

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board Meeting Minutes
April 5, 2022
Approved April 19, 2022

Members Present: Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan (via Zoom), John Lyman, Branden Martin (via Zoom), Dennis Place, Jonathan Slason, Greg Waples, Mike Webb (alternate – via Zoom).

Members Absent: None.

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

Applicants:

- **Kelley's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation:** Cindy Reid, Michael Wisniewski, Tyler Lorrie (in person); Derrick Read (via Zoom)

Public Present (via Zoom): Mary Beth, Carl Bohlen, Barbara Forauer, Susan Rassmussen.

Dennis P. called the meeting to order at approximately 7:04 PM.

1. Agenda Changes: None.

2. March 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes:

Greg W. made a motion, and John L. seconded, to approve the March 15, 2022 minutes as presented. The motion passed 7-0 (Jonathan S. recused himself).

3. Kelley's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation -20-50-20.000 – Preliminary plat application to expand their existing 24-unit senior affordable multi-family housing development with 24 new additional units on a 6.49-acre property located on Kelley's Field Road in the Village Zoning District.

Michael W. began by pointing out the existing buildings and parking for the plan and showed the location of the proposed new building and extended parking for the additional 24 units. He noted that they will be creating a driveway loop both for ease of getting in and out of the development and for emergency vehicle access.

John L. noted that existing building and apartment numbers should be reviewed for accuracy, to ensure that emergency services are able to get to the correct location when responding to calls. Dick J. asked if there are numbers on the buildings that make them easily identifiable. Michael W. replied that there will only be one new building, which will have one number. Jonathan S. asked about the perimeter and whether access for emergency responders is sufficient. Michael W. replied that he is relatively confident that they will have enough contingency funding to build an asphalt loop around the building, which emergency responders can use with ladders, though they may not be able to drive vehicles onto it. Dick J. asked whether there are additional egress windows, and Michael W. replied that they are not required to have an emergency egress if they have a sprinkler system (which they are installing). He said that there are two exits for every floor.

Michael W. showed a rendering of the new building from the parking lot, showing the drop-off location in front of the building, the walkways for access, a wraparound porch, and an open landscaped area in

front of the porch. He said that the central landscaped area will include a pavilion and raised garden beds and will serve the entire group of residents as a gathering area for activities.

Michael W. noted that though Hinesburg zoning encourages pitched-roof buildings, the new building proposed in the application will have a flat roof. He said that they chose to have a flat roof because it would make it easier to collect and capture stormwater and prevent erosion as well as enable them to install more solar panels on the roof.

Jonathan S. asked about the condition of the existing sidewalk. Michael W. replied that they will replace the sidewalk, though they are asking for relief from having to install code-compliant (wider) sidewalks. He said that that would entail the removal of three existing site lights and mature landscaping, as well as expanding the sidewalk into the right-of-way. He said that they would like a waiver to expand the existing sidewalk, and would instead propose making improvements to the currently-existing sidewalk.

Michael W. noted a requirement around public space and said that the project provides more outdoor common space than is required. He said that adding 24 units would require 4,800 square feet of public space, and that they have met the space requirement through the outdoor gathering area noted above as well as a walking loop. He said that, however, these areas are private, and they are requesting a waiver from the public space requirement. He said that the spaces are welcoming and would be used by residents, but would not be open to the public continuously.

Dick J. asked if the walking path could be built two or three years after the initial development, should contingency funding not be available. Cindy R. said that affordable housing development counts on having available capital up front and said that it is rare that they would have reserves down the road to pay for additional features. She said that it is also easier to get grants for new construction than for amenities to an existing property once it's up and running.

Michael W. noted that in terms of new infrastructure, the development would be putting in a new waterline to meet the needs of the new building and its sprinkler system, two gravel wetlands to address stormwater issues, and a new transformer to power the elevator system in the new building.

Mitch C. asked about the lack of a forebay for the southerly gravel wetland in the proposed plan. Derrick R. replied that the gravel wetland was designed to capture the roof runoff. He said that State regulations do not require a forebay to pretreat stormwater for roof runoff. He explained what a gravel wetland is, noting that it is most effective stormwater treatment mechanism for new projects, having the added benefit of reducing phosphorus runoff. Dick J. asked how many inches of stormwater the gravel wetland would be able to hold without spilling over. Derrick R. replied that the gravel wetlands are both designed to handle a 100-year storm. Mitch C. noted that Hinesburg requires that a 100-year storm be conveyed effectively and since the pre-development discharge is less than the post development discharge, this standard is met.

Jonathan S. asked if there are noise attenuation with the transformer that will be installed, as he noticed that it is near a residential structure and that they can be noisy. Michael W. replied that they have just begun engaging with Green Mountain Power on the transformer details, but he will inquire with them about noise attenuation.

John L. asked if the lighting meets brightness requirements. Michael W. replied that the existing pole lights meet current requirements, but they have not reviewed the house lighting since it was renovated

about five years ago. He said that house lights for the new building will meet requirements. Dick J. asked if the pavilion will have lighting. Michael W. replied that they will put recessed downcast lights in the pavilion.

Michael W. additionally noted that they will be installing a fire hydrant on the site, and that they have worked with the fire chief on locating it.

Dennis P. asked about the applicant's proposed waiver for a smaller livable floor area than is currently in the regulations. Mitch C. recommended that the Development Review Board (DRB) grant the waiver. The DRB concurred.

Dennis P. asked about the requested front yard parking waiver. DRB members agreed that a waiver is appropriate, given the topographical constraints of the site.

Mitch C. noted that staff recommended additional cornice detailing and asked for the DRB to weigh in. Jonathan S. said that he'd be willing to grant the sidewalk waiver and let the cornice detailing recommendation go, given the cost-constrained nature of the project and the need to bring more affordable senior housing into the area. Ted B. said that it is important for the population that will be living there to have an adequate sidewalk, and said it would be important to know how close to a five-foot sidewalk the Applicant could get, without negatively impacting the project. Mitch C. asked if it would be possible to expand the sidewalk where possible and keep it narrow where it's more difficult to widen it. Michael W. said that that would be possible to do. DRB members said that they would be fine without additional cornice detailing.

Jonathan S. asked about heating and cooling and whether it is centralized or would use heat pumps. Michael W. replied that they typically have gas heat with hydraulic radiation and cooling through heat pumps or electric heat pumps for both, but have not settled on which type of system they will use.

Mike W. asked about Act 250 permitting requirements for this project. Cindy R. said that Act 250 requirements are not applicable to this development, based on the opinion that they received from the Act 250 district coordinator. Michael W. noted that they typically exceed RBES requirements for Act 250.

Greg W. noted the \$72,000 landscaping budget and asked what is being proposed within that budget. Michael W. replied that they will prepare a detailed breakdown of the budget for final plat, and that it will include landscaping material, the raised bed planters, and potentially the pavilion.

Dennis P. opened the discussion up to the public.

Carl Bohlen spoke as the chair of the Affordable Housing Committee, noting the Committee's support for the project. He urged the DRB not to require any costs that aren't absolutely necessary, using the sidewalk requirements as an example, given that this is a nonprofit project for affordable housing units.

Barbara Forauer asked if the exterior lighting on the porch could be action or motion-activated. Michael W. replied that the main entry would have a light that would be on a timer and then activated by motion, and that the porch area lighting would be activated by a switch in the common room. Barbara F. then said that heat pumps make more sense than using fossil fuel for heating and cooling. She also asked where the stormwater would drain into from the project. Derrick R. replied that the runoff to the north would follow an existing ditch line to a catch basin at the bottom of the driveway and would

discharge in a ditch on the west side of 116. He said that the runoff to the south would discharge into a wetland. Barbara F. replied that it sounds like this would all end up in the rain garden at the United Church (and Mitch C. confirmed this, adding that they will be improving upon the current runoff levels). Barbara F. asked whether there would be a full-time staff manager to assist clients/residents. Cindy R. replied that they will have a Services and Supports at Home (SASH) Coordinator on site for certain hours, but that they wouldn't be staffing the residence 24/7.

Jonathan S. asked about funding sources and whether federal funding could be used (for example, whether ADA funding could be used for the sidewalk improvements). Michael W. replied that they are not required to provide ADA-accessible walkways, since the grading is too steep. He noted that they are ADA-compliant overall, though, because the residence could be dropped off in front of the building and have ADA-compliant access into the building.

Dennis P. made a motion, and Greg W. seconded, to close the public hearing and direct staff to write conditions of approval. The motion passed 7-0.

4. David Quaglietta – 11-01-06.100 – Conditional Use review for a motorcycle repair home occupation on a 21-45-acre property located at 2360 Silver Street in the Agricultural Zoning District. Continued from 2/15/22. **The Applicant has requested a continuance till May 17, 2022.**

Ted B. made a motion, and Greg W. seconded, to continue the hearing until May 17, 2022. The motion passed 7-0.

5. Decision Deliberation:

- **Robert & Anne Frost – 04-01-39.100** – Four-lot Final Plat Subdivision application.

Dick J. asked if the order contains the driveway maintenance agreement.

Mitch C. added a new Order #13 to the decision: A maintenance agreement as described in Finding of Fact #21 and Conclusion #6 shall be provided to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any building permits on Lots #6 and #7.

Greg W. made a motion, and John L. seconded, to approve the subdivision application decision as amended. The motion passed 7-0 (Jonathan S. recused himself).

6. News/Announcements/Correspondence

Mitch C. said that the next meeting will include Rocky Martin, Farrell/Livingston, and potentially a development on a private right-of-way application.

The meeting adjourned at 8:38 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Coonradt, Recording Secretary