

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
August 22, 2018
Approved September 12, 2018**

Members Present: Joe Iadanza, Maggie Gordon, Jeff French, Dennis Place, John Kiedaisch, Barbara Forauer, James Donegan, Marie Gardner

Members Absent: Rolf Kielman

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning)

Joe I. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7PM.

Agenda changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Official Map Revisions: - continued from 8/8, 7/25, 7/11, 6/27 meetings

Alex W. presented draft 3 (dated 8/20/18) of the Official Map revisions with changes based on discussion at the previous meetings. This version of the map was accompanied by a companion draft document describing various community facilities on the map (dated 8/20/18).

John K. noted that future stormwater treatment areas are shown on this draft. He suggested that existing stormwater treatment areas be added to the map for reference. Examples of those with a sizable footprint include: Silver Street rain garden, United Church rain garden, Creekside development pond/wetland, Thistle Hill detention ponds, CVU high school pond, etc. John K. suggested contacting Lewis Creek Association for details about recent stormwater treatment improvements at CVU.

John K. made the following suggestions for map revisions:

Modify map labels (particularly street names) to be more readable.

Add the existing sidewalk on Shelburne Falls Road in front of UVM Medical.

Modify the existing road lines to better differentiate them from the parcel lines.

Include the access strip on lot 15 at Commerce Park as part of the future community facility – i.e., identify the entire parcel.

John K. wondered if a note should be added about the time horizon for completion of certain future community facilities. Perhaps noting that we expect some of these elements to be completed at the time the property is developed. Joe I. felt this was implicit given how the Official Map works. He felt

that time frame is less important than specificity about the facility. There was general discussion about this, but no consensus to add time horizon information to the map.

John K. suggested moving the Charlotte Road sidewalk segment from the south side to the north side of the road, given how wet the south side is near the solar trackers. Alex W. agreed that the north side would likely be easier to install a sidewalk. There was discussion of the pros and cons of each side, including the safest place for the Charlotte Road crosswalk – i.e., either at Green Street or at Stella Road. There was no consensus as to which side the sidewalk should be shown on.

Barbara F. questioned the practicality of the facility labeled “F” – called “walkers respite” in the description. This is meant to be a future small-scale area with seating and shade trees for users of the Mechanicsville Road sidewalk (west side of the road). Barbara said a lot of fill would be necessary given how the land drops away from the road. There was discussion about the utility and value of this element, and the general consensus was to leave it on the map in order to preserve the option should the property be developed some day.

James D. suggested consideration of using the library as a community center – the existing library serves in this fashion to some extent with its community room. In the future, he said it might be possible to relocate the library to a more central spot in the village core, and have the new library be large enough to co-locate with a community center. There was discussion about the pros and cons of this, and how other municipal buildings play into the creation of a community center someday.

John K. said he would like more time to review the descriptions of the future community facilities. He suggested completing the discussion at the next meeting. Regarding community outreach, he said that we could start soon with specific landowners to get feedback on Official Map elements on their property. Alex W. suggested waiting until after the next meeting, to make sure the Planning Commission felt all the draft revisions were ready for feedback. He suggested starting by sending all affected landowners correspondence to inform them (e.g., draft map, highlighting elements proposed on their property, and an explanation and request for feedback), and then following up with face-to-face meetings or phone calls. He suggested outreach to the community at-large (e.g., Front Porch Forum, newspaper articles, website) at the same time or after landowner meetings. Joe I. felt this was a good strategy.

Village Area Design Standards – continued from 8/8, 7/25, 6/13, 5/23 meetings

Alex W. explained that draft 4 of the greenspace design standards was a clean version (i.e., no track changes from previous versions), and that changes had principally been made to the section detailing the contribution amount necessary for opting out of providing greenspace on-site (last page). He said he also reverted the residential minimum size calculation (first page) to 200 square feet per dwelling instead of per bedroom – for simplicity and to reduce the amount of public open space required.

Joe I. expressed concern about allowing stormwater treatment areas to count as part of the required public open space, even if “properly designed.” Several other Commissioners agreed with this concern. Maggie G. said it would be nice to encourage multi-use stormwater treatment areas. Jeff F. asked if the existing stormwater regulations required treatment areas to be visually interesting and multi-use. Alex W. said he didn’t think the regulations required this. The consensus was to prohibit stormwater treatment areas from being used to satisfy the minimum public open space requirements.

John K. suggested having examples to help the reader on the calculation of the minimum public open space requirement. Joe I. noted that the examples under the “amount of contribution” section included this. Alex W. said he would try to rework this to have examples at the end more clearly demonstrate the various calculations as they apply to all sections.

Alex W. noted that the draft had an error in the second example on the last page, in that the minimum contribution would not be calculated by multiplying by \$10/sq ft, but rather would be double the amount spent for the required on-site open space – per the earlier text.

Alex W. noted that having design standards for open space is fairly common in municipal regulations, but requiring that developments provide a minimum amount of developed open space for public use is less common. Because of this, he wasn’t able to find many examples on the calculation of a minimum amount of public open space. South Burlington’s City Center design standards was one of the few. Jeff F. recommended querying the VT League of Cities and Towns. John K. recommended getting feedback from the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. Alex W. said he could do that once we have a draft ready, and that he could also ask fellow VT planners to do a peer review.

Alex W. asked if the Commission would like to move the greenspace design standards forward for community outreach and feedback now, or wait until the Commission has a chance to discuss and develop additional design standards on architecture, streetscape, etc. Both Joe I. and Jeff F. felt that the Official Map and greenspace design standards should move forward as a package with the other revisions to follow later as a separate package. Several other Commissioners supported this idea. There was some discussion about next steps.

Municipal Planning Grant:

Given the previous discussion, Alex W. suggested that a possible municipal planning grant application for this year could be focused on consultant assistance and public outreach on the remaining village area design standards – i.e., architectural, streetscape, etc. There was consensus that this made sense given that it would further the work the Commission is planning to tackle next. Alex W. briefly reviewed some of the other planning projects that could be fodder for a planning grant application. Alex W. said he would work up a grant application for the village design standards project idea, and get the synopsis back to the Commission for review/approval in September. The Select Board will need to sign off in September as well, as the grant application deadline is October 1.

Minutes of July 25 and August 8, 2018 Meetings:

Alex W. said he had a variety of typographical changes to the July 25 minutes. John K. provided revisions (an additional clarifying sentence) to something he said about stormwater and the capacity of the culvert under Route 116 for Patrick Brook.

Maggie G. **made a motion to adopt the July 25, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.** John K. **seconded.** The Commission voted **7-0 to approve** the motion, with Jeff F. abstaining.

Alex W. said he had a few typographical changes to the August 8 minutes.

Maggie G. **made a motion to adopt the August 8, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.** Barb F. **seconded.** The Commission voted **4-0 to approve** the motion, with Jeff F., Marie G., Dennis P., Joe I. abstaining.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Maggie G. noted that the Conservation Commission is interested in inviting PC members to an upcoming meeting for a guest speaker on natural resource mapping. This will likely be in October, and Maggie will provide more information at a subsequent meeting.

John K. asked if there were any metrics about viewership of PC meetings on the VCAM website or cable broadcast. John K. said he was curious to know how many people watch the meetings, and he wondered if a simple survey could be done to see. Alex W. said the first place to check would be with VCAM staff for information about traffic to the website – i.e., clicks on the PC meeting recordings. Alex W. said a survey would be easy to do, but he wasn't sure the response would be helpful. He said he could follow up with the Town Administrator to see about interest in surveying to see how many people watch any of the VCAM recordings – PC, DRB, Select Board.

The meeting adjourned at 9pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex Weinhagen, Director of Planning and Zoning