

**Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
July 17, 2018**

Approved August 7, 2018

Members Present: Greg Waples, Ted Bloomhardt, Andy Greenberg (Alternate), Rolf Kielman, Dennis Place, Sarah Murphy, Dick Jordan

Members Absent: Jonathan Slason (Alternate), John Lyman

Applicants: Christina Frost, Renae Marshall, Joy Dubin Grossman, Mike Anthony, Andrea Morgante

Public Present: None

Also Present: Mitchel Cypes (Development Review Coordinator), Kate Kelly (Recording Secretary)

Dennis P. called the meeting to order at 7:32 pm.

Agenda Changes:

Mitchel C. mentioned that he received a request to add a 6-month extension for the Place Rd. subdivision, and would like to add it to Other Business.

Review minutes of the 6/19/18 meeting:

A few minor amendments were made.

Greg W. **made a motion to approve the 6/19/18 meeting minutes as amended.** Ted B. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **4-0**. Sarah M., Rolf K., and Andy G. abstained.

Town of Hinesburg: Site Plan review for a new highway road salt shed and remaining site improvements on a +38.1-acre town-owned property located at 907 Beecher Hill Road in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District. This is phase 3 and 4 of a four-phase project and is being undertaken to facilitate the return of Chittenden Solid Waste District service to the site.

Renae M. provided some project background, that the town had previously received approval for phasing of this project. After approval, CSWD decided to leave until construction was completed. The town has drilled the new well; CSWD is saying they will return.

Applicant is requesting approval for everything related to the town (including salt shed and pieces relevant to town garage construction).

Renae M. noted that the shed size has changed from original plans. The new company quoted a better price, and the shed is a little larger (went from 65' x 100' to 70' x 120'). The height increased by 5', but it will comply with the new regulations.

Mitchel C. added that the increase in impervious surface is minimal.

Greg W. asked for clarification on if the new shed is higher. Mitchel C. answered the old shed was close to 35' height limit. Discussion ensued, and Mike A. clarified that this is not a cone, this is a lower dome.

Dick J. noted that on the downhill side you'll see a 39'8" building. Discussion ensued, and several members requested a better explanation of what's going on. Rolf K. asked if we are now using an average grade. Ted B. confirmed this. Dick J. felt that many houses in the town could be significantly taller on the downhill side under the new regulations.

Andrea M. mentioned that Starksboro and Ferrisburgh have the same shed.

Rolf K. asked if the vaulting runs east-west, and Renae M. confirmed this.

Greg W. wondered about visibility for neighbors/drivers. Most felt it would be visible from North Rd./Beecher Hill.

Andy G. asked about the height of the current garage, and Mitchel C. replied that the current garage is 24'5". Andy G. said he felt that this building is already quite high. Discussion ensued about visibility. 38'6" is the highest point of the building.

Greg W. suggested we talk about if it fits into neighborhood.

Sarah M. wondered if the building is larger, would the town need additional blacktop for a turn-around area. Mike A. answered that the town would not require additional blacktop.

Andy G. went back to CSWD; he thought phases 1 & 2 were approved without CSWD because things needed to get sorted out. What has prevented this from being sorted out? Andrea M. clarified that the applicant has nothing to sort out, but it is an internal CSWD discussion about drop off centers county-wide. Greg W. said CSWD was concerned about how this development would affect their process. We allowed stages 1 & 2, and they had to react to that. Andy G. said he thought they would be allowed to operate there, then trenching was going through their area. Andrea M. said they did not intend to stay at that location; no one responded to CSWD's RFP for fast trash hauling from that site or other sites. They chose to leave anyways. It is difficult to understand why they left. We have provided what they asked for initially, they requested new conduit to be placed in, we paid for new well; we have every indication they will return.

Dick J. asked if the well will be shared by the town garage and CSWD. Andrea M. clarified that CSWD will not have water or wastewater on site. We put in the new well because the existing well wasn't in compliance with solid waste permit.

Ted B. asked Renae M. to describe phase 3 & 4. Phase 4 is salt shed. Phase 3 is demolition of existing structure, finishing stormwater ponds. Greg W. asked if the town hopes to finish this fall to put sand and salt in. Mike A. replied they would like to be able to store the sand under the shed this winter as well. This will save the Highway Dept. time to load (and money if they can buy salt in larger quantity).

Discussion ensued about description of shed and roof (35 year life expectancy).

Dick J. asked about when landscaping would be finished. Andrea M. answered earthwork in the fall, planting in the spring.

Sarah M. asked about tying timeline for landscaping in with phasing to confirm it is at the time of spring planting. Mitchel C. said it was already addressed in prior decision, with a 2 year time limit.

Andy G. asked about the color, etc. – all the same, white material as on roof.

Greg W. asked if transfer of mix happens outside or inside; his concern is with sounds for neighboring properties. As they screen at gravel pit, they mix in salt and bring it to trucks. Greg W. asked about sounds, and Mike A. said there may be less noise, and will take less time to load.

Dennis P. opened discussion to the public. There was no Public comment.

Ted B. mentioned this building will certainly be visible, then asked what this area is zoned. Mitchel C. answered it is in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District.

Dennis P. **made a motion to approve the draft decision as written**, Rolf **seconded**. The Board voted **6-1**. Andy G. dissented.

United Church of Hinesburg: Site plan review for proposed changes to outdoor lighting on a 2.2-acre property located at 10580 Route 116 in the Village Zoning District. The applicant is proposing one spot light to illuminate the front of the church and four building-mounted lighting fixtures.

Mitchel C. mentioned that the applicant requested a continuance to August 21.

Sarah M. **made a motion to grant the continuance**, Greg W. **seconded**, the Board voted **6-0** (Rolf K. was absent).

Garin & Christina Frost (Frost Beer Works): Conditional use review for the addition of restaurant/food truck use to their 1.34-acre property located at 171 Commerce Street in the Commercial Zoning District. The applicants are proposing to have a food truck on site during their beer tasting hours, and to extend the hours of beer tasting. Continued from 6/19/18.

Christina Frost (Frost Beer Works) was present to discuss their company's application.

Greg W. asked why the applicant wasn't present last time; Christina F. stated she didn't realize they needed to be here, and apologized. Greg W. said they should recognize that they should attend in the future.

The applicant would like to have a food truck and extended Sat. hours 12-8 PM (actually 7 PM, with time for people to leave). Currently listed hours are Sunday 3-6 PM, would like Sunday hours extended to 12-6 PM. Christina F. said they would like to provide this as a community service. Would also like to occasionally have a fundraising event on Thursdays (50% of all profits that night back to fundraising recipient). A food truck makes it a family place, and the food truck they've had is a local woman from Hinesburg.

Dick J. asked if their intention is to stay with the same food truck, or to change food trucks. Christina F. said she doesn't know, but right now prefers to establish a relationship with one food truck (ease and consistency). They would not have more than one food truck at a time.

Dick J. asked if the food truck is there for their business or to support Frost business. Concerned about people coming up just for food. Andy G. stated that parking may be an issue – 22 parking spaces may not be adequate, as he had seen people parking in the stream setback area and along Commerce St. Are we concerned about parking in stream setback area? Is Commerce St. parking allowed? Discussion ensued. Sarah M. asked about parking at the post office.

Mitchel C. stated that in the past, other businesses used to have 14-18 or more employees, so 22 spaces was deemed adequate. Now, Frost has 6 employees, so there would be adequate parking for a food truck.

Greg W. said the Board could use their usual condition that if parking becomes an issue, the applicant would need to come back to the Board. Christina replied she could modify how they currently park, to ameliorate the parking issue.

Ted B. stated it is hard to calculate parking spots because it's not like a number of seats at a restaurant. Dick J. asked if anyone has asked the food truck how many customers they need to show up. Greg W. asked about sampling at the brewery. Dick J. stated there are 6 seats for sampling inside or outside. Greg W. asked if they get tour busses. Christina F. said they are a small brewery.

Ted B. said we have a condition in the order about parking. Andy G. asked if we are concerned with parking in stream setback area. Greg W. said we can ask them to block off stream setback. Andy G. said he saw a SD Ireland truck parked there. Christina F. clarified that they are doing construction back there. Greg W. suggested applicant take measures to disallow parking in the stream setback area. Dick J. said we could require them to keep parking on the gravel lot.

Sarah M. asked about proposed hours. Most agreed they are fine.

Dick J. asked about seating. Mitchel C. said Zoning Administrator had reviewed prior decisions, and they were limited to 6 seats (not necessarily inside or outside). Dick J. asked if this is feasible/adequate.

Christina F. asked if the visiting food truck is an event, so they can sit with food when there is an event. Greg W. said the Department of Liquor Control has their own regulations regarding an event. Dennis P. asked if people can bring their own chairs. Sarah M. mentioned picnic tables were present at their event, and they felt like food truck seats.

Greg W. asked why we granted 6 seats to begin with. Discussion ensued – Christina F. said 6 seats was what they were approved for indoors (but they don't have any indoors), they were told they could move them outdoors. Christina F. stated she was under the impression that the food truck was an event that would allow additional seating; she recently added picnic benches inside, but they are not seating.

Greg W. felt there should be a systemized way of dealing with this.

Mitchel C. stated an event is a once a year thing. They originally asked about doing this once, so it was considered an event; now it is a regular (seasonal) thing. The Board was suggesting maybe it would be to Frost's advantage to ask for 6 seats outside in addition to 6 inside.

Christina F. agreed they should have more seats in general, but they want to grow slowly and manageably. She was concerned about getting seats, as it would be a bigger issue to get permitting from other regulatory bodies. Mitchel C. said the Board approving extra seating would then not limit Frost to getting them from other regulatory bodies.

Mitchel C. suggested adding seats only when food truck was present. Christina F. agreed.

Dick J. asked about the limits of the decision on when food truck is allowed. Mitchel C. said it limits it to 4 days a week (tasting hours).

Dick J. said they could add more seats indoors if things are going really well.

Dick J. and Greg W. suggested staff amend draft and come back.

Discussion ensued about seating inside vs. outside, and numbers of seats. Dick J. is fine with 18 seats. Ted B. said there are probably enough parking spaces. Sarah M. mentioned that 12 seats would have to be tied to food truck.

Christina F. asked if she could change the hours slightly. Change Friday and Sunday to 12-8 PM. Most agreed this is fine.

Public hearing was closed.

Ted B. made a motion to **direct staff to draft conditions of approval**. Dennis P. **seconded**. Board voted **7-0**.

Other Business:

Decision Deliberation: Giroux-Besaw: Preliminary plat review for a seven-unit PUD located at 429 Richmond Road. Hearing closed on 6/19/18.

Mitchel C. mentioned that John L. gave his yes vote to the decision.

Dick J. made a few changes.

Greg W. **made a motion to approve as amended**. Dennis P. **seconded**. The Board voted **5-0**. Sarah M., Rolf K., and Andy G. abstained.

Next meeting Aug. 7:

Mitchel C. said Hannaford will present traffic info at next meeting. Rolf K. won't be there.

New zoning and sub-division regulations:

Ted B. pointed out height calculation change.

Mitchel C. said there is no more transfer of land applications for DRB, they will now be going to the office (boundary adjustment) or subdivision revision.

A training session on the new regulations is tentatively scheduled for 8/21/18.

On Dropbox for this hearing, there is a Regulations file with Track Changes version of regulations.

Rolf K. asked about height limitations, where is it defined. It is defined under building height.

Place 2-lot subdivision:

Application by Hilton Place, 2-lot subdivision (former driving range, therefore under Act 250). Act 250 has additional requirements, so they are requesting an additional 6 month extension.

Ted B. **made a motion to approve the 6-month extension**, and Greg W. **seconded**. Board voted **6-0**. Dennis P. recused himself.

News/Announcements/Correspondence

Dennis P. **made a motion to adjourn**. Greg W. **seconded the motion**. The Board voted **7-0**.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary