

Town of Hinesburg
Planning Commission
May 27, 2020
Approved June 10, 2020

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

Members Absent: James Donegan, Denver Wilson, 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 7:04 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---

Review Changes from last meeting Discussion (highlighted in Draft 6, Incorporated in Draft 7):

Old language is crossed out in red, new language is in red, and newest proposed language is highlighted.

- Minor changes in off-street parking and lighting section.

5.22.2 Site- Level Standards- added compliance for stormwater referencing 5.27 (which was proposed by John K.)

- a. *Proposal:* John K.-Could also include specific methods of treatment, containment, control, etc.
- b. Alex W.- Lewis Creek Association's *Water Matters Workshop* (suggestions relative to town addressed in a meeting in 2018)- 5.27 covers most of the workshop suggestions, however regulation language lacks the education side of positive change, so landowners can understand potential positive change of their own property, even if it's actions not subject to regulations.

- Stormwater knowledge evolves and different actions can be done in the future, so stormwater section can always be readdressed in future regulation changes.
- John K.- A lot is built-in and addressed. Speaking in terms of future projects, not existing. To provide good recommendations/influence to developers.

V. Front Yard Parking Restriction

- c. 5.22.2 (3)(b) Alex referenced new proposed language for Parking Lots for Existing Buildings
 - *Concern:* John K.- Who defines ‘necessary’? Is it in glossary?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- Not defined in standards, so it would be the dictionary definition. DRB would have discretion.

VI. Building Façade Requirements

- a. 5.22.3 – Alex W. referenced Rolf K.’s proposed language, which discusses variation. Alex brought up Rolf’s suggestion of menu of variations and created a second menu for architectural detail. The proposed language requires 2 from each category. Is it too confusing?
 - John K.- Upper floors vs Lower floors? Are there multiple of each?
 - *Clarification:* Alex W.- It references the options of Stepping back just the 3rd floor, or stepping back 2nd and 3rd floor.
 - Rolf K. *experienced a poor connection while speaking making it difficult to hear.*
- b. *Consideration:* Alex W.- Now that the whole document is put together, is it too much and needs to be thinned, or is it good?
 - John K.- Would rather keep what was worked on.
 - Alex W.- From this point, summaries will be added for explanations, and the consultant will add helpful illustrations.
 - Maggie G.- In favor of inspiring architectural creativity
- c. Rolf K.- Appears complicated, but some language will rub off on those proposing less than 30’ in length. Graphics help with understanding.
- d. Alex W.- Architectural Details- Written for larger building facades, >30’. Should it be required for smaller buildings too and just repeated for larger buildings?
 - Rolf K.- Thinks it’s worth pondering. Also, architectural detail depends on century. John K. agreed.
 - Alex W.- Wants more than mediocre and beyond function.
 - Rolf K.- Brought up the creativity of modern details versus the typical contemporary detail.
 - Alex. W.- Does trim of minimum width technically suffice architectural detail.
 - *Clarification:* Rolf K.- Yes because it shows attention to how the window meets the wall.
 - Barbara F.- Paragraph (b), just before #1- “*that provide adequate coverage, visual interest, and serve to enrich the buildings appearance*” – seems to be main purpose, and all of the 5 items are important to include.
 - Is 30’ too short?
 - Rolf K.- Based on rough dimensions of existing buildings around town. Median is 30’. A lot had to do with availability of lumber span.
- e. Dennis P.- Could we get rid of “over 30’ in length” and still get desired look?
 - Rolf K.- Yes (*Rolf experienced connection issues*)
 - Alex W.- Can arrange sentences to make it apply to all buildings, as well as, repetition in the

- over 30' in length building facades.
- f. John K.- What about the façade section not applying to all buildings?
 - Alex W.- Trying to ensure variation, but not as important with narrow building.
 - John K.- Inquired about buildings under 30' in length, but with a 45' height
 - Alex W.- Previous section references 4 story buildings having to have the top floor stepped back. But it is a good point for 3 story building.
 - *Proposal:* John K.- Adding language regulating for all buildings.
 - Alex asked for input from other members regarding regulation applying for all buildings, including narrow ones.
 - g. Barbara F.- Should be applied to all buildings. 30' seems like a long span.
 - Alex W.- Reminded members that this section is just a piece of larger standards, there are also other standards calling for prominent entry and windows. Façade section doesn't have to address all architectural aspects, just for façade form variation.
 - h. *Concern:* Maggie G.- If also requiring for buildings under 30', would be requiring too much in not that large of space.
 - i. Alex W.- It would be hard to accomplish many of the variations for a small façade
 - j. John K.- Referenced *Twice is Nice*. Does it suffice Façade Variation? Suggested adding in the language 'For Example' or Illustrations of many examples
 - *Proposal:* Maggie G.- To include photos of specific buildings in town as examples.
 - Alex W.- Agreed with Maggie. There are limited funds for an Illustration Consultant, so local photos could provide additional graphic supplements, like Winooski's Regulations.
 - Could also include examples of what to avoid.
 - k. Alex W. screenshared a photo of *Twice is Nice*. The Commission examined if it abided by at least 2 façade variation standards since it is roughly 30' in length.
 - Dennis P. -Prominent entry? There are multiple entries.
 - Rolf K.- Entry is slightly recessed.
 - Alex W.- Change in plane with 4' depth, does the porch suffice?
 - Rolf K.- With building elevation- no, but with architectural detail of porch- yes
 - Alex W.- No variation of roof change
 - Dennis P.- Which entry is the prominent one?
 - Alex W.- Per section which defines types of prominent entries, the porch above creates an arcade.
 - Rolf K.- There isn't one prominent main entry
 - John K.- There was a time there was 2 businesses, each with a door.
 - Maggie G.- Language? Are we asking too much?
 - Barbara F.- Without the porch it would be monolithic.
 - Alex W.- Agrees that the porch is critical to meet variation. Not convinced that if porch wasn't there, that it still wouldn't be an attractive building due to architectural detailing of roof parapet and window trim.
 - John K.- The other Italiante buildings down the street are also attractive.
 - l. Maggie G.- Not convinced about language. 2 features of variation for 30' building seems unrealistic.
 - m. Barbara F. – Parkside Café: 45' length – Meets standards but is still boring like a box.

- n. *Concern:* Marie G.- Doesn't think designers throw extra things in these days.

VII. **Retail Building Size Cap**

- a. Maggie G.- Alex's list of buildings with various functions helped.
- Alex W.- P.C. has a current regulation which caps commercial size only in Village N and NW districts, not the commercial district. Talk of having a size cap village wide. Also, consideration of grocery stores having a different cap for future structures.
 - Historically, commercial district has been viewed as a different development pattern. 1970's style of bunching commercial in one area.
- b. John K.- Projected information of business economy? Unless there's data, seems ambiguous number choices.
- Maggie G.- Alex's list includes sizes of newer small grocery stores such as Mac's
 - Richmond Market: 14,000 sq. ft. -- Jericho: 18,000 sq. ft. -- Healthy Living: 28,000 Lantman's is almost 15,000 sq.ft.
 - Marie G.- 20,000 sq ft. Seems too small. Hard to predict.
- c. Maggie G.- When commercial area was full, all of the surrounding residential areas didn't exist. Now it is and doesn't feel it's inappropriate to limit.
- Marie G.- Speaking of specifically grocery stores, of 20,000 not being big enough. 20,000 sq ft. for any other retail is fine.
 - Barbara F.- Creativity for multi-story grocery building
- d. Dennis P.- Is there a current available lot, other than lot 15, bigger than 20,000 sq. ft.?
- Maggie G.- No, but lots can be combined
 - Marie G.- Only other empty lot is owned by Michael S of Dark Star. Towards the bank. If Hannafords was being built, you would drive in next to that lot.
 - *Clarification:* John K.- Yes you can combine lots
 - Marie G.- Just talking about Commerce Park?
 - Maggie G.- No, retail cap extends to Haystack.
 - Marie G.- Not for big buildings but is still concerned about grocery store size limits.
- e. *Proposal:* Alex W.- Yes, Lantman's is tight. Suggestion of someone from the P.C. speaking with owner about the future of grocery stores in Hinesburg-- Brian Busier. *Alex experienced connection issues.*
- Should size cap reference each business within a larger footprint? Or overall size? Would it apply to second story of retail?
 - Maggie G.- Had a conversation with Bryce in the past. Will touch base with him again for feedback.
 - John K. – Not about Lantman's future plans.
 - Maggie G.- No, in general, and their idea on size
- f. *Concern:* Marie G.- NRG is larger than proposed cap but is seen positively.
- Maggie G.- We're talking about retail but that is interesting because NRG is now renting out some space to 2 other businesses.
 - Rolf K.- Alex's points are interesting. Define as singular use. Foot print--Several businesses, like Lantman's, also has a significant 2nd floor for non-public business operations.
 - Marie G.- If 2nd floor is open to the public—need for elevator?

- Rolf K.- \$50,000 per elevator. If 2nd floor is only a percentage of footprint (mezzanine) then it might not be needed.

VIII. Minutes of April 22 Meeting

- Minor spelling adjustments were made.
- Rolf K. **made a motion to approve the April 22 Minutes.** John K. **seconded.** **The board voted 6-0.**

IX. Minutes of May 13

- Held off for final tweaking

X. Other Business and Correspondence

- Correspondence- Affordable Housing Committee letter to DRB
 - P.C. was copied on a letter concerning Haystack Crossing. Ben Avery from Black Rock attended a remote Affordable Housing Committee meeting.
 - A.H.C. wanted P.C. To be aware of Affordable Housing status at Haystack. Carl Bohlen testified at a recent DRB meeting, **in support of the Affordable Housing proposal of Haystack.** Carl B. suggested the **perpetual record in deeds**, so it won't be lost in the future.
 - Alex will e-mail copy of letter to Planning Commission members.
- Agenda items for June 10 meeting
 - Retail Size Cap Discussion
 - Energy Committee has suggested revisions for energy chapter of Town Plan.
 - Contractors yards

The meeting adjourned at 8:51 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Sau, Recording Secretary