

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
May 5, 2020
Approved May 19, 2020

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

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

Applicants: **Jim Donovan & Patricia O'Donnell**

Black Rock Construction/ Haystack Crossing, LLC:

Michael Buscher – TJ Boyle Associates

Ben Avery- Black Rock Construction

Public Present: Danielle Ade, Andrea Morgante, Carl Bohlen, Catherine Goldsmith, Johanna White, Phil Pouech, Michael Bissonette, Kate Kelly, Barbara Foraurer, Robert Hyams, and C G Murphy. *Since this was a remote meeting, it is possible there were other members of the Public in attendance, who did not speak nor make themselves known.*

Also Present: Al Barber (Hinesburg Fire Chief), Mitchel Cypes (Development Review Coordinator), Alex Weinhausen (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. Please stay muted until the Public portion of the meeting when it is appropriate for you to speak.
- b. Place yourself in a *well-lit room*, use headphones if possible, and let your family know not to disturb you.
- 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 21, 2020 meeting:

- a. Minor spelling adjustments were made.
- b. Ted B. **made a motion to approve the minutes of April 7, 2020 as amended.** John L. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 6-0;**

IV. Jim Donovan & Patricia O'Donnell

Final Plat review for a 3-lot subdivision of a +30-acre property located at 613

Mechanicsville Road in the Residential 1 and Rural Residential 1 Zoning Districts. Lot 1 would be 4.3 acres and include an existing mobile home. Lot 2 would be +2.2 acres and include the existing triplex. Lot 3 would be 23.6 acres and will remain undeveloped.

- a. Jim D.- Minor changes between Sketch to Final plans. Plans submitted shows the buildings, erosion hazard areas, building envelope area sitting outside of 75' stream setback, wetland setbacks, erosion setbacks, property line setbacks, and two drainage easements (not inside of building envelope).
 - No development is planned for Lot 3, and there is a note on the plans that there is to be no development without further DRB approval. An access permit from the Town to CVU Rd was obtained. There will be no access from Mechanicsville Rd due to crossing too many delicate areas, such as wetlands.
 - Proposed sewer easement over Lot 2 for the benefit of Lot 3. Location to be determined in the future.
 - Some utilities are mapped. Someone who was supposed to map pre-existing utilities didn't show up so they're not shown. However, sketch plan provides general known locations.
 - Mobile home on Lot 1, 603 Mechanicsville Road gets water through the triplex on Lot 2 at 613 Mechanicsville Road, so it will be disconnected and receive its own connection in future when Lot 1 (with mobile home) is developed.
- b. Dennis P.- Asked about the stream setback locations
 - *Clarification:* Jim D- Took care of it. Initially had it backwards, with the thought that the stream that runs to the South of the barn was not a defined stream, but when found out that it was, the building envelope was modified. It actually creates two building envelopes on Lot 2, as the stream setback divides the buildable area.
- c. *Concern:* Dick J.- Small building envelope to the right of the barn- Reasonable size? Area meets all setbacks?
 - *Clarification:* Jim D.- Yes. Is larger than it looks. Can fit a 24x36 house with room to spare.
- d. *Clarification:* Jim D.- 8 possible units could be developed between lots 1 and 2. Assigning 2 units to Lot 1. Assigning 6 units to Lot 2. Potential for 3 additional units on Lot 2, and one additional unit on Lot 1.
 - Dick J.- Additional units beyond existing? Dwelling on Lot 2 is currently multiple apartments?
 - Jim D. - Yes there are 3 units in it, with possible of 6 total.
- e. Ted B.- Barns are within restricted areas of setbacks?
 - Jim D.- Yes
 - Dick J.- Both of them
 - *Clarification:* Mitch C. - Both considered pre-existing non-conforming structures.
 - *Concern:* Ted B.- But they can't be converted to something else where they are located. They may be pole barns.
 - Jim D. - They are just pole barns.
 - *Clarification:* Mitch C. - If they do want to make additions to structures in future, as they are non-conforming, they would have to come back to DRB for conditional use approval. If owner of Lot 2 wanted to create 3 additional units within the building envelopes, All they would need is a building permit.
- f. *Concern:* Dick J.- Lot 2 gravel driveway is within stream setback. Requesting safe guard for driveway gravel migrating into stream, concern for water quality and water
 - Mitch C.- It is a pre-existing condition. If owner wanted to expand/ change driveway, they would have to get DRB approval for development in a village stream buffer.
 - *Proposal:* Ted B. - Notation that owner cannot change pre-existing condition without DRB approval.

V. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public:

- a. *Proposal:* Andrea M.- References regulation to not mow buffer to allow revegetation of stream. Proposal of written provision of allowing vegetation to grow but allowing to remove invasive
 - *Clarification:* Mitch C. - Will craft the decision to include this reference. Regulation refers to village stream buffer vs buffers overall. But both are in village.

Ted B. moved to close public hearing and to direct staff to draft conditions of approval. Dennis P. seconded the motion. Board voted 6-0

VI. Black Rock Construction/ Haystack Crossing, LLC:

Preliminary Plat and Conditional Use review for Phase 1 of a major mixed use (residential, commercial, light industrial) development on a +76-acre property located on the west side of Route 116 north of Kinney Drug and Patrick Brook in the Village Northwest and Agricultural Zoning Districts. Hearing continued from 2/18/20, 3/17/20 and 4/21/20. Topics to be addressed include: density bonus calculation, affordable housing, the Central Green, connection to Hinesburg Center II, building heights, residential and commercial phasing, a needed subdivision revision, and public input on other topics.

VII. Density Bonus Calculation (Haystack Crossing LLC)-

- a. Mitch C. - Mike did a good job on narrative explaining the development, however, not fully clear on how it meets the regulatory aspect- it will be good to clarify for DRB. Bringing up to board to explain any calculations.
- Applicant **33.228 acres** in NW zoning district outside of stream buffer. Base density is *3 units per acre (without any bonuses) = 99.68*.
 - Applicant provided for full buildout with 120% Density Bonus
 1. +50% Bonus= utilize 2 incentive points--for *small dwelling sizes and renewable energy*.
 2. +70% density bonus=with affordable housing-- **50 units affordable dwellings**. Calculation for full build-out.
 - Mike B.- Not accurate. First density bonus is 50%. Going to use 2 density bonuses for 75% of Total Density Bonus. Going to use affordable for last bit of density units. Total of 30% for 40 affordable units.
 - *Clarification:* Mitch C. – Chart section 2.91 (Page 9 of Zoning Regulations), Percent Density Bonus by District: *Village NW District (VG NW)*--2 points you get 50 %, whereas, 75% would be for the Village Zoning District.
 - Mike B.- Hasn't been brought up to them yet.
 - Ben A.- Mitch discussed wanting to clarify last week
 - Mike B. and Ben A. agreed on the mistake and will review/ adjust calculations in application.
 - Ben A.- Coming into Phase 1 with 20 proposed affordable units, so halfway there. Will reassess Phase 2 to meet requirement.
 - Mitch C.- Does meet the minimum for first phase. 40% density bonus for 139 dwelling units. 50 congregate units that don't count as density. 139 is bigger than 126.
- b. Ted B.- Resubmission of calculation?
- Mike B.- Narrative will remain the same, just the numbers adjusted.
- c. *Concern:* Dick J.- Meeting all points for Phase 1 and then Phase 2 never gets built because Phase 2 is not guaranteed. Would like to potential residential portioned to phases.
- Ben A.- It's structured where Phase 1 stands alone from bonuses
 - *Clarification:* Mike B.- To completely buildout for Phase 1 requires 30 additional residential units. Over 10 units, would already trigger requirement for 10 affordable units, which provides 20 units. Only 7 affordable units short of being able to fully build it. Going to provide next 10% of affordable units off of based density, which brings total affordable units up to 20 units, which gives an additional 40 units bringing total up to 140
 - *Clarification:* Mitch- 139. If you want to get density bonuses later on, you would have to build some structures that meet requirement, even if not applying for density bonus at this time.
 - Ben A.- We are not differing requirements of Phase 2 to meet Phase 1

VIII. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public- in regards to Density Bonus Calculation:

- a. *Concern and Proposal:* Andrea M.- Storm water and conditional uses- Maximizing density and stormwater pond that is infringing, is there a possibility of changing location of stormwater pond so they don't need to get conditional use. Will DRB consider the relationship to density and conditional use due to maximizing density.
- *Clarification:* Mike B.- Regarding Conditional Use of Setback—It's not that we don't have room for the conditional use elsewhere, it has to do with grading—to connect to Hinesburg Center 2. Even if wasn't for connection to Hinesburg Center 2, wouldn't need Conditional use or that specific location. Has to be located there regardless of buildings.
 - Andrea M.- Concentration of density uses—located furthest from the space and plays into overall subdivision of lots. Density of people living of one area vs overall density.
- b. Carl B.- Affordable housing number units- 20 units in phase 1 and recalculation of phase 2?
- Ben A.- Correct.
 - Dennis P.- Doesn't think the number of units is going down.
 - Mike B- Between Phases 1 and 2 =Total of 30 units,
 1. **Phase 1= 20 Affordable Units**
 2. Originally anticipated 10 affordable units in Phase 2.
Recalculation: Phase 2= 30 Affordable Units
 3. **Total= 50 Affordable Units**
- c. Sarah M.- Density asking for with Density Bonus, is that both Haystack 1 and Haystack 2?
- Sarah M. - Hard to understand split between density bonus between phases.
 - Mike B.- Total base is 99 units. Without any Density Bonus, 99 units could be built.
 1. More than 10 units proposed, there's a 10% inclusionary zoning requirement. Meaning 10% of units have to be affordable (10 units).
 2. Providing 10 Affordable Units, automatically provides 20% Density Bonus, increasing Total Units= 119 Units.
 3. 126 Units proposed to Phase 1, Need mechanism to allow additional 7 units. Proposing to provide total of 20% Affordable Units, based on Base Density according to Zoning Regulations.
 4. By providing 20 units, gives 40% Density Bonus, giving 40 additional units, Total Allowable Unit count for Phase 1 =139 Units. However, Proposal of Phase 1 = 126 Units
- d. Mitch C.- Per water and sewer allocation- 20 Affordable Units being built in Phase 1 are being required based minimum inclusionary, as well as, the Water/Sewer Allocation approved by the Selectboard
- Ben A. - Legal Standpoint- Calculation meets requirements with Hinesburg Staff. (Pass/ Fail Situation)
 - Mitch C.- It's in the supplemental Staff Report
 - Alex W.- Mike and Ben's revision will be in package for next meeting. Meets requirements with excess to ensure full build-out of Phase 2. The energy committee will have comments on meeting renewable energy bonuses- potential future conversation.

IX. Subdivision Revision Application (Haystack Crossing LLC)

- a. Mitch C.- Condition of preliminary plat division – Will have to get 2 Subdivision Revision – Town and KB Realty.
- Application with town- Change in the pedestrian entry to Recreational Fields.
 - KB Realty – Land swap to allow development access to mount Route 116 to line up with Riggs Rd.
- b. *Clarification:* Alex W.- Has confirmed with KB Realty regarding land swap agreement with applicant.
- Town revision as not been discussed with Selectboard, but understood to be working collaboratively, with expectation of that application included as part of final plat application.

- Mitch is making everyone aware of contingent applications.
- Mitch C. - Memorandum of Understanding in the Dropbox for the KB Realty land swap.

X. Southern Connection

- a. Ben A. - Will be in form of Memorandum of Understanding with lot real estate to make future connection, following the completion of their infrastructure on southern side. Intention of Phase 1 to buildout to lot line on Haystack side. Connection would be pro-rated shared expense when possible.

- XI. Dennis P. **opened hearing to the public**- regarding Subdivision Revision and Southern Connection: No comment

XII. Development of Central Green (Haystack Crossing LLC)

- a. Ben A. - In the full buildout there will be a central green on the east and west sides of Haystack Rd with a through pedestrian connection to Recreation fields. Future town plan of open space. Proposal currently left area as open green, with interest in what the board would like to see. Has not yet incorporated community features – *can't develop private amenities for public use due to liability and management*. Would the board like to see amenities for Haystack Community usage that will be available for the town in the future? Would the board like the dedication of lands now, with turnover at the time of development? Would the board like community amenities but would like to refine for a clear understanding for final proposal.
 - Dennis P.- Have you spoken to the Select Board?
 - Ben A.- No
- b. Alex W.- That is what Mitch and Alex has in mind for the next step. Town Development Map has recently been updated, which mirrors the developments planned. 3 Select Board members are familiar with types of amenities described on Official Map and Companion Document. Staff Report outlines favoring to condition preliminary plat approval with applicant having a conversation with Select Board, for greater clarity during returning for final approval.
- c. **Concern:** Dennis P.- Don't want to see another Lot 1, without anything done with for years.
 - **Clarification:** Alex W. - That's why Ben proposes to improve now even if town takes over later, similar to process of roads. Should be brought up to Select Board first so DRB can codify, rather than invent it.
 - Ted B. - If there is a liability involved with amenities staying in Haystack Community, board recommend to Select Board the public access. Don't want Haystack owners to think something is taken away that is theirs 10 years later-- sooner is better than later.
 - Mitch C.- Meeting with Select Board sooner than later would be good for the applicant.
 - Ben A.- Will schedule meeting with Select Board. Wanted to bring up to DRB first, so that when it comes to making an understanding with Select Board, doesn't want to be stuck in-between when brought back to DRB
- d. **Proposal:** Ted B.- should be including walking paths and amenities, or early transferal with money to do those things.
 - Ben A. - Seems to be on the same page with DRB advocating for community amenities, just have to get agreeance with Select Board and Public Works.
- e. Dennis P. - Asked Alex if the Select Board would be amenable.
 - Alex W. - Couldn't be any more current with Select Board given the discussion and adoption of the Planning Commission's recent Official Map Revisions and list of amenities. Agrees on the difficulty of the consideration of the Public Works maintenance and future costs.
- f. **Concern:** Dennis P- Just need to make sure it is set up where the public will use it.
 - Alex- Historically, previous Select Board had a vision of bringing public into NW District on Town's first official map in 2009.

- *Proposal*: Dennis P.- Offered to also meet with Select Board

XIII. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public- in regards to Development of Central Green:

- a. *Concern*: Andrea M.- *Recreation Commission*- Usually thought of in terms of the fields, but this is a public space which should be incorporated to connect to ball fields with Public Works and Recreation Commission. Might not happen in one meeting with Selectboard, due to the understanding of long-term implications of taking it over. Considering neighboring towns having to close public parks during COVID response.
- b. *Concern*: Dick J. - If town public area, is there *sufficient parking*? When there is a game, the rec-fields parking will be full. There is on-street parking, but it could be filled with residential visitors.
 - Mike B. - Expect events at rec. fields, where fields won't have sufficient parking, so the development supplies the overflow for the fields.
 1. Parking can be reassessed, but uses of the space is needed, such as target age range if there's a playground.
- c. Ben A.- Additional green planned in Phase 2 – Eastern side of Haystack Road. Proposal of how area is being built out leaves room for re-evaluation of parking after Phase 1 is built and adjusting prior to building Phase 2. Reiterates the overflow capability of neighborhood for fields. Referenced Williston ballpark having insufficient parking.
- d. Mitch C.- There is intent of connectivity of the Recreation Fields to the Green
- e. *Proposal*: Carl B.- Encourages Select Board for outreach for *community dialogue* on uses.

XIV. Affordable Housing Units (Haystack Crossing LLC)

- a. Ben A.- Specifying exact units in development?
 - Mitch C.- Yes. Proposal includes 10 affordable housing units in congregate housing and 10 in rest of neighborhood. Regulation goes to identifying for application
- b. *Proposal*: Ben A.- In original presentation, Mike had identified affordable rental and for-purchase housing. Proposed to sprinkle units around development to integrate into community for more community spirit, not a designated area.
 - In the previous developments, designated 2 inner units of a quad affordable, and outer two regular, limiting segregating affordable spaces from community.
 - References flexibility geographically, economically, and ... to serve community in best possible way. Affordable units for sale versus affordable rentals.
 - Dennis, Ted, and John L. agree on integration.
- c. *Concern*: Ted B.- how do we keep affordable units from being built last? Is there a percentage condition?
- d. Alex W.- Regulations provides guidance. The board can write conditions of approval that reference.
 - Ben's vision is the exact vision of inclusionary zoning. Not separating affordable units, rather including everyone.
 - *Proposal*: Alex W.- Maybe there's a way Ben and Mitch can work on types of units instead of locations to provides certainty vision comes to pass.
 - *Proposal*: Ben A.- Maybe write narrative of types of housing.
 - Alex W.- Yes, narrative would help.
 - Mitch C.- From narrative, maybe can incorporate some kind of language for flexibility in the decision.

XV. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public- in regards to Affordable Housing Units:

- a. Carl B.- **Representing Affordable Housing Committee**- flexibility of location, and rentals vs for-purchase; was one of the recommendations for integration.
 - There might be a way closer to final for a market study and trends (Champlain Housing Trust), so to not lock project into number of bedrooms. Ben has met several times, the key for the committee is to really lock into *perpetual affordability*. Ben agrees.

- Alex and Mitch stated covenants in the deeds to keep them affordable after Black Rock is out of picture would be required.
- *Congregate housing*- commercial development vs. not commercial development
AHC believes *Congregate housing should be considered part of commercial construction*. – Requirement that commercial development has to happen prior or at the same time as residential
 1. Commercial assures that they will be filled.
 2. Other commercial proposed in Phase 1 has risk—Not clear what would go there. 25% commercial vacancy rate—especially now with businesses being shut down.
 3. Senior Housing is something needed based on needs assessment and it includes 10 affordable units.
- Committee has mixed results on affordable housing. Largest is Green St.- Ben willing to seek partnership with Housing Vermont and Champlain Housing Trust, in Phase 2, for similar type of project to incorporate. 30 affordable units projected for Phase 2- attractive amount to non-profit developers to work with Ben, and the timing of money they might be willing to invest back in Hinesburg.
- All commercial space proposed in phase 1 (not congregate housing), would like to see condition of being built in a way that if it's unable to be used for commercial, it could be easily converted to residential.
- Accessory apartments- fine with insuring can be part of development but would no longer be owner of that property. Need for condition with association. Wanting to avoid situation of Thistle Hill, which prohibits the building of accessory apartments—as long as State Law and Hinesburg Zoning Regulations are followed.
- Too early for committing to bedroom size—looking for flexibility until closer to construction
- Proposal of Senior housing: 1 Bedroom- Committee agrees
- Supports but defers to Energy Committee for solar option
- Not just small units are affordable. Smaller units are beneficial for naturally being more affordable, but shouldn't count as the "affordable units"- has to not be over 30%, follow HUD definitions, and be a percentage below market in relation to area wide median income at the time.
- b. *Clarification:* Ben A. - Discussed with staff- affordable rental- 3rd party monitoring and an annual statement for compliance.
 - Deed restriction to include a form the HOA would fill out that verifies conformance to the Town
 - Mitch C.- It will be recorded in Land Records- decision goes with property, not owner
- c. Barbara F.- Who is responsible for maintaining rental? Black Rock?
 - *Clarification:* Ben A.- Whichever entity owns it. May or may not be Black Rock
- d. -
 - Ben A.- Perpetually affordable: Modeled after examples in Williston and S. Burlington
 1. Lily Ln.- S. Burlington (Not Black Rock Construction's project)
 2. North Bridge – Williston (Recently started)
 3. Mike B.- Development by Kinney Drugs has an affordable unit
 - Dennis P.- Lily Ln. – so if you drove in, you wouldn't be able to tell which ones are affordable?
 - Ben A.- Not a Black Rock project. But at Black Rock's new project, you really can't tell which is which.
- e. Catherine G.- Green St. has affordable housing rental?
 - Alex W.- Yes

XVI. Ratio of Commercial and Residential Sequencing – Due to the meeting going longer than expected, it was agreed that this discussion item will be moved to a future meeting.

XVII. 3 Story Building Fire Protection (Haystack Crossing LLC)

- a. Mitch C.- Fire Dept has ability to service up to 28ft. Ladder truck, not currently purchased, could service 70'. 3.5 stories proposed would be a challenge for the fire department, however there are other buildings in town that are challenging. It is on town schedule to purchase ladder truck soon, and this may assist.
- b. Al B.- The building will have to be sprinklered anyways because it is over 2 stories, but if it was a fire on the second story where people are living above fire need to exit, would make it challenging. Fire department rescues cannot be done from roof.
- c. *Proposal:* Dennis P.- Do we have another town?
 - *Clarification:* Al B.- Shelburne and Williston. However, need it for rescue, not putting fire out. It is more important to be there immediately.
 - *Concern:* Dennis P. - Is there a way to tell those towns to assist?
 - Al B.- Yes that is already set in place for other buildings.
- d. Dennis P.- You are looking into buying a used truck?
 - Al B.- Yes because we are having problems with a truck.
 - *Concern:* Dennis P.- But we do have to build another building to put it in?
 - Al B. - Yes but with the ambulance conversation. For short term, it can be worked out. But long term, yes there will need to be more space.
 - Alex W.- Under the impression in 2025 that the ladder truck would replace another truck? Would the ambulance would make it lack space?
 - Al B.- There can be temporary housing
- e. Dennis P.- Impact Fee towards purchase
 - Al B. - Yes, if town went used route, would be pretty close with impact fee money to purchase outright. So it wouldn't even have impact on tax rate.
 - Dennis P.- So sooner than 2024?
 - Al B.- Potentially be done by the time
- f. Dennis P.- Impact fees only good for 6 years?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Yes, if town hasn't been used, people can request to get it back. Police impact fees are going to building bond. Some of the Fire Dept impact fees have already gone to a new design development of new station. Mitch has done estimates of how much impact fees are available, as well as how much Haystack would contribute. Haven't given anything back because fees have been being used, not hitting 6 year mark.
- g. Al B.- New truck will cost 1 million dollars. He knows of an available used truck for a much smaller amount. It is lightly used and has in capital placement to replace in a year.
- h. Dick J.- Exterior Fire Escapes?
 - Al B.- Internal fireproof staircase
- i. Ben A. - Type of building is 12-14 month process. Construction of building starts the clock.
 - Ted B.- As you populate building, could you populate 3rd floor last to delay until truck is in place?
 - Ben A.- Theoretically Yes.
- j. *Clarification:* Al B. - With building has basement- it is considered 3 stories, and can't use roof.
 - Ben A.- This building type is fully sprinkled and state of the art fire alarm system. Fire Dept is alarmed well before the smell of smoke.

XVIII. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public – in regards to 3 Story Building Fire Protection:

- a. *Proposal:* Andrea M.- good to know from other communities how often the ladder truck is necessary to be used—statistically.

- Ben A.- To his knowledge, only example in St. Albans that wasn't full yet.
- *Clarification:* Al B.- 3 weeks ago in Williston, Essex had one. Situation where buildings exist, they run truck to every one of those calls because they don't know when it is a fire. **If you have those buildings without that truck, insurance goes up for the whole town. If town doesn't have proper fire protection, there's a penalty.**
- *Concern:* Andrea M. - Really important to do a risk assessment on this.
- b. *Proposal:* John L. - Can delay a C.O. (certificate of occupancy) until in place?
 - *Clarification and Proposal:* Alex W.- You can include anything in *Condition of Approval*. This is another situation for the Select Board, sooner rather than later. Capital Budget plan doesn't reflect that
 - Al B.- Projected Timeline
 - *Concern:* Ben A. - John's comment on C.O. - would never get building financed with a condition like that.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W. - Regulations do grant DRB to phase project, wouldn't be condition of C.O., rather phases.
 - Mitch C. - Guidelines of permit will be in the decision.
- c. Barbara F. - Senior housing is congregated building? 2 story?
 - Alex W.- It hasn't changed. Senior housing is 3 stories with understory parking so more like 3.5 stories

XIX. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public for general comments on Haystack Crossing application:

- a. *Concern:* Mitch C.- Read an e-mail from Catherine G. on behalf of the **Village Steering Committee** (She was having trouble voicing herself virtually), which stated "Based on the difficulties we are all encountering in our day-to-day professional communications and VSC communications via electronic means such as Zoom, we believe that any complex projects that merit extensive public opinion, require cross-coordination between multiple town committees or boards, and include dense explanatory documents (ex. blueprints, agency studies, consultant studies) should be postponed until in-person meetings are again feasible. The likelihood that citizens will not be able to fully understand dense technical documents and access online meetings due to insufficient internet connections degrades the public comment process. Furthermore, the spotty nature of most digital meeting platforms degrades inter-committee dialogue and makes it more likely that we will miss or insufficiently discuss critical aspects of these long-term projects. Tonight, could not hear parts of Michael Busier's comments as well as members of the public."
 - Mitch C.- We are trying to do the best that we can, given the circumstance. If you are having a problem responding at the hearing or are watching this meeting on VCAM and want to comment, contact Mitch via email. It is checked regularly during meeting. Such emails will be read at the meeting. If anyone listening has technical questions or concerns with particular documents, contact Mitch for help.
 - Catherine G. attempted to comment again but came through choppy due to technical issues.
 - John L.- Important to do our best to continue and do our best. Life is different but important to continue.

Dennis P. **made a motion to continue the Haystack public hearing and conditional use for setback buffer on May 19th**. Ted B. **seconded the motion**. The Board **voted 6-0**.

XX. News/Announcements/Correspondence:

- a. Next Meeting: May 19th Meeting: Site visit at 6pm at Russell – tentatively - with social distancing
 1. Site visits are open to the public
 2. Bring masks
 - Continuation of Russell Hearing

- Continuation of Haystack Crossing
 1. Traffic and other particular issues
 2. Storm Water- Design has been evolving. There was some significant concerns and they have resubmitted and is currently being reviewed by Mitch C.
 3. Items to be discussed will be available for the public to review ahead of time.
 4. Also the Ratio of Commercial and Residential sequencing item, skipped at this meeting will be postponed to the May 19th meeting.
- b. Dennis acknowledged having received public correspondence to be addressed next meeting.
- c. Branden Martin- Cannot attend Site Visit—Requests new plans with updated contours.
 - Mitch C.- If you can't make site meeting, it will be staked out so potential of people being able to visit on their own.
 - Alex W.- Potential of everyone going by themselves- dependent on status of the State of Emergency

Dennis P. moved to adjourn, John L. seconded

The meeting adjourned at 9:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary