

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
September 12, 2018
Approved September 26, 2018**

Members Present: Maggie Gordon, Rolf Kielman, Dennis Place, John Kiedaisch, Barbara Forauer, James Donegan, Marie Gardner

Members Absent: Jeff French, Joe Iadanza

Public Present: Cody Potter, Norman Smith, Ronald Spivack, Jake Potter, Stuart Robinson, Ed Matthews, Jean Kiedaisch

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Kate Kelly (Recording Secretary)

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:02 PM.

Agenda changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Official Map Revisions: - continued from 8/22, 8/8, 7/25, 7/11, 6/27 meetings

Alex W. discussed the changes he made to the map as per John K.'s and other's comments at last meeting. Lenore Budd had requested a slightly broader scale to cover the trail connection from Lavigne Hill Rd. to Russell Trails. John K. agreed that the scale should be broadened.

Alex W. pointed out the wording on the map regarding area G, and requested the Commission review this. John K. suggested adding "between the park and Mechanicsville Rd." after the word "property". James D. asked about the sports listed as examples. He proposed adding mountain bike trails and pump track. Alex W. said that for this particular facility (G), it probably wouldn't have the trails themselves (could be the trailhead for trails), but a pump track would be a possibility, and he could add this.

John K. mentioned that he thinks of the existing trails (dashed black lines) as walking trails – are they available to bikes? James D. said for the Russell Trails, bikes are permitted but they aren't designed for bikes. John K. wondered if bikes would damage the trails if they were heavily used.

James D. asked if the official map should be made townwide. He mentioned specifically Sunny Acres/Triple L area. Could we put a note with an arrow noting a future park? Alex W. replied we could, but we need to find a location for it. Barbara F. mentioned a piece of property near Sunset Lake; Marie

G. said it is recently newly sold. Alex W. said there is some town property (Fire Dept.) near Sunset Lake, but may have some wetland restrictions. John K. said it is hard to access.

Maggie G. welcomed the newly-arrived members of the public (Boy Scouts).

Alex W. showed the town-owned areas near Birchwood Dr. and Sunset Lake, but mentioned it has wetland areas. Marie G. said it drops away quickly from the road. Discussion ensued about the lots.

Alex W. then showed the area near Triple L, and pointed out the area east of Richmond Rd. for a potential park. John K. asked about trails or sidewalks to get there. There is nothing there, but it (Richmond Rd. sidewalk) is on the official map. Discussion ensued. Alex W. suggested bringing this up as part of community outreach for official map, but not adding it to the map yet. Barbara F. asked about this land being privately owned; wouldn't it be wise to tentatively get it on to the map? Alex W. replied that the discussion to date about the park doesn't seem robust enough to him to put it on the map. Maggie G. asked about the zoning here; Alex W. replied it is Rural Residential 2 on the east side, Rural Residential 1 on the west side. John K. felt it may be worth figuring out community interest first, then determining location and bringing it to the community.

A member of the public said it is important to consider the private landowners. He asked if we ask permission from the landowner. Alex W. replied that we do not ask permission, but seek input and discussion, and the landowner gets notice and an understanding of what that means. He explained how the Official Map works procedurally (Town gets first right of refusal, has the option to purchase the land if the developer refuses to leave the space available for the facility).

Rolf K. brought up the intersection of Buck Hill Rd. and 116. The town settlement now reaches this point, and there is a speed problem as traffic reaches this point. Maggie G. pointed out that this area was part of a scoping study; John K. pointed out we have new housing going in there too. He suggested adding a note here for traffic calming. All agreed this was a good idea. James D. suggested adding a crosswalk here. Alex W. mentioned that VTrans is sometimes resistant to putting in crosswalks when there is no sidewalk infrastructure on the other side of the road, but there are trails east of 116, so they could potentially be convinced.

John K. had several grammatical changes to make, and will provide these to Alex W.

John K. asked about intersection 5; was there a new scoping study that included this intersection? Alex W. replied there was not. John K. asked if we should say there should be a scoping study; Alex W. didn't feel this would be good. John K. pointed out that intersections 2 and 4 say "still need scoping study." Alex W. replied that he didn't feel we'd need a scoping study, just to make this a 4-way stop, but will make the change.

Dennis P. asked if we should mention the size of the community facility (1 acre? 2 acres?). Alex W. said he can measure the size of each facility and note it.

Dennis P. asked in particular about area G and if the size would depend on the amount of development that occurs here. Alex W. replied the official map element could be larger than what is required by the standards. It might be helpful to know the acreage. John K. suggested adding the word approximately to the descriptions. John K. asked about A, B, C, and D (shapes that came out of a proposal from the developer). He proposed making G a circle instead of rectangle, with an area attached. Alex W. replied we are using the word approximate throughout the document, and he will add the acreage. John K. asked if the word approximately could apply to shape and size. Alex W. said he could spell that out in the document.

The Boy Scouts left the meeting.

Marie G. said that G seemed small compared to B, C, & E, and the size of the property that it is. John K. said it has to do with density too, has to do with the amount of development around it. Dennis P. said we should be sensitive to the interests of the present owners, because they are looking to donate land to the cemetery.

John K. asked about what an enhanced crosswalk is. Alex W. replied it means more than just paint; could be textured pavement, raised surface, different patterns (red/gray brickwork), but refers to the surface (not as much the signs and lights around it). Dennis P. brought up rapid flashers, which he feels can be dangerous, because people think they can hit the button then walk right out.

John K. asked about bioretention facilities (how do we define it, should we put it in the description). Alex W. replied it is a good question; bioretention is where water is retained, but also has plant matter that helps with filtration. John K. asked if we should define what it means, and Maggie G. asked if it is a standard industry term that doesn't need definition. Alex W. replied he can get John K. the state stormwater regs and see if it is well-defined there, then potentially add an asterisk to reference the regs. We could alternatively refer to the town plan or zoning regs. Alex W. will look into it and make the proper reference.

Maggie G. suggested talking about next steps. Alex W. replied that next steps had already been discussed at last meeting. He suggested focusing on feedback and outreach first; the public hearing likely wouldn't happen until the holidays or January.

Dennis P. asked how many of the facilities were new/changed enough to require outreach. Alex W. replied A is new, B is revised, G is new, D is new, F is new. The Commission discussed.

Alex W. mentioned it would be helpful to have one or two commissioners to help edit or write the letter to landowners who have property that will be affected. Barbara F. and Rolf K. volunteered. All agreed

they'd like to see the letter at the next meeting before it goes out to landowners. Alex W. said he will also work with Aaron Kimball to get a website ready. Dennis P. suggested making a request to see if any landowners would like to donate land for a park.

Maggie G. suggested talking about the municipal planning grant first, then the village area design standards. All agreed.

Municipal Planning Grant:

Alex W. noted he has reached out to some consultants to get an idea of how much this proposal may cost, but hasn't heard back from them.

No Commissioners had changes.

Marie G. **moved to support applying for the Municipal Planning Grant as described in the synopsis.** John K. **seconded the motion.** The Commission voted **7-0**.

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

John K. asked about non-residential development that is less than 6000 sq. ft. Alex W. replied that in the applicability paragraph, 6000 sq. ft. is the cut off (less than that, you don't have to do anything).

John K. noted that to require more than 2000 sq. ft. of public open space, you'd need 13,000 sq. ft. of non-residential development, so the categories should be adjusted to reflect the actual numbers required.

Dennis P. wondered if a landowner who has an official map element on their property is exempt from these standards. Alex W. replied no; if they make a small development (8-unit), then these standards don't apply (they still need to leave the area on the official map open). If they want to do 80-units, they need to make the area on the official map available, but must also develop public open space as per these standards. Given the choice, it is more likely that they will choose to put their public open space in area the area demarcated on the official map.

Marie G. asked if these rules would not allow G to move on the property. Alex W. noted that it is possible that they can revise the official map during the development and review process. Alex W. read the state statute on changes to the official map. Discussion ensued about how this process would work.

John K. suggested fixing the numbers – this is implying that there are areas of non-residential development of 50,000 sq. ft. or more. Alex W. replied that Blomstrann proposal was ~150,000 sq. ft. of new non-residential development, Haystack Crossing was ~50,000 sq. ft., and Hinesburg Center was 13,000+.

John K. felt that note 3 needed further clarification. Alex W. said he can clarify this.

Rolf K. asked about 200 sq. ft. per dwelling. Alex W. replied this only kicks in for 10 dwellings or more.

Maggie G. asked about next steps. Alex W. replied he'd like to send it to the Town Attorney to check on any possible takings issue and to the Vermont Planners Association for peer review. If the Commission is happy with the changes, he will send it out.

Alex W. showed the version with no track changes with a text description of examples vs. a tabular representation. Most liked the text version. He said he would make the suggested changes then send out for legal and peer review.

Rolf K. asked if the zoning we have might on occasion lead to developments where there wouldn't be enough area to provide the required open space. Alex W. replied there is a fair amount of land available in the areas yet to be developed. In addition, there's the option here to opt out or include improvements on other property.

Dennis P. asked if there is a chance that, for a small development, they will add a small 2000 sq. ft. area, and we would rather have had them contribute to the development of bigger areas. Alex W. replied that this is likely. Dennis P. suggested that we require developers to build in the official map areas; if you build outside of these areas, why not just have them contribute to the bigger areas. Alex W. replied that on smaller projects, we didn't talk about where we'd like to develop. There was discussion about the size of the development and the open space. Alex W. said we could tweak the off-site allowance section, to make it easier to make a contribution on those areas that are smaller instead of developing small space on their land.

Barbara F. asked why an 8-unit development doesn't have to contribute to anything. Alex W. replied that he felt that with a smaller profit margin on smaller developments, it may sink the project to ask them to make a contribution/develop open space on site.

Dennis P. asked about how the Green St. development may have been affected by these standards had they been in force at that time. Alex W. did some calculations and replied that they wouldn't have met these standards with their current plan. They would have been forced to change their design a bit to get their units plus greenspace. Discussion ensued.

John K. asked if we could run this comparison with the second phase of Creekside. Is this 200 sq. ft. an appropriate number? Alex W. replied that Hinesburg Center proposed 66 new units + 13,000 sq. ft. of non-residential. That would equate to 13,200 sq. ft. + 3,000 sq. ft. = 16,200 sq. ft. of public open space. Alex W. said the park the developer proposed is in excess of 16,000 sq. ft., but the center area is not. He

doesn't know what is in their current master plan, and it is questionable if their proposed area is public or for the neighborhood. John K. suggested we leave the 200 sq. ft. requirement.

Jean Kiedaisch joined the meeting.

Alex W. said he hopes to have this finished at the next meeting.

Minutes of August 22, 2018 Meetings:

James D. **made a motion to approve the August 22, 2018 meeting minutes.** Barbara F. **seconded the motion.** The Commission voted **6-0 to approve** the motion, with Rolf K. abstaining.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Alex W. informed the Commission that Williston is revising the regulations to their growth management system. Hinesburg's wastewater committee is studying their system. Williston will have a hearing on regulations revisions on Sept. 18.

Alex W. noted that two years ago, an Act 250 commission formed to provide recommendations on ways to improve the Act 250 state level (and some local level) permitting for development. They've been holding forums for communities, and looking at reforms in every direction. Tonight's was the last forum. Once the Commission releases its report, there will likely be changes to Act 250. John K. noted the Commissioners are all self-appointed legislators, and that Chris Pearson is the vice chair of the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary