Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
May 5th, 2015
Approved 5/19/2015

Board Members Present: Greg Waples, Dick Jordan, Dennis Place, Andrea Bayer, Ted Bloomhardt, Sarah Murphy. Kevin Cheney arrived at 7:58pm.

Board Members Absent: Zoe Wainer.

Representing Applications: Alan & Nancy Norris, Bill Maclay, Ashley Bond, Jeff Glassbery, Jan Blomstrann, Kevin Worden and John Floyd.

Public Present: Dorothy Pellett, Bart Frisbie. Also present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator) and Freeda Powers (Recording Secretary).

Dennis P. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:33pm. There were no agenda changes. There were no public comments for non-agenda items.

Greg W. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 4/21/15.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **5-0**. Andrea B. abstained.

Norris: (Ct'd from 3/17, 4/21) The applicants are requesting final plat approval for a 24-Unit PUD.

Andrea B., Sarah M., Ted B. and Dennis P. had no questions and felt ready to deliberate. Dick J. asked for clarification regarding building elevations; intended to be as shown in plans? The Applicant said yes. Dennis P. made a **motion to close the public hearings for the Final Plat request for a 24-Unit PUD and for the Conditional Use for Development in a Stream Buffer Area, to take up in deliberative session and directed staff to draft approvals.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

NRG: (Ct'd from 4/21) Jan Blomstrann and Jeff Glassbery and Kevin Worden represented this PUD Sketch Plan Review application for property located at 110 Riggs Road.

Addressing concerns raised about the triangle shaped green space in the NW portion of the plans, the Applicant showed comparable, typical green space areas which they noted were between .5A-1A; the triangle shaped area in these plans is .42A. The Applicant feels that the duplexes around this space will create an area for neighborly activities. Alternative flat portions of the parcel were noted. The Applicant acknowledged staff comments regarding the need for more usable flat, dry open space for the residential area and concede that they may have to redesign the triangle green.

Dick J. asked about what look like ponds around the parcel shown in the plans. The Applicant explained that that these were potential storm water treatment areas and are mostly marshy, not ponds. Greg W. asked if these areas would be fenced for safety purposes. The Applicant said no, this type of storm water treatment area is not typically fenced because it doesn't pose a safety risk.

Peter Erb said it is important in this project to implement LID practices to keep the existing wetlands functional. He also reminded the Board and the Applicant to be cognizant of the existing spring on the parcel and to be mindful when putting in utilities so as not to hit veins to that water source. The Applicant said their consultant is familiar with the existing water features of the site and feels confident that can be part of the plans to make that clear.

Jeff G. said they received late feedback from the Village Steering Committee on Friday regarding the interconnectivity of the project. He said they (he and the Applicant) believe they have created a plan which is responsive to the Town Plan and provides adequate interconnectivity via the N/S sidewalks and the sidewalk connectivity to the Village. Due to site elevations, he said, they cannot provide vehicular connectivity internally. He feels that an internal road requirement is opposite of what is desirable for walkability.

Greg W. voiced his concern with the dead-end roads in the plans. He said this is a relatively dense residential development with only one point of entrance/exit via CVU Road and only one via Rte. 116 to a dense commercial portion. The regulations say developers should avoid dead-end roads. The Applicant said this issue was raised in their memo dated 4/28/15, Item #4. The Applicant said they have had their civil engineer look at the ability for emergency exit/entrance and also noted that the proposed bike path access will be 10' wide which would allow some emergency vehicle access and also act as a second point of entrance/egress for pedestrian traffic. Alex W. encouraged the Board to consider other developments which do in fact incorporate dead-end roads (Creekside, Lyman Meadows). Dick J. asked about the elevation of the path access. The Applicant said emergency vehicles could make it. Jeff G. said their findings were that it would not be favorable to have a roadway through to CVU as it would likely become a bypass route from Rte. 116. Ted B. asked the Applicant how many houses will be served via the CVU access. The Applicant said about 62-65.

Ted B. asked about the solar array location. The Applicant said the solar array area of 1.5A will either be located behind the existing NRG building or in the SW portion of the parcel. If the array goes behind the NRG building, that area would not be totally cleared, some buffer would remain.

Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and to take up in deliberative session.** Andrea B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

University of Vermont Medical Center: Ashley Bond and John Floyd represented this application, seeking Sign Review to replace the current sign with a new one at the same location to reflect the recent name change. The proposed sign will be just over 6' tall and will have a sign area of approximately 15.89 sq. ft. on each side. Internal LED illumination is proposed. The sides of the upper half of the sign will also show illumination to make the two halves of the sign more distinct.

Greg W. asked that the Applicant be sure that the illumination of the sign does not impact drivers. John Floyd, of Design Signs out of Essex Junction, said the lighting is more of a design element than an illumination in this sign. Dick J. said Condition #1 addresses this issue.

Sarah M. asked about the color of the proposed sign. The Applicant said the base will be grey aluminum. The new sign will be set in the same place as the existing sign.

Ted B. asked about hours. The Applicant said the original permit does ask for accommodations to the established hours of 8-6. They would like to request that those hours be opened to 7-7. Alex W. reminded the Board that internally lit signs shall not be on unless it is within the hours of operation for the business. He suggested the Applicant modify their requested Hours of Operation (Order #2) to 7-7 so the Board can then accommodate their request for the sign to be on for those hours.

Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Ted B. made a **motion to accept the conditions as modified and to close the public hearing.** Andrea B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Bedard: George Bedard represented this application for Sketch Plan review for a 4-Lot Subdivision on a 53.35A lot located on the south side of Texas Hill. The proposal has three smaller lots ranging from 3-5A and a larger parcel of about 40A.

The Applicant demonstrated on each lot where potential house site envelopes might be located. He said he will try to have these nailed down in preliminary review. The Applicant proposes a "floating" envelope for Lot #4 which is 40+ acres with a variety of location options. He would agree that prior to permit issuing that being finalized. Dick J. said a final plat should show the building envelope. George B. said he could do that at a later time, or he could show a larger envelope but he would like some flexibility here. Greg W. said there was not much mention in the staff report regarding natural resources, etc. Alex W. said prior discussions about preserving the western side of the property for important N/S wildlife connectivity is what resulted in the proposed building envelopes being shown to the eastern side.

Dennis P. asked about the water supply to these lots. The Applicant said individual wells will serve each lot and they will have either individual or shared septic. George B. said the wells should be drilled slowly, taking time.

The Applicant said there was logging done on what will be Lot #4 last fall. There is a temporary access to the logging area. The proposed access to these lots will be almost directly across from Bishop Road.

Dennis P. asked about Item #3 in the staff report regarding engaging an engineer. George B. said there will be an engineer involved in the building and in the road construction as well as in the septic design. He said there will be a simple road association worked out to cover road maintenance, storm water and (possibly) septic.

Dennis P. asked about doing a site visit. The Board did not feel this was necessary. Sarah M. said she will visit on her own. She asked about the house sites being in the core wildlife habitat area. George B. said all these homes are technically in it as the entire area is considered core wildlife habitat.

Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public.

Susie Harris spoke as a resident of Bishop Road, she wonders also about the water supply. She worries about the potential impact on neighboring water supplies. Greg W. said the previous application for this parcel was for an 8-Lot Subdivision and at that time demonstrated adequate water supply. Ted B. said it is important to note also that the area of influence when a new well is drilled is localized. Susie H. also asked that adequate space be given between the septic and the proposed wells. George B. said the proposed septic will meet all state requirements for separation. Susie H. said she feel this subdivision has the potential to change her experience of her property a good deal. George B. said these homes will have similar traffic patterns as the existing homes in the neighborhood and will not be changing the nature of the neighborhood in his opinion. The regulations, he added, like developers to cluster homes and he feels he has done this with adequately sized lots. Susie H. asked for clarification regarding potential clearing to accommodate these homes. George B. said Lot #4 does preserve forestry rights and the other lots will allow for firewood cutting, etc. There will be cutting necessary for house site clearing as well. Susie H. asked about the expected timeline for these homes to be built and sold. George B. said homes go up in about 3-4 months once a lot sells.

George B. noted a power source on an adjoining lot to the North and said he would like to bring it overhead as brook erosion has created potential issues with destabilization.

Dick J. asked how and when to address the potential building envelope on Lot #4. Alex W. recommended the Board restrict this to a single building envelope which will respect the natural features of the site. He said this does not preclude future buyers from coming back to revise the envelope. Peter E. said he feels that Lot #3's configuration limits the building envelope potential of that lot.

Ted B. made a **motion to close the public hearing and take up in deliberative session.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0**.

Other Business: Alex W. announced that Peter E. will be retiring at the end of June. The Board thanked him for his work, guidance and input over the years. Alex W., Trever L., and Peter E. have had discussions regarding his succession. Alex W. said they would ultimately like to pursue separating the Zoning Administrator duties from the DRB and creating a full-time DRB coordinator position and hiring a part-time Zoning Administrator.

Greg W. **made a motion to close the public meeting and to go into deliberative session to discuss the Davis & Jenkins application decisions.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.** The Board went into deliberative session at 9:16pm.

The meeting adjourned at 10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary