

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
October 9, 2019
Approved October 23, 2019**

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

Members Absent: Joe Iadanza

Public Present:

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: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items: None.

Growth Management Scoring System for Water/Wastewater Allocation:

Alex W. requested revisions to the scoring system. James D. said in general it makes sense, but he has concerns about if there aren't projects competing against each other. He wondered if the minimum required value should be significantly higher. Alex W. walked through the scoring system, which includes public infrastructure, and is scored on a 20 point basis, then includes bonus points for ecological practices and fiber ready development. A developer would earn 0 points if they only meet the town standards; they would need to go above and beyond to get points.

Barbara F. asked if they'd have to get points in all criteria; Alex W. said no, you could get all your points in one. James D. asked what would happen if they proposed a park or something that we didn't need or want. Alex W. replied that additional infrastructure (not on Official Map) would need approval by the Selectboard. The Commission discussed the options of repairing infrastructure (like sidewalks) vs. adding new infrastructure. Alex W. replied hopefully in the future the option to include repairing would make its way into the scoring system.

Rolf K. felt it was a great job, but he felt there was too much emphasis on public infrastructure combined with stormwater (45 points) versus locational things (like green field vs. brown field usage), which had only 10 points. He felt some of the design quality issues the Commission has been discussing might make their way into the second criteria (location) to raise it to 20 points, and decrease the public infrastructure/stormwater points.

John K. asked about if points could overlap between stormwater and public infrastructure. Dan M. said he felt they separated these categories based on town plan. Alex W. said they could potentially overlap, as stormwater is above and beyond the public infrastructure category.

Dennis P. asked about phasing and large projects, and envisioned that earlier phases might get many points (e.g. if they put in stormwater early for the full development), then later phases would not get as many points. Alex W. said he agreed that there will need to be language to address how phases are scored. The Commission discussed examples of stormwater infrastructure, and if they should get points in both categories. Alex W. explained that the stormwater infrastructure category is about the quality/level of treatment.

The Commission discussed whether a developer could pay into a fund for existing infrastructure. Dan M. replied they wanted to avoid a situation where developers are writing checks, more about actual delivery. Alex W. said that past analyses have shown that residential development don't cover their own expenses for taking over roads/sidewalks and maintenance. They discussed the fees associated with roads, wells, etc. Rolf K. suggested that giving points for exemplary roads would be good. Alex W. felt this would be a requirement (not necessarily worth points). John K. discussed the language in the roads section. Maggie G. mentioned double dipping between carbon sequestration and the section that follows (ecological practices). They discussed the ecological practices section. Maggie G. wondered about combining ecological practices with renewable energy section. Dan M. said that the renewable energy standards are about meeting state standards, whereas ecological practices are more subjective, so shouldn't be combined.

The Commission reviewed the Job Creation section. John K. asked how we monitor actual job creation. Alex W. replied that getting points would be based not on speculation development, but on a real development/business that wants to be there, but that John K.'s concern wasn't fully addressed in the scoring system. John K. commented on job cuts subsequent to business opening, and the Commission felt that it would be hard to address this issue. Alex W. suggested it might be worth including jobs based on the first 3-5 years. Rolf K. felt this was an important category, and it would be understood that it is variable. James D. felt the bonus points should be based on a percentage of the other points, because the majority of jobs created would be based on the total number of jobs created, so the point system should be tied more to the total number of jobs. Marie G. said she didn't feel points should be given if the owner is a Hinesburg resident. Alex W. replied that the idea here was that a local owner circulates money locally more effectively. John K. felt it should be removed, and the Commission discussed further. They also reviewed James D.'s suggestion of applying this as a percentage (25%).

The Commission discussed how this system would apply to the regulations (it would be a section in the zoning regulations). John K. cautioned that it should be checked with our lawyer.

Dennis P. suggested that they shouldn't give points for minimum wage jobs, but only for living wage jobs. The Commission agreed with Dennis P. They discussed the idea that the harder you make it for

non-residential to get points, the more you encourage residential-only development. They requested that Alex W. edit this.

The Commission discussed housing. Rolf K. felt incentivizing senior housing co-locating with amenities/other housing would be a good idea. Alex W. felt this could go in bonus points category. The Commission discussed the affordable housing section. James D. suggested incentivizing a larger amount of affordable homes (not based on percentage). Maggie G. wondered why so many of the points in this category are in the bonus section. Alex W. replied the bonus area is for senior housing. The Commission discussed, and decided not to change the point allocation here.

November & December Meeting Schedule Changes:

Alex W. said the second meeting of both November and December fall on holidays, and on first November meeting, neither Alex or Maggie can make it. He proposed new dates: Oct. 30 (Wednesday) and Nov. 21 (Thursday). The Commission agreed to these. Alex W. suggested canceling the second Dec. meeting, and the Commission agreed.

Minutes of September 25 Meeting:

Barbara F. **made a motion to approve the minutes of September 25, 2019 as written**, and James D. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 5-0**, with Rolf K., Marie G., and Dennis P. abstaining.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Barbara F. talked about a discussion she had with a friend on the Selectboard in Wallingford, and their wastewater discharge that occurs into Otter Creek with large rain events. She asked if we do this, and Alex W. replied the current system will hold much more capacity than we get, and that the new system would be sized for much larger flows than we would ever see to make sure that doesn't happen.

Alex W. said Starksboro will hold a public hearing on zoning changes, on Oct. 17. Alex W. quickly skimmed these, and saw nothing that would adversely affect town of Hinesburg.

John K. asked about status of charging stations at fire station. Alex W. replied that the town did not receive that grant.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary