

Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
August 26, 2015

Approved 9/23

Members Present: Maggie Gordon, Aaron Kimball, Joe Iadanza, James Donegan, Kyle Bostwick, Jeff French, Dennis Place.

Members Absent: Russell Fox, Rolf Kielman.

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

Public Present: Johanna White, Carrie Fenn, Peter & DeeDee Erb, Barbara Forauer.

Joe I. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:34pm.

There were no changes to the agenda. There were no non-agenda items.

Storm Water Regulations: The Commissioners discussed the Select Board's interest in flexibility in the bylaws to rate sites/development (risk level) so as not to have the same level of review for all. The possibility of risk categorization was discussed. Maggie G. said the risk evaluation is there for the erosion control portion within the state guidelines, however, the new regs also address storm water. This does not address impervious surface which is what we as a Commission were working on. Joe I. agreed, adding that he is not personally in favor of rolling back the agreed upon threshold of impervious surface area (10K sq.) The Select Board also questions whether the requirement for a licensed engineer is a level of rigor necessary in all cases. Joe I. said he also agrees with Maggie's point that this addresses erosion control but that a long-term rating (storm water) is harder to do. Maggie G. said it is difficult to just look at a site and determine its' risk level based on impervious surface alone.

Kyle B. said we want to address runoff and we also want to encourage development in areas of a site which will have the least impact. Maggie G. said this is tied to the benefits of the required engineers' report as developing in higher risk areas will cost more as well. Kyle B. asked why wouldn't we differentiate or define risk. Alex W. said it is also important to consider that not only storm water plans determine where on a lot development should happen, adding that storm water control offers an engineered solution.

Kyle B. clarified his point, saying storm water plans wouldn't allow or disallow a development envelope, would simply hold projects to a higher standard based on the impacts of that location. Alex W. said he is not sure that an engineer on a given project would best know the site. Joe I. said he understands the struggle but frankly does not know how to determine susceptibility or risk of a site with a simpler checklist. We're asking developers to also consider impact to the downstream properties and greater watershed. Maggie G. said the threshold we have set means we are not talking about the average .5acre lot. Alex W. said no, but it will affect many rural lots. Kyle B. said the 10,000 Sq. ft. threshold seems appropriate in some areas, and in others he feels the number should even be lower; that area will not look or impact the same in all parts of Hinesburg. He cautions against painting all projects with the same brush. Joe I. agreed, saying it's in the broader scope of the Commission's list of priorities i.e., Shoreline and Steep Slope Protection.

James D. suggested a simpler calculation to assess risk value; XXX' from a body of water or XXX% slope = lower thresholds. Kyle B. said without delving into such things as soil type, infiltration, etc. this would be difficult to simplify. Maggie G. said it is important to remember that all of the watershed is connected. Joe I. said the % of the watershed definition mitigates on its own and almost provides a level of risk; it almost establishes for us an increased risk for parcels higher up on hills.

Dennis P. asked about how to address cumulative impacts in subdivisions. Joe I. said while subdivisions do not at this time consider the cumulative effects, it is also difficult to address the cumulative impacts of single lot development; in that regard, at least subdivisions offer Master Plans and allow for engineering. He added that we should definitely be incentivizing Master Plans in his opinion. Jeff F. said he feels that the 10K sq. threshold the Commission came to is a good place to be. He said it is important to remember that we as a town and as property owners will pay for it in engineering, town complexity in regulations, or in the cleanup of aftermath but there is a cost to pay somehow and we should be wise in deciding how we see that bigger picture. We can always improve but he feels this is a good start. Dennis P. agreed. Joe I. gave the example of a longer vs. steeper driveway on a steep slope parcel. He points out that we want to give dispensation for good decision making.

Alex W. read the states' 1st inch rainfall treatment standards and recommended that someone in the Planning Commission contact Millie Archer if they feel that the Select Board was right.

Joe I. opened the meeting to public comments. Carrie F. spoke from the audience, saying she feels that the Commission should stand their ground. Barbara F. spoke from the audience, saying she agrees with Jeff's' comments that we will pay one way or another and that if that payment comes in the form of clean-up after flooding, we all pay. She encouraged the Commission to keep the threshold as is.

Village Rezoning-Better Defining Mixed Use: The Commissioners discussed what the expectation/intent of designating the Village/VNE/VNW areas as "mixed use" is, and asked is that ultimately being reflected in what they see thus far. The aim of this discussion was to offer guidance and clarity to the DRB review process and to avoid single category development phases (i.e., all residential). Maggie G. offered a brief review of her study of the existing development in the Village core area (Silver Street to Kinney Drug area).

The Commission discussed the definition of Mixed-Use; to mean a combination of uses, both residential and non-residential within a single building. Joe I. said it is also important to consider scale in this discussion; are we talking about development on a single lot, or within a cluster of lots? How does that mixed-use get spread out? James D. said along those lines, also consider scale in the sense of larger lots i.e., a 100acre lot. Peter E. spoke from the audience, saying the goal is not just mixed-use but also the types of uses within that mix which should be considered. Consider, he suggested, what types of uses you want and will allow in the village growth area and then how to get them here.

There was some discussion about how the types of development you allow also impact the types of jobs such development will attract and can or cannot support; i.e., small or light industrial. The kinds of buildings we're getting at this point are not what manufacturing use needs. Joe I. said for larger number of use types, we don't necessarily need segregation. Alex W. said here is one place where Form Based Code could help as it is hard to know what future uses might be but it is easier to define what uses might

need in terms of loading docks, etc. In FBC, we could accommodate a class of use. Jeff F. said mixed-use and livability of a community means to work, live, eat, etc. all within the town. He feels that we need a quota % or developers will just say they can only do what the market will bear. Kyle B. said a quota would be tough—where do we want light industrial, etc.? Joe I. said Master Plans with more specificity would help; not to draw out specific areas but to also tell us how the lots are purposed and connected.

The Commission had a discussion about the best approach and the difference of planning vs. building for a desired use. Classes of use were discussed as an option. Joe I. cautioned on the level of specificity in order to allow the market to dictate what fits in but to designate the class itself. Jeff F. said it would be wise also to keep an eye on the balance of needed uses. Kyle B. noted the four pillars of a livable community: Eat, Sleep, Work, and Live.

Peter E. encouraged the Board to consider home occupations and the power of associations to prevent or refuse them.

Dennis P. said we should also be cognizant of the link between use & water/sewer needs.

Minutes from 8/12: Tabled to next meeting.

Other Business: The Board discussed the possible future sale of the old police department building. Alex W. said the new wells on the Wainer property will not be online until Feb/Mar rather than the anticipated Nov/Dec timeline. Jeff F. said Village Steering Committee design standards and feedback will be coming to the PC. Joe I. said a paired down version of the Economic Development Plan is coming.

Joe I. made a **motion to adjourn**. Maggie G. **seconded** the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:52pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary