

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**March 1st, 2016**  
*Approved 3/15/16*

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

Representing Applications: Trever Lashua, Andrea Haulenbeek, Grace Cioffi, Bill Schubart, Alex & Malyn Dziurzynski.

Public Present: Tom Ayer, Jamie Carroll, Jeff Davis, Paul W. (tree warden).

Also present: Freeda Powers (Recording Secretary) and Annie Geratowski (DRB Coordinator).

Dennis P. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:31pm.

**Agenda Changes:**

**Minutes:** Dennis P. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 2/16/16**. Ted B. **seconded the motion**. Andrea B. abstained. The Board voted **6-0**.

**Town of Hinesburg/Old Police Station:** Combined Preliminary & Final Plat Review for the subdivision of, and a PUD on a .85acre parcel; also for Conditional Use Review for office space exceeding 1,000 sq. ft. The property is located on the west side of VT Rte. 116 and the south side of Farmall Drive in the Village Zoning District.

The Board reviewed elements of the proposal and went over staff comments in the Staff Report. Specifically noted were parking spaces (now a total of 8 shown) and the connection from the parking lot to the building (via sidewalks and across the garage entrance). Dick J. voiced his concerns with counting existing on-street parking spaces which are also claimed by other development. Alex W. assured the Board that this is indeed how shared parking is intended and calculated to work. Dick J. also voiced his concern with meeting ADA requirements regarding the long distance between parking and structure. Sarah M. agreed. In response to some of the Applicants requests regarding putting off such things as park infrastructure, she added that she has a problem with elements that we (the Board) thought were necessary now not being implemented. She reminded the Applicant that the DRB regularly asks developers to put in everything (i.e., infrastructure & public spaces).

Tom Ayer spoke from the audience saying he does not feel that the distance is excessive nor burdensome. He said he feels the give and take is there in this proposal. Furthermore, he said regarding infrastructure (sidewalks) he would hate to see us build something that we may not need. The sidewalk along Rte. 116 needs to be upgraded, he said and in this plan, it would be.

John L. voiced his concern with pedestrians crossing in front of the garage where there is no existing sidewalk; could we condition striping or painted lines? Tom A. said there is a sidewalk on the eastern

side of the building. Trevor L. said the frequency of vehicle traffic there is minimum (primarily a.m. & p.m. periods). Sarah M. asked if the Applicants have spoken with the Police Department regarding this issue. Trevor L. said they have had a preliminary discussion at the beginning of the application.

Regarding storm water, Item #3 in the Staff Report, Alex W. said that Otter Creek did the analysis and that the engineer indicates that the site is flat with nothing extravagant needed in regards to storm water. Typical silt fencing is absent from the plan and we can ask to add that, he said. Greg W. asked what about water pooling issues previously noted in the Farmall Drive area. Alex W. said those issues were primarily related to a plug issue which has since been resolved. Dennis P. asked about potential impacts to the sewer line. Trevor L. said it is preferred not to build on top of the sewer line. He is unclear on line depths, however.

Dick J. asked how will run-off get to where it's going; existing swales? Alex W. explained that run-off will go down the road to the catch basin and said he is unsure on the north side. Dick J. said the applicant needs to be sure to slope or grade appropriately prior to building the parking lot. Ted B. asked if the parking area will be gravel or paved? Trevor L. said paved. Alex W. clarified that we do not have a timeline for when the area will be paved and that it will likely begin as gravel. He added that the EFG company has done a Landscaping Plan for their project and noted that the Town wishes to put off their Landscaping Plan until later. Some of the EFG plan is off their lot.

A representative from EFG spoke from the audience, saying their lot is very small and that their landscaping proposal is to extend help to the Town. Dick J. asked who would be responsible for the landscaping so far as replacements, maintenance, etc., would that be EFG or the Town? The representative said it is his understanding that the landscaping that falls outside our property would no longer be their responsibility. He reiterated that their landscaping plans are an offer to help the town. Dick J. said he would like to know that the money is set aside. Alex W. said the Board can Condition it with a date certain. Dick J. said he would like the money to be allocated and designated to Landscaping. Also, he said, he would like some clarification regarding ADA requirements. The Applicant asked if the Board was okay with the reduction of 1 parking space to 8. Greg W. responded by asking the Applicant if it works. The Applicant said they feel that for the current business it does. Greg W. suggested the Applicant consider the access road for shoulder space (parking potential). The Applicant said if the access road were to be restricted to one-way traffic that might be a short-term parking option. Alex W. said if a problem arises, the Applicant must come back to address it.

Regarding Shared Infrastructure and Legal Language, the Applicant has indicated that these are not done yet. An easement for wastewater means the Applicant needs to do a bit of research.

Regarding Lighting, EFG requests no specificity at this time in design. Alex W. suggested conditioning the Zoning Administrator to approve prior to C.O.

Waivers; the Applicant is requesting waivers regarding minimum lot depth and size.

PUD Standards regarding the building location of the new police station; due to a Zoning Administration error, Alex W. explained, there is not a compliance issue since it is preexisting. Dick J. asked if the lot line could be moved. Alex W. said yes, or eliminated, but we'd rather not.

Ted B. said there should be a gravel path included in the plans and asked the Applicant to provide estimated cost for this. Trevor L. said it would not be maintained in winter. Dick J. asked about the timeframe for pavement removal of the old police station parking area. Alex W. said Summer/Fall.

Sarah M. asked if the Applicant will be doing parking in Phase 1. Alex W. said yes, with the connector road. Paul W. spoke from the audience, saying there are a couple of existing trees likely to be impacted; he asked the Board to condition to have the Town pay to have them transplanted. The Applicant was okay with this. Paul W. addressed sidewalk design along Rte. 116, saying we can add one more Oak tree to continue them if the "jog" is closer to the building. Ted B. agreed, saying he supports and encourages this. Trevor L. said the ROW of Rte. 116 is reviewed and handled by the State and VTrans so it may take time to make any changes there.

The Board agreed to combine Preliminary and Final Plat Review. Ted B. made a **motion to continue the public hearing to the 3/15/16 meeting**. Greg W. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 7-0**.

**Molly Daly/John & Priscilla Sheehan:** Conditional Use Review of a woodshed added to a previously existing non-compliant structure on a .57acre property located at 426 Turkey Lane in the Ag District.

Bill S. spoke as the new owner of the house, he said he was made aware of a zoning issue with the existing wood shed (addition to a larger shed). There are no intended changes or adjustments. He said the shed has been there for years. Neighbors have been notified and voiced no concerns. The area the wood is kept is open, like a lean-to, with a roof. The Board had no issues. Greg W. **made a motion to approve**. Dick J. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 7-0**.

**Malyn & Alexander Dziurzynski:** Conditional Use Review of a Non-Compliant Structure and revisions to a Subdivision Final Plat for two properties located at 90& 108 Shadow Lane in the RR1 & Shoreline Districts. The Applicant is seeking to merge to adjacent properties, remove the 2 existing seasonal camps, and build a year round single family home.

The Applicants reviewed their proposal to combine 2 lots and build a home. Dennis P. noted that the properties are in two districts. Greg W. asked about potential impacts to neighbors' viewsheds. The Applicants said they will be improving the neighbors' views by tearing down the 2 existing seasonal camps upslope. Greg W. asked about storm water runoff control. The Applicant said they have a personal interest in landscaping in ways to aide runoff and drainage along Shadow Lane. They hope to make improvements with fir trees and other vegetative plantings. The high side of the property allows space for potential relocation of a lower culvert to widen it or add rocks.

Currently the lots both have overgrown gravel driveways. The Applicant requests to keep the larger 14' culvert in place for additional access/egress to the property but do not plan on using the existing driveways.

Greg W. asked about an existing shed shown on the parcel map. The Applicant said it is a garden shed, less than 10X10', and they will be keeping it. The Applicant said they have tried to remain creative in design to remain a low profile to respect the neighbors and the neighborhood. They noted that the new

home will have a similar footprint as the existing structure. They also reiterated their eager desire to consider landscaping to aide and improve as they can storm-water and runoff from the property.

Greg W. asked about septic. The Applicant said they are looking at traditional pumping system. They have met with a state engineer and the area has been selected and soils have been tested.

Jamie Carroll spoke from the audience, as an adjacent landowner, he said he is overall supportive of the application and feels it is progress for the neighborhood. He feels the site plan is hard to read; setbacks appear to be from the property line rather from center of road. There are no home dimensions given either. He feels the structure is unique for the area. He feels that the roof design sends water up the hill. He recommends a rain garden or some other mitigation there. He also voiced concerns with sufficient parking.

Jeff Davis spoke, saying he feels the design is incomplete. Where, for example, is the location of the well? Also, what is the siding material? He would like to see these details. Also, he said, we have do have an Association and he asked the Board to Condition the Applicants to join.

Brian Washburn spoke, he owns two lots on Shadow Lane, voicing his concerns in regards to septic. The Applicant said they will be filling three existing shallow wells. Jamie C. spoke, citing Section 1.3 which mentions lots in 2 districts and notes the potential for higher lot coverage. Annie G. said she has already spoke with the Applicants about this option. Greg W. said he feels that water is an issue here—we may need more info prior to finalizing. The Applicant said they have had engineers out to the property and did not want to continue spending money prior to knowing what the Boards' feedback and allowances would be. Dennis P. made a **motion to continue the public hearing to the 4/5/16 meeting**. Andrea B. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 7-0**.

**Andrea Haulenbeek:** Conditional Use Review for an Integrated Ag Operation on an approximately 182 acre property located at 1568 Baldwin Road in the Ag District. The Applicant proposes to host events in a reconstructed barn.

The Applicant reviewed with the Board her proposal to host events in a reconstructed barn sitting on an old foundation. The barn yard has been covered in crushed stone. There will be no net increase of impervious surface. The barn will be used to host events as mentioned in the Town Plan, she said, to preserve the open land and open farms, preserve the quality of the neighborhood. She feels strongly that the barn is a beautiful addition, and absolutely matches the rural character of the area. The Fire Marshall has said the barn is adequately sized for 500 standing/200 seated people. The parking areas have been paced and measured and are adequately sized for save vehicle space. The septic for the house is fine, the Applicant said, they will likely use port-a-potty for events. Water supply depends on the use; the Applicants feel the existing well (drilled in 2008) is fine, noting that the proposal does not qualify for state regulation since it is not in use a large enough percent of the year. The Applicant said no other houses will be impacted in the area. She showed the Board photos of the reconstructed barn.

The Board reviewed Staff Comments. Regarding Hours of Operation, the Board was okay with flexible hours so long as the Applicants agreed to no amplified music after 10pm and everybody to be off the premises by 12 midnight. Regarding traffic, the Board understands that the events will be limited in number (by weather). Also, parking is not to be on Baldwin Road. Signage is important and needs to be

visible. The Applicant would like another 35mph sign on Baldwin Road. The Board told her to address the Select Board with this request. Circulation will be one-way. Regarding lighting, it should provide safety for visitors but must be downcast and shielded per regulations on outdoor lighting.

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft conditions of approval.** Andrea B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Greg W. made a **motion to adjourn.** Andrea B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.** The meeting adjourned at 10:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary