

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
November 21, 2019**
Approved December 11, 2019

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

Members Absent: Dennis Place, James Donegan

Public Present: none

Also Present: Alex Weinhagen (Director of Planning & Zoning)

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:

(continued from October 30 meeting)

Alex W. explained that he had revised the scoring system document per the discussion at the last few Planning Commission meetings. A track changes version of the document was distributed ahead of the meeting. He pointed out four areas in particular that needed additional discussion:

1. Public Infrastructure criterion – Ecological Practices bonus points category. PC members had asked for public infrastructure examples for this category. Alex W. said that Andrea Morgante originally suggested it as part of the allocation committee's work, and she provided some examples that will be discussed when we get to that section this evening.
2. Job Creation criterion – Livable wage. Currently, this is a bonus point category. Alex W. revised it per a suggestion by James so that bonus points would accrue based on a percentage of the new jobs created.
3. Location, Redevelopment, Innovation criterion (formerly the Village Proximity and Redevelopment criterion) – Alex W. reworked this criterion based on previous PC discussion and based on some of Rolf's comments (dated 10/28/19).
4. Criteria scores and minimum score. Per the prior discussions, Alex W. said the PC needs to make sure the maximum scores for each criterion are calibrated right. He revised these based on Rolf's

suggestion – taking some from public infrastructure and stormwater, and adding these to the Location, Redevelopment, Innovation criterion. Alex W. said the PC also needs to make sure the minimum score requirements are calibrated properly.

The Commission reviewed the revised scoring system document page by page.

On page one, Commissioners felt the revised distribution of points across the six criteria made sense, with some points taken from the public infrastructure and storm water criteria, and added to the revised location, redevelopment, innovation criterion. The revised scoring distribution still adds up to a total of 100 points, with four criteria having a maximum score of 15 points, and two having a maximum score of 20 points.

The Commission discussed the minimum score requirement. Commissioners were generally comfortable with the 20 point minimum score for residential and mixed use (residential plus non-residential) projects. Marie G. and Dan M. felt the 10 point minimum for purely non-residential projects was adequate. Joe I. suggested raising this to 15 points to help ensure better projects, and projects that would be more likely to acquire points in more than one criterion. The Commission ran some existing developments through the scoring system at the October 30 meeting. The group ran some additional non-residential projects through the scoring system, with the understanding that the energy efficiency criterion scoring would depend on whether the project met the current Efficiency Vermont above code standards.

The UVM Medical project on Shelburne Falls Road scored seven points without any energy efficiency points - five points in job creation (at least five new jobs created) and two points in location, redevelopment, innovation (location in Village NW district that is a coherent extension of existing development in the Commercial district). If built at the first tier of above code energy efficiency (Efficiency Vermont certified high performance level), the UVM Medical project would score 13 points. The Animal Hospital of Hinesburg on Commerce Street scored ten points without any energy efficiency points – two points in job creation (at least two new jobs created) and eight points in location, redevelopment, innovation (location in the Commercial district). If built at the first tier of above code energy efficiency (Efficiency Vermont certified high performance level), the Animal Hospital of Hinesburg project would score 16 points.

The Commission agreed to compromise, and set the minimum score for purely non-residential projects at 12 points. Most Commissioners felt this level would be readily achievable under the scoring system, and would encourage projects to score in more than one category.

On page 2, under the public infrastructure criterion, Alex W. provided some examples from Andrea Morgante for the ecological practices category. Some were already covered in the existing scoring language (wastewater pre-treatment, stormwater infrastructure) but others included: restore wetlands, restore floodplain and or natural stream channels, permanently conserve land of a certain size, install

renewable energy production that would serve public institutions. Commissioners felt these examples made sense, and Alex W. said he would add them to the document to help clarify this bonus category.

On page 3, the Commission discussed the livable wage bonus point category in the job creation criterion. Alex W. said this had been changed per James Donegan's suggestion such that the bonus be a percentage of the new jobs created rather than a fixed number. Alex W. noted that at the last meeting, Dennis Place had questioned whether livable wage jobs should be a pre-requisite for any points in the job creation criterion. Alex W. said that Dennis P. emailed him ahead of tonight's meeting to say that he thought the revised version was a reasonable compromise.

The Commission discussed how livable wage bonus points and the employee benefits bonus points would be calculated given that they are now percentages. For example if two new jobs are created, and both are living wage jobs with benefits, the bonus points would be: 25% for livable wage (0.5 points) and 25% for employee benefits (0.5 points). The Commission felt the bonus points in these two categories should be summed first and then rounded to the nearest whole number. Alex W. said he would revise the document accordingly, and that he would revise the livable wage reference in the document for the most recent report from the VT Legislative Joint Fiscal Office.

No changes discussed for page 4 or page 5 – i.e., housing needs and stormwater treatment criteria.

On page 6 and page 7, the Commission reviewed the extensive changes to what was the village proximity and redevelopment criterion, which has been reworked and retitled as the location, redevelopment, and innovation criterion. Points are now available for location by zoning district, for redevelopment of already developed properties, with bonus points for historic structure use, development of contaminated brownfield sites, and various types of design innovation that go above and beyond Town and State requirements.

John K. suggested clarifying the text at the end of the Historic Structure Use category, such that the parenthetical phrase reads, "per current Town assessment, prior to redevelopment". Otherwise, Commissioners felt the revised language was good.

On page 7 and 8, the Commission reviewed the extensive changes to the energy efficiency and renewable technology criterion. This section still awards points for projects that build to Efficiency Vermont's two-tiered above code programs. Rolf K. explained that he had met with Chuck Reiss (Energy Committee) regarding the CLEAR rating system for renewable technology use. Rolf K. said this system was interesting, but was also rather complicated and still under development. He recommended not using this system at this time, and instead keeping the focus in this criterion on energy efficiency paired with net zero homes, and electric vehicle charging. In addition to bonus points for net zero homes, he suggested awarding some points for net zero ready homes.

Rolf K. also said it was important for all projects to address enhanced energy efficiency (i.e., beyond minimum State code), in order for Vermont to reach the goals in the statewide energy plan. Alex W. noted that the zoning regulations already include a section on energy efficiency and green building standards (section 5.23). He recommended the Commission review this section as we move forward with the allocation scoring system. He said that if the Commission is interested in higher energy efficiency standards for all new development, it might be better to add that requirement to section 5.23 rather than keep it in the allocation scoring system that only applies in the water/sewer service area.

The Commission discussed next steps, and instructed Alex W. to warn a public hearing on the allocation scoring system zoning changes for the January 22, 2020 meeting.

Minutes of October 30 Meeting:

Barbara F. **made a motion to approve the minutes of October 30, 2019 as written**, and Marie G. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 7-0**.

Other Business & Correspondence:

Alex W. noted that the Select Board public hearing on the Official Map revisions and Zoning Regulation revisions will be on December 4. He reviewed the minor changes made to the Commission's proposal by the Select Board. He indicated these were minor enough that no follow up report from the Commission was needed.

Alex W. noted that the December 11 meeting would be Joe Iadanza's final meeting as a Planning Commissioner after 22 years of service to the Town on the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Weinhagen, Director of Planning & Zoning