

**SUBDIVISION & PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FINAL PLAT  
REVIEW FOR THE DECEMBER 6, 2022 DRB MEETING**

<b>Applicant:</b> Hinesburg Center Investments, LLC c/o Brett Grabowski, 32 Seymour Street, Williston, VT 05495	<b>Owner:</b> Estate of David Lyman c/o Barbara Lyman, 368 Read Ave. West, St. Albans, VT 05478
<b>Landscape Architect:</b> Mike Buscher T.J. Boyle Associates LLC., 301 College Street, Burlington Vermont 05401	<b>Engineering &amp; Survey:</b> Roger Dickinson & Dan Heil, Trudell Consulting Engineers 478 Blair Park Road, Williston, VT 05495
<b>Property Location, Tax Numbers, Zoning Districts and Areas:</b> Located to the west of Hinesburg Center 1 / Kinney Drugs, between the Creekside development and Patrick Brook. Tax Map #08-01-06.320. 9.7 acres is located in the Village zoning district (VG). 36.5 acres is located in the Agricultural zoning district (AG). Total Area is 46.2 acres.	

**PROJECT APPLICATION** - Hinesburg Center Investments, LLC, hereafter referred to as the Applicant, is requesting a final plat approval for a 22-lot, 73 residential unit subdivision, referred to as the Hinesburg Center Phase II development (HC2), which includes 15 single family residential lots, a 24 residential unit lot in two 9-plexes and one 6-plex, a 34 residential unit lot in one building, two commercial/office use lots, one light industrial use lot, two remaining land lots, and four proposed right-of-ways, three of which are proposed to be dedicated to the Town. The non-residential development includes 12,000sf of office/commercial space and 2,800sf of light industrial space. This proposed subdivision is located in the Village zoning district (VG) directly to the west of Kailey’s Way and north of the Creekside development.

**BACKGROUND** – A full background and history was provided in the October 29, 2022 Staff report for the November 1<sup>st</sup> DRB meeting. There was an additional report provided on November 10, 2022 for the November 15<sup>th</sup> DRB meeting.

**PRIOR MEETING REVIEWS:**

- October 4, 2022 – Floodplain review for the Patrick Brook Crossing - The Applicant was joined by Matt Murawski, P.E., rivers engineer, who provided a plan at the meeting that clarified the earlier submittal. He also modified the vertical exaggeration for better clarity. State floodplain manager, Rebecca Pfeifer, subbing for Kyle Medash, attended the meeting for a short time, but unfortunately had to leave. Matt M. was able to explain the methods and results of his modeling. The result is that there would be no change in elevation in the floodway except for a 2½ inch high drop before the proposed culvert and a 2½ inch high bump just after the proposed culvert. Matt M. described these changes as typical of culvert hydraulics. DRB members stated that they would like some feedback from the State on the analysis.
- October 4, 2022 – Floodplain review for the overall project was introduced. The prior approval was mentioned. Concerns about flooding on Lot #30 were mentioned.
- November 1, 2022 – Density – The proposed density and bonuses were discussed and have not changed since the preliminary plat hearing. A potential modification was discussed when reviewing the energy standards. When discussing the timing of when to have the solar panels placed, the Applicant discussed how many units could be placed

without the solar panels. Currently the Applicant is proposing to utilize bonus to allow 115% of residential units above the 45.88-unit base density, which equates to 98 units. They are proposing to place 91 residential units. Without the renewable energy bonus, the applicant would have from small residences and inclusionary units a bonus to allow 90% more units above base density, which equates to 87 residential units. The project would need to be reduced by four units if the renewable energy bonus was not pursued.

- November 1, 2022 – Water & Sewer – The approved allocations were mentioned in the introduction. No change from preliminary. The reduction in scale of this project may mean a reduction in the required allocation. The Applicant may decide to maintain a higher level of allocation to provide flexibility in the future.
- November 1, 2022 – Planned Unit Development (PUD) waivers per Section 4.5.6(4) of the HZR as mentioned in the introduction – The only proposed change from preliminary plat is that the 34-unit apartment building will not need a 6-foot reduction to 4-feet from the Kailey’s Way right-of-way, but instead only a 3-foot reduction to have a 7-foot setback.
- November 1, 2022 – Official Map – The introduction mentioned the required infrastructure described on the Hinesburg Official Map. There are no proposed changes from the preliminary plat application. The application appears to allow all of the future public infrastructure and facilities shown on the Official Map. This application now includes a memorandum of intent (MOI) for the proposed Patrick Brook crossing.
- November 1, 2022 – Garage Setback – The Applicant stated in the introduction that they have been able to provide a 20-foot distance to create a second parking spot for the 9-plexes and the 6-plex on proposed Road ‘D’. For the carriage houses that abut Road ‘D’, the Board agreed in the preliminary plat approval to grant a waiver of the garage setback provision in section 5.22.3(5) of the HZR. However, the preliminary plat approval also required that the eastern side of the building envelopes for these six lots be reduced to ensure that there will be 20 feet between the garage and Road ‘D’ to allow for a parking space outside of the one car garage. The final plans do not reflect this building envelope change. For the houses on the west side of Road ‘B’, the Applicant requested flexibility at preliminary plat in where the driveways will be placed and will accept a condition to ensure that Section 5.22.3(5) of the HZR that requires garages or other accessory buildings to be set back at least 10 feet farther back from the front property line than the principal structure is followed.
- November 1, 2022 – Traffic circulation – At preliminary it was noted that there are no proposed dead-end streets in HC2. The road layout for HC2 has not changed. In addition, the project includes 10-foot-wide recreation paths and 5-foot-wide sidewalks for pedestrian circulation. This includes a proposed access to the north to connect with the proposed Haystack development. No concerns noted.
- November 1, 2022 – Traffic volume - The Applicant submitted a traffic report, titled Exhibit 8. The report indicated that the wait times at the Farmall Drive/Commerce Street/VT Route 116 intersection would only mildly change. The Applicant acknowledged that the study only showed 10,000sf of commercial/office space instead of the proposed 12,000sf, and will need to be updated. The importance of the Patrick Brook connector was emphasized since for Creekside, HC1 and HC2 will only have the Farmall Road and Patrick Brook connector for access and egress.

- November 1, 2022 – residential to non-residential mix and construction schedule - The Applicant stated that the total non-residential floor area in HC1 is about 23,000sf. This amount was checked at the hearing. The Applicant wants the DRB to approve allowing the building of the residential in HC2 before the non-residential because of the large amount of non-residential that was built in HC1 for only 18 residential units. HC2 has 14,500sf of non-residential space proposed and 73 residential units. The Haystack development is required to have a total of 27,016sf of non-residential floor area for 176 proposed residential units.
- November 1, 2022 – affordable housing units - The Applicant has provided proposed locations for nine affordable units, 6 of which would be in existing apartment buildings in HC1, and three of which would be in the new 34-unit apartment building (Building ‘C’). Section 5.21.4(2) of the HZR requires that the bedroom mix for the affordable units be the same as the market rate units. There are two proposed units, a 594sf studio and a 723sf 1-bedroom unit, which will require a waiver from the minimum square footage requirement of Section 5.21.4(3c) of the HZR. The Applicant stated that all of the affordable units will be rental units. The Affordable Housing Committee indicated that they would like to comment on this proposal. Section 5.21.4(1) of the HZR requires that the affordable units are integrated with the rest of the development.
- November 1, 2022 – Stormwater - LaPlatte drainage area - The Applicant provided data to say that the total drainage area at the LaPlatte where Patrick Brook joins the LaPlatte is 17 square miles. In addition, that Patrick Brook has an area of 7.4 square miles. Should the drainage area of the LaPlatte exceed 10 square miles where the proposed stormwater system outfalls to the LaPlatte, then the Applicant can claim waivers from the Channel Protection and 10-year storm event standards. Though it seems that the area for the LaPlatte would appear to be only 9.6 square miles, when the associated area from the discharge of the canal, which is upstream of the proposed outfall, is added, the area could be over 10-square miles. This application will need a State stormwater permit, which this should be reviewed.
- November 1, 2022 – Stormwater - 100-year storm conveyance – The Applicant concurred that there are areas in the modeling where the stormwater storage and discharge is undefined and agreed to address this concern. Part of what is needed to be demonstrated is that the overflow will not enter the Creekside development.
- November 1, 2022 – Stormwater – maintenance – The Applicant stated that there was a submittal during preliminary plat, which should address this requirement.
- November 1, 2022 - Erosion control – The Applicant has submitted plan sheets 9A through 9D that show proposed locations and details for silt fencing, erosion matting, a stabilized truck entrance and inlet protection. The Applicant acknowledged needing a State CGP.
- November 1, 2022 - Renewable energy – The Applicant stated that all the residences will have solar ready roofs and the conduit for charging electric vehicles. They stated that all the proposed residences will be sited for maximum solar gain. The Applicant provided a detailed analysis as to how they could meet the renewable energy requirements for a density bonus. This analysis included rooftop solar on the larger existing (HC1) and proposed (HC2) buildings, solar panel of the proposed residential building and an array on a more western portion of the property. When asked of the timing to place this infrastructure, it was noted by the Applicant that they could build 87 of the proposed 91

residential units without the renewable energy density bonus. They propose a condition of approval to place sufficient renewable energy for a density bonus prior to the approval of the 88<sup>th</sup> building permit. Feedback from the Energy Committee is encouraged.

- November 1, 2022 – Lot #55 – This was lot #56 at preliminary plat review and is located on the southwest corner of the proposed development. It is the only proposed residence that would access Farmall Drive and would be next to the Bostwick residence. The Applicant stated that the lot has a class 2 wetland and that they will need to obtain additional State approvals to develop this lot. The Applicant would like to reserve the opportunity to place a housing unit on this lot in the future with additional State approvals and DRB review. Concerns have been raised about whether development of this lot would affect flooding in the area. The overall development is designed to remove stormwater from lot #30. The Applicant will accept a condition in the final plat approval that the Applicant return to the DRB for development in a floodplain and a subdivision revision in order to develop lot #55.
- November 15, 2022 – Floodplain Review - Kyle Medash attended the meeting via Zoom. He emphasized the ‘no adverse impact’ requirement, that the maximum rise in water elevation should be 0.1-feet, and that the base flood elevation (BFE) did not consider the HC1 development. Staff commented that the HC1 development may increase the level of the BFE, which the new development to be considered may be less of an increase than the 0.22-feet (2.64-inches) bump after the culvert. Brett Grabowski countered that they are not increasing the flood elevation upstream or downstream of this development, that the reason 0.1-feet is used is because it is the smallest measurable amount, that there would be no adverse impact, and that this design and modeling show conformance to the Town regulations.
- November 15, 2022 – Inclusionary Zoning Requirements – Bedroom Mix – Section 5.21.4(2) of the HZR states “in order to assure an adequate distribution of affordable units by household size, the bedroom mix of affordable units in any project shall be in the same ratio as the bedroom mix of the market units of the project, unless waived by the DRB with input from the Champlain Housing Trust.” The combined HC1 and HC2 projects will be mostly 2-bedroom units. The average number of bedrooms of the proposed nine affordable units is similar to those of the market units, however, compared to market units, the nine proposed affordable units have proportionately less one-bedroom units and no three-bedroom units. The bedroom mix for the nine affordable units would be 22.2% one bedroom, 77.8% two bedroom, and 0% three-bedroom. The bedroom mix for the 80 market units would be 27.5% one bedroom, 61.2% two bedroom, and 11.2% three-bedroom. The Applicant stated that the proposed affordable units would be on average larger than the proposed market rate units. The Applicant should either adjust the bedroom mix of the affordable units and/or provide more detailed information and a clear and compelling rationale for a waiver that does not undermine the intent of the regulation.
- November 15, 2022 – Inclusionary Zoning Requirements – Location of the proposed units - As proposed, the nine affordable dwelling units would be concentrated in three apartment buildings; whereas, section 5.21 of the HZR requires that the affordable units be integrated with the rest of the development. Six of the units will be in the older HC1 project at 32 Farmall Drive and 42 Farmall Drive. The preliminary plat approval, Findings of Fact #54, mentioned a memo from the Hinesburg Affordable Housing

Committee (HAHC), with input from Champlain Housing Trust and Staff, supporting the Applicant's request to increase the number of affordable units to be placed in HC1 from one to three. This finding is supported with Conclusion #24 in the approval. The Applicant stated that there are advantages to the residents of the proposed affordable units. The HAHC plans to discuss this matter at its next meeting on Tuesday, November 29<sup>th</sup> with Staff and the Applicant. At the next DRB meeting, the Applicant should be ready to discuss how the proposal integrates with affordable units with the rest of the development pursuant to section 5.21.4 of the HZR.

- November 15, 2022 – Public Open Space – The Applicant has demonstrated conformance with Section 5.22.5 of the HZR. The Applicant has calculated an area requirement of 16,775sf for public open space. There are sufficient proposed trails to satisfy 30% of this requirement. Mentioned features and amenities include some landscaping, hardscape, artwork, and outdoor seating, which would be placed on lot #70 and possibly lot #30. There are some amenities proposed on lot #52 for the residents of the 34-unit apartment building. Also listed are shade trees, sidewalks and bike storage, which appear to be required under other regulations. The Applicant has also proposed to a financial contribution of \$41,925 to the 'Lot #1 fund', which the Selectboard approved 'to recommend that the DRB consider and approve the request' at its May 4, 2022 meeting.
- November 15, 2022 – Parking Overall - The Applicant is proposing to have 39 on-street parking spaces and 43 off street parking spaces. HC1 has 97 existing parking spaces. They are proposing to remove one on-street parking space in HC1 for stormwater treatment. The new total for the development will be 178 parking spaces. This does not include the two parking spaces that will be provided for the single-family residences and each of the units in the two nine-plex and the six-plex. The Applicant stressed that the apartment building would need far less than the two spaces per unit recommended in Section 5.5 of the HZR. This appears to be consistent with the preliminary plat application. The Applicant resubmitted the shared parking calculation (HC-EX-3) and their HC1 parking study (HC-EX-4) to support their design.
- November 15, 2022 – Parking shared between lots #50 through #53 – The proposed property line between commercial lots #50 and #51, with the 34-unit apartment lot #52, putting the entire parking area between these lots on to lot #52. The concern was would there be sufficient parking available for commercial lots #50 and #51 in order to ensure the viability of the future commercial uses as proposed. The Applicant proposed to address this concern by providing a shared parking & maintenance agreement between lots #50, #51 and #52. The Applicant will also have lot #53 to be part of this agreement.
- November 15, 2022 – Parking shared between HC2 and Creekside – Concern was raised by some Creekside residents that some residents of the proposed HC2 will park in Creekside. The concern was raised because proposed in HC2 is a smaller 20-foot-wide roads compared to the 24-foot-wide roads found in Creekside. The Applicant explained that there will be dedicated parking areas in HC2 that expand the roadway to 28-feet in width. Also, that should two vehicles park on opposite sides of a 24-foot-wide road, vehicles can not pass through. The Applicant contends that as many Creekside residents will utilize HC2 as vice-versa.
- November 15, 2022 – Greenspace calculation – The Applicant demonstrated conformance to Section 4.5.7(2) of the HZR, which requires development in the Village

growth area to provide or preserve at least 10% of greenspace. The Applicant provided on drawing HC2-EX-2 a greenspace calculation, which shows that the entire Hinesburg Center development, combined HC1 & HC2, provides 35.1% of the area as overall greenspace, and 15.6% of the area outside of the stream setback area. Section 4.5.7(1) of the HZR requires that at least 50% of land in the agricultural zoning district (AG) be greenspace. With little development proposed in the AG, this is not a concern.

- November 15, 2022 – Landscaping – The Applicant has provided on page 8 of their project narrative a calculation of construction costs and a minimum landscaping budget based the requirements of Section 6.5.5 of the HSR. The estimated overall construction costs are \$18,965,000. The minimum planting budget is \$197,150 per section 6.5 of the HSR. The total proposed planting budget is \$169,446, which is \$27,704 (14%) less than the required minimum. The Applicant’s landscaping plan includes street trees, a public area on lot #70, improvements to lot #30, budget allowances for the properties requiring site plan and the single-family residences. The Applicant is requesting credits totaling \$35,550 for planned site/pedestrian improvements on lot 52 (Building ‘C’) that include: decorative hardscaping, a gas fire pit, outdoor gas grills, tables, and seating.

Concerns were raised at the hearing about increasing the amenities on lot #70 to provide additional landscape for this centrally located public space. The Applicant stated that they believe that keeping most of this area as playable lawn space would be more beneficial. Also, should the planting budget allowance for lot 53 be increased from \$2,000 to \$6,000 to be comparable to lots 50 & 51?

- November 15, 2022 – Lighting – The Applicant demonstrated conformance to the standards of Section 5.29 of the HZR. The Applicant proposes continuous lighting on Road ‘A’ from Farmall Drive to proposed Road ‘C’ (Patrick Road) and the full length of Patrick Road in the HC2 development. The Applicant is also proposing to full illuminate the parking area between Building ‘C’ and the commercial properties, the parking area for Building ‘D’, and to have lighting at the Road ‘A’ and Road ‘B’ intersection, by both intersections of Road ‘B’ with Road ‘D’ and at the proposed crosswalk across Road ‘B’ in the northwestern part of the development.

The Applicant has submitted a plan, L-300, which shows a photometric plan, required per Section 5.29.4(2), and a lighting detail sheet, L-401. The proposed lighting indicates a color rendition index (CRI) of 70, which exceeds the minimum 60 CRI per Section 5.29.3(3) of the HZR. The proposed lighting will have a color temperature (CCT) of 3000K, which is less than the maximum CCT of 4000K per Section 5.29.3(4) of the HZR. The proposed heights for the light poles for the streets and parking areas would be 20-foot and 12-foot respectively, which would conform to Section 5.29.3(5) of the HZR. For conformance to Section 5.29.4(3) of the HZR, Plan L-300 states the following:

- The proposed maximum illumination on grade would be 2.7-foot candles, which is less than the allowable 6.00-foot candles.
  - The average lighting will not exceed 1.5-foot candles.
  - The maximum uniformity ratio would be 5.3, which is less than the allowable 8.1
- November 15, 2022 – Road profile and depth – The Applicant demonstrated conformance to Sections 5.1.6(1), 6.1.3 & 6.1.8 of the HSR with civil plans #4 and #5, proposed are a 4% grade from the existing Farmall Drive near PT Therapy on to Road

‘A’, a 5% grade from the existing Farmall Drive near the Bostwick residence on to Road ‘B’, and the rest of the road grades ranging from about ½% to about 2%. Vertical curves are proposed for the larger changes in grades. As shown on detail sheet #6 in the civil set, the roads are proposed to have 24-inches of crushed stone placed to a State specification, and 5½-inches of asphalt to be placed in two lifts.

- November 15, 2022 – Utilities - The Applicant provided an update to two of the submitted civil plans that better shows the location of the gas and power lines, along with the location of proposed water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure. These plans demonstrate conformance with Section 6.9 of the HSR.
- November 15, 2022 – Stormwater low impact design (LID) standard – The Applicant demonstrated conformance to Section 6.6.2(5) of the HSR for LID with clustered development, minimizing pavement widths, minimizing setbacks and frontages, open space preservation, soil conservation and runoff disconnection.
- November 15, 2022 – Schools (Sections 1.2.2, 3.3.4, 5.1.11 & 5.2 of the HSR) – An email from Jeanne Jensen of Champlain Valley School District on March 16, 2020, estimated that the number of new students for this development to be a total of nine ranging from K-12. However, reviewing this, I found that this was only for the earlier first phase of the development with 24 proposed units. Using the same factors and equations, a revised total of 14 (14.34) students would be as follows:
  - 24 one-bedroom/studio units – no students
  - 10 two-bedroom units in the 34-unit apartment building –  $0.18/\text{unit} = 1.80$  students.
  - 24 two-bedroom units in the 9-plexes and 6-plex –  $0.18/\text{unit} = 4.32$  students
  - 6 two-bedroom carriage houses –  $0.29/\text{unit} = 1.74$  students
  - 9 three-bedroom single family residences -  $0.72/\text{unit} = 6.48$  studentsNote this calculation assumes 9 three-bedroom single family residences, including development on lot #55. Development on proposed lot #55 is not proposed in this application. Without lot #55, there would be 8 three-bedroom single family residences. If only 8 are considered, the calculated number of students would still be 14 (13.64).
- November 15, 2022 – Archaeological study – The Applicant stated that there were no areas of concern. The DRB could provide the same condition required of the Haystack development that a report required for ACT 250 be provided to the Town for conformance to Section 5.1.3 of the HSR.

**REVIEW ITEMS FOR THE DECEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup> MEETING:**

1. **Stormwater – Outflow to the LaPlatte** - The Applicant is proposing to outlet the discharge the proposed main gravel wetland, which treats stormwater for 92% of the project area, directly to the LaPlatte. Doing so, the Applicant can obtain waivers from the channel protection, 10-year storm and 100-year storm events. It is unclear from the plans how stormwater will reach the LaPlatte and whether erosion will be controlled. Additional information and design are required.
2. **Stormwater - Water quality (WQ) standard** – The Applicant proposes to provide WQ treatment for most of the project, 4.50-acres of the proposed 4.88-acres, with a new gravel wetland. A northwest 0.22-acre portion of the development would qualify for a disconnect to provide treatment. A 0.16-acres southeastern portion of the proposed

development, including a portion of Road ‘A’ and an existing 0.17-acre portion of Kailey’s Way would be treated by a Filterra bioretention system.

The proposed gravel wetland would meet the WQ standard by permanently storing 50% of the WQ volume and releasing the remainder of this volume over a 24-hour period. For permanent storage, the forebay would hold 3,057cf of the total 16,296cf (0.3735 acre-ft) WQ volume, and an additional 6,634cf would be stored in the stone voids. The total permanent storage would be 9,691cf, which would be 59.5% of the total WQ volume. The remainder of the WQ volume would be released, according to the modeling, over 1,545 minutes, which exceeds the 1,440-minute requirement.

WQ treatment for the southeastern portion of the development would utilize a proposed filtration (Filterra) system. WQ treatment for the southwestern portion of the development would utilize a proposed bioretention system that would infiltrate the entire WQ volume. How will the Filterra bioretention system be maintained and how often? What are the consequences should regular maintenance not be performed?

3. **Stormwater discharge to the Creekside stormwater system** – The southeastern portion of the proposed development, including portions of Road ‘A’ and the existing Kailey’s Way would discharge to the existing Creekside stormwater system. This discharge would be retained by an underground 48-inch-diameter 230-foot-long storage pipe. The discharge to the Creekside systems for the WQ, channel protection and 10-year storm event would be through a 1-inch orifice that would send 0.03cfs, 0.04cfs and 0.05cfs respectively to the Creekside system. The southwest portion of the proposed development, which would include the Farmall Drive extension almost to the Road ‘A’ intersection would infiltrate the entire discharge of the WQ and channel protection storm events. The discharge from the 10-year storm event would be 0.02cfs.

Updated plans have been submitted to show the location of the proposed 230-foot-long underground storage that would reduce the discharge to Creekside. However, this was then modified to a different alignment in updated plans. Details are required to demonstrate that the system will work as modeled.

4. **Stormwater discharge in the 100-year storm event** – As discussed in the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the full conveyance of stormwater during the 100-year storm event has not been defined. The stormwater pipes would be overfilled and stormwater would pond on the roadways. Ponding on the roadways is not a concern, unless this water elevations flood existing or proposed structures. Updated modeling to show the extent of road flooding during this event is required for conformance to Sections 5.1.7 & 6.6.2(3) of the HSR. This updated modeling analysis would clarify whether a stormwater discharge during this event would flow into the Creekside development.
5. **How will the stormwater systems be maintained?**
6. **Legal Documents (HOA, Easements, etc.)** – A draft homeowners association (HOA) declaration was provided with the preliminary plat application, along with an irrevocable

offer of dedication and easement deeds for roads A, B, & C that are being offered to the Town. The HOA needs to be updated to reflect the final plans, to clearly list the common and limited common elements (e.g., roads, sidewalks, trails, village green, lot 30, shared parking, etc.), and to address how those common elements will be managed. The HOA should also clearly address the relationship between HC2 and HC1 – particularly the shared parking that is key to this project. An irrevocable offer of dedication and easement deed are also needed for the various trail easements and the riparian area.

7. **Updated Traffic Report** - The Applicant agreed at the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting to provide an updated traffic report that matches the proposed non-residential use.
8. **Affordable Housing & Inclusionary Zoning** - Per the November 10 staff report and the discussion at the November 15 meeting, the Applicant should better integrate the location of the affordable dwelling units into the overall development pursuant to section 5.21.4 of the HZR. The Applicant also needs to either adjust the bedroom mix of the affordable units to provide a three-bedroom unit, and/or provide more detailed information/narrative and/or a clear/compelling rationale for a waiver that does not undermine the intent of section 5.21.4(2) of the HZR. Hopefully, the November 29 meeting with the Affordable Housing Committee should help elucidate these issues and potential solutions..
9. **Shared Parking Agreement/Deed** - The Applicant needs to provide a shared parking agreement/deeds for lots #50 through #53 as described at the November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.
10. **Western Portion of the Property** - Is there any other planned use for the western portion of the property besides some trails and a solar array? Has the Applicant discussed placing the solar array in the floodplain with State officials or any solar energy companies?
11. **Trails Committee** – The Applicant needs to describe their coordination with the Trails Committee regarding recreation paths – e.g., how they will be improved and maintained.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchel Cypes, P.E.

Hinesburg Development Review Coordinator