

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
October 23, 2019
Approved October 30, 2019**

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

Members Absent: James Donegan

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 7:02 PM.

Agenda Changes: None.

Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items:

Barbara F. displayed the poster for Water Matters, which will be happening November 7, discussing what we as private citizens can do regarding stormwater.

Growth Management Scoring System for Water/Wastewater Allocation:

The Commission began reviewing where they left off at the last meeting. Alex W. updated the Commission on the stormwater section, which talks about giving extra points for green infrastructure, on-site infiltration, etc. John K. asked how they would ask developers to document, for example, infiltration. Alex W. replied that it would be modeling in HydroCAD, and it will be up to the applicant to demonstrate why they should get a certain number of points. Alex W. pointed out that because this will occur at sketch plan level, the applicant will have to do a little more work to show why they deserve this number of points. He explained that Tier 1 is the best treatment that will remove the most phosphorus, sediment, etc., but these require suitable soils. The Commission felt that if you can demonstrate that you can meet the same standards, you will get some points.

Joe I. asked about the water quality storm event. Alex W. said this is equivalent to 1" of rain (which is when the majority of pollutants run off), which is 90% of storm events. Barbara F. asked if our regulations are tighter than the VT Stormwater Manual; Alex W. said they are. Our regulations have 4 additional provisions, and our trigger is lower than the state's (instead of 1 acre of impervious, ours is 10,000 sq. ft.). Alex W. said a single house could (and did, due to long driveway) set off these provisions.

Rolf K. discussed his comments, that the number of points allotted to infrastructure (including stormwater) should be decreased, and the village proximity and redevelopment section should be increased. Alex W. argued that these (stormwater and infrastructure) are not doing the same things and should not be combined (stormwater is maintained privately, and is not the same as public infrastructure). Joe I. and John K. felt they should remain separate, and Joe I. suggested adding a comment that infrastructure doesn't include stormwater.

The Commission reviewed the Village Proximity and Redevelopment section. Alex W. said they could include something about construction quality. They also would apply points for renovating/updating existing structures. Dennis P. asked if an existing structure would already have sewer. Alex W. replied they would, but this would require additional allocation.

The Commission discussed the focal points described, and the points allotted. Alex W. reminded the Commission that the sewer service area goes up Richmond Rd., so the Committee wanted to prioritize projects close to the village core. John K. mentioned that we have some projects near CVU, and CVU isn't a core focal point. The Committee was concerned that they were giving away points, and it would be too easy to earn points. Alex W. showed a map of the village growth area, the four focal points, and a ¼ mile buffer. Most of Village NE and Village NW, and Quinn property, wouldn't get 8 bonus points, only the 4 points. The Commission discussed how they could incentivize growth within certain areas of the village. Alex W. suggested incentivizing brown field development as opposed to green field development. The Commission and Alex W. mentioned Williston's point system, and discussed which areas in town could be developed still. There was concern about how the scoring system didn't include certain areas/focal points. Alex W. suggested that looking at this differently (using zoning districts) may be useful. Rolf K. mentioned that the phasing piece should also be addressed, along with redevelopment of buildings, and design innovation. Alex W. said the only area with substantial greenfield would be NW, NE, and Quinn properties. We could give extra points for projects in these zones that build close to certain focal areas. Maggie G. felt disincentivizing would be better. Alex W. said this is possible, but the committee didn't really consider this.

Alex W. reviewed the changes to be made, and the Commission discussed how they could incentivize developing the areas closest to the village core area in phasing. Alex W. will revise the document.

Rolf K. mentioned design standards, and Alex W. wondered how to include these in this scoring system. He felt it would be difficult to get into details without getting into construction standards. They then discussed how projects would get (and potentially lose) their allocation. Joe I. asked what would happen if, at preliminary plat, the DRB put restrictions on development, such that the preliminary plat came out with less bonus points than at sketch plan. Alex W. said the options are a clawback provision, or if it's the DRB process that changes it, then Joe I. felt this should be addressed. Alex W. felt the best solution is to say that the developer would need to come back and start the allocation process over.

Rolf K. volunteered to contact Chuck Reiss regarding the Energy Committee's recommendations.

Fiscal Year 2021 Planning & Zoning Budget

Alex W. said that it is budget time, and the planning & zoning department budget is fairly small (other than staff costs). They do have a special projects line item. Alex W said he's requested in the past that this amount should include the local match amounts for two grants (\$2,000 for Municipal Planning Grant, and \$4,000-6,000 for Regional Planning Commission Grant). This year, this is going for the Richmond Rd./Texas Hill Rd./North Rd. intersection redesign, and the Municipal Planning Grant. He recommended including ~10% match for future projects. He mentioned potentially addressing stormwater analysis and fiscal analysis in the next 18 months. Maggie G. suggested looking at RR1 re-zoning. Alex W. also mentioned Shoreline District re-zoning, and a comprehensive regulation overhaul. Joe I. suggested saving over several years to do a comprehensive regulation overhaul. Marie G. suggested looking at RR1.

John K. mentioned the Economic Development Committee. Alex W. said Revolving Loan Fund Committee was created, and the two committees existed side by side for some time, with many of the same members. The Economic Development Committee is now on hiatus, and the Revolving Loan Fund Committee has taken over their work. John K. hoped they might have some ideas to bring jobs to town.

Dennis P. suggested getting a park built on lot 1. John K. suggested adding this to the public works department.

Minutes of October 9 Meeting:

Dennis P. **made a motion to approve the minutes of October 9, 2019 as written**, and Barbara F. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 7-0**; Joe I. abstained.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Alex W. received notice from the town of Monkton that a hearing will be Nov. 21 to review their town plan revisions. Alex W. has a hard copy for review, and it is available on the website.

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary