

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
January 23, 2019
Approved February 13, 2019**

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

Members Absent: James Donegan, Rolf Kielman

Public Present: None

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

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:01 PM.

Agenda changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Official Map Revisions:

Maggie G. mentioned that Alex has included along with draft 6 the expanded map going up to North Rd. and Richmond Rd. Alex W. walked through the changes leading up to draft 6. Draft 5 was the beginning of the public input period. Since then, he has reincluded the connection to Geprag's from Ballard's Corner. Lenore Budd (Trails) would like to see the dotted line from behind Ballard's continue into the park; the Commission agreed this would be fine.

John K. wanted the connection of proposed road from south, north to Shelburne Falls Rd. to be extended; Alex W. did this and narrowed the buffer here. The numbering/labeling system has changed, and corresponds to the narrative document. On the west side of 116, Alex W. labeled the police station, fire station, and green space (lot 1). He also labeled the library and Hinesburg Community Resource Center. The Commission had discussed moving stormwater treatment from behind Hart and Mead to the NW corner of Lyman Park. Alex W. spoke with the school (both Hinesburg and CVSD), and all thought it was fine as long as it didn't impact the softball outfield. Joe I. asked if the school had an agreement with the state that would require green space here. Alex W. replied they didn't comment on this.

Alex W. also followed up with stormwater and wetland folks from state; the Stream Management Program replied that you can't do stormwater treatment in the stream itself. They could do it in a class 3 wetland. If a class 2 wetland, a permit would be needed.

John K. asked about the two number 44's (see attached Facility Descriptions). Alex W. replied that the town discovered it wasn't possible to do stormwater treatment within the stream. The western part of 44 is higher elevation and would need to have water pumped up into it. Alex W. replied perhaps something could happen south of number 18; he and Andrea M. had investigated this in the past, and it has significant wetlands and is in the flood hazard area. The granting agency didn't like wetland impacts and that it was in the flood hazard area. But, the state wouldn't necessarily have a problem with doing treatment here, this restriction was just due to the granting agency. Alex W. suggested adding a new number, and shifting the in-stream system to something to the west.

Discussion ensued about the definition of a stream, and what organisms live there. Alex W. mentioned that the school did improvements to Lyman Park, including in southeast corner; they installed a curtain drain that comes around and discharges in northwest corner, which is where they are proposing stormwater treatment.

John K. asked about the area of the police station/fire station/open space: the most recent plan for that area would be parking behind police station and open space up to Farmall. Alex W. replied this map reflects what the conditions are today, as the future plans aren't set in stone.

Joe I. asked about number 35. Did they decide to put on west or east side of road? Alex W. noted they added sidewalk on east side of road. Maggie G. said she wouldn't want to remove it. Most agreed.

Jeff F. asked why village growth area drops off in corner of CVU and Mechanicsville. Alex W. replied it is because of property lines, and because that area is exceedingly wet, so there is little development potential. Jeff F. asked about the town-owned area on Richmond Rd. north of Town Cemetery. Alex W. replied that there was a recent 4-lot subdivision here, and this lot was donated to the town. There was an idea to do stormwater treatment there. John K. and Maggie G. suggested turning it green and putting a stormwater treatment there.

Alex W. also spoke with CVU about #43 on their properties; they haven't done anything on those specific locations, and he assumes that there is no problem with this. John K. requested putting more dots on the CVU map with existing stormwater treatment areas.

Maggie G. suggested going to sheet 2. Alex W. mentioned that the Selectboard wants to move forward with a sidewalk along Richmond Rd., and they are looking at options (path, etc.). Alex W. was instructed to apply for a Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission grant to study the Richmond Rd/North Rd. intersection. Maggie G. said it would slow down Richmond Rd. traffic and potentially provide a skate park for kids who are skateboarding on North Rd. She pointed out that power trucks use it as a staging area, and Joe I. mentioned the reverse park n ride that we heard about through public comment.

Alex W. asked if the Commission wanted this sheet at all. He pointed out other publicly owned parcels in the Birchwood Drive area. Marie G. said they were given to the town over the years by Ernie Giroux; this happened when the town accepted things regardless of resources or value. Marie G. felt the slivers to the north aren't of any use. The forested one may be of use; kids use it to play in. Alex W. displayed the area (which has a wetland constraint), which still has 180 feet wide unconstrained. It is much more sizable than the intersection area. Dennis P. suggested moving the park over to Birchwood, which would also save sidewalk.

Maggie G. asked if it would be necessary to show a future community facility here, because the town already owns it. Alex W. said it seems like a good location, but we haven't talked to any of the neighbors. Dennis P. suggested selling the other three town-owned lots in Birchwood, and put the money toward a park.

Marie G. felt we should know more about it before we put it on the map. John K. agreed, and said we should have a site visit. The Commission agreed to wait to do a site visit, and Alex W. will speak with the neighborhood.

Alex W. stepped out, and the Commission examined the facility descriptions. Jeff F. brought up 10 and 11 near Rec Area; is this a temporary road that needs to be identified on here? Most agreed this would be a good idea.

Maggie G. asked about a path that was mown this summer near the Bissonette Rec Area. Dennis P. asked how the Commission felt about developers coming in and doing phases, so some roads wouldn't go all the way through. Jeff F. said Water Allocation Committee is looking at using a point system that would encourage some of this (making these connections).

Alex W. re-entered the room, and noted that everything was renumbered and new text was added. Joe I. said he liked road calming language. He'd like to see velocity added in.

John K. brought up 14 and 15 (Patrick Brook Crossing) and 18 (Canal Crossing): wouldn't this require permitting, and is this an issue? Alex W. said yes, it will be difficult and expensive to go over Patrick Brook and the Canal. John K. would recommend mentioning this.

Dennis P. asked about the culvert under 116; Alex W. stated that Lewis Creek Association and the experts they've hired recommend that it be made larger. VTrans said it's close to proper size and in pretty good shape, so it will wait unless there's a maintenance issue. Alex W. will add additional language to numbers 14 and 18. Alex W. mentioned that when Brett Grabowski proposed phase 2, The Board asked Brett Grabowski (at 14) and his hydrogeologist to model the crossing here, with the appropriate size box culvert and looked at impacts to flood elevations. They concluded that this area (14) will only require a large box culvert.

The Commission was ok with the descriptions on the map.

Additional public comments since last meeting:

Jeff Glassberg: on number 33, Jeff G. requested a boundary revision to hug the trail. Because Jan has preserved 3 lots back behind, and given town a conservation easement, does it make sense to extend park back to include those three lots? Jeff F. mentioned it is a nice view. The Commission liked the idea.

Karl Novak brought up the importance of preserving wetlands on lot 15.

Peter Erb wondered if we are preserving enough open space. John K. would like to see a calculation of all open space, and seeing if that comes within recommendations of the APA.

Maggie G. suggested closing up official map revisions. The Commission decided to wait until March 13 for public hearing.

Village Area Public Open Space Design Standards:

Alex W. mentioned the drafts discussed at prior meetings. John K. had suggested getting better background information about recreation facilities and current usage. At the last meeting, the Commission also ran through some examples, and noticed that existing developments set aside way more public open space than these standards required. But in some, they required hardly any, and this would require them to create some. Peter Erb felt they should be creating more public open space. Alex W. reviewed the past drafts, and the Commission's intention in creating these design standards.

Dennis P. asked how this is fair to developer; Alex W. pointed out it can be coincident with Official Map element, but doesn't have to be. John K. asked about how to maintain these spaces. Alex W. pointed out that in Williston water plan, they give bonus points for maintenance on the public facilities. It has to be part of development, but not given to the town. John K. asked for examples of where developers maintain the area. On Green Street, Alex W. mentioned the developer gave the town an easement to the sidewalks, but the town has no responsibility to maintain or plow them. He also mentioned the Hinesburg Center (Kinney Drug) development, where they pushed VTrans to have public parking on 116. VTrans allowed it if town maintained it, and the town required the developer to do it (plow sidewalks and parking on 116).

Dennis P. asked about the developer creating private open space; Alex W. replied the developer could create private open space, but it is not required; they would be required to create public open space. Alex W. said the DRB could require the developer to create private open space. John K. asked why it should be up to DRB; shouldn't they have guidelines from the Planning Commission? Alex W. replied that if we want more for private open spaces, then we should write more standards.

Alex said pointed out at p. 2 at the bottom, the second sentence says maintenance of the space and its improvements shall be the responsibility of the landowner, unless there is an agreement with the town to provide that maintenance and upkeep. Marie G. said it is covered in the language.

Alex W. asked the Commission about Peter E.'s comments. Is this a flaw? Is it ok for developments to provide a small amount of public open space in coordination with larger amounts on the official map? Jeff F. points out Peter E.'s 5th paragraph, which says that the DRB has the burden. Alex W. replied that these public open space requirements are very prescriptive. Peter's comments are about the minimum: this is what you will get. Dennis P. pointed out that most of these developments already have an official map property on them. Joe I. pointed out that these are in addition to the official map elements. Discussion ensued about how the developer would likely use and apply these standards; Alex W. said that all applications, including phasing, would be required to complete this amount of public open space. They would have to create public open space in each phase, so need to create this in phase 1, and in phase 2, etc. Alex W. pointed out there is a lot of leftover land in some of these developments, and some may donate land.

John K. brought up Village NE, element 33. Blomstrann development group would still be required to do public open space; could they put this all within 33 and not have any anywhere else? Alex W. said they could. Alex discussed another scenario, that if they wanted to develop the lot near element 2, they'd have to make a case for public open space to be made in element 33. We may see less of a sprinkling of small open spaces, because many developers build in their official map element. Jeff F. pointed out the DRB wouldn't allow them to do this, and many developers wouldn't do this because it wouldn't sell without green space.

Alex W. said we could change the wording to require developers to build on their own lot, which would make town responsible for developing the official map elements. He pointed out we are going to build the sidewalk from Riggs Rd. down to Commerce St. Once that happens, this area could be a destination for use.

Joe I. said this conversation needs more discussion. Maggie G. said she'd like to do more digging into the numbers as Rolf K. did. Joe I. said we need to think about the distribution of elements. He pointed out that the Official Map isn't set in stone, it's a plan – we should consider that maybe not everything on Official Map will occur. What do we want besides that? Alex W. argued that if you allow developers to satisfy requirements within Official Map elements, development of Official Map elements will be much more likely to happen. Joe I. said it is more likely, but the Official Map is a negotiation. Alex W. said the developer would be less likely to push back (in a legal sense) if they're gaining an advantage.

Maggie G. decided to continue the discussion to the next meeting.

Minutes of January 9 and December 12 Meetings:

Joe I. **made a motion to approve the minutes of December 12, 2018.** Marie G. **seconded** the motion, and the Commission **voted 7-0** to approve.

Barbara F. **made a motion to approve the minutes of January 9, 2019.** John K. **seconded** the motion, and the Commission **voted 7-0** to approve.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Kate Kelly mentioned the Conservation Commission's upcoming winter party at Geprag's Park, happening Sunday, February 10, 3:30-7 PM. All are invited!

Barbara F. brought up regulations for lighting. She asked if these regulations apply to everywhere in town, or just village center? Alex W. replied it is only for new lights, but for everywhere in town. The new lights also have an exemption for a certain number of lights (with low lighting levels) on houses.

She also mentioned the dog issue – dogs off leash all the time and leaving a mess. Alex W. replied they should address this through neighbors and association, possibly police.

Alex W. mentioned that the DRB has two alternate positions available.

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary

Official Map - Community Facility Descriptions

DRAFT 3 – 1/2/19 – for Planning Commission review

Future Intersection Improvements

(see 2014 Route 116 scoping study for details on #1-5)

1 – Route 116, CVU Road turn lanes & signal improvement – In process. Active State Agency of Transportation project with funding and preliminary plans. Projected time horizon: culvert improvements in 2019; new lanes, signals, and project completion in 2020.

2 – Route 116, Riggs Road roundabout or alternative – No project specific studies conducted to date (i.e., still needs scoping), but recommended in the 2014 Route 116 scoping study. A key intersection impacting development plans for properties on both sides of Route 116. See conceptual master plans for the Blomstrann property (east side) and Haystack Crossing property (west side).

3 – Route 116, Mechanicsville Road restricted turning, enhanced crosswalks – Alternatives identified by VTrans as part of the Town and Act 250 review of the proposed Hannaford project. The Town identified restricted turning at peak hours as a preferred option for Hannaford to mitigate traffic issues at this intersection. An enhanced crosswalk across Route 116 is also needed, as well as a standard crosswalk across Mechanicsville Road to connect to the future sidewalk north of the intersection (east side of Route 116).

4 – Route 116, Silver Street roundabout or alternative – No project specific studies to date (i.e., still needs scoping), but recommended in the 2014 Route 116 scoping study after planned improvements are made to the signal phasing at the Route 116, Charlotte Road intersection.

5 – Route 116, Buck Hill Road roundabout, splitter island, crosswalk – No specific studies to date (i.e., still needs scoping), but recommended in the 2014 Route 116 scoping study. A key village entry point where improvements can help slow drivers and make them aware that they are entering the village, while also providing pedestrian connectivity from the village sidewalk system (west side of Route 116) to Buck Hill Road and the adjacent trail system on the east side of Route 116. Intersection changing from three-way to four-way with a new private road on the west side to access a new 24-unit development (under construction in 2019).

6 – Mechanicsville Road, Commerce Street four-way stop or alternative – No project specific studies to date (i.e., still needs scoping). Currently a two-way stop, but may require a change to a four-way stop or an alternative when there is new development or an increase in traffic volume in the Residential 1 zoning district.

7 – Richmond Road, North Road four-way stop or alternative – No project specific studies to date (i.e., still needs scoping). Currently a two-way stop plus a curving segment that allows Richmond Road traffic to avoid the intersection. Presents opportunities to consolidate traffic movements, improve safety, and reclaim road areas for park or green space.

8-9 – Reserved – for future intersection improvements.

Future Roads & Road Improvements

Relatively wide future road improvement areas shown on the Official Map are to allow flexibility in road geometry.

10 – Haystack Road Improvement – From Shelburne Falls Road to south of stream. Improve existing road: adjust width (if necessary), add a bike lane, add sidewalk, add street trees, add traffic calming (if necessary).

11 – Haystack Road Extension – South from existing road to future East/West Recreation Road. A new road to serve future development in the Village Northwest zoning district. Important features: width appropriate for on-street parking (possibly both sides) and a bike lane; sidewalk (likely both sides) – some potentially wider than five feet; traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., stop-controlled or roundabout intersections, multiple crosswalks, crosswalk bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands on road centerline, etc.); street trees.

12 – Recreation Road (East) – West from Route 116 to Haystack Road Extension. A new road to serve future development in the Village Northwest zoning district. Important features: non-linear roadway to slow vehicles; width appropriate for on-street parking (possibly both sides) and a bike lane; sidewalk (likely both sides) – some potentially wider than five feet; traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., stop-controlled or roundabout intersections, multiple crosswalks, crosswalk bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands on road centerline, etc.); street trees.

13 – Recreation Road (West) – West from Haystack Road Extension to the Bissonette Recreation Area. A new road to serve the municipal recreation area and future development in the Village Northwest zoning district. Important features: width appropriate for limited on-street parking (likely only one side if at all) and a bike lane; sidewalk (likely both sides); traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., stop-controlled or roundabout intersections, multiple crosswalks, crosswalk bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands on road centerline, etc.); street trees.

14 – Patrick Brook Crossing Road (North) – South from Recreation Road across Patrick Brook and its 100' riparian buffer. A new road to connect the Village and Village Northwest zoning districts. Important features: width appropriate for a bike lane, but otherwise narrowed to reduce impacts on Patrick Brook; no on-street parking within the riparian buffer area; sidewalk or multi-use path (possibly on just one side of the road); street trees.

15 – Patrick Brook Crossing Road (South) – South of the Patrick Brook riparian buffer to Farmall Drive Extension. A new road to serve future development in the Village zoning district and to connect to the Village Northwest zoning district. Important features: width appropriate for on-street parking (possibly both sides) and a bike lane; sidewalk (likely both sides) – some potentially wider than five feet; traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., stop-controlled or roundabout intersections, multiple crosswalks, crosswalk bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands on road centerline, etc.); street trees.

16 – Farmall Drive Extension – Extension of Farmall Drive West of Kaileys Way. A new road to serve the future development in the Village zoning district. Important features: width appropriate for limited on-street parking (likely only one side) and a bike lane; sidewalk (likely both sides); traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., stop-controlled or roundabout intersections, multiple crosswalks, crosswalk bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands on road centerline, etc.); street trees.

17 – Farmall Drive Improvement – Existing western portion of Farmall Drive between future Farmall Drive Extension and Stella Road Extension. Improve existing road: retain existing 24' width; prohibit on-street parking; add a crosswalk to Fredric Way; consider making one-way or adding traffic calming to slow speed and favor pedestrian movement and safety (e.g., signage, plow-friendly speed humps, etc.); retain existing sidewalks and street trees.

18 – Stella Road Extension – South of Farmall Drive across the Canal and behind the Cheese Plant to Stella Road. A new road and/or bike/pedestrian infrastructure to provide village connectivity outside of the Route 116 corridor. This connection will serve bikes and pedestrians. Whether it also serves vehicular traffic will depend on development proposals for the area, permitting issues, cost to the Town, and the overall public interest. Important features: width appropriate for a bike lane, but otherwise narrowed to reduce speeds and reduce impacts on the Canal and existing development; no on-street parking; sidewalk or multi-use path on just one side of the road.

19 – Stella Road Improvement – South of the Cheese Plant to Charlotte Road. Improve existing road: adjust width (if necessary), add a bike lane, add sidewalk on one side, add street trees.

20 – Cheese Plant Road Improvement – West of Route 116 to Stella Road. Improve existing road/drive: adjust width (if necessary), extend sidewalk on one side, add traffic calming to favor pedestrian movement and safety while ensuring continued access for Cheese Plant businesses. Consider making this a one-way road (no Stella Road through traffic). Formalize intersection with Stella Road for safety and functionality.

21-29 – Reserved – for future road improvements.

Future Community Facilities

Shape and size shown on the Official Map and noted below are approximate.

30 – Route 116 Linear Green/Park (approximately 5.0 acres) – At least 100' wide from the west edge of the Route 116 right of way. To provide room for a multi-use recreation path that will take a curvilinear form from Patrick Brook to the Route 116, Shelburne Falls Road intersection. Also to accommodate complimentary infrastructure including shade trees, benches, public art, small gathering places, etc.

31 – Central Park West & Community Center (approximately 2.55 acres) – To become the western side of a park at the center of the Village Northwest zoning district, with connection from Route 116 and community facilities A & C to the Bissonette Recreation Area. Park to include robust amenities to encourage community use – e.g., benches, picnic tables, playground facilities, shade trees, public art, bocce courts, volleyball courts, hard surface courts (e.g., tennis and/or pickle-ball, basketball), etc. Also to accommodate room for a future community center (e.g., multi-generational center) or indoor recreational center that could benefit from sharing existing parking with the Bissonette Recreation Area.

32 – Central Park East (approximately 1.38 acres) – To become the eastern side of a park at the center of the Village Northwest zoning district, with connection to Route 116 via sidewalks or other pathways. Park to serve as more of a gathering space with fewer recreational facilities than described for community facility “B”. Including appropriate amenities – e.g., benches, picnic tables, gazebo/shelter, shade trees, public art, etc.

33 – Overlook Park (approximately 2.82 acres) – A park at the height of land in the Village Northeast zoning district to provide a unique community gathering place affording views overlooking the village area. Connected to the west via trails to a future sidewalk along the east side of Route 116, and to the east via a trail along and around the hillside to CVU Road. Park amenities to include benches and interpretative displays (e.g., identifying village features in the view) in the open portion of the hillside, and trail connections in the wooded portions.

34 – Commerce Park & Wetland (approximately 4.8 acres) - A mix of community facilities and wetland preservation/enhancement. See the Lot 15 Committee’s January 3, 2012 analysis report for details on possible community uses – e.g., wetland preservation, walkways, gathering spaces, playground, recreation court space, open air theater, civic building and associated parking.

35 – Walkers Respite (approximately 1611 square feet) – A small-scale area with seating and shade trees for users of the Mechanicsville Road sidewalk (west side of road).

36 – Mechanicsville Neighborhood Park (approximately 2.55 acres) – A developed park with open and wooded spaces, adjacent and connected to the Town Cemetery. Robust amenities to encourage neighborhood use and engagement of the larger Hinesburg community – e.g., benches, picnic tables, gazebo/shelter, playground facilities, shade trees, public art, hard surface courts (e.g., tennis and/or pickle-ball, basketball), bicycle pump track, etc. Connected to Town trails to the southeast (e.g., Sullivan Trail, Lavigne Hill Road). NOTE – Also connected to Mechanicsville Road via future public roads and sidewalks – not shown on the map due to uncertain locations to be determined as part of any development plan for the portion of the property between the park and Mechanicsville Road.

37 – Richmond Road Park (approximately 0.75 acre) – A small developed park with recreational facilities at the terminus of the future Richmond Road sidewalk, and at the existing Green Mountain Transit bus stop. Recreational amenities to encourage neighborhood use – e.g., playground facilities, gazebo/shelter, shade trees, public art, benches, etc. Also to include a small parking area for shared use – i.e., bus stop, limited park and ride, etc.

38-39 – Reserved – for future community facilities.

Future Stormwater Treatment Locations

(see 2015 Feasibility Study by VHB and Milone & MacBroom – Opportunities to Manage Transportation – Related Stormwater Runoff)

40 – Route 116 detention area - North of gas station. Collect and treat stormwater from Route 116 ditch (runoff from road and adjacent commercial areas).

41 – Lyman Park detention or bioretention area – Along existing swale and northwest corner of Lyman Park. Note – Relocated from the position identified in the 2015 study (along Lyman Park Road) to capture stormwater from more sites, to have a location with more space, and to utilize more Town-owned property.

42 – HCS bioretention area – North of lower Hinesburg Community School parking lot, and south of existing bioretention area (Silver Street rain garden). Treat runoff from school roof and parking lots.

43 – CVU detention or bioretention areas – Between CVU recreation fields and along upper parking lot. Treat runoff from fields and parking lot.

44 – Cheese Plant detention and pre-treatment pond – Ditch network flowing west from Route 116 with possible detention near gravel parking lot. Convert old sewer lagoon into stormwater pre-treatment pond. Treat runoff from Route 116 and existing Cheese Plant site.

45 – Lyman Park bioretention – Existing swale from Lyman Meadows condominiums along south side of Lyman Meadows Park. Improve swale for additional bioretention.

DRAFT