry and one-way streets or dead-end streets. Bill M. said while he understands and appreciates the concern, there are no other access points for this project.

John Lyman encouraged the Applicant to be cautious in sharp angles such as are demonstrated in a small triangle of streets in this project as they relate to emergency vehicles required turning radii.

Zoe W. suggested the Applicant consider increasing the open space in the plan via elimination of homes abutting the wetlands in the #3 “Meadow Residential” portion of the project, along with one of the roads in the triangle noted by John L. Bill M. said the triangle area being noted is ideal for a flat spot and therefore they are reluctant to remove it from the plans. Also, he said, this project includes a good percentage of open space.

Bill M. noted also that several areas across the entire project have been identified for potential stormwater treatment and the project intends to utilize LID practices and treatment measures to the fullest extent that the soils and the site will allow. In this regard, several detention ponds/rain gardens were noted.

Zoe W. opened discussion to the public.

John K. spoke from the audience asking the applicant how they will determine design. The Applicant said it is probable that different developers will do each lot. John K. asked about solar; what is the required percentage for this project? Zoe W. clarified that the language does not specify a %, only that it be ‘substantial’. John K. also noted that the triangle being discussed is not a small area; measuring approximately 200’ per side which he feels would reasonably be usable green space.

Dan Woodworth spoke from the audience, as an abutting land owner on CVU Road, he voiced concerns with the traffic flow impacts of this project as well as the potential storm water flow impacts to his and other neighboring properties. Zoe W. said a traffic study (yet to be done) would determine the potential traffic impacts of the project and assured him that the applicant would need to demonstrate adequate storm water controls and treatment measures.

Dennis P. asked about the height of the structures and elevation of the site and suggested perhaps a site visit with balloons would be helpful. Alex W. agreed to provide the Board with the proposal and the

existing site elevations overlaid to aid in this and the Applicant agreed to provide the Board with sketches similar to the street scale they showed tonight.

Dick J. asked the Applicant to clarify the implementation of belowground parking; will it be underground or under the structures (raising the building height). The Applicant said the plan is to dig into the hillside so the parking might be open on one side.

Peter E. asked the Applicant what storm water event they will be building to. The Applicant said likely they will build to the 10 year storm event but assured the Board that the project will meet state and local standards. Peter E. encouraged the Applicant to be aware of the importance of an adequately sized culvert to protect Rte. 116.

Zoe W. made a **motion to continue this application to the 5/5 meeting**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**.

**Davis:** Transfer of Land to Adjoiner, Subdivision Approval for Development on Transferred Land, Conditional Use Approval for Expansion of a Non-Complying Structure. The Applicants, Jeff & Jean Davis, are requesting a Transfer of Land to Adjoiner to merge two lots owned by them and Subdivision Approval as well as Conditional Use approval to demolish the existing structure at 177 Shadow Ln and also to build a new entry and garage attached to the existing, noncomplying structure at 187 Shadow Ln. There will be no net increase in lot coverage and there will be no encroachment into any setback areas; the project will improve some of the existing non-complying setbacks. The new garage will measure 26' X 24' and the ridge height will be approximately 2.5' higher than the ridge height of the existing structure. The new garage will be fitted with gutters to aid in storm water runoff.

Zoe W. encouraged rain garden installation where the Applicant proposes removing existing pavement. The Applicant was amenable to this. The Applicant agreed to leave the existing culvert in place. The Applicant is working with neighboring landowners, the Carrolls, to preserve the view corridor.

Regarding compatibility with surrounding homes, the Board agreed that the project is not incompatible with surrounding structures (of which there are few).

Zoe W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and directed staff to draft Approval for the Board to sign at the next meeting**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**.

**Other Business:** Zoe W. acknowledge three submissions from members of the public; Jean Kiedaisch<sup>[fp2]</sup>, Barbara Fouraur, and Mary Beth Bowman.

Zoe W. made a **motion to adjourn**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**. The meeting adjourned at 9:42pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary