

**Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
June 4, 2019**

Approved June 18, 2019

Members Present: Dennis Place, John Lyman, Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, Sarah Murphy

Members Absent: Jonathan Slason, Bryan Currier (alternate), Greg Waples

Applicants: Michael Buscher, Brett Grabowski

Public Present: Greg Tomczyk, Jen & Brian Hunter, Andrea Morgante

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

Dennis P. called the meeting to order at 7:34 PM.

Agenda Changes:

Mitchel C. said the draft decisions are not ready, so they could be removed from the agenda. He mentioned that the DRB has one alternate position available; anyone interested should contact Mitchel C.

Review minutes of the May 21, 2019 meeting:

Ted B. **made a motion to approve the minutes of May 21, 2019 as written.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 4-0**; Sarah M. abstained.

Hinesburg Center II/The Estate of David Lyman c/o Barbara Lyman: Sketch Plan review for a major subdivision of a +46.2-acre property located north of the Creekside neighborhood, west of the Kinney Drug complex, and south of Patrick Brook in the Village and Agricultural Zoning Districts. The applicant is proposing 77 residential units (a mix of single-family and multi-family), 14,000 sq ft of commercial/retail/office space, 4,600 sq ft of light industrial space, a grid of street and sidewalks, and open space. They are proposing a combination of on-street and

John L. recused himself. Michael Buscher, representing Brett Grabowski, presented the Hinesburg Center II development sketch plan. He showed the previous plan that had received sketch plan approval prior to this. He pointed out the changes made in this plan to the center block and the east side. The densities take full advantage of the bonuses that are allowed and encouraged in Hinesburg's Zoning Regulations. They are proposing a total of 100 residential units, 18 of which already exist as part of Hinesburg Center I. They are looking at 16 single family lots, 7 of which will be smaller carriage style homes. They are proposing three nine-unit buildings. Three of the units will line the street at ground level. Six units will be above and have an individual entrance from the street. All nine units will have garages. The 27 units and the 7 carriage homes will have rear garage access from an alley way. They are proposing one three story multi-family building with 39 units. Mitchel C. pointed out that the narrative proposed 34 units, but the 39 units would maximize the allowable total with bonuses. Michael Buscher said these buildings haven't been fully designed. He pointed out the non-residential buildings on the southeast portion of Hinesburg Center 2 have 4,000 sq. ft. of office space and 2,000 sq. ft. retail, on a footprint of 3,000 sq ft. This is a

product that is different than anything currently available in Hinesburg; a company could build their own building here. Proposed on the north end is a light industrial building, 4,600 sq. ft.

Michael B. pointed out the rec path easement, the community farm location, and the 500 kW net metered ground-mounted solar array shown on plans on the western portion of the property. Michael B. displayed a rendering showing park space (from prior application); they felt the space on edge to south (bordering Creekside) would serve best as a park.

Michael B. displayed Hinesburg Center 1 and Hinesburg Center 2 and cumulative greenspace calculations, and connections to other developments (Haystack Crossing, etc.)

Dennis P. said Creekside is wet. What will they do about it? Michael B. said the road going in will be higher, greenspace would be regraded to encourage water to get into new catch basins. There will be times of year when it is wet. Stormwater discharge from this greenspace and other portions of Hinesburg Center 2 will go to a channel on the west side of the proposed development with series of check dams and into stormwater pond. Dick J. asked about water pipe; this will be gravity fed. Brett Grabowski said that whole area is going to come up. They will be able to tap into existing sewer and water lines. Dennis P. asked who will be responsible for the large park (on north side of Creekside); it will be landowners of Creekside and Hinesburg Center II. Michael B. clarified this is not to be a structured space. Mitchel C. asked if this would be open to wider community: Michael B. replied it would. Michael B. added that they also have the area to the west that is good for a community space/farm.

Sarah M. asked if the grade would prevent stormwater from flowing onto Farmall Drive. Brett G. said Lamoreux and Dickinson has done this work. Michael B. said they would grade east to west to ensure drainage to west.

Michael B. added that Hinesburg Center 2 has been broken into two conceptual phases, which could be changed. Brett G. said they have water and sewer for phase 1, possibly not including one lot.

Dick J. asked how many workers 2,000 sq. ft. would hold; Michael B. said he'd estimate 300 sq. ft. per employee, so likely 12-15 employees for each of 4,000 sq. ft. buildings, depending on many factors.

Dick J. brought up building C, and the difference between 34 and 39 units vs. amount of parking. Michael B. said they are using a shared parking analysis. The 9-units have internal parking garage and space outside. Single family have garages with space for 2. Parallel spaces on one or both (east road) sides of the road. Two parking facilities on the east side of Hinesburg Center II.

Dennis P. asked about on-street parking. Michael B. said that along 116 and Farmall Drive, it is maintained by the town. Dennis P. asked if they would be able to park there during the winter. Michael B. said there is enough off-street parking for residential parking overnight. The multi-family residential unit is calculated per regulations at 2 spaces per unit; for this development (size of these units), it is pretty high. The national average is 1.5 spaces per unit. In Burlington, they are calculating at 1.15 spaces per unit. Sarah asked how many bedrooms; Michael B. answered it is 2 bedrooms per 9-unit. For 39 units, a mix of 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, and studio apartments. This is combined/shared parking with Hinesburg Center I. Sarah M. said she has been at Kinney Drugs at not been able to get a parking space. He said he believes there will be better availability with the new development. Michael B. displayed the spreadsheet for shared parking, using Urban Land Institute numbers. He displayed values of parking from Urban Land Institute, and compared these to a study they've done looking at other developments in Chittenden County. The graph he displayed had parking based on 1.5 spaces per multi-unit. He displayed how the

ULI numbers were much higher than what they actually observed in the field. Sarah M. said she didn't feel they should count the parking for Hinesburg Center I. Michael B. said at 2 spots per unit, they're not providing enough parking in Hinesburg Center II alone, but at Kinney there are empty spots starting at 8 PM. This is where the 1.5 spots vs. 2 spots comes in. Sarah M. asked how many extra spots at phase 1 do they have? He said he hasn't done that work. She reminded about the on-street parking in front of old police station. The Board discussed the lot behind the police station. Michael B. pointed out that as Village buildout happens, there will be more availability for public transportation, and trends towards lower car membership. Sarah M. and Dick J. said they'd like to see the phase 1 data. Michael B. said they'd be happy to provide that information. He mentioned that he has never seen the parallel spaces along Kailey's Way be fully utilized. There is a total of 125 off-street parking spaces between both phases (79 HC1, 46 Hinesburg Center 2), which includes Kailey's Way. The total is more than 2 per unit.

Michael B. then discussed the bonus incentives. The base density is 4 units/acre. They plan to utilize the maximum 120% bonus. He reviewed the incentives and potential methods to obtain density bonuses. He said they propose meeting bonus through dwelling unit size, affordable housing, and renewable energy. They would encourage use of smaller units; combined Hinesburg Center I and Hinesburg Center II = 57% < 1,200 sq. ft. In regards to Green Home Certification – the town Planning & Zoning indicated they are looking for higher level of certification, and this is outside this project's financial constraints. They are proposing renewable energy to meet at least 25% of energy needs. He displayed average amounts of energy usage per home, and how much this project would provide.

Dick J. asked if solar panels count as impervious surface; Mitchel C. replied only the bases count.

Michael B. discussed the affordable housing requirement and how many affordable housing units would be required to satisfy the full bonus. He talked about the challenges of meeting the important public spaces & public infrastructure bonus requirement. He said that the Selectboard had indicated an equivalency that would be more than what a typical development would purchase land for. Dennis P. asked about lot 1; Michael B. said they had proposed a plan for lot 1, and the Selectboard was interested, but required too large of a contribution.

Michael B. continued by stating that the development emphasizes streetscape design and, front porches, and that the west side units are the only ones with garages fronting the road. He added that the development is very walkable. He sees this as a good plan for a village core. Dennis P. asked about senior housing; Michael B. said they don't have any here, but there is some proposed north of the stream in the Haystack development. Sarah M. asked about trails to connect to Bissonette Rec Fields; Michael B. displayed the current VAST trail and a path south of the development. The Board discussed how the sidewalk along 116 needs to be permitted through VTrans. Michael B. stated there is an existing informal trail that is being mowed from 116 to the rec fields. There is a trail that would replace that existing trail on Haystack Crossing, between the 50 and 100 feet buffers on Patrick Brook.

Ted B. asked about the small greenspace in close proximity to multi-family units. Michael B. said the number of children in these units (1-bedroom) would be extremely low. They anticipate this space would have tables, BBQ grills. Ted B. said it seems minimal to him for a 39-plex, with street and parking on many sides. He asked how many square feet the area is. Michael B. estimated it to be 60 ft. by 30 ft. Brett G. replied there are other larger greenspaces just to south.

Sarah M. pointed out that much of the greenspace is to the south so the 39-unit doesn't have much space. Brett G. said the 39-unit would have space to south (B on map), and they likely have more space than the single family units. Sarah M. asked where that space is located. The Board discussed green

space in Green Street and other places; she felt 2-bedroom units would encourage families with children. Of the 18 units in Hinesburg Center 1, the Applicant doesn't think they have any school age children. Michael B. said family with children occupancy is often ~15% for 2-bedroom units.

Dick J. commented on the greenspace behind buildings A & B, and if the public would feel comfortable using those spaces (because they are near businesses). Michael B. said he does feel comfortable using small spaces near businesses. Brett G. commented that those small spaces may be useful for some people.

Dick J. asked what dark space at end of parking lot indicates; Michael B. stated it indicates dumpsters or something enclosed. Concerns were raised that the small green space near the 39 unit building would have a dumpster next to it. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the Public.

Greg Tomczyk, who lives on Fredric Way, commented that the water at the proposed larger greenspace goes from east to west, and pools there. He was concerned with details of how applicant will rectify the situation. He was concerned with the elevation profile of the phases from 116 west. He still sees a basin there.

Jennifer Hunter, who also lives on Fredric Way. In terms of greenspace, she is concerned that if the greenspace is brought up in elevation, their houses will be at lowest elevation for whole area. She remembers plan prior was that it would be at the same elevation. In regards to parking, she commented that there is not designated parking now, and there are issues with the school bus when there are two people parked; she's concerned with future parking. She understood that the developer kept the greenspace for certain time (20 years?), and after that would it go to homeowners' association. Brett G. said this piece of land was never conveyed to the association.

Michael B. said the two roads to the south and west would be similar to Creekside elevations. The greenspace would still be lower than the houses. Brett G. mentioned that that piece of land is a critical piece of open space, so it needs to be usable and will be brought up in elevation to make it so.

Dick J. said he recalled building C would be built into the hillside there, and the east side of parking lot would come down to a lower elevation. Michael B. said the proposed elevations were 3 feet lower than the east side of building.

Ted B. asked how they would make connection to the north; how does this get coordinated with development on north of creek, and how does the bridge across creek get built? Brett G. said it is a box culvert not a bridge. Andrea M. said she'd like to see permits from the state to understand what's going on. She is concerned about constricting Patrick Brook further there, as the culvert upstream is already undersized. She felt it was premature to state that it will be a box culvert. Michael B. said it had been examined in the past, and the open bottom box culvert (similar to a bridge) was considered to be the best option. Brett G. added that their road does line up with the road to north.

Dick J. asked if a sidewalk would cross with the bridge/culvert. Ted B. said he'd look forward to seeing an agreement in the future regarding this issue.

Mitchel C. asked what storm event would the culvert would be designed. The Applicant didn't know.

Andrea M. encouraged discussion with Hinesburg road foreman, regarding snow removal not just for on-street parking, but also where snow will be placed. How many parking spaces will snow storage take up?

Or will it be removed from the site, vs. dumped in river? She'd like to see contour lines be removed from map, to understand these vs. floodplain lines. They discussed the lines shown on the map. Michael B. said there was a limitation with the survey. Mitchel C. said a survey with contour lines would be a requirement for preliminary.

Dick J. said they'd have to go through the process of showing the fill in the floodplain. Andrea M. proposed seeing sections to show how much fill will be added. She said that it is a deficiency in our regulations that we continue to allow development in the floodplain. She felt this would be asking for trouble in the future that will have to be paid for by taxpayers. She added that recreation paths (improved) shouldn't be within buffers or setbacks of fluvial hazard corridor, to maintain wildlife connectivity and protect. Michael B. replied that the location was at the request from Trails Committee.

Dick J: when phase 1 is built out, will phase 2 be grassed, or left in what condition? The Applicant replied that hopefully phase 2 will be permitted and construction will begin. Brett G. said if not, they will be maintained and mowed.

Ted B. was concerned about access to greenspace; would like to see it closer to 39-plex, but is willing to hear proposals about how to make lot 1 be the destination from building C and 9-plexes. Michael B. pointed out corner greenspace.

Mitchel C. mentioned email comments for this application are in Dropbox. One of these comments arrived on May 31 and another four including Ms. Hunter's came this afternoon.

Kate Kelly echoed concerns about building in the 100 year floodplain. She felt that, with increasing storm intensities with climate change, this could affect the amount of flooding, and/or location of the river/brook and its floodplains. She felt we would be causing problems for future generations by building in the floodplain. Dick J. commented that this is a separate issue that was studied in the prior application. They will have to show again with this floodplain application/stormwater pond.

Greg Tomczyk asked if stormwater is designed for all of phase 2. Michael B. said it will be for an engineer in the future to determine.

Dennis P. **made a motion to close the public hearing and take up the issue in deliberative session.** Sarah M. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 4-0.**

Other Business: Mitchel C. said at next meeting, they will hear two applications: a 2-lot subdivision on Pond Rd., and the other is proposed home occupation 116, near Place Rd. W. for a silversmith.

Ted B. **made a motion to close the hearing and to go into deliberative session,** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 4-0.**

Decision Deliberations: delayed until next meeting

The meeting adjourned at 9:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary