

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
September 1, 2015
Approved 9/15

Members Present: Sarah Murphy, Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, Greg Waples, Dennis Place, John Lyman.

Members Absent: Andrea Bayer

Representing Applications: Karl Usher, Mike Dee, David Bissonette, Peter Lazorchak.

Public Present: Ken Castonguay.

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.

Dennis P. reviewed the rules & procedures for the meeting.

Greg W. made a **motion to approve minutes of 8/4/15**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. Ted B. abstained from the vote. The Board voted **5-0**.

Ted B. made a **motion to approve minutes of 8/11/15**. Greg W. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **6-0**.

Usher: Ct'd from 8/11. The Board continued review of proposed revisions to the shared driveway that serves the subdivision on Pond Road. Four specific revisions were discussed: Relocation, Slope/Grade, Crown & Storm Water Drainage.

The applicants demonstrated a 25yr storm event design as the plan. The applicant said they are also keeping the crown in the driveway for favorable drivability and constructability. Greg W. asked if the overall impact of these changes will increase the runoff to the south. The applicant said yes, to the south, but there is a swale there and there was always going to be runoff regardless. Also, he noted, the existing culvert directs water at the end of the driveway to the north. Sarah M. asked about the depth of that swale. The applicant guessed that the grass swale is about 1' deep or so. Greg W. noted that testimony has indicated that though there may be an increase in water runoff volume there will in fact be a decrease in the velocity at which it leaves the parcel. The Board viewed the modeling summary.

Greg W. asked about input from the town road foreman. Alex W. said he did receive a voicemail from the road foreman, Mike Anthony, but that he could not make it to the meeting tonight. According to his message, he is in favor of the 25yr design but remains concerned with drainage to the SW ending up impacting Pond Road. Greg W. said he feels persuaded that all things considered this is a good application. Ted B. agreed.

Dennis P. addressed the staff report and asked about stone rip-rap. The applicant said this was simply an oversight and that it is standard practice that they will of course follow.

Dennis P. opened discussion to the public. David B. voiced his concerns with where the runoff travels, asking specifically about the swale on the south side. The applicant explained that the swale carries runoff to the culvert which sends it north.

Ted B. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft approval language.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

Enos: Final Plat Review. George Bedard presented this application to the Board. Addressing staff concerns regarding width/depth requirements. He explained that this proposal is within the 21% threshold. Regarding concerns about development on slopes, George B. said it is likely the house site will slide south to where the contours show less steep slopes. He also pointed out an additional berm behind the proposed house site and noted the high infiltration of existing soils on the site. Regarding drainage concerns, George said, there will be no increase in runoff to the ditches.

Regarding the road association being formed for these three lots; there is an existing road agreement in place. The Board discussed the possibility of amending the existing agreement to add these three lots. Greg W. said this makes him think it would be a wise idea to revisit our stance on road associations; as in a case like this where there seems to be a functioning agreement in place already do we need to require a new association with subdivisions? George B. said he feels that his proposal covers all bases.

The Board discussed this application in terms of the new stormwater regulations and found that lots 1 & 3 do not trigger the new rules, but Lot 2 does. For Lot 2, George B. said, they would like to request that they work with the rules once they are settled out and agree to address Lot 2 prior to receiving any building permit. He added that he would like to see LID practices spelled out more clearly.

Dick J. asked about plans for clearing. George B. said it is mostly open hardwood there—not dense. He does not feel that buyers will be looking at these lots in terms of clearing or forestry and suggested no clearcutting outside of the building envelopes perhaps only for the purposes of solar, yard or firewood.

George B. noted that there will be an easement on Lot 3 for drainage. Dennis P. asked if the deed for Lot 3 allows for the storm water control for Lot 2. George B. said yes, it is agreed and they will need to have that control.

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

Dennis P. made a **motion to close the public hearing and take up in deliberative session.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

Dee Physical Therapy: Sign Review. Mike Dee presented this application to the Board for proposed plans for signage for Dee Physical Therapy on Farmall Drive. Originally, the applicant proposed 7 signs for the business.

Sign 'A') Greg W. voiced his concern with the "goose-neck" style of lights and their potential impact on drivers and suggested they should be adjustable. Dick J. suggested alternatively an LED strip of lights on the sign itself.

Sign 'B') Greg W. said he had no problem with.

Sign 'C') Greg W. said he feels it simply does not fit with the rest of Hinesburg; it seems too much. The Applicant said it was simply to advertise the different services provided but he said he is amenable to feedback and understands the comment. The Applicant withdrew his request for sign 'C'.

Sign 'D') The Applicant also withdrew proposed plans for this sign.

Sign 'E') The Applicant agreed with staff comments and withdrew sign 'E' as well.

Sign 'F') Greg W. and John L. both did not care for. The Applicant heard their comments and withdrew sign 'F' as well, but said he would like a sign here to indicate "ENTRANCE" with a directional arrow towards the entrance of the business (Door graphics).

Sarah M. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft approval language.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

Storm Water Regulation Revisions: The Board discussed the Select Boards' recently adopted storm water regulation revisions. 1) On construction sites, follow the states' yellow hand book. This addresses erosion control and goes on to require a plan if the project meets 4 criteria. 2) Require that projects that create over 10,000sq.ft of impervious surface an engineer for certified plans (just a lower threshold than the state). 3) Plans to be certified by an engineer post-construction and provide provisions for inspections. 4) LID implementation (or demonstrate why not). Sarah M. asked for clarification on the 10% rule. Alex W. said it refers to how far off-site to do analysis of project impacts. The regulation revisions also note that smaller projects within the Village Growth Area to require incremental improvements that match the project impacts. Also, the Town can now compel applicants to pay for individual reviews.

Other Business: There is an alternate spot open on the Board. John Lyman has been appointed to the DRB by the Select Board.

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and go into deliberative session to discuss the Balchiunas and Enos applications.** Sarah M. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.** The Board entered deliberative session at 9:40pm.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary