

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
November 23, 2016
Approved December 14, 2016**

Members Present: Maggie Gordon, John Kiedaisch, Rolf Kielman, Joe Iadanza, Dennis Place

Members Absent: Russell Fox, Jeff French, Barbara Forauer, James Donegan

Public Present: Wade Snyder

Also Present: Dawn Morgan (Recording Secretary) and Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning)

Joe I. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:35 pm.

Agenda Changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Town Plan Revisions - Discuss possible revisions based on feedback to date:

Joe I. began the discussion by acknowledging the substantive and particular feedback that has been received to date. He noted the feedback from the CCRPC was something that the Commission should recognize and make amendments for. Joe I. then broached the question of how best to structure the discussion, given the amount of data available.

Alex W. reviewed the different sources of information (public hearing meeting minutes, emails and comments from the CCRPC). He offered the suggestion that he could move forward with making changes for some of the comments that are grammatical or otherwise non-substantive and don't necessarily call for Commission discussion. Joe I., John K. and Alex W. discussed some of the comments from the CCRPC that were required items by the State, and that those items along with their other suggestions could just be incorporated into the plan with limited discussion on the Commission's part.

John K. noted that the CCRPC asked in their comments whether the Town had participated in the development of the North Lake Champlain Basin Plan. He asked if the Town had indeed participated, or whether there was a need to, and Alex W. said that it had not substantively participated and only needed to mention that there is a basin plan and provide appropriate details in the Plan.

John K. followed up on a public hearing question regarding attorney review of the Plan. General discussion followed as to the costs vs. benefits of hiring an attorney. The overall feeling was that because the Plan is a visionary document, guided by State statute, it was not necessary to have an attorney review the document. Alex W. noted that at a Town level the Plan is not necessarily viewed as a legal document. However, he agreed with John K. that during an Act 250 review the State will look to the Town Plan for details. Alex W. said that he will contact other local Towns to see if they are utilizing attorney review for their Plans.

John K. addressed the public hearing comment about permitting combined lots in the Shoreline District, and the Commission agreed that such a specific suggestion could be implemented through the regulatory process rather than including it in the overarching Town Plan.

John K. addressed the public hearing comment about including an organizational flow chart in the Plan, and the Commission agreed that it was a good idea but a more appropriate location for the flow chart would be on the Town website. Maggie G. mentioned that some towns have a “town users guide” that is presented to new residents and an organizational flow chart could be included in something of that nature. Alex W. noted that Hinesburg is a relatively small community and the easiest thing would be for residents to simply call the Town office with questions and they could be directed to the appropriate person from there.

John K. asked if there was an update to the official map, and Alex W. acknowledged that the map is out of date but it is a regulatory document so needs to be looked at separately. He said that he will make a note of the maps status in the Plan.

John K. addressed the public hearing comment regarding the increased cost to build net zero homes, and whether the Town should have a role in encouraging the State’s net zero goals. General discussion followed regarding the State’s energy goals, the Town Energy Committee’s section of the Plan, and potential funding sources available to developers. The Commission decided to make a language change for continuity within the section.

John K. addressed a public hearing comment regarding pictures of historical buildings and Alex W. said that the section in question represented both historical and architectural buildings, and reiterated for the Commission that he would welcome assistance from the community in strengthening the cultural resources section of the Plan.

Joe I. addressed a public email comment regarding intersection design improvements, including roundabouts. General discussion followed about the Town’s receptivity to intersection design improvements and Alex W. said he would add something in the Plan.

Joe I. addressed a public email comment regarding the addition of a running track and pickle ball courts. General discussion followed regarding recreational infrastructure, and the consensus was that specific activities should not be included in the Plan. However, the Commission felt a general statement regarding the inclusion of all ages with special attention to the growing senior population in the community would be appropriate.

Joe I. addressed a public email that contained several grammar and language suggestions. After discussing each suggestion, the Commission agreed to incorporate some of the suggestions and left some of the suggestions alone.

Wade Snyder commented that not paving gravel roads could be an effective way of controlling growth. He gave an example from a town in Virginia where paving roads increased traffic and development. Wade S. suggested that keeping roads gravel would help Hinesburg maintain its rural character. Joe I. noted that Hinesburg utilizes a zoning structure such that even if a road is paved it would still maintain its zoning classification and therefore development would not increase as a direct result of paving. The Commission decided to add language stating consideration of rural character to the section.

Wade S. urged caution on considering a larger cap size for grocery stores. He said his concern was by allowing larger grocery stores the town would be opening itself up to exploitation. General discussion ensued regarding the cap size specific to grocery stores and the reasoning behind stating in the plan that the Town would “consider” a larger cap size. Wade S. gave an example of a town in Virginia that is actively working toward a high quality, walkable community and reiterated his concern about allowing larger grocery stores. Joe I. thanked Wade S. for his input and the Commission decided to leave the section as written.

There was general discussion on how the Commission should proceed with the comment review process. The group decided to individually review each comment and come prepared for the next meeting with specific suggestions they would like to incorporate into the Plan.

Minutes of 11/09/16 Meeting: Maggie G. **made a motion to approve the 11/09/16 minutes as amended** and John K. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **5-0**.

Other Business & Correspondence:

- **Town of Shelburne Zoning Changes and Hearing** - Alex W. commented on the Town of Shelburne’s zoning changes and the email he had forwarded to the Commissioners. He said there is a public hearing scheduled for December 15, 2016 if they are interested in attending.
- **FY17-18 Budget Process & Timing** - Alex W. reported that the Select Board has begun budget planning and he needs to have the Planning Commission budget to the Town Administrator by the end of next week. He said he usually brings the budget to the Commission for discussion, however this year they have been busy with the Plan revision process and have not had an opportunity to do so.

Alex W. gave an update on the grant status for the zoning overhaul project and said that if the funding comes through then that will be the bulk of the Commission’s work for the coming year. Alex W. asked if the Commission has any other projects they would like to include in the budget. There was general discussion regarding the Planning Commission’s budget and the process.

Joe I. **made a motion to close the meeting and adjourn**. Rolf K. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **5-0**. The meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Morgan, Recording Secretary