

**Town of Hinesburg**  
**Development Review Board**  
**September 15, 2020**  
Approved October 6, 2020

Members Present: John Lyman, Dennis Place, Branden Martin (alternate), Ted Bloomhardt, Greg Waples, Sarah Murphy, Bryan Currier (alternate). Dick Jordan joined a few minutes late.

Members Absent: Jonathan Slason

Applicants: **Hinesburg Center 2/ David Lyman Revocable Trust-**

**Milot Real Estate-** Brett Grabowski - Developer

**TJ Boyle & Associates-** Michael Buscher – Landscape Architect

**Lamoureux & Dickinson** - Roger Dickinson & Nick Smith - Civil Engineers

Preliminary Plat review for a major subdivision of a +46.2- acre property located on the west side of Route 116, west of the Kinney Drug development, south of Patrick Brook, and north of the Creekside neighborhood in the Village and Agricultural Zoning Districts. In this phase of the development the applicant is proposing 22 residential units and 6,000 sq ft of commercial/office space.

Public Present: Dan Jacobs, Maggie Gordon, Barbara Forauer, Brian Hunter, Kyle Bostwick, Carl Bohlen, Michael Bissonette, Kate Kelly, and Frank Koss

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

Dennis P. called the meeting to order at 7:33 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. None

**III. Review minutes of the August 18, 2020 meeting:**

IV. Greg W. and Bryan Currier abstained

- a. Dennis P. **made a motion to approve the minutes of August 18, 2020 as amended.** John L. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 4-0.**

V. **Hinesburg Center 2- Introductory Project Meeting**

VI. John L. recused himself.

- Brian C. identified that the engineering firm he works for has a few active projects with TJ Boyle and Associates and has worked with developer in the past. Firm currently has no direct connection to this project so he doesn't see it as a conflict of interest.
- Mitch C., as staff he doesn't recuse himself, but identified that he was one of the designers of Hinesburg Center 1 (HC1) and has worked with the applicant in the past. He has also regulated the applicant in the past.

**VII. Mike B.- presented the Hinesburg Center 2 project, with the master plan map L-102 of the plan set displayed on the zoom call.**

**a. Hinesburg Center 2- Project Overall**

- Village Growth area in Village Zoning District
- Base density of 4 units per acre, with total density of 8.8 units per acre is possible with allowable density bonuses.
- The total buildout as shown on the master plan would have 75 Residential units and 16,800 sq ft. of mixed-use non-residential space
  1. Greg W. pointed out that staff report states 77 units. Sought Clarification
  2. Mike B.- Combined with Hinesburg Center 1- 93 Units total
  3. Submission for approval is overall Master Plan Review, and Preliminary Plat review for Phase2a
- Residential units on the master plan - 16 single family detached units, varied in size
  1. 9 Medium- .14 acres)
  2. 7 Smaller- Accessed from rear alley- .11 acre (1/10<sup>th</sup> acre)
  3. 3 Larger buildings- Multi-family units- for sale units
    - 2 story buildings, 9 units per building
    - Each unit has dedicated private garage with rear building access
    - Each unit has private entry access
  4. Building C- 32 unit multi-family, 3 story, rental units (Not in Phase 2a)
- Non-Residential/ Commercial on the master plan
  1. Buildings A & B, 2 story commercial buildings
  2. 4,000 sq. ft. of office and 2,000 sq ft. of retail
  3. Built to suit- Will accommodate at site plan review
  4. Building C- 2,000 sq. ft. of office
  5. Building D- 2,800 sq. ft. – Light Industrial Space

**b. Traffic – 4 different roads.**

- Main Public roads – Road A- Continues off of Farmall Dr., Road C -North to connect to proposed Haystack project. Featured on Hinesburg Plan
  1. Two 11' wide drive lanes.
  2. 8' wide on-street Parking lanes
  3. Parking on both sides =38' wide road, no parking= 22' wide road
- Minor Public Road- Road B-
  1. Two 10' wide drive lanes
  2. Parking on one side of Road B- 28' wide road
- Central Private Alley- 18' wide- Rear entrance access for garages
- Sidewalks along most roads where there isn't a bike path, Except Road B near stream setback

**c. Bike path-** on south side would connect to existing recreation path, which will connect to open lot to the West of the project (connects to Hinesburg Trails). Additional bike path along west side of Road C, which will connect to Haystack's Recreation path, Bissonnette Recreational fields, with ultimate connection to Ballard's corner and the Library

*Mitch displayed L-101*

- Offering 20' recreational easements on west side of property- proposed by Rec Path Committee.
- d. **Solar Array**- Proposed map shows proposed location. It is in the flood plain.
- e. Potential **community farm garden** on the western part of the property was shown on map.

**VIII.** *Mitch displayed the Phasing Plan*

- a. Mike B. - Building A was added to phase 2A as required in the Sketch Plan decision. Phase 2A includes Road A, with full loop of Road B
- Open space between Creekside and Hinesburg Center 2 (HC2), was initially imagined as single-family homes, but is now proposed as a green space to connect both communities. It currently collects water but will be engineered with a catch basin.
  - Mike B. identified that he is also a Creekside Resident.
- b. *Concern:* Dick J. asked about the original grading of the project being lower. There were past concerns from Creekside property owners about the project being more elevated, and water flowing into their community.
- Mike B. - the greenspace currently floods from a bigger area, but proposed water management proposed by Hinesburg Center 2 will control all of that water.
- c. Mike B. – **Green areas**- identified a few proposed parklets, similar design to Hinesburg Center 1.
- Village Zoning – 10% green space requirement
  - Hinesburg Center 1- 35.9%
  - Hinesburg Center 2- 32%
  - Combined 33.7% green space
- d. **Density Bonus**- base density of 4 units per acre--11.47 acres.
- Base Density- 45.88 units
  - With more than 10 units, need to provide 20% inclusionary units= 5 units once hitting 45 units
  - Which allows Density Bonus= Additional 9 units
  - 3 possible Density Bonus = 100% Density
  - Allowable **density max total- 100.94 units** (Mitch C- explained that the total rounds down)
  - HC1 – *Existing* 18 units
  - HC2 – Possible 82 units max
  - **Proposed** 93 total units (7 units shy of overall max density)
    1. *Proposed* HC2A- 22 units
    2. HC2A + HC1 = 40 total units – under base density (no bonuses being utilized)
- e. **Affordable Units** – All units of HC2A are “for sale” units, therefore
- *Proposal:* HC1 4 of 18 units to be classified as designated affordable units.
  - To build out full project (Phases 2a and 2b), would propose additional affordable units as well as 2 incentive bonuses
  - 20% of base density affordability = 5 affordable units between Hinesburg Center 1 and HC2 ()
  - 18 Bonus units -->Base Density of 63.88 units
  - HC2B would require 2 incentive bonuses to construct 93 units
  - Utilize dwelling unit size
    1. Mike B. identified a typo in the narrative provided to staff
    2. Minimum to meet is 48 units @ 1500sq ft for single family units
      - 1,200 sq ft for multi-family units
  - Renewable Energy (to meet density bonus)
    1. 1 incentive = 25% of overall energy consumption of residential units would have to be renewable energy
    2. Preliminary calculation included in narrative, will be refined prior to permitting for HC 2B
- f. Dick J.- HC1- residences are not all affordable units?

- Brett G.- technically all of the units would meet affordability requirements, but only 1 is currently designated for restricted income inclusionary zoning
  - Chittenden county is \$80,000 median income. – 80% of median marks affordability
  - Alex W. - There are 2 parts to the inclusionary zoning. One is the Rental price has to be affordable to 80% of the county's median income and the second requirement is that the renter can only earn up to 100% of the median county income.
- g. Mike B.- Parking**
- Single Family -2 private parking spots for each unit
  - 9 plex- 27 units- each unit would have 2 private parking spots
  - 32 multifamily rental and non-residential space- combination of on and off-street parking.
  - Proposes shared parking – Parking study of Hinesburg Center 1 in Jan 2020
    1. Observation don't include pharmacy
    2. Maximum occupied of 49 spaces. 63 spaces on Jan 9<sup>th</sup> (out of 97 spaces)
    3. Says that on street parking of Farmall Dr is successful
- h. Branden M- phasing- why proposing to build half of the parking lot behind A and B in 2A**
- Could that parking lot be accessed?
  - Mike B.- it would be from Kailey's Way behind Kinney Drug
- i. Ted B.-Flood Plains**
- *Mitch Displayed Sheet 1*
  - Mitch and Nick pointed out the overlapping flood plain lines.
    1. FEMA and Milone & MacBroom Survey
  - Nick S. – Flood plain is a foot lower than identified by FEMA. Based on previous proposal of filling and Patrick Brook. Drawn out during phase 1 and may need to be adjusted.
  - Ted B.- There will be some filling in flood plain?
  - Nick S. – Yes
  - Brett G. - In a past application they received conditional use approval to add fill in the floodplain, but the original Conditional Use approval has expired. They will be reapplying based on their new design.
- j. Alex W. - Staff hasn't done complete review of proposal as modifications have recently been submitted. Encouraged board to review the most recent sketch plan decision. There were very specific decisions- many the applicant have addressed, some haven't been, and some things have changed. Alex W. will provide.**
- k. Greg W.- phasing- Commercial in earlier stages**
- Mike B. - Fairly large amount of commercial in HC1. Lot 43 on Kailey's Way has taken over 5 years to rent out. Not great market currently. More remote work is being done.

**IX. Dennis P. opened the Hinesburg Center 2 hearing to the public.**

- a. Dan Jacobs- President of Creekside association.**
- *Concern:* Keep construction traffic out of neighborhood.
  - Appreciate the building of east to west connector first.
  - *Concern:* Green space flooding- neighborhood wants to be addressed
    1. Want the creation of green space- doesn't want to be started and finished years later
  - Last project had problems with siting of buildings being too close/ discrepancies
    1. *Proposal:* Independent engineer to watch project, so that it happens as it should in a timely manner
- b. *Proposal:* Mitch C. – For big projects like this, a condition in the approval order requires that an independent reviewer check the construction.**
- c. Kyle Bostwick- Creekside Resident**
- *Concern:* Worried about flooding and elevation- this project is elevated 4'

- *Concern:* Nov 1<sup>st</sup>- saw water a few feet from house to the West and North
  1. Hoping transition from Kinney Drugs in Road 'C' is good
  2. Thinks transition to 4' will not be gentle, which would make a dam
  3. Thinks lot 56 should be taken out of project, so 4' is more gradual
  4. Dangerously worried about water.
- d. Dennis **made a motion to continue the Hinesburg Center 2 hearing on October 6<sup>th</sup>. Ted B seconded. Board voted 6-0**
- e. Mitch C.- More technical meeting. Will plan with Mike B.

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

- XI.** Next meeting- October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (in 3 weeks)
- a. Subdivision revision
  - b. Appeal of Zoning Administrator decision
  - c. Hinesburg Center 2

- XII.** Ted B. **made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and to go into deliberative decision session. Board voted 6-0**
- a. 4 decisions pending
  - b. The public portion of the meeting ended.
  - c. Bryan C. signed off because he didn't attend the hearings of items being deliberated.
  - d. Greg W. call dropped at some point during the meeting.

**The meeting adjourned at 8:22 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary