

Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board Meeting Minutes
June 21, 2022
Approved – July 19, 2022

Members Present: Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, John Lyman, Dennis Place, Jonathan Slason, Greg Waples.

Members Absent: Branden Martin, Mike Webb.

DRB Staff: Mitch Cypes (Development Review Coordinator), Amy Coonradt (Recording Secretary – via Zoom)

Applicants:

- **Matti Vesterstein** – Matti Vesterstein (Applicant, in person), Garrett Mernick (Applicant, in person), Anders Mellon (via Zoom)
- **Vermont Well & Pump** – Rob Frost (Applicant, in person) Jacques Larose (via Zoom), Kiesha Richardson (VT Well & Pump Office Manager, via Zoom)
- **Kelley's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation** – Cindy Reid (Applicant, in person), Michael Wisniewski (Applicant, in person), Derick Read (in person).

Public Present (in person): Sean Lang, Nancy Waples.

Public Present (via Zoom): Michelle Jimmo.

Dennis P. **called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 PM.**

1. Agenda Changes:

2. June 7, 2022 Meeting Minutes:

Greg W. **made a motion, and John L. seconded, to approve the June 7, 2022 minutes as amended. The motion passed 4-0.**

The minutes were amended as follows:

- Staff to clarify Matt Montgomery's role as a wetland consultant for the PR&R Development application.

3. Matti Vesterstein – 11-01-06.200 – Site plan application for commercial agricultural operations for cannabis cultivation on a 22.76-acre property located at 372 Ishim Road in the Agricultural Zoning District (AG).

Greg W. and Dennis P. recused themselves from the application hearing.

Matti V. said that they will not be adding any infrastructure and will be using organic approaches. He said that they will be using the garage for drying space, but that is the only part of the residence being used. He said that in terms of security, per state guidelines they are building a fence and will have trail cameras and video camera systems to monitor the property. He said that there is only one access point to get into where the plants will be going.

Dick J. asked how big the cultivation area is. Matti V. replied that it will be around 100 by 100 feet.

Dick J. asked if the Applicant has plans to expand the cultivation area in future. Matti V. replied that they are going to start small and potentially expand in future. Dick J. asked if the Applicant is allowed to expand operations without approval. Mitch C. replied that the Applicant is maximizing their state license, and if they expand their use they will need to return to the DRB. Ted B. noted that the DRB is not approving the size of the operation. Jonathan S. noted that as long as thresholds for performance measures such as traffic, noise, and air quality are not exceeded, they could expand reasonably.

Dick J. asked about the fencing. Matti V. replied that they will be installing chain link fence, noting that the Cannabis Control Board (CCB)'s requirements for fencing are to ensure that unauthorized access to cultivation areas is prevented (but that they do not have specific language about height, and list a number of acceptable materials).

John L. asked about the sight distance from the driveway to the cultivation area. Matti V. replied that the cultivation area is relatively set back from the road. Mitch C. added that there is some grading that blocks sight to the area from the road, and also noted that the site is at somewhat of a dead end on Ishim Road.

Dennis P. opened the discussion up to the public.

Michelle Jimmo noted that cannabis requires more water than other plants and asked how the Applicant plans to get water to the area. Matti V. replied that there is a well on the property.

Jonathan S. said that the approval should be written such that it is wholesale, in order to avoid retail traffic.

Jonathan S. made a motion, and Ted B. seconded, to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft conditions of approval. The motion passed 4-0 (Dennis P. and Greg W. abstained).

4. Vermont Well & Pump – 12-01-12.000 – Site Plan application that will include a full redesign of the site including removing the existing office former residence and placing a new office building with garage on their 1.33-acre property located in the Industrial 1 Zoning District (I1). Conditional Use review for a roof with a higher than 35-foot elevation. Sign review.

Jacques L. said that the business site is on the corner of Hollow Road and Route 116. He said that it is a contractor's yard, and that the site was in front of the DRB in 2017 for approval for a garage at the rear of the site and an office building. He said that the office building is now removed and combined with the garage and moved to the front to meet the zoning regulations. He said that they are relocating parking to the site of the building, will have a stormwater treatment facility and storage buildings and areas, and will add around a dozen equipment storage spaces for equipment, will relocate the wastewater system to give flexibility and make the yard more useful. He noted that they have a permit for that system and for earthwork and a permit from VTrans for work in the right-of-way. He noted that there are some building elevations that will need conditional use approval, since they are taller than what the zoning regulations allow. He said that the raised portion of the roof will be one bay in the garage to stand up the well rig and do maintenance on it inside the covered garage. He noted that they included a lighting plan for security lighting. He said that they are not planning on making changes to the current signage.

Greg W. asked how the well rig is currently being maintained. Robert F. (the Applicant) replied that they are currently maintaining it outside, and that it would be beneficial to conduct that work inside. Greg W. asked what is around the site. Mitch C. replied that they are surrounded on two sides by Clifford Lumber

(north and east). Greg W. asked about nearby residential areas and whether they would be impacted by the taller building, and asked whether comments have been submitted by adjacent residents. Mitch C. replied that there have not been comments submitted by adjacent residents on the proposed building. Greg W. asked about water flow and whether it will be an issue. Robert F. replied that all of his flow goes into the stormwater pond and into a culvert diagonally across from Route 116. Jacques L. noted that VTrans commented that the culvert in question has been an issue in the past, and have requested as a condition of approval that it be cleared when there are obstructions. Dick J. asked about one of the other culverts and whether it is in good repair and condition. Jacques L. replied that the culvert likely needs to be cleaned but that that is in the purview of VTrans.

Jacques L. said that they would be happy to do additional landscaping if the DRB would like more. He noted a staff comment about light spillage to the east, and said that the lighting being contemplated will be low spillage. Mitch C. asked about the time of day that the lights would be on. Robert Frost replied that the lights will be for security purposes, and could be motion-sensor lights.

Jonathan S. said that in terms of landscaping, the property doesn't need additional planting the southwest, but if anything, planting would be between the parking area and the stormwater pond. He said that he would be comfortable with the conditional use for the roof if there is sufficient landscaping around it. Jacques L. noted that there is a berm on the property and said that it might work well for landscaping, such as hedges.

Robert F. said that the raised part of the roof would provide an opportunity for passive lighting. Dick J. said that having windows all around would lessen the visual impact of having that raised portion of the roof sticking up, and would make it less noticeable.

Dennis P. asked where hazardous waste is sent. Rob replied that it is oil and they send it away. Jacques L. added that they have approval for holding tanks for floor drains in their stormwater permit. He said that the holding tanks will generally contain snowmelt, but that if there is some kind of catastrophic flow, it won't go into the groundwater but into the holding tanks.

Dennis P. then noted the LEED scorecard staff comment and asked whether one should be required for this application. He said that he is comfortable with waiving it. Jonathan S. said that he is comfortable with the waiver in this industrial context.

Dennis P. asked about the dumpster location. Robert F. said that they don't have a preference for dumpster location but said that they need to ensure that trucks coming in are able to access the dumpster. Jacques L. said that the currently proposed location is convenient, would have an enclosure, and seems to make sense at this point in time. He said that the enclosure is a concrete pad with posts and screenboard. Mitch C. said that if the location that would need less screening. Jonathan S. said that he is comfortable with either a full enclosure or less screening, since it is an industrial site.

Dennis P. opened the discussion up to the public.

Michelle Jimmo asked about the vegetation along the Hollow Road edge, saying that it creates sight line and visibility concerns. She asked whether that existing growth and foliage will be cut back to increase visibility. Jacques L. replied that there is significant grading occurring around the bottom of the basin and that all of the foliage within that infiltration area will be removed. He said that VTrans also requested that they clean out the ditch on Hollow Road as well. He further added that improvements being made related to this application will improve sight and runoff issues downstream.

Dennis P. made a motion, and Jonathan S. seconded, to close the public hearings and direct staff to draft conditions of approvals. The motion passed 6-0.

5. Kelley's Field Limited Partnership c/o Cathedral Square Corporation – 20-50-20.200 – Final plat application to expand their existing 24-unit senior affordable multifamily housing development with 24 new additional units on a 6.49-acre property located on Kelley's Field Road in the Village Zoning District (VG).

Michael W. said that they would like to focus on the 4 outstanding issues that have been raised regarding the application. He said that one of the biggest items from the previous discussion was the sidewalk along the right of way. He noted that it is being built and will be generally 5 feet wide (narrower to accommodate light poles in some places). He said that they have cleared up right-of-way issues and have a draft agreement waiting to be executed by both parties. He said that they also included extra parking, though they do not anticipate needing it.

Michael W. said that with regards to the public open space requirement, they would like to seek a waiver. He said that staff comments do note that the Applicant makes compelling points. He said that he interprets the public space requirement as being triggered if it fronts on a public right-of-way. However, the site would be situated on a private property on a private driveway. He said that there could be security concerns if there is more public traffic. He said that they tried to make a very welcoming front yard right off the of the new parking lot, with a pavilion and landscaping. Jonathan S. asked if they will post a "private" sign. Michael W. replied that it will operate the way it has, and that they don't anticipate putting up a sign. Cindy R. added that there is a sign for Kelley's Field, but there will not be an additional posted sign. She said that there will be some Hinesburg community members enrolled in Services and Supports at Home (SASH) who will be receiving care coordination services and will be engaging in activities with SASH workers related to wellness. Dick J. said that this isn't like Hinesburg Center II, which is in a more central point in town. He said he'd be comfortable with a waiver. Jonathan S. agreed that he is comfortable with a waiver, also given the specific population of residents (over the age of 55).

Jonathan S. said that with regards to the sidewalk, the engineering around the stormwater drain at the intersection with Route 116 needs to be considered carefully, due to the actual gradient of the drain. Michael W. agreed, saying that the catch basin is below the sidewalk grade so it would be difficult to get the road drainage to it. Jonathan S. suggested that they could terminate the sidewalk at gradient with a cleaner slope, or if they're able to get agreement with the property owners, they could cut a diagonal and go on the back side of the stormwater drain (rather than the road side of the drain). Michael W. noted that there is a large maple tree in that area, which makes things difficult in terms of engineering in that area. Dick J. said that if whatever solution they come up with isn't working, then the Applicant will need to come back to the DRB to come up with an alternative.

Michael W. noted that there were concerns about some of the landscaping being invasive species, specifically about reblooming day lilies, catmint, and European mountain ash. He said that they checked with a landscape architect who determined that the proposed species are not invasive but have similar names to some invasive species. He noted that the European mountain ash is a species that can be invasive, but they are proposing to plant one as a replacement for one that is being removed (and the landscape architect did not have concerns with that). He said that they would like to keep the landscaping plan as submitted, since they have addressed concerns.

Jonathan S. asked about the low impact design (LID) for stormwater. Derick R. not that the site will have 2 gravel wetlands and that the pipes in each of those has reduced the amount of flow going through them to around 13.5 gallons per minute. He said that doing more than this would not do much to improve that, and would further increase costs. Cindy R. spoke about increased costs for this project across the board, and said that they are working to make sure the project is as lean as possible without compromising the program or quality. Michael W. said that this has also caused some minor dimensional changes to apartments and the layout of the buildings, which will be provided to staff.

Derick R. then spoke about the survey, noting the staff comment that utilities need to be added to the final plat. Mitch C. confirmed that these would be the basic utilities, such as electric, gas, and phone.

Dennis P. opened the discussion up to the public.

Michelle Jimmo asked if there are water spigots or water access for the planters outside so that residents will be able to have and water gardens. Michael W. said that there will be a yard hydrant that will be located near the planter boxes. Michelle Jimmo noted that there are only 2 additional handicapped parking spots being added and said that that seemed low, given the demographics of residents. Michael W. replied that they generally cross-check the needs with Cathedral Square and also noted that the number of spots exceeds the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations, which require 1 space per 25 residents.

Ted B. made a motion, and Greg W. seconded, to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft conditions of approval, with the expectation that the Applicant will provide exact dimensions (which are being reduced by less than 5%). The motion passed 6-0.

6. News/Announcements/Correspondence

Mitch C. noted that the July 5 meeting has been cancelled. He also noted that on July 19th they will have the Mobbs sketch plan application and accompanying site visit, a continuance for Farrell, and a final plat review for Haystack. He noted that Hinesburg Center II will also be returning in the next several months.

7. Honoring Greg Waples for his 22 years of service on the Development Review Board and the Zoning Board of Adjustment

DRB members spoke about their experiences working with Greg W. over the years. Greg W. has been a continuous member of the DRB since its start in February 2002. Greg W. was also a member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA), which predated the DRB, for the ZBA's last two years.

Greg W. said that one of the most impressive highlights of working with the DRB is how collegial, deliberative, and respectful the board has been, despite working on divisive issues. He wished the DRB well in its future endeavors. The DRB wished him well in his.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Coonradt, Recording Secretary