

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
October 25, 2017
Approved November 8, 2017**

Members Present: Barbara Forauer, Marie Gardner, John Kiedaisch, Rolf Kielman, Maggie Gordon, Jeff French (left the meeting at 9:12 pm), James Donegan

Members Absent: Joe Iadanza, Dennis Place

Public Present: None

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

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:32 pm.

Agenda Changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Zoning & Subdivision Revisions – Housekeeping Changes (Review Second Draft of Proposed Changes):

Alex W. provided an MS Word “track changes” version for the Commission to review on screen. He also provided the Commission with a shortened summary of the substantive changes.

Section 5.1.1 #5, 5.1.2 #4, 5.2.6 – Home occupation traffic allowance

Alex W. reviewed conversations from previous meetings. He said that the Commission had discussed the current regulations that call for a maximum number of vehicle trips that cannot change the overall character of the neighborhood. He said that in previous discussions it was noted that a home occupation on a busy road (e.g., Rte 116) could result in a minimal impact on the overall character of that particular neighborhood and therefore might not require a limit to the number of trips. He said that the Commission had expressed a desire to provide the DRB with clear parameters.

Alex W. said that after meeting directly with the DRB, they said that they would appreciate the ability to apply their discretion and do not need a specified number of trips in the regulation. He said that he also queried other towns and although a couple have limits on vehicle trips, those limits are higher than ours. As a result, no additional changes were made to the section.

John K. asked about distinguishing between the types of vehicles creating traffic (e.g., vehicles, delivery trucks, large trucks carrying gravel, etc.). Alex W. said that there is not currently a distinction

between vehicles, as most home occupancies are small and there is a separate provision in the regulations for contractor's yards.

Section 5.6.3 – Front yard parking allowance

John K. noted that there is a difference between employee/customer vehicles in a parking lot and vehicles in an auto dealership prominently displayed for sale in the front yard. There was some discussion of other instances where this may also be the case (e.g., trailer or boat sales, equipment rental, etc.). The Commission suggested a separate section in the regulations addressing such situations, as well as clarification of the screening language to better communicate that screening does not need to be a solid wall hiding all vehicles but should be able screen the bulk of individual vehicles, regardless of whether it is a car, truck, SUV, etc. Alex W. said that he would work on revising the section accordingly.

Section 5.9 – Accessory apartments

Alex W. said that State statute says a town must allow the minimum size of accessory apartments to be at least 30% of the livable floor area of the principal dwelling size. There was general discussion about desirable sizing caps for accessory apartments. Marie G. expressed concern about the revised draft allowing for large accessory apartments and said that she preferred the previous version of the draft.

There was discussion about removing the requirement that no additional access drives be created in favor of compliance with rural area design standards. Marie G. said that she preferred requiring accessory apartments to utilize the same driveway as the primary dwelling. She went on to say that she had a concern about accessory apartments being built far from the primary dwelling, resulting in additional curb cuts and fragmentation of the landscape. There was additional discussion and the Commission agreed to revisit the discussion when the full Commission was present.

Section 5.10.3 – Demolition and replacement of non-complying structures

Alex W. said that this section was revised to define the demolition of a non-complying structure to be 75% or more of the structure removed, replaced or reconstructed – 75% of the total floor area not including the foundation or areas below grade. Rolf K. expressed concern that developers might try to take advantage of the language if the removal, replacement or reconstruction is between 50%-75%. Additional discussion followed and the Commission decided that the language was appropriate for the time being.

Subdivision Regulations – Article 9 Definitions: Building Envelope

Alex W. said that he did some research and also reached out to other planners about the possibility of creating a type of “non-building” envelope, as discussed in a previous meeting. He said that most of his peers said that it was an interesting idea but that to him it feels more like a semantics issue. He went on to say that he tried to accommodate Dennis P.’s concerns by modifying the language in

Section 6.10.7 to “allow for the envelope to encompass as much of the lot as possible while accomplishing the protection and compliance mentioned above”.

The Commission was able to complete its review of the second draft of proposed housekeeping regulations.

Alex W. said that, although the Commission still has a few items to discuss, they could move forward with warning a public hearing. He said that the Commission could even use the opportunity to get public feedback on some of their unfinished items. He recommended the hearing be scheduled for the first meeting in December and the Commission agreed.

Other Business & Correspondence:

John K. requested a 1-year work timeline to provide a longer view of the Commission’s work goals. Alex W. said that this would be good timing since he needs to put together similar information for the Selectboard during the budgeting process. There was discussion about some of the potential projects to include on the timeline.

Minutes of 09/27/17 Meeting: Rolf K. **made a motion to approve the 09/27/17 minutes as amended.** John K. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **6-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Morgan, Recording Secretary