

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
September 19, 2017
Approved October 3, 2017

Members Present: Greg Waples, Sarah Murphy, Dick Jordan, Dennis Place, Ted Bloomhardt, Rolf Kielman, Andy Greenberg (Alternate) joined the Board after the Wheeler application, Jonathan Slason (Alternate) joined the Board for the Janos Laszlo deliberation

Members Absent: John Lyman

Representing Applications: Bruce Wheeler, Michael Burke, Mike Anthony, Jessica Louisos, Renae Marshall, Steve Smith, Brian Wright, George Bedard, Jen McCuin, Tom Ayer

Public Present: None.

Also Present: Mitchel Cypes (Development Review Coordinator), Dawn Morgan (Recording Secretary)

Dennis P. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:32 pm.

Agenda Changes: None.

Review minutes of the 09/05/17 meeting: Ted B. **made a motion to approve the 09/05/17 meeting minutes as amended.** Sarah M. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **4-0.** Greg W. & Dick J. abstained.

Bruce Wheeler: Sketch plan review for a proposed 2-lot subdivision for an approximately 12.6-acre property located at 331 Windswept Way in the Rural Residential 1 District. Lot 1 would consist of approximately 7.2 acres and include the existing house. Lot 2 would consist of approximately 5.4 acres and a house site to be accessed from Windswept Way.

The Applicant (represented by Bruce Wheeler and George Bedard) described the proposed subdivision layout, location of the septic system, house footprint and 50-foot right of way. George B. said that the house sits back sufficiently from the property line and well away from class 3 unprotected wetlands to the south. He said that Bruce W. had attempted to dig a shallow well years ago but at the time hit large boulders. George B. said that they are now waiting to see if the area turns into a vernal pool, and if so it will need a 50-foot buffer around it. He said that the house location was selected to be able to accommodate the buffer if necessary.

Ted B. inquired about the existing driveway and whether the proposed home would be utilizing the same access. The Applicant said that the new extension will be at the right of way opening, and the other will be reconciled with the neighbor. There was additional discussion regarding the number of homes on Windswept Way as well as the condition of the road.

There were no public comments.

Greg W. **moved to approve the draft decision as written.** Rolf M. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **6-0.**

Town of Hinesburg Highway Garage and CSWD Facility: Site Plan review for a new, relocated town highway garage and Champlain Solid Waste District transfer station on a 38-acre property located at 907 Beecher Hill Road in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District.

The Application was represented by Renae Marshall, Steve Smith, Michael Burke, Jessica Louisos, Brian Wright and Mike Anthony.

Steve S. provided an overview of the project in its current state and compared it to the proposed changes. He said the project is proposed to take place in four phases: 1) construction of the garage including a new drilled well, new septic system and a new stormwater management area, 2) demolition of the existing garage, moving into the new garage, and naturalized planting of a 75-foot stream bank (that is currently primarily gravel) along with the addition of some storm water treatment facility interspersed, 3) demolition of the existing CSWD facility and construction of the new facility (which will interrupt service for a period of approximately 2-4 months), and 4) construction of the Town's salt shed.

Dick J. asked how long the Applicant anticipated all four phases would take, and Steve S. responded approximately 1-1/2 years if all goes well. Dennis P. asked if residents would be directed to another CSWD facility during phase 3, and Brian Wright indicated that they would communicate with the community prior to closure. Brian W. also said that the Williston facility is open 6 days/week and they do not anticipate the need to extend operating hours of other facilities during the transition period. There was some discussion about area drop-off centers and it was noted that there should be no impact on residents with curbside pickup. Brian W. said that he anticipated the closure to occur around July-Sept of 2018.

Sarah M. asked about traffic flow and entry/exit through the proposed CSWD facility and the impact on Beecher Hill Road if there was congestion. Brian W. said that he anticipated traffic flow to be similar in nature to the existing facility. There was additional discussion about traffic flow and general site design.

Jessica Louisos noted that the project would result in a reduction of impervious surface area, as much of the stream bank is currently compacted gravel. Rolf K. inquired about retention areas and Jessica L. said that the area has gravel underneath so the basins will be infiltration systems, which is the State's "top tier" treatment option. She went on to say that this site currently has no formal treatment system, so this would be a more formal system able to handle up to the 1-year storm. Ted B. asked what happens beyond a 1-year storm, and Jessica L. said that they have modeled up to 10-year and 100-year storms. She said the level that the peak is slowed and volume reduced meets State standards. There was additional discussion regarding the storm water plan.

There was continued discussion regarding traffic flow within the proposed CSWD facility and potential stacking onto Beecher Hill Road.

Mitchel C. read aloud an email from neighbors (Jane Racer and David Cloutier) that expressed concern about noise and visibility. General discussion followed regarding the use of landscaping to mitigate noise and visibility, as well as the proposed plantings in the stream bank area. Steve S. noted that Town trucks will continue to operate collecting gravel, but that noise from those activities are generally protected by the nearby hills.

There was brief discussion about parking spots, signage and lighting. There were no public comments.

Dick J. moved to **close the public hearing and take up the matter in deliberative session**. Greg W. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **7-0**.

Town of Hinesburg Recreation Fields: Review of proposed revisions to the 12/2/14 subdivision, site plan, and conditional use approvals to reflect as-built conditions. The 8.19-acre property is located south of Shelburne Falls Road and west of VT Route 116 in the Village NW and Agricultural Zoning Districts.

The Applicant (represented by Tom Ayer and Jen McCuin) explained that this project was originally planned in conjunction with the Haystack Crossing project but said that the Haystack project has since been delayed due to water allocation issues. He said that the Bissonnettes had requested the ability to hay their field in the meantime. As a result, the access road to the recreational field parking lot was constructed in a more direct route for better access to the agricultural fields. The Applicant said that the road now appears to be adequate for the recreational field purposes, and this proposed revision reflects the adjusted location of the road.

There was discussion about traffic flow and potential overflow parking along the sides of the road. The Applicant noted that the sides of the road will be mowed.

Sarah M. asked if it made sense to escrow privacy screening funds to be used once the Haystack project is completed. The Applicant said that they currently have the funds, and Sarah M. said that she felt it did not make sense to install landscaping at this time since Haystack has not been constructed yet and it could be some time before that project comes to fruition. The Applicant noted that there are currently some plantings that are nice and will be visually appealing.

There was general discussion about future landscaping needs, future culverts, the location of the original proposed access road and space for potential bus turnaround and parking.

Dennis P. opened the discussion to the public.

Jonathan S. (speaking as a member of the public) expressed concern that the roadway only had a 12" sub-base. He was concerned that the potential traffic, bus use and parking on the grass would quickly degrade the road. He said that the high water table in the area was likely the reason for the drainage ditches and, given the limited depth, if the water table is as high as he thinks it is the sub-base may become saturated and prone to freeze-thaw cycle damage. He went on to say that his primary concern was that maintenance responsibility will fall to the Town and, given how "temporary" the road may be, the Town could experience higher costs on this facility.

Lastly, Jonathan S. inquired about the recreation trail connection and if this project could help facilitate the trail. Discussion about the trail followed.

Dick J. **moved to close the public hearing and take up the discussion in deliberative session**. Rolf K. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **7-0**.

Other business

Janos Laszlo: Decision Deliberation –Subdivision Revision to modify driveway access conditions for a new 13.11-acre parcel located on the west side of Leavensworth Road. Hearing closed on September 5, 2017.

Greg W. and Dick J. recused themselves from the discussion. Jonathan S. joined the Board

Ted B. **moved to approve the revision as written.** Rolf K. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **6-0.**

Ted B. **moved to retire to deliberative session at 9:25 pm.** Rolf K. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **8-0.**

Ted B. **moved to reopen the public hearing for the Town of Hinesburg Highway Garage and CSWD Facility Site Plan review and continue the hearing to October 3, 2017.** Sarah M. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **7-0.**

The hearing is being reopened so the Town working with CSWD can provide the following information:

1. Describe traffic flow within the proposed CSWD facility. How different is the flow from the current facility?
2. What is the proposed capacity of the CSWD facility in users/hour?
3. How does the capacity of the proposed CSWD facility compare with the capacity of the existing CSWD facility?
4. What is the queuing capacity of the existing and proposed access road?
5. Is there room for the CSWD facility to grow?
6. Describe the reasoning for the need of having an 80-foot pavement width in front of the Town Garage. The DRB noted that if this was a smaller width, the size of the CSWD facility could increase.

The meeting ended at 10:30PM

Respectfully submitted,
Dawn Morgan, Recording Secretary