

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board Meeting Minutes
December 21, 2021
Approved January 4, 2022

Members Present: Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan (via Zoom), John Lyman, Branden Martin (via Zoom), Dennis Place, Greg Waples (via Zoom).

Members Absent: Jonathan Slason.

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

Applicants:

- **Kelly's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation:** Cindi Reid (Owner), Michael Wisniewski (Applicant/Architect), Greg Montgomery (Engineer via Zoom), Tyler Labrie (Partner Owner Representative)
- **Jim Donovan & Patricia O'Donnell:** Jim Donovan (Applicant via Zoom)

Public Present: Carl Bohlen, Barbara Forauer.

Dennis P. **called the meeting to order at approximately 7:02 PM.**

1. Agenda Changes:

None.

2. December 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes:

Ted B. **made a motion, and Ted B. seconded, to approve the December 7, 2021 minutes as presented. The motion passed 6-0.**

3. Kelly's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation – 20-50-20.000 – Sketch Plan application to expand their existing 24 unit senior affordable multifamily housing development with 24 new additional units on a 6.49-acre lot in the Village Zoning District.

Cindi R. said that when Cathedral Square renovated the original property in 2015, they had always intended to build additional units. She noted that they are proposing 24 units of new construction to be added to the existing 24 units. She noted that this would help address the housing crisis in Chittenden County. She said that this would be a mixed-income housing community of ages 55+. She noted that Cathedral Square would be the management agent and the service provider for the residents.

Michael W. showed the drawing of the existing location. He pointed out the entry to the development and the three existing buildings. He pointed out the existing driveway, pavilion, and existing garage. He said that though there is a lot of open area, there are a lot of constraints on the site. He pointed out a wetland buffer and a stream buffer on the south side of the property. He pointed out steep slopes on the side of the property. He showed the proposed area for the new construction. He said that because the site is tight he would like to spend tonight vetting it to make sure that the Board has no insurmountable concerns.

Michael W. then showed the sketch of the site with the new building. He spoke about stormwater elements. He pointed out the existing drainage area, noting that they would install a gravel wetland to handle stormwater. He pointed out the flat space that would be where the new construction is located.

He noted that another gravel wetland will be installed on the southeast side of the property. He said that the original design did not have a stormwater permit. He showed that the parking lot is divided by a buffer. He said that in addition to new housing, they also want this project to include additional community space, more outdoor space, relocation of the pavilion, a designated smoking shelter, and a trash/recycling area. He showed where walking paths between buildings and around the property would be located. He said that 4 of the units would be on the ground floor and that the remainder would be on the first and second floors. He noted that they would all be one-bedroom units, except for one market-rate two-bedroom unit. He noted that the roof of the new building would be flat and would have solar panels installed.

Greg W. asked about the gravel wetland. Michael W. replied that it is a depression that will be covered with planting and will allow the water to infiltrate and to move. Mitch C. clarified that one existing stormwater location will be improved to install a gravel wetland and then will add another gravel wetland as a retention treatment area. He noted that a stormwater plan will be provided at preliminary plat.

Michael W. pointed out the proposed raised beds for community gardens for residents. He noted that this area is close to the stream buffer setback and that they would likely need to do a small amount of grading to construct the beds. He said that they would be asking for a temporary waiver to encroach into the setback slightly in order to construct the beds. Mitch C. asked how much of a disturbance they are anticipating and whether it can be shifted. Michael W. replied that they won't have detail until further into the planning process, but they anticipate having several feet of slope that they would like to grade in order to situate the raised beds in the proposed location. Cindy R. added that they are trying to build community between the first set of buildings and the new building and that one way they are proposing to do that is to have shared community green spaces. Dick J. said that if the encroachment is minimal, then it shouldn't be a problem.

Michael W. then spoke about parking, saying that they are maximizing the parking on the site and will have 43 spaces (which includes both resident and staff parking needs), which comes out to slightly less than one space per unit. He said that Cathedral Square conducted a parking study on the existing 24 units and found that the existing 16 spaces was sufficient. He noted that based on this, they calculated that the added units would result in a total parking need of around 39 spaces. He said that many of the residents do not have cars. Greg W. asked where additional parking spaces would be located if they needed more. Michael W. replied that they would need to cut into the community green space in order to fit more parking spaces. He said that they could also relocate the mailbox to squeeze in another space or two. John L. asked where snow would be stored. He also said that there needs to be room for emergency vehicles as well. Michael W. replied that they created a loop in the parking lot for emergency vehicle turnaround and that they also included emergency vehicle radii in the sketch plan submission. Dennis P. said that he would like to see a backup plan in case parking becomes an issue down the road.

Greg W. asked if Cathedral Square has any covenants or contract terms with their tenants around parking and what spaces can be used for. Cindy R. replied that this is a low-income population that is typically downsizing and will most often be one-car households (if they have cars at all). She said that they typically guarantee one space per unit. Greg W. suggested that the DRB would need to draft conditions stipulating that each unit would be allowed one car.

Jonathan S. submitted written comment saying that the parking 0.9 ratio is acceptable from his perspective, but would be helpful to confirm the eligibility to be a resident (income, ability, age?) Mitch

C. confirmed that the eligibility criteria are income and age. Mitch C. asked if the units meet inclusionary zoning requirements. Cindy R. replied that she would need to check.

Michael W. noted that the driveway and sidewalk will be replaced. Greg W. asked if there is the possibility of road access connectivity with Lantman's and other services and businesses in Town. He said that it would shorten the curve for people trying to get essential services in Hinesburg. Greg Montgomery said that establishing an additional connection would involve crossing a stream and a wetland, as well as private property, and would involve state permitting. Dick J. asked if residents are using alternatives to cars, like electric golf carts. Michael W. replied that many residents use bicycles and other alternative modes of transportation.

Jonathan S. submitted additional written comments noting that he is fine with not needing a traffic study and that lighting and safety at the entrance to the road should be considered.

Dennis P. opened the discussion up to the public.

Barbara Forauer asked where the solar panels would be installed. Michael W. replied that they will be on the roof of the new building. Barbara F. asked if each unit would have their own heat pumps. Michael W. replied that they don't have final details on heating and cooling yet. Barbara F. asked whether a resident or non-resident would be managing the property. Cindy R. replied that a Services and Supports at Home (SASH) Coordinator would provide management services.

Carl Bohlen expressed support for this project on behalf of the affordable housing committee. He said that the proposed addition would meet inclusionary zoning criteria. Mitch C. noted that meeting the inclusionary zoning criteria would make the project eligible for density bonuses, but that staff has not calculated that yet.

Greg W. asked if there is any other site in Hinesburg that is dedicated to affordable housing on this magnitude. Carl B. said that the Green Street project has 24 units, 22 of which are perpetually affordable.

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

4. Extension Request – Jim Donovan & Patricia O'Donnell – 17-22-62.300 - Sketch Plan review for a 6-lot subdivision of a ±23.6-acre parcel located on the south side of CVU Road in the Rural Residential 1 Zoning District. The application was approved on June 15, 2021.

Greg W. made a motion and John L. seconded, to approve the extension request. The motion passed 6-0.

5. Natural Resource Inventory website

Mitch C. said that Town staff and several of the Town's committees (the Conservation Commission and the Planning Commission, most notably) have worked to combine a number of different factors and resources into an interactive map for board members and the public to see where these features are located in Hinesburg. He showed some of the features of the website. He said that it shows features like residences by type, contours, different zoning areas, forestry information, prime agricultural soils, forestry resources, and recreational areas. He noted that it includes data through 2018.

6. News/Announcements/Correspondence

Mitch C. said that at the next meeting they will review a development on a private right-of-way. He noted that they have received several applications, which will be heard in January and February.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Coonradt, Recording Secretary