

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**April 21, 2020**  
Approved May 5, 2020

Members Present: Dennis Place, John Lyman, Dick Jordan, Ted Bloomhardt, Sarah Murphy, Greg Waples, and Branden Martin (alternate)

Members Absent: Jonathan Slason and Bryan Currier (alternate)

Applicants: **Black Rock Construction/ Haystack Crossing, LLC:**

Dave Marshall – Civil Engineering Associates, Inc.

Michael Buscher – TJ Boyle Associates

Ben Avery- Black Rock Construction

Public Present: Jean Kiedaisch, Kate Kelly, Phil Pouech, Johanna White, Michael Bissonette, Carl Bohlen, Catherine Goldsmith, Andrea Morgante and Robert Hyams

Also Present: Mitchel Cypes (Development Review Coordinator), Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), and Laura Sau (Recording Secretary)

Dennis P. **called the meeting to order** at 7:31 PM.

**I. Meeting Procedures:**

Mitch C.- Displayed Meeting Procedures. Meeting was held remotely due to the current State of Emergency in our best conformance with the Governor's executive order.

- a. Everyone will be *muted* while Dennis is running the meeting. If you have something to say, you should unmute and get Dennis' attention.
- b. Place yourself in a *well-lit room*, use headphones if possible, and let your family know not to disturb you. You want to wear appropriate clothes that can be seen.
- c. **Please Identify Yourself When You Speak**
- d. Chat and file sharing has been disabled.
- e. If watching via VCAM, you can e-mail Mitch with questions or comments.

**II. Agenda Changes:**

- a. No agenda changes

**III. Review minutes of the April 7, 2020 meeting:**

- a. Minor spelling and grammar adjustments were made.
- b. Greg W. **made a motion to approve the minutes of April 7, 2020 as amended.** Dennis P. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0;**

**IV. Black Rock Construction/ Haystack Crossing, LLC:**

Conditional Use review for development in a stream setback area and continuance (from 2/18/20 & 3/17/20) of the Subdivision Preliminary Plat review for a major mixed-use development located on the west side of Route 116 and north of Patrick Brook in the Village Northwest and Agricultural Zoning Districts. Topics to be addressed in this portion of the Preliminary Plat review include stormwater low impact design compliance and traffic. If time permits there will be a discussion of upcoming meeting topics.

- a. Dave Marshall- Stream set-back
  - SHT. C3.1-4 Reference the 100-foot stream setback from Patrick Brook

- SHT. 3.2 - The road to Hinesburg Center 2 and stormwater treatment for the road is in the stream setback. They wanted to bring the road as close as possible to the property line, but avoiding the 100-year floodplain.
- C3.4 (Left hand side of sheet) – The discharge pipe for the large gravel wetland encroaches the stream setback. If moved, everything would have to be raised 1.5’
- C3.10- There is an existing 24” culvert conveying stormwater from Riggs Brook under Haystack Crossing.
  1. Looked at hydro capacity. Current 24” culvert could handle 50 year water level, however, water would have to build up fairly deep before flowing through covert.
  2. *Concern:* To account for floatables in that water buildup
  3. *Proposal:* 30” culvert at the inlet would allow water to better enter the pipe. Water flow in culverts reduces in the middle of culverts. Having the larger inlet will allow for sufficient flow through the pipe.
  4. Mitch C. - Noticed that the pipe extension was labeled as a 24” diameter pipe. David M. said they will update the plan to show a 30” diameter culvert.
- b. *Concern:* Dick J. – SH. C.3.1- Showing Road and Walking path. Is everyone in sync with Hinesburg Center, with path connecting? Will it be a box culvert to carry both road and path?
  - Michael B. (planning for both projects- Haystack and Hinesburg Center)- Yes, path will connect, crossing Farmall Dr. Yes, there is a box culvert in design.
- c. *Concern:* Dick J.- Why does circle walking path stop?
  - *Clarification:* Michael B.- Currently it leads to ‘common lot’, potentially connecting to Senior Housing Facility. It also extends south to connect to path along Patrick Brook, but there’s a discrepancy whether or not the town wants/ doesn’t want the path. Right now, there’s a potential path drawn out, but is still being discussed whether it is just an easement.
  - Dave M.- It is still in discussion. Not here with Site Plan application but wanted to at least integrate some of the concept to show reasoning of drain shapes.
  - Ben A. - In agreement of contributing floating easement to add to the town trail system. Waiting for feedback from Trails Committee for further solid plans.
- d. Dave M.--Will have a dedicated application session for storm water with Storm Water Consultant available for discussion
  - *Concern:* Greg W.- When storm water plan is presented, will it include how storms like Irene, would affect distribution of storm water and down river proposals?
  - *Clarification:* Mitch C. - Model is designed for 100 year storm, so in short, yes that includes Irene. But not discussing tonight.

## V. **Public Comments:**

- a. Bob H. - Is the buffer fixed or allow for channel migration? What happens if top of banks shifts, will setback shifts?
  - Mitch C.- Measured as 100’ from top of bank. If bank shifts, the setback potentially shifts.
- b. Bob H.- The two storm water ponds, what is the discharge? Sheet flow across the buffer?
  - Dave M.- Yes, discharged across surface, not in concentrated manor to allow vegetation to absorb.
  - *Concern:* Bob H.- How frequently will the pond be discharged? On-going?
  - Dave M.- There will be a natural discharge into the gravel, but the frequency relates to storms flowing water over top
  - *Concern:* Bob H.- Large storm water feature on the west-- it has a discharge pipe, (3.4) still daylighting in the buffer, not the stream channel?

- Dave M. - Yes, discharging in the buffer. Metal spreader at the end of pipe, acts as mini dam for even spread of water. It is a natural low point on the property, to replicate where the storm water naturally flows currently
- c. *Concern:* Bob H.- Interest from Conservation Commission/ community-- Stream channel restoration. If restoration happens, there's potential of raising stream bed. Sounds like that would not adversely impact this design.
  - Dave M.- Agrees. Future work the town may do in accordance with 100 year flood plan more so relates to the LaPlatte River than Patrick Brook. During a 100 year storm event stormwater from the LaPlatte will flow into Patrick Brook.
- d. *Concern:* Bob H.-North end of property, Riggs brook is incised/ eroding. – 30" inlet, 24" outlet—is that discharge High energy water that will exacerbate erosion.
  - Dave M. - Suitably sized plunge pool so that a scour hole doesn't occur. This area of the project isn't trying to deal with remaining downstream or upstream but is responsible for providing an appropriate means of stabilized distribution in this particular area. Also, because project needs to collect and treat its storm water, it is taking small portions of land that would go directly to the stream and redirecting the stormwater to the major structure. Everything that normally goes to the LaPlatte will get there, but not more at one time than the existing conditions.
- e. Bob H.- Is that the existing northerly road?
  - *Clarification:* Dave M.- Yes, Intention of marrying existing and proposed stormwater pipes
- f. *Concern:* Andrea M.- 24" culvert- When Ballfield was being put it, it was known to be undersized, why isn't it being upsized to an appropriate sized culvert?
  - *Clarification:* Dave M.- We are increasing inlet to allow more appropriately sized water into culvert. Once water is in the pipe, the 24" is sufficient for the flow.
  - *Concern:* Andrea M.- Problems with long term maintenance connection between 24"-30" (highway department maintenance)
    1. Dave M.- Willing to work with highway dept but believes to be meeting water requirements with proposed because the flow is remaining the same.
- g. *Concern:* Andrea M.- Development of rec path—There shouldn't be anything developed in buffer including path. If there is a path to be developed, it should be outside of buffer.
  - Ben A.- Doesn't currently represent a path in the plans. There's plenty of access to the ball fields. Happy to not build the path, but there is a floating easement for the town to develop later, which is typical with projects, but not proposing path in buffer.
  - *Proposal:* Andrea M.- Can there be a proposed floating easement not in 100' buffer?
  - Dave M. - The path shown is a remnant of a request from the sketch plan application.
  - *Concern:* Andrea M.- Wants to ensure a conversation with trails committee need for sidewalks along with other path
    1. *Proposal:* Can Section drawing to show land compared to height of road, to show amounts of fill, especially when referencing existing flow and low points.
  - *Clarification:* Dave M.- Part of application packet will be to show profile of existing (7' of elevation change from grade on left hand side to roadway)
  - Andrea M.- Are those profiles in packet items available?
  - Mitch C.- In Dropbox-- will send to Andrea M.
  - *Clarification:* Michael B.- Reason for area shown is for requested continued VAST easement access to Jiffy/ Ballard's Corner. Also, Zoning regulations specifically notes that DRB provide relief for stream buffer including unapproved paths to public recreation area. Not cut and dry, there is discussion room for setbacks, as the 100' is beyond state requirements.
- h. *Concern:* Kate K.- Stormwater on SW of property-- There are some wetlands underneath Eastern side of pond. Urge the board to consider environmental impact by replacing what historically is a natural wetland, with proposed gravel wetlands. Consider avoiding that area.

- Dave M.- Goal to avoid Class 2 Wetlands. This area is a Class 3 Wetlands so decided that it will be an impacted area. There is a packet of restoration components, happy to keep working with Conservation Commission on.

## VI. **C2 Low Impact design**

- a. Regulation in town allow for bigger picture – low LID Document techniques: From S. Burlington and Shelburne
  - Provides examples for projects. This project references 12 different LID practices to minimize bigger picture storm water approaches, vs. S. Burlington document has 3-4. Applicant has adopted various LID types from Hinesburg Manual to reduce impact on impervious area. (insert 12 types)
    1. **Cluster Development into a designated area instead of spreading out the development, which results in a smaller stormwater discharge.**
    2. **Minimize Setbacks and Frontages-** Reduce amount of impervious area necessary
    3. **Open Space Preservation-** consolidate large areas for preservation
    4. **Shared Driveway-** Intermediate feature to reduce length of driveways
    5. **Site Fingerprinting-** Identify development areas
      - a. *Clarification:* Mitch C.- Isn't this also including where Construction equipment stored for minimal impact?
      - b. Dave M.- Yes, that is a component State of Vermont has adopted to control activity impact including subcontractors. Secondary control areas are also shown on erosion sheet.
    6. **Vegetated Buffer-** State of Vermont technique, but State isn't as strict as Hinesburg.
    7. **Disconnection of Impervious Area-** Stormwater discharge is reduced when you allow a walkway to sheet flow to a flat area downhill to allow stormwater to infiltrate or be absorbed by vegetation. He showed areas where this would occur.
    8. **Landscaping Practices-** Aggressive change of buffer- planting of native, drought tolerant plants by condition of approval. Conversion of tilled areas and reforestation. Trees do a great job of rain interception, to help hydro balance of not allowing 100% of water to hit the ground. Species type and such up for discussion.
    9. **Soil Conservation and Amendments-** This is now a requirement of the State stormwater manual- Any time you are doing construction, the top 12" is not compacted and is beneficial to filtering water. Minimize impact of runoff on site from impact of topsoil.
    10. **Runoff Conveyance Practices-** Long flow paths of drops of water.
    11. **Vegetated Swale-** Utilizing grass channels instead of pipes slows down the stormwater discharge and allows for some of the .
    12. **Rain barrels & Cisterns-** Are to be offered on each residential building as part of the building package where gutters are a component of the project
      - *Concern:* Dick J.- Enclosed or open storage devices? Concerned with water collection due to mosquitoes
      - Dave M.- From knowledge- they are typically closed top.
- b. Mitch C. - Rain Barrel- You included quadplexes on Jenna Drive and Haystack Crossing, but what about 3 quadplexes on South End Circle?
  - Ben A.- There's no reason why those couldn't be included.

## **VII. Open to public**

- a. *Concern:* Bob H.- Disconnection – infiltration and managing top 12". We know its clay, is there a plow pan layer to be dealt with to help with infiltration?
  - Dave M.- currently 6-8" of topsoil. But with plan asking for 12", we can have the opportunity to make it a bit better. Move top soil off to side- and almost double it up when put back. Make sure it meets requirements of soil health. It is laid out on that sheet.
- b. *Concern:* Kate K. - Rain Barrels- VT state Stormwater Barrel regulation- has to have identified use, ie, garden, and the amount of volume that will be used. If rain barrels are being offered in package, will it sit within the guidelines.
  - *Clarification:* Dave M.- We aren't taking credits of percentage of usage but identifying encouragement towards homeowners. Not trying to jam obligation onto homeowners.

## **VIII. Traffic**

- a. Dave M.- Summary: Making recommended solutions from town-hired consultant. Will show what they're agreeing/ not agreeing to do.
- b. Ben A. – Bulk of recommendations will provide additional information in 14 days.
  - Complete traffic study by next meeting.
  - Will skip over items where Consultant in agreeance with town consultant
  - Alex W. - At the Feb 18<sup>th</sup> meeting the Town was authorized to do an independent review of traffic. Stantec was chosen to do the review. The Applicant received the review

## **IX. Memo: Corey Mack – RSG to BlackRock and Civil Engineering**

- a. (1.) Dave M. - Will do a Synchro analysis.
- b. (2.) Dave M. - Will review crash reports near the proposed entry by Riggs Road intersection. Will study the accidents by type and time of day.
  - (3) There were certain improvements Hannaford were going to include. Initially report considered additional Hannafords traffic, but will update for new condition.
    - a. Will reestablish traffic at that intersection.
  - *Concern:* Dick J.- Hannaford was talking about signaling change. Now that isn't happening, is the town changing signaling?
    - 1. Alex W.-Town did feasibility study with planning commission and cost estimate of \$88,000, not included in town budget this upcoming year or VTRANS, so there is no promise for it to happen.
    - 2. Michael B.- Timing of lights and relocation of sidewalk?
  - Alex W.- (4) Feasibility study on website- also included left hand turns into Lantman's, curb adjustments, resynchronization of lights and adjusting sidewalks
- c. (6.) Dave M.- Accommodation for alternative transportation across town. Model to leave your site for other nodes of transportation. Will better document credits taken or adjust accordingly.
- d. (7.) Dave M.- Anticipated turning lane improvements—make sure traffic plan coordinates with their plan. In discussion with updating plan.
  - 1. Committed for phase 1. Phase 2, not sure of the time frame, so not committed yet.
  - *Concern:* Dick J.- Wouldn't it still be appropriate to include trips and such for anticipated residential of phase 2 to recompute, given phase 1 conditions of intersection grades. Useful to tell us if we're on verge of problem.
    - 1. Dave M.- Not comfortable yet to anticipate conditions
    - 2. Ben A.- It's not just our phase 2, it's also Riggs Rd., NRG and other applicants-- Hinesburg Center Development has been over the past 15 years. Not fair to make assumptions at this point in application

3. *Proposal:* Dick J.- Why can't make reasonable study with own masterplan's traffic pattern.
  4. *Concern:* Ben A.- Concerned about it affecting boards decisions
  5. Dick J.- Consider that we do hope to make decisions to build whole project.
  6. Ted B.- It's not effecting decisions now
  7. *Concern:* Alex W.- Ben has been clear throughout process about bad information. Dick makes a good point about internal traffic. Once phase 1 is built, it would be difficult to retrofit so urge traffic consultant to think about the interior prior to building.
  8. *Proposal:* Ben A.- Will talk to Cory about creating relativity phase 2 to phase 1, instead of recreating all of tables. Will talk to Corey's opinion in broad layout.
  9. *Proposal:* John L.- Would be nice to know percentages of traffic increase so it's not to tight from get go.
  10. Ben A.- Will work on something in 2 week time frame.
    - a. Internal or created conditions hard to undo.
    - b. Traffic consultants will do. Handling different dynamics of 4 way and pushback of various options of traffic signals.
- e. (8.) Dave M.- Will talk to Cory about the internal traffic
- f. (9.) Dave M.- Will evaluate left-turn warrant for both site access point including the left-turn condition for traffic entering Riggs Road from VT 116 Southbound:
- Ben A.- Extensive discussion with NRG, V-Trans and Town Staff—Number of Items including slightly expanded right of way envelope for future development of NRG if they do choose to follow through in the future. Also discussed (#10) at that meeting referencing phase 1 and neighboring project prior to draft LOI.
  - Dave M.- Waiting before committing to \$250,000 left hand turn. Trying not to get to ahead of ourselves prior to possible additional lane or improvements on Route 116. Currently proposing 'right in, right out' entrance.
- g. (11.) Dave M.- As part of any traffic report- good to go. Going to remodel without Hannaford improvements.
- h. Dennis P. **opened discussion to board members but will get into depths at next meeting.** No Comment.
- i. Dennis P. **opened discussion to public keeping in mind that discussion will continue next meeting.** No public comment.
- j. Mitch C.- there are e-mails from public received but were brought up today. There were not additional e-mails during meeting.
- Andrea Morgante- will send e-mail of comments and will be discussed at next meeting.
- k. **Upcoming Meetings:** Mitch C.-
- May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting- 3-lot final plot subdivision application for Donovan and O'Donnell + Haystack
  - May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting- site visit and sketch plan application for Russell 3-lot subdivision
  - Going forward- Remote allow for shorter meetings. But what would you like to have heard next?
  - Ben A.-Due to heavy lifting engineering items – Storm water for ample time to review with Andres Torizzo for review on May 19th. Also final traffic feedback- Will have 10-14 days to digest with board. Shorter discussion on 5th—Misc. planning items with Mike Buscher-renewable energy items. Public Spaces and proposed parks for public to lay in on for final.
  - Ben A.- Sends appreciation for public in these conditions. Dennis Thanked Ben and Dave for explanations of topics. Mitch thanked DRB for follow-through.
  - Alex W.- Seems like a joint process of Mitch and Ben leading up to meeting, knowing what to focus on at meeting and bring expert. Would like to see this again to prepare public for topic.

Dennis P. **made a motion to continue the public hearing on May 5th.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0.** Greg Abstained.

**X. News/Announcements/Correspondence:**

- a.** Mitch C.- No additional items besides upcoming agenda already discussed.

Dennis P. moved to adjourn, John L. seconded  
**The meeting adjourned at 9:42 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary