

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
April 8, 2020
Approved April 22, 2020**

Members Present: Maggie Gordon, Rolf Kielman, Barbara Forauer, John Kiedaisch, Dennis Place, and Denver Wilson

Members Absent: Marie Gardner, James Donegan, Dan Myhre

Public Present: Doug Stewert

Also Present: Alex Weinhausen (Director of Planning & Zoning) & Laura Sau (Recording Secretary)

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:01 PM.

I. Remote Meeting Connection & Procedures

- a. Mute/ unmute at lower left of screen with microphone icon. Alex W. will mute people if there are echoes.
- b. Identify yourself when you start to speak since not all participants are on video.
- c. This meeting is being recorded by VCAM
- d. If there are bandwidth issues and audio is crackling, you can try turning off the video and using only audio.

II. Agenda Changes: None.

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

IV. Village Area Architectural & Streetscape Design Standards:

Last meeting, #6 was discussed. Since the last meeting, Alex W. has adjusted the language of previously discussed standards.

- a. **#7) Streetscape and building details** – landscaping beyond street trees, outdoor lighting, and utility & mechanical equipment
 - Barbara F.- Where do you find streetscape and building details we have now?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- section 5.22.3 of Zoning regulations – Village area design standards ie. Façade and Garage
 - *Concern:* John K. – Orientation of roof ridge line East> West
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Last meeting there was back and forth discussion about where it was most appropriate to place roof orientation.
 - **On Alex W.'s to-do list is to speak to Utility Management to discuss town-wide regulation vs. village**
 - Maggie G.- Likes language of visual interest

- *Concern:* Rolf K.- Sidewalk widths and bike paths-- We're talking about streetscape details, but are sidewalk details and dimensions discussed?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Not yet, but when we talked about setbacks and build-to line. When our graphic artist creates images for 1. Setbacks options, we can include that.
 - *Proposal:* Maggie G.- Jericho regulations has street view graphic examples which show widths of sidewalks which would be great because they're very helpful.
 - Alex screen-shared Jericho regulations graphic. Alex W.- We could do something similar with the different letters as our categories.
 - Rolf K.- Sharrow? Barbara F: Shared Right of way?
 - *Concern:* John K.- Minimum and maximum right away line. 10'-40' is much too far apart for commercial diverse setbacks.
- *Concern:* Barbara F.- New sidewalk by mobile station 116 north-- traffic is scary. The sidewalk is so close to traffic, there is not much room to walk and there wouldn't be much room for streetscape design.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- State of VT made it hard to push the sidewalk any further in due to the minimization of wetlands impact.
- *Concern:* Rolf K.- What about bike parking?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- We do have guidelines for off street parking, and a bike provision. Placement of the bike rack isn't in a standard, so it will be discussed on case by case basis.
- *Concern:* Barbara F.- Farnell St. -- The Utility boxes in the front yard destroys the yard. Is it possible to make it always in the side yard?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- The electrical runs along the street, underground. Every certain distance there must be a vault, sometimes you can't choose. Might have better luck regulating building related utilities such as HVAC.
 - Denver W.- I wouldn't want utilities in the front yard but maybe this is the best we can do.
 - John K.- Believes that those boxes are transformers stepping down power, so it would be more expensive for the bigger wires to lead all the way to the house. Also, it would be harder for maintenance for the power company.
- John K.- Likes the sound of getting lights lower than 20'. For example, the tall lights in front of the windows upstairs of businesses.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Section 5.29 doesn't distinguish between parking lot and pedestrian streetscape lighting. That is why these new regulations encourages lower height lights, more specific for pedestrian safety in the village. We do have the option of mandating lower heights.
 - *Concern:* John K.- There was discussion of not seeing source of light, but at Kinney drug on 116 and you can see the lights.
 - Alex W.- agrees that we should visit and look at that one because it is directional downward towards the pedestrian. **Alex W. is making a note to reopen 5.29 to readdress that issue in that section.**

b. On-street parking

- *Concern:* Dennis P.- what do we do with on-street parking during the winter?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- In the winter it is prohibited, in reality, it's based on

snowstorms.

- Rolf K.- Overnight or Anytime?
- Dennis P.- In S. Burlington, it's anytime during the Winter which seems too much.
- Alex W.- Overnight, residential needs to have a place to park not on the street in case of storm.
- Rolf K.- Not having on-street parking all the time during the winter seems too rigid. No overnight winter parking for street cleaning seems more productive.
- Alex W.- We have been using a commonsense decision making but the head plow man says that it hasn't been working.
- Dennis P.- We have to have plenty of off-street parking.
- Maggie G.- Which streets? Alex W.- Primarily Farmall Dr.'s interior segment in the residential area.
- *Proposal:* Barbara F.- If the town plow can't get through, to not plow until cars move.
 - a. *Clarification:* Alex W.- That could create greater problems when it is time to plow with ice buildup. Perhaps the situation will get better with more infrastructure development with a newer plow, but for now we have to account the current situation.
- Rolf K.- When you build a road, are there town standards?
 - a. *Clarification:* Alex W.- Our road standards have been in limbo for several years. No official standards have been adopted. That would be the correct place to place the Streetscape and lighting.
- *Concern:* Maggie G.- excessive unused on-street parking
 - *Clarification and Concern:* Alex W: There is a current encouragement for providing on-street parking. The proposal is to require making on-street parking available, except for streets solely single – two family homes. Haystack is getting excited to provide, but there is a balancing act if it's an area that it won't be used 80-90% of the time.
 - Barbara F.- Agrees. For example: Farmall should be a wider street and is in support of Alex's wording.
 - a. *Proposal:* Rolf K.- "strongly encourage" at least on one side of the street in single family home neighborhoods where it is denser, where there isn't a driveway long enough for 2-3 cars. We have been encouraging density, instead of making the building lot car dominate, the street becomes part of the parking scene for visitors and such, on occasion.
- *Concern:* Maggie G.- What about wider roads or slowing traffic down. Ex: Thistle Hill.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Thistle Hill was designed without on-street parking, single family homes neighborhood. If it had, it would have 10 feet wider. Wouldn't have wanted it. It is a density issue and frequent use.
- Rolf K.- What is Black Rock planning?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- mixed use. We have been talking about removing some for narrower roads and controlling water run off.
- *Proposal:* Dennis P.- Highly recommends guest parking area.
 - Alex W.- agrees that higher density development areas do need to address. The proposed regulation grants the DRB the discretion depending per application.
 - Dennis P.- would like to be more explicit about guest parking.

- *Proposal:* Alex W.- suggests that it's referenced in off street parking section.
- *Proposal:* Barbara F.- References curve to straight away affects possibilities of on-street parking in Thistle Hill and Creekside. So that might be a way to address parking in the design of the street.
 - *Proposal:* John K- also suggest breaking up chunks of guest on-street parking into smaller segments to minimize its visual and traffic effect.
 - a. *Proposal:* Denver W- Add subsection about ratio of parking spots to number of homes, which doesn't directly specify on-street or off-street.
 - b. *Concern:* Alex W.- Likes suggestion and will look into that language, but is also weary about over-killing spaces that won't be used.
- Barbara F.: Zoning Regs Pg. 69 references Off- Street Parking

Alex plans on cleaning up and preparing proposed sections already discussed in past meetings in preparation for Graphics Consultant.

Proposal: Maggie G.- Would it be helpful to move back to having packets/ paper copies and deliver to members? Barbara F. and John K. will print it out themselves.

---- Discussion of the following items will be continued at the next meeting---

- c. Multi-story buildings
- d. Maximum length of monolithic building façade
- e. Minimum building frontage

V. Minutes of March 11 Meeting

No changes were made to minutes, new format was approved by members.

Denver W. **made a motion to approve the minutes of March 11, 2020 as amended**, and John K. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 4-0**. Dennis P. and Barbara F. abstained.

VI. Other Business and Correspondence

- a. **Notice- Town of Richmond – April 1 regulation revision hearing**
- b. **Notice- Town of Williston – April 21 town plan revision hearing**
 - Not a full re-write, but they are adding an energy section to be given to state to be taken more seriously
 - Dennis P.: Remote meeting?
 - Alex W.: Yes, every board is using similar platform if holding meetings.
- c. **Underhill** has planning commission upcoming in April and May, felt it wasn't appropriate for the upcoming public hearings and have put them off.
- d. **Agenda items for April 22 meeting**
 - Will continue discussion on Architectural Design Standards
 - discussion on consultant selection for graphics to be featured in standards
 - Contractor's Yard Regulations (Will discuss more in sub-committee)

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary