

**Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board**

July 5, 2016

Approved 7/19

Members Present: Dennis Place, Dick Jordan, John Lyman, Rolf Keilman. Greg Waples arrived at 7:35pm.
Representing Applications: Ron Bovat, Chaya Thanhauser, Adam Randolph, April Thanhauser, Chuck Reiss, Andy White.

Public Present: Pat Mainer, Crocker Bennett, Chris Boerner.

Also Present: Dawn Morgan (Recording Secretary) and Annie Geratowski (DRB Coordinator).

Dennis P. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:33 pm.

Agenda Changes: none.

Minutes of 6/7 and 6/21: Dennis P. made a **motion to approve the 06/07/16 minutes as amended and 06/21/16 minutes as written.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **4-0 (Greg W. abstained).**

Ron Bovat: Conditional Use Review for replacement of an existing mobile home in an existing park with a larger mobile home, which would not meet the setback requirements, at 125 Jourdan Street (Site 13 in Sunset Lake Villa) in the Shoreline Zoning District.

Greg W. commented that the regulations are flexible in terms of dealing with setback issues and general congestion in mobile home parks. He noted that manufacturing standards have changed since the Planning Commission set the regulations and voiced a general concern regarding replacement of existing mobile homes in the park with larger mobile homes. He asked for clarification as to whether the Applicant was the park owner or the mobile home owner. Ron Bovat responded that he owns the mobile home but is representing the owner, Sunset Lake Villa % Brian Kaufman, from Massachusetts.

Greg W. reiterated that his concern is the possibility of overcrowding in the future as newer homes with larger footprints replace older, smaller homes. He noted, and Annie G. confirmed, that the Applicant should work with Staff, the Board and the Planning Commission prior to mobile home replacements for solutions to overcrowding and/or possible adjustment to current regulations.

There was additional discussion regarding fire and safety concerns should newer homes become situated too closely together, and whether or not there was enough space in the park to meet front and side yard setback requirements for larger homes.

Greg W. asked how power is run to the park. Ron B. said that all units have underground power conduit that extends from a pole.

There were no public comments. Dick J. made a **motion to approve the decision as written.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 5-0.**

Chaya Thanhauser & Adam Randolph: Conditional Use Review for an accessory apartment on their 18.41-acre property located at 193 Fletcher Farm Road in the Agricultural Zoning District. The applicants are proposing to build a freestanding, one-story-with-loft accessory structure.

Chaya T. (the landowner) initially spoke and introduced her mother, April Thanhauser, who is working with builder Chuck Reiss in designing an accessory apartment next to Chaya T. and Adam Randolph's home. April T. noted that a large part of the property is designated as a wetland, so they are being careful to stay in compliance with setback regulations. Their plan is to set the house outside of the wetland buffer zone. They additionally plan to install a new septic system that will serve both homes, as the existing septic system currently reaches into the wetland.

April T. is working with Chuck R. to design a net-zero home that utilizes only renewable energy power sources and are looking into a solar array to supply both the primary and the accessory dwellings. Chuck R. commented that the design currently falls within the 660 square feet maximum allowable size for the accessory apartment. Annie G. confirmed that the apartment cannot exceed the greater of 660 square feet or 30% of the total floor area of the single family home. Chuck R. stated that the plans call for a 219 square foot porch on one end with storage underneath, and a loft on the other end of the apartment. He further noted that the loft is within regulation height. The home is designed to utilize both active and passive solar, and will be insulated to an R-15 value.

Additionally, the plans call for a full unfinished basement, which Annie G. confirmed does not count as square footage (unless it is finished). Dick J. asked if there was a bathroom in the basement, and Chuck R. confirmed that there is not.

Greg W. asked if there was the potential for the two dwellings to be subdivided in the future. Annie G. confirmed that yes, the way the current design is drafted the accessory dwelling could potentially be divided from the primary residence.

Rolf K. asked if there was to be a shared access driveway and parking. Chuck R. confirmed that the driveway would be shared but that each dwelling is required to have two parking spaces. Dick J. asked if the apartment would be visible to Fletcher Farm. Chuck R. confirmed that it would be visible. He further noted that the Applicant had considered other siting locations but they were either rocky ledge or too close in proximity to the wetland, so the current site seems most logical to the Applicant.

Dennis P. opened discussion to the public. Pat Mainer said that she is supportive of the accessory apartment but expressed concern that trees will need to be removed for the installation of the shared driveway. She noted that there is an existing driveway and wondered if there was any way to utilize that driveway instead of creating a new one. Rolf K. asked whether the current driveway was to the west of the primary home. Chuck R. confirmed, but said that regulations require the creation of a shared drive. Annie G. clarified that accessory apartments cannot create new access roads, and inquired further as to whether there were any additional possibilities for parking. Chuck R. responded that the other possible driveway and parking locations were too rocky.

Crocker Bennet (a neighbor to the north of the primary home) requested that the Board take into consideration the essential character of the neighborhood, which he said consisted of few homes that are visible from the road. He explained that his property would look down onto the proposed structure and was concerned about the visibility of the proposed apartment. He noted that the primary home is tucked back within the tree line and is not visible from his property or the road, but that the apartment

would be clearly visible from the road. He suggested that there might be alternative siting locations within the tree line.

Crocker B. further expressed concern that the proposed structure is permanent and could be easily subdivided in the future by the current or future property owners. As such, he felt that the Board should be reviewing an application for subdivision, rather than for an accessory apartment, and requested that the Board deny the permit.

Chuck R. asked if he could respond, and Dennis P. allowed. Chuck R. explained that he and the Applicants have worked to follow all of the regulations and believes that the proposed design is an allowable use. The Applicant's intent was to build a home that could utilize solar energy both actively and passively, which he believes to be in keeping with the Town's renewable energy usage goals. He noted that to relocate the site would require the blasting of ledge and tree clearing, and said that the planned apartment would be located 80 feet from the nearest tree and is not placed too far out into the field. He said that the Applicant has worked diligently to comply with wetland regulations and believes the proposed location to be the best fit for all considerations.

Crocker B. mentioned that there is a large parking area in existence where the primary home is currently parking tractors and vehicles, and wonders if the Applicant could use that for access instead of building a new shared driveway. Dennis P. asked how far Crocker B.'s house is away from the proposed apartment. Crocker B. said approximately 500-700 feet, but emphasized that he is primarily concerned with maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

George W. said that he does not believe concern about uncharacteristic development applies to the proposed apartment. He further noted that the Board's role is not to protect views. Rolf K. confirmed that the slope from the primary dwelling to the proposed apartment would be about 20 feet. Andy White, of Reiss Building, commented that he believes that the design takes into account the neighborhood character, using clapboard barn board for siding which would be on par with the appearance of an agricultural barn or outbuilding.

Greg W. said that the current proposal seems unobjectionable, but may not be appropriate for subdivision planning in the future. He noted that the current or future property owners would need to go through a formal subdivision process at that time. Chaya T. responded that her understanding is that a subdivision would require an improved road, something they are not inclined to do at this time. Rolf K. inquired as to the planned roof material. Chuck R. said it would be standing seam in a color in keeping with the neighborhood.

Dennis P. made a motion to **close the public hearing and approve the decision as written**. John L. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 5-0**.

Other Business:

* Ted & Carol Bloomhardt: 6-month Extension of Sketch Plan Approval of a 2-lot subdivision at 1381 Silver Street — Greg W. mad a **motion to approve**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 5-0**.

* William & Colleen MacKinnon: 6-month Extension of Sketch Plan Approval of a 2-lot subdivision at 99 Black Dog Lane — Greg W. mad a **motion to approve**. Dennis P. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 5-0**.

Greg W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and adjourn.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 5-0.** The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dawn Morgan, Recording Secretary