

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
January 20, 2015

Approved 2/3/15

Members Present: Dennis Place, Andrea Bayer, Greg Waples, Zoe Wainer, Ted Bloomhardt. Sarah Murphy arrived at 7:40pm. Alternates present: John Lyman, Kevin Cheney.

Members Absent: Dick Jordan.

Also present: Peter Erb (Zoning Administrator) Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning) and Freeda Powers (Recording Secretary). Representing Applications: Bobby & Randy Therrien, Mike Buscher.

Public Present: Johanna White, John Kiedaisch, Larry & Robin Winters, Dan Jacobs, Mary Beth Bowman.

Zoe W. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:30pm.

There were no changes to the agenda.

Minutes from 1/6/15: Zoe W. **made a motion to approve as amended** the minutes from 1/6/15. Greg W. **seconded the motion**. The board voted **7-0**.

Hinesburg Center, LLC Phase II Sketch Plan: Continued from 12/16/14.

Kevin Cheney joined the Board for this application. Mike Buscher represented this application. The applicants are working on revisions so tonight will mainly be to discuss the density bonuses for the project. The applicants have been working with staff and the revised plans will require only two incentive points. The main one the applicant wants to discuss tonight is for the Important Public Space/Infrastructure; they propose the Lot 1 Town Green as an idea. Zoe W. asked the applicant if the other bonus they are hoping to receive is the density bonus for dwelling unit size; 50-74% proposed at smaller size to gain the full density point? The applicant said yes. Back to the idea for the Town Green, Mike B. said that would include a play area and sidewalks for connectivity and would total roughly 1/3 of Lot 1. He said they will need to go to the Select Board with this proposal and will also need to speak with Rocky Martin. There is approximately \$30,000 reserved for the play area and approximately \$10,000 estimated for the sidewalks for a total of about \$40,000 (includes landscaping). The applicant said they still need to look at and discuss the area in terms of grade and details of the play structure equipment; here they are seeking DRB input.

The applicant said they are still working on overall total unit numbers for the plan.

The Master Plan for the overall site were viewed via overhead projector and the Board noted it includes the old police station building. The Select Board has one year to decide if that structure will remain or be torn down.

Greg W. asked about Lot 30; was it not a part of the Creekside development? Alex W. said yes it was featured as the community space for the Creekside development. Greg W. wondered how many projects were "piggy-backing" on Lot 30. Zoe W. said it is like a "layering" of uses for that lot in that the

Creekside development got credit for creating the green space, Phase II may get credit for developing that green space into a park or other community feature. Ted B. said his comment is that the proposed work in the community space seems incomplete, only addressing a portion of the overall lot.

Sarah M. questioned the cost estimate offered by the applicant for the play equipment, suggesting it may be quite a bit higher than estimated. Alex W. said an overall estimate of \$600,000 (for Town Green, new parking lot, play area, etc.) was offered by the SE Group landscape architect.

Greg W. said in his opinion, parking will be an issue; specifically that the play area for children only works with nearby parking.

John K. spoke from the audience, saying that when the project was brought before the state to make a connection to Rte. 116 and the Police Department through to the Creekside development, it was agreed that road would be done when the additional parking is done. This may have larger implications. He also noted that the figure of \$600,000 was mostly due to parking infrastructure, not the town common.

Greg W. said the proposal in his view is not out of the question, but needs to work for the territory.

Sarah M. said she questions the figures for this project and said the applicant and Board should prepare for them to be higher. She also feels that the area will need to be graded and perhaps some fill brought in as it is somewhat wet. She also cautioned that the applicant and Board be cognizant of how this project ties in with the rest of the area.

Ted B. reiterated his concern that the proposal feels incomplete but overall said he is okay with considering the idea.

Alex W. said there will need to be phasing, therefore funding for the Town Green will be put out some time. The Town has to put the road to Creekside in within the Act 250 timeframe of 5 years; this time line should also be considered.

Zoe W. opened discussion to the public.

John Lyman spoke from the audience. Regarding the connecting road to Creekside, he wondered if the potential future Fire Station expansion impacted. John K. replied that the plans for the Fire Station are complete and Act 250 approved. The road fits with those plans. The Town Green plans were just ideas, he said. John L. agreed, the plans are conceptual at this point, but said be careful not to force the applicant to this.

Dan Jacobs spoke from the audience, as a resident of Creekside, he asked if the applicants anticipate a need for drainage to connect to the Creekside storm water infrastructure? The applicant said likely the previous approval factored in the entire build-out of this project. Dan J. requested that the Creekside Homeowners Association be involved and in agreement if any drainage connection does occur. John K. said storm water and runoff were also factored into this Master Plan; it was determined by engineers that there is adequate capacity to accept the storm water and runoff via an underground connection to the Creekside system. John K. added an overall comment on this Phase II project as it relates to the Town's lack of adequate water capacity. He is frustrated that to date there has been no info provided by the applicant regarding total gallons required to this phase (Article 1; Section 5.1) and he strongly encouraged the Board to require this from the developer. Also, he added, we have no specific numbers from the Town with regards to our capacity limits, or potential future yields. Without these numbers,

he said, the Board in his view is unable to evaluate the project effectively. Zoe W. replied that the Board and the Town have been having this discussion and are aware of the concern. Greg W. agreed, saying the Board is sensitive to this issue.

Peter E. reminded all that if projects get Sketch Plan approval, they are wedded to the regulations before them; the Planning Commission is in the process of revising some of these regulations now. He encouraged the Board to consider this.

Greg W. said the Board is also still awaiting input regarding potential school impacts.

Overall, the Board agreed they were in favor of the proposal as a concept. Ted B voiced his concern with the proposal as we define as “*significant* public space or infrastructure”.

Zoe W. made a **motion to continue the public hearing to 3/3/15**. Sarah M. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 7-0**.

Therrien: 2-Lot Subdivision Sketch Plan: Sarah M. recused herself from this application as an abutting landowner. John Lyman and Kevin Cheney joined the Board to hear this application.

Bobby Therrien explained this brief application to the Board, which seeks to subdivide a 2+ acre lot on Hawk Lane into two 1A lots. This would create an additional building lot. Access to the new lot will be over an existing driveway which crosses a very small mapped stream (which the applicants say is dry approximately 7 months of the year). A short 50' ROW is necessary to cross a corner of Lot 1 and from there the driveway will proceed directly to the new residence.

Zoe W. said there will be a required Conditional Use review to go through the stream buffer area. Alex W. said that is correct.

The Board viewed and discussed the existing road, Hawk Lane, which was built at a width of 18' to the Therrien home (last lot at end of road). The Board agreed the road's grade and condition are good. Greg W. said a Road Association should be created; all landowners on the road would be allowed but not forced to join. The applicant said there are currently 9 landowners on Hawk Lane and they all get along very well and share in the cost of plowing and maintenance; they do not want a Road Association. Greg W. explained that while no one will be forced to join it, an association is a good idea, noting that it may facilitate future property transfers and will not be a burden to anyone now.

John Lyman said be sure there is adequate room for emergency vehicle access and turn-around space at the end of the road. The applicant assured the Board that there is adequate room for that.

Robin Winters spoke from the audience, a neighbor to the Therriens, she said their deeds all state that they own 1/9th of the road. She feels that there is no need for a Road Association. Zoe W. said the Board is likely to put it in as a condition unless evidence is given that it is not needed.

Larry Winters spoke from the audience. He asked if the Board does require a Road Association, will that trump what is written in their deeds. Greg W. said no, an association cannot affect ownership rights.

Zoe W. made a **motion to close the public hearing and direct staff to come up with conditions of approval which address the formation of a Road Association.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Other Business: None.

Zoe W. made a **motion to adjourn.** Ted B. **seconded** the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:09pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary