

**Town of Hinesburg  
Planning Commission  
October 30, 2019  
Approved November 21, 2019**

Members Present: Maggie Gordon, Joe Iadanza, John Kiedaisch, Barbara Forauer, Marie Gardner, Dennis Place; Rolf Kielman and Dan Myhre entered the meeting a few minutes late

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 7:00 PM.

**Agenda Changes:** None.

**Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items:** None.

**Growth Management Scoring System for Water/Wastewater Allocation:**

The final criterion to review is Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technology. Alex W. summarized that maximum points available are 15, and the goal is to build to higher energy efficiency standards than state stipulates. This is based on Efficiency Vermont tiers (at Energy Committee's recommendations). Alex W. showed and reviewed the tiers. He mentioned that the CLEAR rating is unfinished, but Rolf K. and Chuck Reiss have been working on it. He'd recommend this get removed for now, and could be re-inserted later.

Barbara F. said she'd like to see new homes be solar-ready; she researched and learned that it's only about \$200 to make the home ready (conduits).

Rolf K. entered the meeting.

Barbara F. suggested facing roofs south and having a minimum size. She suggested the Committee may want to consider including this. John K. suggested also including notes about making the roof able to hold the weight of panels. Alex W. and Rolf K. said this shouldn't require any major roof changes.

Dan M. entered the meeting.

Joe I. asked about how we treat mixed use buildings. He felt residential square footage will likely outweigh commercial square footage, so he suggested putting this first by making residential high performance, and non-residential lower (base). He'd also suggest prioritizing insulation. Rolf K. replied this would be included in Efficiency Vermont's standards.

John K. asked why non-residential buildings standards are the same in the 5 point category and 10 point category. Alex W. will review to see if this is a typo.

Maggie G. questioned vehicle charging. She would like to drop CLEAR rating and incentivize vehicle charging. John K. mentioned you can charge on 120V. Marie G. said there was a problem in Portland, OR with charging cords running across sidewalk from front of garage. The Commission discussed charging/parking for multi-units. Alex W. will adjust the points in this section.

He mentioned that he found the e-mail from Laura (Energy Committee). He feels that the language regarding non-residential is a typo. For commercial non-residential, Laura did recommend a tiered system for high performance vs. net zero.

Joe I. would like residential to be at the high performance level for both 5 points and 10 points. The Commission discussed. John K. wondered if we could give points separately for residential and non-residential. He suggested reviewing this back by the Energy Committee. He asked, and Alex W. described, level 1-3 charging stations, and the Commission discussed the types of charging stations.

John K. said he'd like to see more points for multiple charging stations in non-residential. The Commission discussed tying this to number of employees or percentage of employees. They suggested changing this section to one bonus point for each charger.

Alex W. reviewed the numbers for various developments that were run by the Allocation Committee, so Alex W. re-ran these numbers. For Green Street, under this scoring system, they'd receive: Public Infrastructure (not including the sidewalk along Charlotte Rd. which was required) = 0 points. Job Creation: 0 points. The Commission discussed point values for re-location of existing jobs from outside area – the Commission would like to remove this from the criteria. Dennis P. suggested that we keep this in the criteria, because there is a gain to the town by having the building there (it's not just about jobs). Housing Needs: 8 points, plus ~7 more bonus points = max 15 points. Stormwater Treatment: 0. Village Proximity & Redevelopment = 8. Energy Efficiency: 5. = 28 points total.

Thistle Hill example: Public Infrastructure = 2 points for trails. Job Creation = 0. Housing Needs = 0. Stormwater Treatment = 6 points for having visual interest. Village Proximity & Redevelopment = 8 (less than ¼ mile from P.O.). Energy Efficiency = 0. = 16 points total.

Meadow Mist example: Public Infrastructure = sidewalk was required, so 0 points. Job Creation = 0 points. Housing Needs = 0. Stormwater Treatment = 0. Village Proximity & Redevelopment = 4 points (1/2 mile to school). Energy Efficiency = 5 points. = 9 points total.

Joe I. commented that most of these examples are fairly low.

Hinesburg Center is 18 apartments, one affordable, and includes Kinney Drugs, Parkside Café, Dee PT, Blue Cottage and Ma & Pembum. Public Infrastructure: 0. Job Creation = 12 for Kinney. For others, they were built on spec, so no extra points. They discussed the mixed use buildings bonus point section, and that it requires clarification. Housing Needs = 0. Stormwater Treatment = 0. Village Proximity & Redevelopment = 8 (close to Police Station). Energy Efficiency = 0. = 24 points total.

Alex W. said the committee recommended a minimum of 20 points for residential and mixed use, and 10 for commercial. Joe I. commented that this doesn't seem to be enough points. Alex W. noted that many of the points are coming from the Village Proximity section. Alex W. said one of Dan M.'s concerns was that if the minimum is too difficult to meet, and a development can't clear this hurdle, an entire development could be stopped because you couldn't get your allocation. A couple members of the allocation committee were concerned about being taken to court if they set the minimum too high. Dan M. added that we may want to get more residential users on the system to spread costs of wastewater. Joe I. commented that we've already fueled building of housing with our other regulations.

The Commission discussed Joe I.'s recommendation to increase the minimum. Rolf K. agreed that raising this number would be good. Dennis P. wondered how Meadow Mist would be able to change their project to meet the minimum. The Commission discussed. Alex W. suggested re-calibrating the points. He will re-work them for the next meeting, Nov. 21.

#### **Minutes of October 23 Meeting:**

Joe I. **made a motion to approve the minutes of October 23, 2019 as written**, and Barbara F. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 8-0**.

#### **Other Business & Correspondence:**

Alex W. announced the Town of Shelburne Planning Commission's hearing on Nov. 14, to review changes to their form-based code (optional on Route 7 corridor) and historic design review committee in Shelburne Village area.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kate Kelly, Recording Secretary