

MINUTES
ST. ALBANS DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD
ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET
6:30 PM, MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2024

DRAFT

Members of the Board Present: IN PERSON: KarenMarie Peltier, Chair; Stephen Poston, Vice Chair; John Morrie; Erik Johnson; Caleb Menard

Members of the Board Absent: Evan Champagne, Alternate; Elizabeth Reed, Alternate

Members of City Staff Present: Sara Bennett, Property Services Manager; Katie Haseltine, Minute Taker; Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning and Development

Members of the Public Present: VIA ZOOM: Grant Butterfield

1. Begin Recording and Call to Order - K. Peltier called to order at 6:37 PM

- a. Pledge of Allegiance - J. Morrie led the pledge of allegiance.
- b. Assign Alternates (as necessary) - none needed
- c. Consider any additions or deletions to agenda - no additions

2. Design Review - Consideration of the following applications:

- **DAB Case 2023-022 | Grant Butterfield | 175 Lake Street | Parcel #23049167**

Applicant seeks Site Plan Review for the site plan amendments and fencing. This property is located in the B1 Central Business Zoning District and the DR2 Traditional Downtown Expansion Review District.

- a. K. Peltier opens discussion for the case. G. Butterfield references a concern about the plan and look being different than what was approved. The only change is that the building has been raised by a foot. The storm water lines were meant to join onto Lake Street, but as the project started, they had trouble getting onto Lake Street and sought out Maple Street instead. Maple Street's storm water line is different and that is why they had to increase a foot.
- b. G. Butterfield shares the second thing is the addition of a fence in an Ameristar Montage Design with multiple style options, which they are learning towards the Majestic style. The fence allows slats to be added for privacy, but G. Butterfield was hoping to not use the slats on the entire fence, only in certain areas. S. Poston asks what the purpose of the slats are, and G. Butterfield shares they thought it would be nice to provide Midas some privacy and some privacy to the apartments at 175 Lake Street. S. Poston understands the need for slats around the dumpster, but would advise to steer away from the slats elsewhere for plowing reasons. K. Peltier feels the slats are a little drastic and would prefer to see some landscaping used as screening instead. J. Morrie concerned that utilizing partial slats could encourage passerby's to use them as stepping stones to jump over a fence, so it could pose more of a problem than anticipated. G. Butterfield is happy to leave out the slats. S. Poston asks if maybe G. Butterfield would want to revisit the slats later and leave the fence without for now. G. Butterfield is happy to leave the slats out and come back before the board at a later date should they decide to use slats later on. C. Menard asks about the potential of stopping the fence at the dumpster and restarting further down.
- c. E. Johnson returns to the topic of the plan change in reference to the metal and how it meets the ground and the material being used. The new design has a different number of windows and a change in material. S. Poston references that the new design follows a recommendation made by the DAB. E. Johnson recalls S. Poston's comment from a previous meeting and would like to see the landscaping proposed followed through with as he believes that is a good addition to the area.
- d. K. Peltier requests an updated plan. S. Bennett will send updated plan with C2.01 to the board.

- e. S. Poston recaps the changes of the building height by one foot, stairs and ramp that weren't shown on the original illustration, slightly different pattern of glass around the southeast corner, a little more stone around the bottom that was requested by the DAB from the first meeting, and the addition of a fence around the parking area. G. Butterfield notes that the original illustration provided did not match the design being proposed, but that has been fixed in the new design.
- f. G. Butterfield adds that the fencing for the parking area is also being requested to go around the boundary of Midas which is part of the Lasalle Street project. Mainly, G. Butterfield is just looking to keep some consistency in the fence design. K. Peltier favors keeping consistency.
- g. G. Butterfield shares that they are also looking into doing some solar structure on the back of the building. E. Johnson asks if that would be a separate case. S. Bennett shares that what G. Butterfield is proposing, net metered solar, does not have to be reviewed. S. Bennett also shares that the structure is not completely covered and has gaps between slats so it is not considered a car port or other similar structure.
- h. S. Poston favorable recommendation for the changes presented to the property at 175 Lake Street:
 - i. Building is slightly taller due to engineering requirements, but still within zoning regulations
 - ii. Ramp and steps along Lake Street are approved as shown on the updated illustration
 - iii. Glass fenestration pattern along Lake Street is slightly altered
 - iv. Glass at street level is altered due to previous DAB recommendation
 - v. There will be a fence along the western side of the building as discussed and shown:
 - 1. The fence extends to the northern extent of the parking lot, then returns to Maple Street. A portion of the fence will also run between the Midas Property and the adjacent Lasalle Street property to Stevens Brook. 42:09
 - 2. The fence presented will be Ameristar Montage in style Majestic , color Black.
 - 3. Visual privacy slats will be provided around the garbage receptacles.
 - vi. K. Peltier adds that the original illustration the board previously looked at was not 100% accurate, and the board has since been given a more accurate updated illustration.
 - vii. J. Morrie seconds with K. Peltier's addition. Motion passes with all in favor.

• **DAB Case 2023-023 | Grant Butterfield | 18-22 Lasalle Street | Parcel #23049177**

Applicant seeks Site Plan Review for a 28-Unit apartment building. This property is located in the B1 Central Business Zoning District and the DR2 Traditional Downtown Expansion Review District.

- K. Peltier opens discussion for the case. G. Butterfield summarizes the proposal of a 28-unit apartment building with each apartment being 1 bedroom. There is a room on the top floor that will be used as a community room. The first floor is designed for common use and utility type use, not for gathering. The building is on 3/4 of an acre and is 3-stories high. The architect has also put in plans for a bike storage area since the 55+ community is utilizing bikes more.
- E. Johnson asks what the plan is for dumpster trucks to come and pick up trash. G. Butterfield shares there is access along Maple Street that they will use for trash pick up.
- C. Menard asks if there are any sidewalks along this property. E. Johnson doesn't believe there is. G. Butterfield shares there are not any sidewalks. E. Johnson asks if there is any plan to put in a sidewalk along Maple for the residents of this apartment building. G. Butterfield would like to see that, but there are no plans yet. S. Poston believes the sidewalk conversation is a good one to have and encourages G. Butterfield to consider that since there is concern on the user friendliness of the access to the street. G. Butterfield is unsure what the city's plan is for putting in a sidewalk. S. Poston thinks it would be a good thing
- G. Butterfield asks if a footpath is considered part of the road if it is in the buffer zone. S. Bennett would have to check but she believes you cannot put it in the buffer zone.
- J. Morrie asks how a fire truck would go around the building. E. Johnson shares there is access around Maple Street and believes that would address that. S. Poston shares it is slightly confusing

because the illustrations don't clearly show where pavement ends. G. Butterfield confirms pavement would go through and up to Maple Street. C. Menard asks if it will be a 2-way road off Maple Street. S. Bennett shares there is not enough room for a 2-way road. G. Butterfield shares it will be a one-way and firetrucks, dumpster trucks, etc. will have to do a 2 point turn to exit out the way they came in.

- E. Johnson asks if there are regulations in place warranting lighting on third floor buildings. S. Poston doesn't believe there is. K. Peltier looks at the regulations and that the discussion has been had in the past referencing the need for lighting to be on a dimmer and have a timer. E. Johnson wants to be mindful of neighbors and the lighting going in their homes. E. Johnson also mentions the type of light being used should be a warm light versus a stark, brighter light. G. Butterfield confirms all those things will be used in the lighting for this building.
- C. Menard asks if a canopy or cover might be considered for door on the west side.
- J. Morrie suggests adding green paint to the paved area to designate an area for foot/bike traffic. K. Peltier wants to advise the DRB to consider this and make a recommendation. S. Bennett does not have the knowledge of how that would be addressed.
- S. Poston makes a favorable recommendation for the project presented at 18-22 LaSalle Street:
 - A protected canopy to provide cover from weather on the west side exit from the stairwell
 - Recommend that measures be taken to ensure safe foot/vehicle traffic on LaSalle and Maple street access points. These measures could include: concrete blocks, asphalt paving, green lane striping to differentiate pedestrian from vehicle traffic.
 - Lighting control system to ensure that the brightest lights are not shining onto neighboring properties at the latest times of the evening.
 - C. Menard seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.

3. Other Business

- Sign Updates
 - S. Bennett has none.
- Enforcement Updates
 - S. Bennett shares an enforcement update on the screen next door (National Guard). Since her communication to them, they have removed the screen, but never heard back from them.
 - E. Johnson shares there is a flashing light at the Hangry Donut Shop and that has been an area of concern in the past. S. Bennett will look into it.
- Public Facilities Discussion
 - K. Peltier references last months meeting and E. Johnson's statement. E. Johnson references a recent case where the applicant was cited for their chain link fence and they rebutted with reference to the chain link fence at the Police Department.
 - C. Sawyer asks E. Johnson for clarification. E. Johnson shares that currently it doesn't seem that municipal buildings are held to the same regulations that the general public is held to.
 - C. Sawyer shares that the City can't require municipal cases to appear before a board, even if the decision was advisory, because it is a form of regulation that is not allowed under statute.
 - E. Johnson appreciates the discussion. J. Morrie thinks that C. Sawyer has covered the questions the board had regarding those regulations.
 - C. Sawyer recognizes the applicants reference to the Police Department, but it is not apples to apples. The Police Department is much further set back from the road in comparison to the applicants property. When it comes down to it, S. Bennet and C. Sawyer will be responsible for delivering the news to the applicant that they will have to follow the rule. C. Sawyer acknowledges that right now the case is in their court, and the board can sympathize with the applicant that those regulations don't provide many options, but, in the end this will go to the zoning office and regulations will still be in place.

- C. Sawyer recognizes that the DAB has some specific insight into fencing, and suggests that the board could write up a case to propose a change to the current regulations by the city.
 - Approve Meeting Minutes
 - December 18, 2023
 - K. Peltier motions to approve. E. Johnson seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
 - Confirm next meeting date: **February 26, 2024**
 - K. Peltier confirms next meeting.
 - Other - None
4. Public Comment
- a. None.
5. Adjourn.
- a. K. Peltier adjourns the meeting at 8:07 pm.

DRAFT