

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2021
Approved February 16, 2021

Members Present: Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, John Lyman, Sarah Murphy, Dennis Place, Jonathan Slason, Greg Waples, Branden Martin (alternate), Bryan Currier (alternate).

Members Absent: None.

DRB Staff: Mitchel Cypes (Development Review Coordinator); Amy Coonradt (Recording Secretary).

Applicants:

- Randall Kay, Rachel Kring (Hinesburg Community Resource Center)
- Jason Barnard, Howard Russell (Russell Family Trust)

Public Present: Margaret McNurlan, Merrily Lovell, Beth Anne Cellars, Dave Crook, Bev Knight. *Since this was a remote meeting, it is probable that there were others were in attendance who did not speak nor make themselves known.*

Dennis P. called the meeting to order at approximately 7:01 PM.

1. Meeting Procedures:

Mitch C. explained the meeting was being held remotely via Zoom due to the COVID-19 state of emergency and the closure of the Town Office. He reviewed remote meeting protocols.

2. Agenda Changes:

Mitch C. noted that the Palmer decision will be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

3. January 19, 2021 Meeting Minutes:

John L. **made a motion, and Jonathan S. seconded, to accept and approve the minutes as presented. The motion passed 7-0.**

4. Hinesburg Community Resource Center: Review for three signs proposed for 1) the HCRC property, a 0.47-acre lot located at 51 Ballards Corner Road, 2) Ballards Corner Road, and 3) Shelburne Falls Road. All locations are within the Commercial Zoning District.

Randall K. spoke about this item, saying that the Hinesburg Community Resource Center (and food shelf) continues to expand its mission and the number of people receiving its services, and needs appropriate signage. He and Rachel K., the executive director of the Resource Center, are proposing to have one sign on the building property, one sign above or below the library sign on Shelburne Falls Road, and one sign on Ballards Corner Road. He said that all three signs would be ideal, but that the property sign and sign on Shelburne Falls Road are the higher-priority signs.

Dennis P. asked where the largest, most prominent sign would be put. Randall K. replied that it would be a lit sign on HCRC's property. Dick J. asked about the sign on Ballards Corner Road. Randall K. replied that it would be a directional sign to indicate where the food shelf is located and would not block views to the library. Mitch C. suggested that the bigger sign remain on the property and that the smaller signs be used as the more directional signs. Dick J. noted that the signs focus on HCRC and not necessarily the food shelf. Rachel K. replied that the food shelf is the most visible part of HCRC's services, but that it also

has an emergency assistance fund, that it runs friends and families playgroups, and it is contemplating additional services. She noted that the food shelf is open two days per week.

Dick J. asked for details about the downcast lighting for the sign on the property. Randall K. confirmed that the lighting is downcast and that they are trying to adjust the lighting to emit as little light pollution as possible. Dick J. asked if the Board is comfortable with approving the signs if the lighting isn't in place yet. Jonathan S. replied that yes, there is a precedent for such approval. Ted B. said that there could be a condition in the approval plan that the lighting would need to be reviewed and approved by staff once it is in place. Mitch C. asked what the wattage would be on the sign and suggested a limit of 100 watts equivalent/1600 lumens. Randall K. agreed.

John L. suggested making it clear that these signs are being erected to address community needs, so that other businesses don't follow suit and try to put up their own signs. Dick J. said that if other companies wanted to have directional signs, they'd need to come before the DRB for approval. Mitch C. noted that because this is a public road, the applicant will also need to get approval for the directional signs from the Selectboard.

The Board discussed the location of the directional sign on Shelburne Falls Road, with members noting that it would need Selectboard approval if it were in the public right of way. Board members also suggested adding conditions into the approval plan that would provide flexibility for the location of the directional sign near their driveway, in order to keep sight lines to the library sign open.

The hearing was opened to the Public. There was no Public comment.

Dennis P. **made a motion, and Dick J. seconded, to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft a decision of approval. The motion passed 7-0, with Bryan C. voting in place of Greg W.**

5. Russell Family Trust: Sketch Plan review for a 3-lot subdivision and planned unit development (PUD) on a ±15.4-acre property at New South Farm, accessing Buck Hill Road West in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District. The two new residential lots will be ±0.63 acres and ±0.47 acres. The remaining lot will be ±14.2 acres of Open Space.

Jason B. provided an overview of the project, noting that he had previously received sketch approval from the Board for development on the west side of the property in June. He said that due to slope and the location of the road, stormwater infrastructure for that proposed development would be pricy, and so he has returned with a proposal for development on the eastern side of the property. He described the two lots and noted that access to them would be through an existing farm road off of Buck Hill Road. He noted that a boundary survey has not been conducted, though some measurements have been taken. He noted that a wetland consultant has come out and delineated the wetland boundary. He additionally noted that the lots would have on-site wells for water but would be served by municipal sewer. Dennis P. asked if the applicant had explored utilizing the town water system. Jason B. replied that it would be costly, since the water main ends before it reaches the lots. Dennis P. asked if the houses would be oriented and face the same direction as the rest of the development, and Jason B. replied in the affirmative, that they would be facing the south.

Mitch C. asked if there would be pedestrian connectivity from the two residential lots to South Farm Road. Jason B. replied that nothing has been proposed yet, but it would be nice to have a connection for the two homes to utilize that path. Mitch C. said that it would allow for better pedestrian connectivity with the Village. Dick J said that connectivity is important, but that a connection would mean putting a

path between two established homes. Jason B. noted that there is an easement there. Mitch C. noted that it would be easier to make a sidewalk or path that goes through that easement for connectivity to the walking path.

Dick J. asked about the proposal to use an existing well on a neighboring property. Jason B. replied that it was not the intent to share the well, and that each lot would have its own private well. Dick J. also expressed concern about the rear setback, since there are existing homes behind the lots. Mitch C. noted that the rear setback was reduced on one house from 30 to 20 feet. Board members were comfortable with that reduction.

The Board reviewed the staff comments from the sketch plan review. The Board was comfortable with classifying the plan as a minor subdivision. The Board was comfortable with the proposed waivers. Members discussed the right of way width and Jason B. said that the proposed access would be its own private road instead of going through the original right of way. The Board asked Jason B. if the driveway grade would not exceed the 13% limit. Jason B. said it would not. The Board discussed the turnaround with the applicant. Jason B. noted that he still needs to meet with the fire chief to discuss, but that the proposed turnaround location would be at the northeastern part of Lot 11, and that it uses the existing drive. The Board was comfortable with out there being a pull-off before the first driveway. The Board discussed pedestrian connectivity and previously-approved easements. The Board noted that the remaining portion of Lot #9 will not be buildable. The Board noted that ownership of Lot #3 is not correctly listed in the plan, and should be corrected at final plat.

Jonathan S. asked if the Board should recommend that the Planning Commission look at pedestrian crossings for Buck Hill Road, if there is more traffic coming onto it from that private road. Jason B. replied that it's a state highway and can't have a crosswalk, but the speed limit could be lowered or a pedestrian sign could be put up.

Howard R. addressed remarks about utilizing an existing private well on the Knight property, saying that he'd had a conversation with the owner of the well who had previously expressed openness to the possibility of sharing, since it is a high-producing well, but that ultimately it didn't make sense to share. He also noted that both properties would be part of the South Farm homeowners association, which would be an easy way to tie the two lots into any shared infrastructure. He said that belonging to that HOA also means that any houses must be oriented to the south and be five-star energy rated.

The hearing was opened to the Public. Beverly K. noted her appreciation for the Russell family's concern about aesthetics and how the pieces of property fit together.

Mitch C. noted that there has been a request from the Trails Committee for coordination as far as roads and parking are concerned, as members of the public and Board members expressed concern about the possibility that South Farm Road could see more parked cars if there is more trail connectivity.

Jonathan S. asked about the possibility of moving Lot #10's building envelope to the south or Lot #11's building envelope to the north, so that there would be a buffer between those two properties for an easement to connect the roads. Jason B. replied that it would be possible to do so, but would need to ensure that building envelope locations still work with the proposed stormwater plan. Merrily L. said that the community goes across Lot #8 to access the trail on the eastern part of lot #9. Mitch C. asked if there was an easement for this pedestrian access. Howard R. said there wasn't. Dick J. noted that the public doesn't think making the connection all the way through is a good idea, and that a town

connection was never envisioned. He added that now is the time to put in the right of way if one is desired.

Ted B. made a motion, and Dennis P. seconded, to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft conditions for approval. The motion passed 6-0.

6. Other business: Decision Deliberations

- **Trousdale/Palmer: Final Plat. *Hearing closed 1/19/21.*** This was removed from the agenda and postponed until the following DRB meeting.
- **Hinesburg Center II/David Lyman Revocable Trust: Preliminary Plat. *Hearing closed 1/5/21.***

Ted B. made a motion, and Dick J. seconded, to close the public portion of the meeting and enter into deliberative session to discuss the Hinesburg Center II application. The motion passed 6-0 at 9:12 PM.

7. News/Announcements/Correspondence

None at this time.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Coonradt, Recording Secretary