

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**March 15th, 2016**  
*Approved 4/5/16*

Members Present: Dennis Place, Ted Bloomhardt, John Lyman, Dick Jordan, Greg Waples. Sarah Murphy, arrived at 7:37pm. Members Absent: Andrea Bayer.

Representing Applications: Trever Lashua, Jim Wagner, Jason Barnard, Chris Neme, Richard Faesy.

Public Present: Tom Ayer, Andrew Bortnick, Zoe Dawson, Mike Bissonette.

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:** There were no agenda changes. There were no public comments for non-agenda items.

**Minutes:** Ted B. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 3/1/16.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **5-0.**

**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. Ct'd from 3/01/16.

Trevor Lashua reviewed the top five main items based on feedback and comments from the previous discussion.

#1) Easements and Legal Language; this is not yet drafted, but the legal language has been provided which lays out items to be covered.

#2) Handicap Parking; there are now 6 dedicated parking spaces for the future tenants. Handicap parking requirements are met and the space is now closer than previously shown. Dick J. voiced his concerns with calling it "shared" space if it is being dedicated to the business. Alex W. said this is in fact on par with the legal language of shared use. He also feels that this application does meet the ADA requirements. He pointed out that the handicap parking space should be marked as such either with painting, striping or signage (it isn't at this time).

#3) Landscaping; To preserve the maximum future flexibility for the area on Lot 1, the Applicant now proposes that 3% of construction costs be set aside to be used with a time frame of 5 years for street trees along the connector road, etc. Additionally, the Applicant agrees with comments from Paul Wiczoreck's suggestions regarding preservation of some existing trees on site.

#4) Gravel Path; The gravel path will not be used year round and the Applicant feels that the money is better spent in Lot 1. Sidewalks will be maintained year round, the Applicant noted. Greg W. asked if the Applicant was amenable to a time table here as with the landscaping. The Applicant agreed and suggested 5 years. Greg W. felt that was too long but Dick J. pointed out that it is consistent with the build-out of the rest of the park. Greg W. conceded that point but emphasized the importance of access over landscaping.

#5) Erosion and Storm Water Control; the Board was provided with several maps demonstrating stormwater runoff patterns. Alex W. said this is a simple site, it should all work, and more clarity is now provided with the maps.

John L. asked the Applicant to identify the area in front of the fire house to keep people from walking across.

Sarah M. voiced some concern with sheet flow over 100'. Alex W. reiterated that this is an exceedingly flat site and he feels there is an adequate system for the water to enter into. Sarah M. asked that the Applicant consider sidewalk and road elevations as they relate to and impact runoff as well. Alex W. said he has already mentioned this to the civil engineer. Sarah M. asked the Applicant to consider a catch basin. Alex W. said that would need to be engineered at the development of Lot 1, if it is even necessary. He said he does not feel that there is a drainage issue. Sarah M. asked that the Applicant consider the issue thoroughly now to potentially save costs later.

Dick J. asked if there are concerns with washout at the end of the pavement. Alex W. said no, due again to the slightness of grade.

Ted B. said to the right of the building, is that existing pavement to be removed? Trevor L. said yes and described plans to remove the pavement and work that area into the landscaping plan.

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

Chris Neme and Richard Faesy represented the new owners of the building, EFG. They described their business and landscaping proposal. They are anticipating two types of uses occupying three portions of the building. Potential retail will occupy the 1<sup>st</sup> floor; upstairs will be two offices to be leased out. The existing garage will be torn down and replaced with a two-story building where our business offices will reside. They described a zero net energy goal with ultra-energy efficiency standards to be implemented in any new construction. The landscaping plan partially extends beyond their property line, but the Applicants feel that it benefits aesthetically the overall landscaping of the site and they are prepared to spend the extra money to be good citizens of the Town.

Outdoor lighting will be dark sky compliant and the Applicants ask that the Board allow conditional approval with regard to final design details.

The Applicants noted that the building height on the new construction may be slightly higher than the existing building due to 7' ceiling heights in the cape. Dick J. asked about scale as the windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor seem a bit high in the elevations shown. The Applicant said that they believe the scale is accurate and pointed out that those windows on the north side are where the kitchen is so they may in fact be higher than the windows in the front.

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

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft conditions of approval.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

**James Wagner:** Conditional Use Review of an accessory apartment on an 18.76 acre parcel at 1890 Gilman Road in the Ag District. The Applicant is seeking approval for the construction of an accessory apartment separate from the existing structure.

A draft decision was provided to the Board.

Specific Accessory Apartment regulations have not changed. The Applicant has to demonstrate evidence of state wastewater permits. The Board had no issues with the application. There were no public comments or questions.

Dennis P. **made a motion to approve as written draft approval.** Ted B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.**

**Theresa D. Giroux Revocable Living Trust/Annette Besaw:** Final Plat Review of a 2-lot subdivision of a 10.52 acre parcel located at 429 & 431 Richmond Road in the RR1 District. Lot 1 would be 2.05a with the existing house and detached accessory dwelling. Lot 2 would be 8.47a on the south end of the property and is not proposed for development at this time.

Jason Bedard represented this application. He showed that the plan has been scaled back from a 3-Lot to a 2-Lot subdivision based on feedback from staff. Existing access will be maintained. There is no new impervious surface area proposed. State wastewater permit paperwork has been submitted. The Applicant will talk with neighbors about relocating an existing box shed, garden plot and lean-to as they encroach onto the southern portion of Lot 2, although it has no effect on this process. Easement and deed language has been drafted. The Board was provided with a draft decision.

Dennis P. **made a motion to approve as written draft approval.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.** The Applicant will check with the Town regarding water allocation.

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and go into deliberative session to discuss the Goodrich decision.** Ted B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0 and entered deliberative session at 8:23pm.**

The Board **voted 5-0** for the Goodrich Sketch Plan Approval. Greg W. abstained.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freedra Powers, Recording Secretary