

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
September 11, 2019
Approved September 25, 2019**

Members Present: Dan Myhre, Maggie Gordon, Joe Iadanza, John Kiedaisch, Barbara Forauer, Marie Gardner, Rolf Kielman, James Donegan, Dennis Place

Members Absent:

Public Present: Johanna White

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning), Kate Kelly (Recording Secretary)

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:00 PM.

Agenda Changes:

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items:

Johanna White said Lewis Creek Association and Responsible Growth Hinesburg will present the next Water Matters event on November 7 here at Town Hall. She requested sponsorship from the Planning Commission for the event. She said the program is still under development, but she believes it will be a proposition to the citizens to how they would react to the costs for taking care of stormwater. They plan to bring a sand and water table for a hands on activity, and have Jessica Louisos speak. Their next meeting will be Friday this week. Would the Planning Commission be interested in joining as a sponsor? Alex W. said the Commission has sponsored in the past. In the past, one of the speakers was going to be Joe Colangelo, and the topic was to be how Shelburne found itself as an impaired waterway, and what that has cost the municipality in terms of remediation. Maggie G. asked what is involved with sponsorship? Johanna W. said she doesn't know currently, but no money or cookies. James D. asked if they could wait to decide until the next meeting. Johanna W. said yes. She said they'd like to invite surrounding towns (last year it was over 90 people).

They discussed the deadline, and Rolf K. said he didn't see any reason to wait. James D. would like to wait until next meeting to get more information/program. The Commission decided to wait until their next meeting, Sept. 25.

Architectural and Streetscape Design Standards:

Maggie G. said the Commission should look at which standards they'd like to take a closer look at. They reviewed the existing standards, beginning with building height relief. They discussed whether they

should address this standard at all, and Marie G. brought up the language required vs. encouraged. Joe I. said we would need to look at micro-zones to make this work. The Commission discussed building height. Maggie G. said she would be interested in looking at language requesting multi-story buildings along street side. Joe I. mentioned that South Burlington used limits on how far any one-story building could be from any other one-story building. Barbara F. suggested requesting no false fronts on second story buildings. Maggie G. asked about building height relief; most agreed this would be useful to see. They discussed the idea of setting back a third story to use the roof area.

James D. felt architectural variety is important to avoid monotony. They reviewed the current front façades building standards, and discussed buildings in Hinesburg and Kinney's. The Commission discussed permeability, window displays, and the area on the 116 side of Kinney and Parkside Café.

Rolf K. mentioned numbers 10 and 11 (visual change to façade and how much of a lot can you fill). Rolf K. discussed the percentage lot fill, and John K. suggested looking at our current building frontage fill. He also mentioned that the narrow lot buildings become the defacto width which then would get varied.

Maggie G. suggested reviewing street grid. She felt this wouldn't work much on east side of town (hills). Marie G. said she didn't know how much could be done on the west either with wetlands. John K. said the grids don't necessarily have to be a grid, and should respond to topography. He felt we could guide this using our standards. Joe I. suggested using block sizes to guide how far apart connections are. They discussed requiring on-street parking.

Maggie G. brought up porches, flower boxes, street lamps, etc. Alex W. felt if the Commission wants more visual interest, we should add this to our standards and provide a picture.

Maggie G. and Barbara F. brought up pieces of other towns' regulations they'd like to have Alex W. include, and will forward to him.

Alex W. will draft language for everything discussed.

Municipal Planning Grant Project Ideas:

Hinesburg hasn't received this grant in the past couple years, partially because we lost our village center designation. We now have this back so will hopefully be more competitive. Alex W. said the two proposed projects are similar to what we've applied for in the past. One idea is to hire someone to take what we've come up with and create pictorial designs for it. Due to grant timing, it might stretch out how long it takes to get these standards to public hearing until early next year.

Alex W. mentioned the other idea is to hire an economic analyst to analyze the costs of and planning for capital infrastructure. There may not be enough money in this funding source to make this project viable.

Joe I. suggested stormwater planning for the village. Alex W. said his contact with the state said that the Municipal Planning Grant was not the best funding source for this. Kate Kelly announced that Lewis Creek Association received a grant to do some planning for stormwater and a conceptual design in this portion of the village. Alex W. said he would like to have someone at the town level to support stormwater too.

James D. voted for #2, Marie G. for #1. The Commission discussed. They agreed that if #2 fits within the grant, go for that; if it doesn't fit, go with #1.

Minutes of August 28 Meeting:

Joe I. **made a motion to approve the minutes of August 28, 2019 as written**, and Barbara F. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 7-0**.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Marie G. suggested the stormwater related letter should go to the Selectboard, and that the issue is bigger than the DRB. Alex W. said that this planning project could fit under the regional planning commission's UPWP project, especially when there is a transportation nexus. Alex W. stated his concerns with the asynchronous developments. He also mentioned that our current standards don't allow the DRB to do anything legally about the results of a cumulative look outside the project area. Marie G. asked about Bittersweet Hill developments. John K. mentioned that if there are major errors in a developer's conceptual proposal, there are issues with how you can back up. We should encourage this during conceptual work. He also said it's an issue of who gets there first. Alex W. said sketch plan is supposed to be rough. There's no way to gauge that we will have impairment until we have designs. John K. argued that looking at what the impacts could be would be valuable.

Alex W. said that we are looking at some of this, but we aren't looking at the overall picture. Joe I. agreed with Alex W. that we can't base big decisions on this low level of quality of data. Rolf K. said he felt this should go to both the DRB and the Selectboard. Marie G. said it is a big issue that needs to be addressed. Rolf K. said an area of downtown Burlington has several different rain garden structures incorporated in to streetscape, and he approves the memo. Alex W. said he agrees with Marie G. that it is a town responsibility.

Maggie G. asked if there are other solutions that would address the multiple developments? Alex W. said he would suggest it go to the Selectboard and that they partner with the Planning or Conservation Commission to fund the study. This would be a planning study, which would be an update to the previous studies. State standards have been updated since this study. We could focus the study to these parcels. James D. suggested we do this (update the previous studies). Maggie G. asked about what the DRB could do with the results. Alex W. replied if we do as a planning study, the Planning

Commission can then act in whatever way makes sense; if we put it in the DRB's hands it isn't actionable.

Maggie G. asked what would happen after study? Alex W. replied we would revise our stormwater regulations (although we don't know what these regulations would be, which would be another study). Maybe the memo to the DRB should say that impacts are important and should be considered, but not dictate that a study be done every time a study comes forward. Joe I. suggested that the DRB letter be sent as a stop-gap. Maggie G. asked Kate K.'s thoughts. She replied that she thought it could go to the Selectboard. The Commission discussed further. John K. said we could recommend that the DRB pay attention to what they know now, but we may need to change the rules.

Joe I. **made a motion to approve the memo to the DRB.** Rolf K. **seconded the motion.**

James D. asked about addressing the Selectboard. Joe I. said that is a good amendment, that we should be doing this as a town, and update the study to include current projections. Joe I. **amended his motion to also communicate with the Select Board that the Planning Commission strongly recommends that the existing studies for stormwater in this area be updated with the latest information we have on the five proposed projects that are possible in this area.** Rolf K. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0** on both the motion and the amendment.

Marie G. asked about the status of the Official Map with the Selectboard. Alex W. replied that the Selectboard considered, but decided they needed more time. They had tentatively scheduled it for Sept. 18, but it may need to get bumped until October. If they don't approve it within a year of the public hearing, it is declared denied.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary