



Town of Hinesburg
Planning & Zoning Department
10632 Route 116, Hinesburg, VT 05461
802-482-2281 (ph) 802-482-5404 (fax)
www.hinesburg.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Development Review Board
CC: Applicant
FROM: Alex Weinhagen, Director of Planning & Zoning
DATE: September 10, 2015
RE: Wind Energy Associates – September 15 meeting discussion items

After discussion at the April 7 and May 5 meetings, the Board closed the sketch plan review for the Wind Energy Associates subdivision sketch plan application. Several new issues were raised during the Board's closed deliberations, and as a result the Board reopened the sketch plan review to give the applicant an opportunity to respond prior to finalizing a decision. The reopened meeting was scheduled for August 4; however, the applicant requested a continuance to the September 15 meeting in order to allow the Selectboard's discussion to play out about a possible development moratorium through interim bylaws. The Selectboard opted not to pursue a development moratorium through interim bylaws at this time.

Please see my 6/4/15 memo for a summary of the four new issues that came up in the Board deliberations. Please see the applicant's letter (dated 9/1/15) and supporting plans and submissions for their responses. I had a productive meeting on August 11 with the project team to discuss all this. I think they've adequately addressed the new issues, such that a sketch plan approval can be considered with appropriate conditions for further details and evidence to be submitted as part of the preliminary plat application. Remember that site engineering has not yet been done. Some of the issues discussed during the sketch plan review may require plan revisions once more data are obtained, and initial site engineering has been completed. This is the nature of our iterative review process for major subdivisions. Based on the additional submittals and my conversations with the applicant, I don't think any of the compliance issues raised to date constitute fatal flaws that should prevent the project from proceeding to the next step of the review.

- 1. Development on Steep Slopes** – The revised plan (sheet #21) better depicts the concept for the residential development at the end of the road on lot 8. It shows conceptually how development on the steep slopes in this part of the project can still achieve a proper streetscape (e.g., sidewalk, street trees, road width, parking) and usable residential space (e.g., yard, decks, etc.). Clearly, this will need to be fleshed out and further substantiated with engineering and a landscaping plan as part of any preliminary plat review.
- 2. Residential Road Width** – The applicant indicated that the project has the room and capability to increase the width of the residential road as necessary. They continue to make a case for keeping the road width as narrow as possible. The plan contemplates areas of guest/overflow parking oriented perpendicular to the roadway to address the Board's concerns while not necessitating wide road widths that contribute to stormwater runoff, detract from the pedestrian focus, and adversely

impact the aesthetics of the project. If the capability for a wider road exists, I think the bulk of this discussion should occur as part of the preliminary plat review. Again, once we have engineering data, a stormwater control plan, a landscaping plan, and a better fleshed out streetscape and parking design.

- 3. Senior Housing Parking & Access** – The applicant always intended for there to be underbuilding parking for the senior housing structure (building 2C). The revised plans (sheets #20 & #23) address the issues of vehicular access to this building. As noted above, these conceptual plans will be further honed and revised with site engineering, so the Board will have ample opportunity to review this issue in more detail as part of the preliminary plat review.

- 4. Mix of Uses – Office vs. Manufacturing** – See the applicant’s revised table showing the mix of use analysis for the entire property based on the conceptual master plan. I discussed this at length with the applicant, and I believe they correctly assert that the proposal’s mix of uses (manufacturing, mixed non-residential uses, office space, senior housing) on lots 1-4 is consistent with the purpose and allowed uses of the Village Northeast district. Considering both the existing Renewable NRG Systems building/use and what is proposed for buildings 1A, 1B, 1C, the master plan does show a lot of square footage designed for light industrial and/or manufacturing uses.