

**Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
May 13, 2020
Draft**

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

Members Absent: 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 7:04 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. No Agenda Changes
- III. **Public Comments for Non-Agenda Items:** None.
- IV. **Architectural & Streetscape Design Standards:**
- Continuation of Draft Discussion---
- a. Alex W.- Last meeting, there were a board members concern about non-street side façades. John K. and Alex W. are proposing track changes to address. Page 91, Section 5.22
 - b. Section 7(b) Page 92
 - John K.- Visual interest of side yard landscaping. Planters, not just in-ground planting; Artwork; seating. Concern of use of planting- non-invasive, native planting.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- 4.3.8- Site Plan mentions native plants, so it is referenced in this area. Was concerned if this redundant, but if site plan isn't needed, such as duplex, then it helps.
 - c. Alex W.- 7(c)(mechanical equipment)- keep utility pieces away from areas of public interaction, with screening
 - d. Alex W.- 3 (b) Ground level windows not just on street side.
 - e. John K.- (8) Stormwater Structures- Rolf has some urban ideas and so does Burlington. Looking for
- Draft PC Meeting Minutes – 5/13/2020

language to address suggestions / recommendations to include.

- Alex W.- Referenced robust stormwater section of regulations-- Should this be in the general stormwater regulations or just in these regulations specifically for the Village?
- *Proposal:* John K- Should be in the General Stormwater regulations and referenced in this section so it's not missed in Village Development.

V. (10.) Maximum Length of Monolithic Building Facade

- a. Alex W.- Lewis Creek Association did make suggestions, but not sure how to go about editing. If stormwater design applies to all buildings, may be tricky for businesses to make building work. For example, if ground story windows had to apply to 3 sides of Kinney Drugs.
 - John K.- Function comes into play- such as Kinney Drug Pharmacy. Transparency is desired from active buildings such as food. Not so much on how many sides of buildings vs. what is seen.
- b. Rolf K.- With current regulations encourages parking on the sides and rear, makes one rethink. Most buildings will be accessed on the front and side. Not sure how to detail "secondary" side.
 - Barbara F.- Hard to apply same standards to every building if functions aren't always known when proposed.
- c. Maggie G.- Doesn't think it can be regulated if the function changes. Maybe not all 4 sides, rather a focus on primary façade and secondary. A direction for window and landscaping design. Agrees with Alex that all 4 sides would limit builder.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- 3(b)- worded specifically for "Windows of retail establishments and restaurants". John was correct about directly wanting to see people eating or shopping to draw in people.
 - *Proposal:* Denver W.- To include: "wherever walkways exist" suggestive language
 - Alex W.- May not be able to be enforced but could encourage. Proposed to leave language as is, with room for DRB to decide, leaving room for waivers.
 - Barbara F.- If left the way it was written, would be okay.
 - John K.- Agrees with current language
- d. *Concern:* Dennis P.- Expressed concern of layouts which include a kitchen, which are usually located in the rear. Also worried about recent break-ins.
 - *Proposal:* Maggie G.- Referenced the Public House-- Side and Rear Parking, with walkway to the front. Windows could be required on 2 sides, but not 3.
 - *Proposal:* Alex W.- Language applying to 2 sides of building and not hindering building use.
 - *Proposal:* John K.- Described the intended Village atmosphere of pleasant commerce beyond visiting a friend at home. Could also reference how building plans on designing pleasant, soft materials beyond transparency. Windows are only one way to create pleasant environment.
 - Maggie G.- Asked if John agreed with Alex's language of 2 sides?
 - John K.- Doesn't think of it as a number of sides. In favor of how it is currently worded in drafted proposal.
 - Rolf K. and Denver W. agree.

VI. (11.) Minimum Building Frontage- Kielman Data & Discussion

- a. Rolf K.- Last meeting there was talk of limiting length of building, but maybe that wasn't needed. Rather a certain percentage of lot width.

- Alex W. did a Study of Lantman's – Good Times, Police station area, Fredrick Way, Kinney block and Farmall Dr. – Lot width compared to percentage of frontage.
- Alex screen-shared chart.
 - **Overall Average** Percentage of building width to lot frontage width: **42%**
 - Historic near Lantman's to Good Times- Avg: **55%**
 - Farmall Drive- Avg: **78%**
 - Fredric Way/ Creekside **74%** (with set-back 2 car garages)
- b. *Proposal:* Rolf K.- Village Lot Width 60%,
 - Vary with **function**? --Residential vs. Commercial vs. Mixed-use
 - Vary by **location**? -- Such as beyond elementary school.
 - Easier with Overall Village Growth percentage. If not mandating building length, maybe specifying other rights of way.
- c. *Concern:* Barbara F.—Farmall Dr. – Referenced the flatness of buildings vs Historic section's gazebos, arcades and varying details. Wanted to address.
 - Marie G.- Doesn't mind because the rooflines are varying—better than Williston's Finney Crossing.
 - Maggie G.- Agreed- all but two have porches.
 - Barbara F.- Referenced the second stories blending together because roof lines blend together.
 - Marie G.- Sees variation. They're all mixed-used with commercial below, and residential on the second floor, so it would be hard to regulate building heights.
- d. *Proposal:* Rolf K.- Variety of interruptions to be regulated. (for street side or primary access.
 1. When a building fronts a street over specified length, something has to happen with plane of façade (maybe 30' or over) Indentation for entry, indentation for alleyway, Upper 2 stories step back , building follows bend in road,
 2. **Form Setback:** Porches, Arcades, Canopies...- When building reaches certain length, one has to be applied.
 3. **Materials:** Architectural Detail- Expressed love for historic structures, sculpted wooden details in doorways, or the way the cornice disappears into the sky with details of rhythm. Suggestion of varied material choices and varied roof line. Compared Parkside Café's White band running around above 1st floor, which is a simplified attempt of the the sculpted band on buildings of Church St. (where the store signs sit)
 - Not to mandate all 3, perhaps to include a suggested document or mandate of at least 1 or 2. IE: Aubuchon has porch the length of building which satisfies 1 criteria, so maybe building must meet 2.
- e. Maggie G.-Referenced 2 family structures and other non-residential buildings must have porches, earlier in regulations. Maybe this regulation just for longer buildings?
- f. *Proposal:* Alex W.- Likes menu driven approach of multiple examples. Maybe Illustration Consultant can include drawings for these examples as well. Farmall Dr. is attractive difference, but there is a clear difference between the white band detail of Parkway Café, and ornate architectural details of Twice is Nice.
 - Dennis P.- Twice is Nice has flat roof? Do we discourage?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Yes, unless it has a cornice, emulating Twice is Nice. Also proposed regulations allow flat roofs only for 2 story buildings.

- g. Several board members agree with Rolf K.'s current language.
 - John K.- It does leave questions for DRB to deal with but it's nature of the beast, and that's okay.
 - *Proposal:* Alex W.- Will work with Rolf to work into regulations. In recent Public Open Space draft, DRB wanted specificity (example: 2/5)
 - *Proposal:* Rolf K.- Aim to give visual examples for regulations.
 - John K.- Wants to mandate at least 2 elements of Rolf's criteria, if not 3.

VII. Front Yard Parking Restrictions Gordon Suggestion/ Discussion

- a. *Concern:* Maggie G.- Joe Fallon's building has been sold. A good job has been done turning front office into an apartment building. People park in front even though rear and side parking exists. Assumed when use changed, then no-front yard parking would be allowed.
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Regulations allow for front yard parking for existing buildings, and new buildings for certain percentage with sufficient screen.
- b. Maggie G.- If rear or side yard parking is available, front yard should not be allowed.
- c. Marie G.- Some aren't able to screen.
 - Alex W.- If parking is between sidewalk and road, so it would be hard to screen. Could be screened from road, but not from sidewalk. In the Fallon case, it transitioned from commercial to residential, where presenting site plan standards and requirements aren't the same. Regulations don't require screening for parking.
- d. Members examined Google Street-View examples in Historic area in regards to front-yard parking, parking availability and possibilities of screened parking.
- e. Alex W.- When zoning changes, anyone who had it already there can keep doing what they were doing.
- f. Dennis P.- How is this any different than off street parking.
 - Alex. W.- Agrees that it looks a lot like perpendicular on-street parking.
 - Marie G.- Who owns it? Is it part of 116 right of way?
 - Alex W.- Not sure
 - Marie G.- Prefers parallel Route 116 parking.
 - Alex. W- Because the perpendicular interrupts greenery strip.
 - John K.- Why can't it be changed it to parallel parking
 - Maggie G.- would have to organize with VTrans
 - *Concern:* Barbara F.- Talked about safety of backing out onto main road from perpendicular spot.
- g. Several board members are in favor of Alex's proposed language for parking being linked to site plan reviews or change of use, if sufficient parking exists.
 - John K.- Only references pre-existing parking?
 - Alex W.- Yes.
 - Marie G.- For new buildings it wouldn't be allowed.
 - *Concern:* Dennis P.- If there's plenty of parking in the rear, why are we trying to add off-street parking spots? Just for aesthetics?
 - Marie G.- Flow of traffic
 - Dennis P.- Fixing light would cost \$80k, so it's a bad idea to tackle Route 116.

---Remaining Village Design Standards will be discussed next meeting.---

VIII. Non-frontage Public Area Standards

IX. Retail Building Size Cap

X. Minutes of April 22 Meeting

- a. Alex W.- Requested to differ minutes approval to make adjustments. Maggie G. approved.

XI. Other Business and Correspondence

- a. Design standard illustration consultant review/ selection
- **PlaceSense**- planning consulting firm which worked with Brattleboro.
 - Qualifications in Dropbox
 - Gina Kenny -Regional Planning- admitted not having expertise but interested.
 - One more interested firm which hasn't finished submitting qualifications.
 - Grant is less than \$7,000, so there was no need to put out call.
 - Barbara F.- PlaceSense did a great job with Brattleboro artistry, and can start June 1st.
 - Maggie G.- Agreed.
 - John K.- Time frame? In favor of video chatting with PlaceSense to meet. Agreed in liking Brattleboro's illustrations
 - Alex W.- That's one option, but if majority of Planning Commission wants to hire, PlaceSense can be hired now and a small group can meet her to discuss expectations.

Rolf K. **made a motion to hire PlaceSense as the consulting firm to illustrate the Village's Architectural & Streetscape Design Standards.** Barbara F. **seconded the motion.** The board **voted 8-0**

- *John K., Barbara F., and Maggie G.* are interested in participating in video meeting call with PlaceSense
- b. Notice- Town of Shelburne- May 28 Regulation revision public hearing
- Route 7 corridor
- c. Agenda items for May 13 meeting
- Continue with next draft
 - Retail Building Size Cap
- d. Barbara F.- Regulation with 4 story buildings
- *Clarification:* Alex W.- 2009 Density Bonus for non-residential projects. 35' height limit on buildings, but town resources can't protect buildings. Additional 10' with Density Bonus.
 - Rolf suggested step back requirement. Fire station does intend on purchasing fire truck but yes is an issue currently.
 - John K.- Will continue changes in Zoning ordinances, but at the end we will look at whole thing.
 - Maggie G.- Yes, after retail size cap

The meeting adjourned at 9:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary

DRAFT

DRAFT