

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
April 22, 2020
Draft**

Members Present: Marie Gardner, Maggie Gordon, Denver Wilson, Dennis Place, and Barbara Forauer.
Rolf Kielman and John Kiedaisch joined a few minutes late.

Members Absent: James Donegan and Dan Myhre

Public Present: None

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

Maggie G. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:06 PM.

- I. **Remote Meeting Connection & Procedures** Meeting was held remotely due to the current State of Emergency in our best conformance with the Governor's executive order.
 - 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.
 - e. Chat has been disabled.
- II. **Agenda Changes:**
 - a. Addition 'Other Business' – Reappointment of Zoning Administrator
- III. **Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items:** None.
- IV. **Architectural & Streetscape Design Standards:**

---Continuation of Draft Discussion---

 - a. **(10.) Maximum Length of Monolithic Building Facade** – Limit very large building face without articulation, with exception of industrial building. Facades must be
Rolf K.- Based proposed estimation on sketched aesthetics. Italian 8 buildings are 40-50' wide. Drew's shop, the biggest is probably a little over 100'. The 100' has some reference to recently built buildings. Old high school is 3 stories, about 65' wide. Saw examples in Colorado, in a town similar to the size of Hinesburg, that followed shape of road and had visual interruptions every so often.
 - *Concern and Proposal:* Maggie G.- Porches and Arcades count as relief in facade? Consider a change in plane or entrance as being sufficient.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Thinks the current language references alternative entries counting as interruption.
 - Maggie G.- Recalls no side entry on Hannaford's, but there was a proposed covered

porch.

- Alex W.- References example of Kinney Drug's side entrance and gallery pedestrian space as change in plane.
- Rolf K.- The intent is porches and arcades also represent substantial change in plane. IE: Hotel in Vergennes along the green, meets the intent of what we're talking about.
- **Concern:** Barbara F.- Part of building facing road? Or does it count parking lot side?
 - **Clarification:** Rolf K.- Yes, we are talking about street-side.
 - Alex W.- Yes, we are talking about the side which the building is interacted most frequently.
 - **Concern:** Barbara- The parking lot side potentially has more interaction than street-side.
 - John K.- Agrees with Barbara on the more interactive side
 - Alex W.- Agrees that the customers may interact most from the parking lot side, but argues that the community in general, whether driving by, interacts more on the street-side.
 - John K.- Argues for the aesthetics of the most interacted side.
 - **Concern:** Maggie G.- Agrees to consider the design towards a walkable community.
 - **Clarification:** Alex W.- In the draft we have been reviewing, it references a "buildings front face". In zoning, we define that by the side that faces the street. Some buildings have more than one façade if it sits on a corner.
 - Rolf K.- How do we categorize the parking lot side. Primary façade side and potentially
 - John K.- For example: Lantman's
- Alex W.- Lantman's is about 200' long, so it would have to have a different qualification. Do we want to lengthen the limit if including not just street-side?
- John K.- Questions Aubuchon Plaza
 - **Clarification:** Alex W.- About 190'. Good example to keep in mind, especially it has been brought up before for the lack of articulation.
 - Rolf K.- Yes, it is wise to bring it up. The significant amount of porch cover helps but agreed that it's not aesthetic. 190' structure is doable if it is done well.
 - Maggie G.- Thinking of Rolf's sketch of 40 years from now. There was articulation but a lot was attached as one structure
- **Concern:** John K.- West side of Taft Corners-- An attempt to have variety between different facades but has failed. (By vision center)
 - Maggie G.- You can find that anywhere across the country, for the faux town look. Finney Crossing in Taft corners, recalls buildings with faux separate planes and setbacks, but doesn't remember if it was 2'.
 - **Proposal:** Alex W.- Some of them had a slight protrusion in the top of the first floor, but the building was flat. In Brattleboro language, they use 4' for the break in plane. Thinks should avoid a number too low that it looks pasted versus architecturally intentional.
- **Concern:** Alex W.- How to address non street side of buildings? Nestech buildings, front façade is 90' wide. The frontage is successful in being welcoming with landscaping and materials. The side of building is a very different style, out of functionality instead of aesthetics. Cautions about forcing larger buildings to adhere to additional regulations.

- Rolf K.- Commerce Park. Vet Hospital and Nestech, the proportion of lot width. Percentage of building frontage on lot size. Maybe more precise looking.
- John K.- Disagrees with Alex, about being difficult to design all sides of building. Doesn't think we should back off on design requirements as houses are designed with all sides in mind in its space.
- Barbara F.- Agrees that buildings shouldn't look like warehouses. 2' setback isn't enough. References Canadian 4-5 story apartment building. The dining rooms were jetting out, making the facades interesting for passerby's
- Maggie G.- Agrees with the 4'. Looking at 100' proposal. Tailhook is 121' per google maps. How do people feel about 100'?
- Barbara- Wouldn't want to get much bigger than that. Seems like a decent number for good sized building.
- Maggie G.- maybe carveout for multi-business structures. IE: Mechanicsville Rd.
- Alex W.- Façade longer than 100' if it has significant in's and outs, and plane changes.
- Maggie G.- or covered porch.
- Alex W.- Curious about Senior building dimensions. Potentially add more flexibility- Generally less than 100' unless has significant dynamic planes. Or get rid of 100' altogether?
- John K.- No length but with articulation prescription.
- *Concern:* Rolf K.- Yes, maybe overall length is less important than percentage of articulation, but with real eye on Williston examples. Also mentions negative example of student building in Burlington with random material changes.
 - Maggie G.- Move from faux features of Williston to real architectural features.
- *Denver-* References Aubuchon Plaza, and if the middle section was set back, it would read as 3 facades and would be more satisfying.
 - Alex W.- Screenshared examples of St. Paul Street construction Rolf referenced, and Finney Crossing. Finney Crossing has faux 2' Overhangs on flat buildings.
 - Barbara couldn't see images. Marie G.- described St. Paul Street as better than the cheap aesthetic of Finney Crossing.
 - *Proposal:* Maggie G.- Thinks St. Paul to be better than Finney, but bump outs are still maybe 2'. How do we get to a description leading to more character?
- *Proposal:* Alex W.- Sounds like it has more to do more with articulation than building length. Depth, frequency of plane breaking in relationship to height and overall length of building. In draft, it's every 25', but maybe it has to do with overall length. Asked Rolf to revisit language.
 - Rolf K.- Enriching the façade and meaningfully changing material, Cover and protection for pedestrian navigation, % of building frontage and proximity to street. Going to make another draft.
 - John K.- Definition of village and edge on streetscape, so we're following advice given to town several years ago.

b. (11.) Minimum Building Frontage

- *Proposal:* Alex W.- Heard from many members about not just addressing street-side façade. Going to go back and look at previous regulations that we just addressed street-side façade. John K. volunteered to help going back through other standards. If it is hard to address with building design, compromise can be made in landscaping and fenestrations.
- *Proposal:* Alex W.- Imagine a lot 100' frontage, 40' of frontage has to be occupied by building

- structures, to avoid voids and dead spots in streetscape.
- *Concern:* Denver W.- if 30' house of 100' lot, wouldn't look bad. More so depends on density of lot. Interested in hearing other conversation of necessity of regulating and the impact.
 - *Clarification:* Rolf K.- The idea is for portions of community where we want to increase the health of pedestrian environment. For example, Good Times to Lantman's and beyond -- Most of the length has repetition of small scale residential, but it's like a curtain is drawn. Majority of the houses are same distance from street and takes up similar amount of space on lot. If translated into commercial realm, even if people are sitting outside, that percentage becomes important. In adverse weather, it avoids galloping between buildings or retreating to cars.
 - Denver W.- Questioned if someone would buy 100' of road frontage downtown and only place a 50' building.
 - *Concern:* Maggie G.- Commerce park and Vet which are half of lot. What if companies build what they can with intention of expanding down the road. Referenced "Streetscape details.."
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- One thing that does happen, like a Dollar General, presents itself to the frontage as it should, but locates parking lot on the side lot. Brattleboro specifies how much frontage is parking and driveway. This Standard helps regulate not just front parking, but also side parking lot, ensuring building is most of lot. With that, Rolf's initial suggestion of 60% might work better for commercial, but we are also not in a downtown city, rather a town, so thought the smaller percentage suffices.
 - Denver W.- Parking Lot, Café, Kinney. If 60% of those lots were parking, that would be a big span. It makes more and more sense to avoid vast spans of parking lot. What is there now works.
 - Rolf K.- That is a good example. Let's assume property line runs down parking lot, Parkside probably meets 60%, Kinney might not. If they were farther apart, it would lose connectivity.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Screenshared ArcMap. Kinney and Parkside sit on individual lots and meets at least 60% of frontage. Parking lot sits on its own lot and would need a waiver since it has no building. Brattleboro, Jericho and Westford all have a range of 40-60%.
 - *Clarification:* Rolf K.- Proposing for all Village Growth Districts? Alex W- Yes
 - Rolf K.- Consider if it applies to Northeast Northwest areas.
 - Maggie G.- would those be more or less?
 - Rolf K.- Less. Think about where we want the growth to happen and what makes sense for each district. Can look at again for redrafting.
 - *Proposal:* Alex W.- Agrees that specifying per zoning district may be appropriate. There has been some discussion on re-zoning core streetscapes so this could be a tool.
 - Denver W.- In favor of adopting number that works across the board to minimize regulation specification.
 - John K.-Distinction between areas that 100% residential vs areas that are commercial minimum. Residential tends to have more landscaping.
 - Alex- This draft took out distinction, Rolf initially put in range depending on use/ zoning district. With the leaning away from building length to articulation, maybe we can revisit percentages. With discussion with residences, there will be a balance of located in a rural area with intention of building out.

V. Minutes of April 8 Meeting

Rolf K. **made a motion to approve the minutes of April 8, 2020 as amended**, and John K. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 6-0**. Marie Abstained

VI. Other Business and Correspondence

a. Agenda items for May 13 meeting

- Maggie G.-Will return to items discussed today with Rolf K.'s redraft, as well as discuss Retail building size cap.
- Alex W.- How to reach out to community. Eventually have public meeting on Streetscape once illustrations are done for final draft. After Building size cap, maybe community conversation first.
- Alex W.- Suzanne Mantegna – current Zoning Administrator. Term ends June 1st. Interested in reappointment. Protocol is for the Planning commission to nominate and the Selectboard reappoints. Alex W. highly recommends the P.C. approval for nomination of Suzanne M.
- John- what is her status in Richmond
 - Alex- She's part-time (20 hrs) in Hinesburg. Hinesburg coordinated with Richmond to mesh, where she also holds the part-time position. Her term is also up in Richmond and she is negotiating with them as well. She is interested to continue in Hinesburg.

VII. Denver W. made a motion to nominate Suzanne Mantegna as Zoning Administrator, and Maggie G. **seconded the motion**. The Commission **voted 7-0**.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary