

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**September 15, 2015**

Approved 10/6

Members Present: Sarah Murphy, Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, Andrea Bayer, Dennis Place, John Lyman.

Members Absent: Greg Waples.

Representing Applications: Jeff Glassbery, Jan Blomstrann, Kevin Worden, Alan & Hilde Caswell, Pamela Pratt, Bill Maclay, Kurt Violette.

Public Present:

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.

Ted B. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 9/1/15**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. Andrea B. abstained from the vote. The Board voted **5-0**.

**Wind Energy Associates/ Renewable NRG Systems:** Ct'd from 4/7, 5/5. The application for PUD Sketch Plan Review was reopened to discuss additional issues. The Board addressed concerns regarding 1) Steep slope development. The Applicant showed elevations with stairs in a terrace design with paths, parking access, decks, back yards and areas denoted for overflow/visitor parking. The Applicant voiced their preference for 18-20' road width but said they can accommodate stricter requirements if the Board sees fit. Ted B. said he was concerned with the inclusion of the sidewalk, road, etc. getting to be a wide area—60' or so—between buildings. The Applicant said this design is the same as the one they showed previously now being shown to scale with existing contours and grades shown in the elevations. There will be some cut/fill in this portion of the project, the Applicant said, but they feel that it is totally achievable. The Applicant said they have considered these plans in the context of a cohesive, connected and walkable project.

Dick J. said he has a safety concern with having two sides of the road with parking on both sides; when backing in and out, will there be adequate room? The Applicant said they can add width if the Board wishes but they were aiming to create a more village like setting. John L. asked about road width requirements. Alex W. cited the standards which require 22' width in the village. The Applicant said they can ask for a variance as part of the PUD review process.

The Board looked at the north end of the property and saw plans for additional overflow parking for the proposed townhouses. Also here, the Applicant said, they can make the road 22' wide if the Board requires it but they would ask for a variance to 20' which they feel is more appropriate for denser development and smart growth as it slows traffic and enhances the relationship between the house site and the street and encourages pedestrian inclusion. The Applicant pointed out other engineering variables such as curbs, curves and parking which are all considered in the proposal and design development stage. VTrans is also reconsidering road width standards and design speeds the Applicant

noted. The Applicant offered other references to support the implementation of narrower roads. The Board viewed a sample of photographs of roads taken by the Applicant for a point of visual reference. The Applicant also encouraged the Board to consider the environmental impact of narrower roads in terms of less impervious surface area. Bill Mclay, landscape architect for the project, noted access to additional parking underground. There will be emergency vehicle access to all buildings.

The Applicant reviewed the percentages of the mixed use feature of this proposal; roughly breaking down to 12% residential, 56% manufacturing, 32% office.

Dennis P. asked about the previous discussion about the small "triangle" of green space and where the Applicant had landed on that. The Applicant said they are submitting both, noting the previous one with buildings around the green space was the original.

John L. asked about the impact of the underground parking on storm water/run off and infiltration. The Applicant said runoff is discharged further down site to the wetlands.

The Board had no further questions. There were no public comments or questions.

Ted B. made a **motion to close the public hearing and take up in deliberative session.** Andrea B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

**Pratt/Violette:** Conditional Use for Expansion of a Non-Complying Structure. Pam Pratt and Kurt Violette presented this application to the Board in a request to allow for a ramp accessing the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the rebuilt shed on property located on their property. The original shed was destroyed in a winter storm in 2010. The new shed, built in the same footprint as the original, is now a 2 story (original was a single story). The Applicants showed where a new driveway has also replaced the old one. The Applicants said they feel that this project, which resulted in less than 100 sq. ft. of new impervious surface area (an increase of .03%), should not have required a permit. Additionally, they pointed out, they feel that the ramp fits in with the environment and noted it is as far from the lake as possible.

The Applicant said they are willing to restore the old driveway area to a grassed area to improve the impervious surface area to offset their overall impact and noted there is existing vegetation below the ramp which improves the infiltration there naturally. They have also planted vegetation to increase infiltration overall across the lot.

Andrea B. questioned calling the new structure a shed based on photos shown. Alex W. said the original structure was permitted as such. Dick J. referred to Peter Erbs' report which notes that the new structure was more than what the original was and there seems to have been some question in his mind as the Zoning Administrator at the time of if a C.O should be renewed. The Board acknowledged some submissions from adjoining neighbors regarding the new structure possibly being used as a living space with water and electricity hooked up. The Applicant countered that there are no added exterior walls for structural lateral support and there is no water or wastewater hooked up. There is electricity. The Applicant said they are aware of the state requirements and assured the Board that at this time, they are not seeking to do that. For now, it will be a woodworking shop and additional storage for family items. He asked the Board if in the future he wanted to possibly use the structure for his kids to sleep or eat in, that would be an option? Ted B. said the key in this regard is if any rooms are considered bedrooms which has an impact to septic regulation by the state. This property, he noted, appears to

meet the shoreline septic standards and there are some conversion allowances. The Applicant said composting toilets might also allow some flexibility. Alex W. said that would also be the states prevue.

Dick J. asked about density; there are 3 units on 1 lot in the shoreline here. Alex W. noted that one is an accessory apartment which is allowed by the state. The other, the main residence as it were, is actually a camp. Alex W. reminded the Board that this parcel already has too much on it and is noncompliant.

Dennis P. opened discussion to the public. K.S. (Phyllis' daughter & proxy; adjoining landowner)voiced her concern with the draft approval regarding no future options left for parking or additional impervious surface area (i.e. stairs) which would potentially impact her mothers' ability to add a parking spot or stairs which she was hoping to do in the future. Alex W. said the Applicants' have offered to reseed a significant area where the previous driveway was which will offset that impervious surface limitation.

Alan Caswell, an adjoining neighbor to the north, explained the ownership of the road and connecting driveways.

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

**Brenda Farrington:** 2-Lot Subdivision Sketch Plan Review. Brenda F. presented this application to the Board, showing parcel maps with structures and proposed boundary lines for lots 1 & 2. A shared driveway and proposed driveway were shown. Natural features and primary resources of the parcel were demonstrated, including streams, slopes and core wildlife habitat. The existing driveway was noted to be at least partially within a stream buffer zone.

The Board discussed the potential financial impact of subdividing with the Applicant.

Dick J. asked if there was any road frontage on this parcel. Alex W. reminded the Board that the regulations allow up to 2 houses on a dead end road without frontage.

Dennis P. said he would like a site visit to see the proposed house site and the slopes. Sarah M. asked about the width/length ratio of this parcel. Alex W. sited Section 2.5.7 and said that Lot 2 is more than 5 acres so it will be ok.

Ted B. made a **motion to continue the public hearing to 10/6 with a site visit prior to the meeting (6pm)**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**.

Sarah M. made a **motion to close the public hearing and go into deliberative session to discuss the Usher, Enos and Dee applications**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**. The Board entered deliberative session at 9:15pm.

The meeting adjourned at \*\*\*\*\*pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary