

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**June 2, 2020**  
Approved June 16, 2020

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

Jonathan Slason and Bryan Carrier (alternate) recused themselves from the hearing.

Members Absent: Greg Waples had technological issues and couldn't join the meeting.

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

Andres Torizzo- ... Watershed Consulting Associates

Michael Buscher – TJ Boyle Associates

Dave Marshall – Civil Engineering Associates, Inc.

Ben Avery- Black Rock Construction

Public Present: Merrily Lovell, Robert Hyams, Catherine Goldsmith, Carl Bohlen, and Barbara Forauer, *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. Request from Ben Avery to move Ratio of Residential and Commercial Sequencing to the end just before public input. Public and Board has been preparing for Stormwater and Traffic for tonight. Move those two topics to the top of discussion. Board confirmed.

**III. Review minutes of the May 19, 2020 meeting:**

- a. Minor spelling adjustments were made.
- b. Ted B. **made a motion to approve the minutes of May 5, 2020 as amended.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 4-0**; Dennis P. abstained.

**IV. Black Rock Construction/ Haystack Crossing, LLC- Continuation of Hearing**

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, 4/21/20, and 5/19/20. Topics to be addressed at this meeting include residential/commercial sequencing, stormwater, Trails Committee comments, and conservation comments.

**V. Trails Committee Input -Relayed by Mitch C.**

- a. *Proposal:* Good pedestrian connectivity- especially between this project and Hinesburg Center 2
- b. *Proposal:* Fine with grass VAST Trail by Riggs Brook- They want accessibility to be maintained year round
- c. Fine with sidewalks on one side of street for minor streets.
  - *Concern:* Jenna Dr. (road between Haystack Crossing and Rec Fields) could be potentially used as cut through to recreation fields-- should have sidewalks on both sides of street
  - With talk of Jenna Dr. being northbound one way—fine with sidewalk located on one side
- d. Staff is trying to balance sufficient pedestrian connectivity with an amount of infrastructure that the town is comfortable maintaining. Further discussion on this will occur on the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting when municipal impacts are discussed.
- e. *Concern:* Dick J. - So anyone living on Jenna Dr. would have to go all the way around one-way to get to house. With such a small development, seems like one way is more hassle than worth. May clog things unnecessarily.
- f. Alex W. - Have we talked to applicants about one way road concept?
- g. *Clarification:* Mitch C. - It was mentioned for feedback.
- h. *Clarification:* Alex W.- One way is still a very preliminary idea-- *to help reduce sidewalk infrastructure while maintaining safety.*
  - Intention of area is **pedestrian focus, not vehicular**. If there's minor inconvenience for cars, but balanced with greater pedestrian safety, it should be entertained. Shouldn't be problematic.
  - *Concern:* Dick J. - That's because you don't live on one of those end houses. Thinks it's shortsighted and people will turn the wrong way.
- i. Dave Marshall- Pointed out that the current plan draft includes sidewalks on both sides.
- j. *Clarification:* Alex W. - Reducing amount of sidewalks is not proposed by Black Rock – idea with Mitch in response to Municipal Impact for town's ability for future maintenance. Weighing out functional, practical, and necessary.

**VI. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public- in regard to Trail Committee's Input on connectivity**

- a. No public comment

**VII. Stormwater- Mitch C. displayed Phase 1 combined drainage plan**

- a. Ted B.- Permitting procedure at state level vs. municipal storm water regulations?
  - *Clarification:* Mitch- Town regulations call for stormwater review at preliminary plat. They include what state requires with additional steps—ie. Low impact design, conveyance of 100 yr storm, smaller storms and impacts further downstream. Applicant is now showing what is being proposed to try to meet the requirements of a state storm water permit.
  - State Stormwater Permit would need to be obtained before construction.
  - Generally, it is obtained between preliminary and final. If obtained afterwards, would be contingent on building permits and such.
- b. Dave M. - The project needs an Act 250 land use permit and a state stormwater permit to support of it.
  - Make sure that the town is comfortable. Would be a baseline for submitting state level applications following preliminary town hearing.
- c. Dave M. introduced Andres T. – *has done site investigation and modeling regarding storm water. Civil engineers applied his data to plan— ie.: drainage locations, pipe sizes, stormwater management facilities, treatment facilities, etc.*
  - Dave M. emphasized the use of gravity and existing site contours for storm water flow and collection/ treatment locations.

- Sheet 3.0 – Phase 1 – identifies other sheets which references stormwater.
  - North is generally the top of the sheet- with contours guiding water South/ Southwest. Thus, water management facilities are located by Patrick Brook at the bottom of the page (South), and another at the first street running East West at the top.
  - Minor facilities are sprinkled throughout site.
  - Majority of road run off, impervious areas uphill, and conveyance system discharges to major facility (southwest of site) and gravel wetlands. (Sheet C3.4 on far left side of plan)
  - Tried to minimize concentration of flow as much as possible as it approaches Patrick Brook.
  - Eastern side of site is primarily sheet flow.
  - Southwestern has more channelized flow where, historically, flow has been larger in nature. Also due to nature of concentrated nature of water around facility.
- d. Andres T.- Stormwater designed to mimic existing conditions—diffused discharge towards Southwest of site, with low velocity
- Level spreaders and use natural buffer of stream
  - 6.6.2 Stormwater Criteria (Town Regs)- Water quality treatment
    1. **Water Quality Treatment Standard:** How water gets cleaned. Removing nitrogen phosphorus sediment in storm water—
      - *Proposed:* Gravel wetlands- Highest performing method other than putting water into the ground, which is not doable on site on large extent.
      - 5 proposed areas- removes nutrients while moving through stone medium with wetland plantings, while slowly releasing water to stream
    2. **Channel protection- 1 year storm (2" rainfall):** needs to be controlled- causes most stream erosion. AKA. bank full discharge where once a year Patrick Brook runs full. Control and slowly release. If releasing into warm water, must hold for 24 hrs. If released into cold water, must hold for 12 hours.
      - *Proposed:* On cusp, so system is designed for 24 hours standard and will leak out a small hole. –June 16<sup>th</sup> meeting- Mitch C. clarified that the water will discharge out of a small hole, roughly 1.5" in diameter.
    3. **Ground Water Recharge-** not feasible with high ground water table or heavy soil. When soil work was done, infiltration was not feasible. State rules prohibit if there's seasonal high ground water within 3' of bottom of practice- trying to protect ground water, not to just inject stormwater and potentially contaminate ground water.
      - *Proposed:* Relying on disconnection-- diffusing roof water into the grass areas.
    4. **Healthy Soil Standard-** State Standards (not called out in Hinesburg Regs)- any soil disturbed will have at least 4% organic matter and not be compacted. – to avoid pervious areas acting as impervious, causing runoff water
    5. **Overbank Flood-** Control 10 year storm peak discharge
    6. **Extreme Bank-** Control 100 year storm peak discharge
    7. **Flood Protection Standards:** Proposed accommodates for 10 and 100 year storm.
      - *Proposed:* System will address both 10 and 100 year storm discharge. Andres T discussed how pipes don't need to be sized for 100 year discharge as long as water path is known if stream and pipe network can't handle water amount. Modeling defines how overflow will occur. Able to compare pre and post development—proposed system reduces peak discharge flow by 10 cubic feet per second in the 10 year storm event according to the models, through massive amount of water storage and methods of dispersing stormwater.
- e. Mitch C. displayed his comments via PowerPoint reviewing the Applicant's stormwater modeling.
- A review of the stormwater wasn't in the staff report because it was submitted after the report needed to be submitted to the DRB.

- He believes that the overall system can work, but the design needs tweaking
- *Disclaimer:* Updated plans are anticipated to match updated modeling.
- When Catch basin cannot accommodate stormwater flow, it comes out as overland flow.
- *Concern:* Modeling doesn't show how the stormwater travels between the secondary large gravel wetland outlet and Patrick Brook, which would occur between 28R and 50 R in modeling.

Mitch displayed modeled plan view provided by applicant.

- Shows flow coming out of catch basin because pipes can't accommodate 100 year storm. Shown the plan provided by the Applicant with the paths the stormwater could take. Mitch noted that if the stormwater takes those paths, then stormwater won't go to treatment areas.
  - Mitch showed an example from another project of when pipe overflows, the modeling shows to the extent a parking area is flooded. The Applicant's modeling in addition to showing a wall of water above the pipe had water coming out of the catch basin, which would go immediately to Patrick Brook.
  - Modeling needs to be updated to show where water will overflow will actually go and how much area would be effected.
  - Ted B. and Mitch discussed modeling error that shows stormwater flowing with the pipe that is 2' above pipe, which would never happen.
- f. *Clarification:* Andres T.- training has advised to simplify when modeling
- Intent is not to recreate every feature. Every node may not correspond 1:1 with every structure on site.
  - On Schematic Model- all of the red lines show prediction of where the water will end up during catch basin overflow-- heading towards stream
  - Standards for 100-year storm—shall not exceed existing discharge for 100-year storm
  - Modeling is overly conservative because each pathway is not defined.
  - If want more detail to accommodate for flow specifics in terms of structures and basements, can consider but regarding town regs- modeling shows the project meeting rules.
- g. Ted B.- Apart from meeting the discharge requirements, of being no worse than existing conditions, how is data in modeling used to inform working the land to accommodate these overflows if overflows are a part of the design?
- h. Andres T.- Schematic Model- can define path for water drop path. Engineering wise, can refine look. Not sure if it's worth it.
- Current model gives sufficient data for pipe sizing and meeting town criteria
- i. Ted B. - Don't design pipes to accommodate all of the water, size pipes for less discharge than existing?
- *Clarification:* Andres T.- Yes, fair statement. Proposed design is for 25-year storm flow-- just over 4" of rain. 25 years is the standard for V-Trans and South Burlington. Rare to size pipes for 100-year storm with surge charge. Surge charge during some extreme events are expected.
  - Dave M.- Typical to accommodate for bigger storms with cross culverts and bridges critical intersections on main roads. For local roads, the 25 year storm is the standard.
  - Red Circles on the plan represent low spots in road network, where water will congregate and try to force into drain. When drain is at max capacity, that's where design of overland paths is important.
  - Dashed lines- are the paths the stormwater will travel.
  - CEA will do specific modeling for the particular low spots to determine how much is bypassing to help design geometry of overland flow feature- depending on slope of land and carrying capacity
  - When town takes over infrastructure and there's and overflow- appropriate protections in place for important areas
  - Ted B.- Asked when will DRB see that study
  - Dave M- Next 30 days

- Dick J.- There would have to be some over land structure to direct water?
  - Dave M.-Yes
  - Dick J.- Sheet flow issue? So this avoids sheet flow to keep houses safe?
  - Dave M.- Yes
- j. Mitch C. - Pointed out the usual outcome, from his experience, is that the roadways would get flooded, the stormwater flows toward the next lowest point, usually along the same road. We need to see a modeling for a secondary outlet. The pathways should mimic the road cross sections.
- Concern: The stormwater would discharge into storm water structures, which it was not designed to enter. The discharge should not be significant due to amount of time to travel, but is necessary to evaluate.
  - Ted B. - If dotted lines are grass swales, when it crosses sidewalks or driveways, is it implied to have a pipe go under? How to control where dotted lines are shown vs. sheet flow and how it intersects circulation path?
- k. Dave M.- Stated that there are scenarios where may be large swale where it meets pipe or low point. Walkways by greenspace areas, would be natural for water to travel over.
- Focus on *erosion protection* wherever water breaks over sidewalk, with critical velocity and depth on down hill side. To demonstrate design can handle those situations.
  - Some of site might have narrow areas where sheet flow isn't appropriate—addressing impact on property values
  - No statute of limitations on engineering design. Looking for long term solutions.
- l. Mitch C. - Continued with his comments. He provided three examples of stormwater ponds that had areas in the modeling that did not match, and could not be matched, in the plans. These ponds used the recreation path as a berm. He expressed concern about erosion.
- Dick J. - Intentional lowering of berm? To allow water to escape?
  - *Concern:* Mitch C.- Correct. From that point, it go out to Patrick Brook?
- m. Andres T.- Responding to Mitch's Comments. Readdressed suggestion of modeling program- of minimum amount of nodes to perform analysis
- In a big enough storm event, stormwater discharging the large gravel wetland would overflow spill way. Spill way is rather steep, lined with stone. Rim of rock at the bottom to further armor
  - Model includes overflow spill way, which is critical point of erosion. Would need to analyze velocity of water. Stone will help with erosion—Once water makes way off spill way, will be on much flatter slope, so modeling is unnecessary.
  - Not trying to recreate entirety of reality, rather to exhibit objectives
  - *Concern:* Dick J.- Natural topology of land will decide where water will flow. Want to make sure water won't travel north towards rec fields. With the topography lines, everything flows SW
  - Andres T.- Yes Topography has it traveling SW
  - Dick J.- Relying on existing vegetation to slow/spread water flow from spillway?
  - Alex W.- Aerial photo overlay will help to show existing landscape of how water will flow. Mostly open meadow with limited shrub vegetation once you get to Patrick Brook. Town regs require to demonstrate 100-year storm won't have adverse effect of erosion downstream. Need to be on same page of properly demonstrating that the only area that needs improvement is spillway where water comes over the top and hits large stones shown in plan.
  - *Proposal:* Mitch C. - C3.4- does not show ground where this discharge will occur. Contours will aid in understanding of context of water flow entering the area.
  - Dave M. - Yes. Straddling lines between operational stormwater and erosion. Haven't completely defined what drops of water leaving spillway will do as it approaches low point of Patrick Brooks or La Platte River. Haven't' been concerned because the flatness equates to low velocity water level, but haven't' demonstrated it on paper for 3<sup>rd</sup> party understanding.
  - Dave M. - Will add documentation showing stable means of conveyance.
- n. *Concern:* Ted B.- Designed for over 25 year flood- pooling on road ways, 100 year – overland flow

- Town on receiving end for future maintenance. Pooling already occurs on common area other side of brook, followed by public concern. Wants to make sure there's a plan that works for people going to live there.
- o. Mitch C. - Where is that water going to go-- Plan doesn't specifically indicate. Asked for update and presented in future.
- p. Ted B.- Reason for modeling is to meet stormwater regs. Overland flow meets regs, but feels like different facet.
  - Mitch C. - Are you putting some of the proposed structures in a new 100 year flood plain?
- q. Alex W.- Displayed Hinesburg Regulations, which is beyond State Standards
 

'The stormwater plan shall be designed so that off-site drainage areas will not be overwhelmed during larger storm events (ie., up to and including a 100 year storm) to a greater extent than in pre development conditions. The evaluation shall demonstrate that offsite areas will not be subject to increased erosion during a 10 year storm even and will not otherwise be adversely impacted during a 10 year and a 100 year storm event'

  - Modeling might be proper, but Hinesburg specifically asks for additional information. Last year Halloween was a 50-year event. Worth Considering. Ted B. notes that deals with off-site.
  - Andres T.- In agreement of board wanting to see further definition of overflow and is prepared to do so

#### **VIII. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public**

- a. Bob Hyams- Riggs Brook. Increasing flow of upstream of discharge point?
- Andres T.- No
  - Bob H. Other ponds discharge points to Patrick Brook?
  - Andres T.- Correct
  - Bob H.- Property line in 100' buffer-- Existing issues with buffer. Was ditched at one point, still remnants of berms, erosion, head cuts. If there are discharge points to somewhere in 100' buffer, and mitigate due to erosion, will it be able to be done? Would it require easement of other landowner? Points to how stream channel and buffer should be managed. For consistent management. Don't know if you'd be able to mitigate existing flows with erosion present.
  - Andres T.- Management practices proposed upstream of buffer, addresses storage and managing water with overflow into level spreader creating sheet flow. Trying to manage erosive flows. Understands there are issues. Other regulatory agency makes it difficult with managing river and wetlands. Plan is to mitigate and disperse upstream, and let buffer restore itself.
  - *Concern:* Bob H.- putting rock structure diffuses flow, however there's still 60-70 ft of buffer, but can't mitigate because not within the project's property
  - Dave M. - Regs don't care about property lines. The state is trying through Act 250 mandating certain buffers, allowing for more comprehensive stream corridors. Role of town creating cooperation between property owners.
  - Bob H.- Addressed staff for role for town in creating arrangement mechanism of channel corridor being managed
  - Alex W.- Walking Patrick Brooks east to west, there are several existing discharge locations. All on subject property. No easement for neighboring property. Some are located within the buffer, yes that's why there's a conditional use application. What happens when Patrick Brooks establishes in a different place is a good question.
  - Bob H. - With design in place, its 60' from Patrick Brook of uncontrolled flow in an area already experiencing erosion.
  - Mitch C. – Design should propose discharge, at 100-year storm, with such a low velocity to affect buffer itself. Systems in place to limit storm water coming out at particular time.
  - Andres T. - Modeling would show velocities that would indicate if there is erosion.

- Bob H. - But with existing buffer with existing condition of erosion, doesn't see how adding diffused flow corrects it. Exists with historical management.
  - Andres T.- Historical evidence of heavy land use due to holes in buffer and soil. South side of path with restored buffer will help
  - Bob H. - Pointed out that this project does not have control over this area.
  - Alex W.- Current property owner does nothing with land on the north side of brook, so this project will override.
  - Mitch C. - If designed correctly this project will not do any additional harm.
- b. *Concern:* Carl B.- Asks DRB to monitor whether treated or untreated water would go into Patrick Brooks
- Asked for DRB consideration of climate change, with frequent storms/ more rain
  - Asked for consideration of 200/300 year storm events.
  - Red Lines- Looks like one goes between two homes, hopes design considers effects on future properties, not just infrastructure.
  - Seemingly more rain in winter when ground is frozen and acts as dams. What happens when there isn't any vegetation? Water will be diverted by plowed snowbanks. Knowing where water will go any month, and its impact year round
- c. Barbara F. - Is there a statute of limitations on engineering designs- so if there's a problem in the future, the company has to come back and fix it?
- Dave M- If negligent, there is no statute of limitation.
  - Barbara F.- Riggs Brook is so flat and already a flood plain. If there's more water, wouldn't it just increase flood plain? Person walked through there one time and was up to their knees in water.
  - Asks DRB to consider further investigation on how water approaches Riggs Brook.
  - Dave M- Riggs Brook- design doesn't direct water towards Riggs Brook, but rather internally managed at facility at southern end of property. There is an existing culvert. Under extreme storm circumstances, there is capacity.
  - Recommendation is gulper and inlet control pipes for efficiency of running half full of water.
- d. Dick J. - Part of consideration in 25 year case, what if Patrick brooks was already raised from rain in surrounding area, what would standing water rise to? Does analysis take that into account or that where you're dumping water into is at normal level.
- Dave M.- In short: Yes, not a problem.
  - If outlet of pipe is already filled it could cause backwater. However, in this design, at 100-year storm water levels, water will still be discharging so far above stream or 100-year flood plain.
  - There will be times were there be damage, not practical investments wide to design for 1,000-year storm.
- e. Mitch C. - The design needs to show that the peak discharge of design at max capacity is less than peak discharge of existing conditions. Retention allows for trickle into pond.
- Ben A. - Design is based around standards. Asked public to pick out questioned areas of design that don't meet standards to discuss during this process. Understands some of the process is confusing but most standards are being met already.
  - Mitch C.- Will send over remaining comments, most of which have been mentioned during hearing.

## **IX. Conservation**

### **X. Mitch C.- Relayed Comments—**

- a. Members of Conservation Commission- wetlands encroachment, maintain Patrick brook river scape, other storm water low impact standards have been discussed and stream water buffer have been discussed. Other comments include:
- Encouragement of native species in stream buffer. Mitch has suggested to Conservation Commission to provide a list of native species

- Use of rounded and slanted curves for amphibian migration.
  - Lessen the amount of impervious surfaces.
  - Encourage Pedestrian movement
  - Sensitivity of the land west of ballfield.
- b. Ben A.- Open to having native species in open spaces.
- Not practical to not have lawns
  - Rounded curves where practically applicable-- Maybe more of Public works comment and with Public Paths and Connectivity
- c. Mike B.- To not have lawns is a hard sell. These are small lots and people will want lawns. Can focus on common areas and buffers. Commercial availability is hard to deal with. Perhaps include something in regulations to not plant invasive species would help.
- d. Mitch C.- Has responded to commission that the project is dealing with it as concentrated development, leaving other spaces for natural areas. So this comment is not included in staff report.
- e. Mike B.- One of the concepts is smart growth develop.

**XI. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public.** No public comment.

**XII. Ratio of Commercial and Residential Sequence**

- a. Ben A.- 50% of retail space building ready to conceive, would pull permit on first.
- Covering >50% out of gate should meet standard – line up with town and economical
- b. Alex W.- 50% proposed commercial space in phase 1, is senior support service space, Building H (not traditional commercial)
- c. Ben A.- correct. 1800 sq ft of commercial space in field before houses is inefficient. Needs density before commercial space is viable. Proved through existing spaces in Hinesburg. Prefers building housing prior to empty commercial space.
- d. Alex W. - senior housing is built, and rest of phase 1A is single family homes, with some mixed-use buildings.
- Ben A.- 17 Single family homes
- e. Alex W.- Where will buildings B and C come in sequencing relative to single family homes
- Ben A.-Before 1B. Asks to not have restriction due to uncertain state of country. Expressed building a contribution to the community first with Building H but asked for flexibility for the rest of Phase 1A.
- f. Mike B. experienced poor internet connection
- Commercial tenants more attracted with more substance in development
  - Ben A.- Pleading practical reality of Hinesburg today.
  - Dennis P. - Have seen before where houses are built, and they don't want to see commercial next door. How can be sure they will be built if we don't know Phase 2 will happen.
  - Ben A.- Phase 1a only rep 25-30% of project. Regardless if built before or after 17 homes, lease time would be long.
  - Mitch C. - When is building A is proposed (Mixed Use 1, Phase 1B)?
  - Ben A.-Phase 1B can have greater discussion about. Proposed to plan in terms of percentages. Ratio will encourage to work with businesses for large spaces and immediate contribution.
  - *Proposal:* Mitch C.- K first and A (commercial residential mix) could be later in phase 1B. Preparing supplemental staff report with comments.
  - Ben A. - Building K not in 1A – could be a substantial amount of wastewater allocation. Much easier sell for that building so encouraged.
  - Dick J. - Riggs Rd North in, South out, would effect customer traffic in corner?
  - Ben A.- Kinney Drugs has been successful. As unfolds, will be downtown business want to be a part of. Not meant to be easy in, easy out fly by, potential businesses of destination places.
- g. Alex shared regulation section 3.6 specific for Village NW District.



- Language addresses non-residential space first or concurrent, to ensure residential area isn't built without commercial space.
- Buildings B and C before Phase 1B is good to ensure proper completion.
- Agreed likely not to recoup infrastructure cost in phase 1A.
- Proposed sequence seems workable.
- Asks DRB members to think if proposed sequence abides by regulation.
- Several members agreed.
- John L.- Makes sense economically – keep in mind to make sure whole project is successful

**XIII. Dennis P. opened the hearing to the public-** In regards to Ratio of Construction Sequencing

- a. Barbara F.- Senior Building referred to as different names- what type?
  - Ben A- independent living with some assistance for basic coordination services.
  - Dennis P. – With cafeteria?
  - Ben A.- Potential of following design of another project with cafeteria open to public, which may work given walkability location. Rent in exchange for dinner for seniors. Smaller business with greater chance of success, institutionalized—better food.
  - Dennis P.- Status in current times?
  - Ben A.- Essex- Covid-free. No people coming and going. Even doing in-house cleaning.
- b. Carl B.- Repeating support of Ben's model
  - Food Service- Committee understood that food service is included.
  - Ben A.- Two potential models, one is limited food service, one is open to public
  - Dick J.- Pointed out that labeling space as commercial eludes to bringing public into space.
  - Ben A.- Pointed out that location is set-up for more successful business than other location.

**XIV. Dennis P. opened the Meeting to the Public for topics not covered-** No Comment

**XV. Dennis P. made a motion to continue the Haystack Crossing LLC/ Black Rock Construction hearing to continue next meeting.**

**XVI. News/Announcements/Correspondence:**

- a. Next meeting: return of Russell Family Trust
- b. Energy committee- Town Energy Standards. June 16th...
- c. Follow up review for Haystack Crossing - Traffic
- d. Mitch will have write-up on ratio based on Ben's testimony.
- e. July 7'th stormwater review
- f. Development on stream buffer
- g. Alex W. Apologized on behalf of Staff– Zoom updated with two passwords, computer includes alpha numeric- which doesn't work for dial-in. In the future, all necessary passwords will be published.
  - *Proposed:* Ben A.- In other towns, they have provided space in town hall for one member who needs access to better connectivity.
  - Al Barber- **Comcast has dropped channel 17 for viewing of meeting.** Now Channel 104?
  - Alex W.- **Agenda will be updated with proper cable channel.** *Access to the meeting is also on VCAM's website. A link is available on the town's website.*

Dick J. **moved to adjourn the meeting**, Tim B. **seconded**.  
**The meeting adjourned at 9:56 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
 Laura Sau, Recording Secretary