

MINUTES
ST. ALBANS CITY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET
6:30 PM, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2024

DRAFT

Members of the Board Present: IN PERSON: Rebecca Pfeiffer, Chair; Rick Coon; Emily Biron; Becky Manahan, Alternate VIA ZOOM: Tanner McCuin

Members of the Board Absent: Dick Thayer

Members of City Staff Present: Sara Bennett, Property Services Manager; Katie Haseltine, Minute Taker.

Members of the Public Present: E. Biron; Jason Doe; Wayne Jaycox; Anthony Lorenzo; Donald Conn, Sr; Maureen Conn; Scott Levick; Brian Toof

A. **BEGIN RECORDING AND OPEN MEETING** - R. Pfeiffer called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Assign Alternates (as necessary)
 1. R. Pfeiffer explains that enough members are present for a quorum so an alternate is not needed, but asks if B. Manahan would like to be assigned to the cases tonight. B. Manahan does.
3. Consider any additions or deletions to agenda. - None

B. **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SEGMENT - PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **Continuation: Case 2023-020 for Appeal of DAB Decision / Keely Doe / 248 North Main St. / Parcel 22063248.** To appeal a Design Advisory Board Decision. This property is located in the B2 - Business Transition Zoning District and the DR4-Gateway Design Review District.
 1. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. J. Doe and S. Bennett take their oath.
 2. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report for the case to the board.
 3. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarity around the previous permitting actions and meetings that took place. S. Bennett notes there may be a typo in the staff report and the applicant has only gone before the DAB so far, this is the first time meeting with the DRB. S. Bennett also clarifies the timeline of the case and that it was an after the fact review.
 4. J. Doe introduces himself and explains their situation regarding the fence. The decision and material approved by the DAB was too expensive to be feasible for the applicant financially, so they have appealed the decision and are seeking an alternative solution. He goes on to reiterate that the fence up previously was a chain link fence and all he did was replace it because parts of the old one were deteriorating and causing an unsafe area. J. Doe feels that they have done a lot of work to the front of this building and notes that many people have commented how aesthetically pleasing it looks.
 5. R. Pfeiffer reads off exemption guidelines relative to this case and is not sure that anything applies. R. Coon asks to clarify new fence. J. Doe shares it is a black chain link fence with slats for privacy. The slats are plastic and get locked in by receiving parts.
 6. E. Biron motions to close the hearing. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
2. **Case 2024-004 for Section 521 Review / Wayne Jaycee, JR / 10 Savage Street / Parcel 22075010.** Request for approval of additional accessory structures. This property is located in the R95 - Residential 9500 Zoning District.

1. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and asks if any board members have any expertise communication or conflict of interest. No one does. S. Bennett and W. Jaycox take their oath.
2. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report for the case.
3. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarity on the Property Information Form. S. Bennett clarifies that the property used to be a duplex and was converted to a single family home. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarification on what the applicant is asking. S. Bennett shares the applicant is looking for approval on the gazebo, temporary structure, and carport.
4. W. Jaycox introduces himself and explains the case. The carport is to house vehicles that he works on. The temporary structure (shed) is something his son received and he will be moving it off the property by the spring. The gazebo has been there for years and was told by a previous DRB board member that he didn't need a permit.
5. R. Pfeiffer explains that the board has the authority to grant approval for additional structures on the property, but they are limited to square footage requirements. Without the temporary structure that is meant to be removed in the spring, R. Pfeiffer explains that the applicant is still over the square footage requirements and asks if the applicant would be open to reducing the size of either the gazebo or carport. W. Jaycox could likely adjust the carport to be smaller. E. Biron asks if the gazebo could be moved since there are multiple violations with the current placement. W. Jaycox shares that they could, but it would require renting equipment and lots of work to get it moved. R. Pfeiffer suggests moving it from its current location to the corner of the house between the pool and covered porch. W. Jaycox shares that the covered porch and deck for the pool are connected and it wouldn't really have room for the gazebo.
6. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarification regarding the specifics of what is considered a structure. S. Bennett shares that she checked with other city staff and a carport was deemed a structure. R. Pfeiffer explains again that certain square footage requirements are in place for additional accessory structures.
7. A. Lorenzo shares that the gazebo has been there for at least 6 years, as long as he has lived next door. A. Lorenzo sought to clarify that structures are those physically anchored in the ground. S. Bennett clarifies by saying structures do not have to be physically anchored. S. Levick asks if we know the square footage of the added on porch. R. Pfeiffer shares that number and S. Levick asks if that was considered in the allowable additional square footage of accessory structures. R. Pfeiffer explains it was not because it considered part of the house and does not need to be considered in the additional square footage. S. Levick asks about the already permitted 8' x 10' shed that has since been expanded and wants to know if that additional square footage was included in this assessment. S. Bennett shares there is no city record or permit for the increase in the shed's dimensions.
8. A. Lorenzo asks who's responsibility it is to enforce the regulations. R. Pfeiffer explains that the city's Zoning/Administration ultimately handles those situations, but often residents will call in to ask about allowable changes and permitting needs.
9. S. Bennett notes that she can measure a set-back, but that the City is not responsible for legally determining boundary lines. Given that information, S. Bennett is curious if the board and/or applicant might be interested in recessing the case to allow time for review of boundary lines and potential options to resolve the square footage restraint. R. Pfeiffer is in favor of recessing to allow more time for review. T. McCuin would also suggest getting clarification from City Staff regarding what is considered a structure and what is considered moveable.
10. B. Manahan motions to recess the meeting until March 4, 2024. E. Biron seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.

3. Case 2024-005 for Conditional Use Review / Emily Biron / 200 Lake Street / Parcel 26049200.

Requests approval for the conversion of a single family home into 4 residential units. This property is located in the B1 - Central Business District and the DR2-Downtown Expansion Design Review District.

1. R. Pfeiffer opens the case. E. Biron is excusing herself from this case as she is the applicant.
R. Pfeiffer asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. S. Bennett and E. Biron take their oath.
2. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report for the case.
3. R. Pfeiffer asks E. Biron if the property has been vacant since December 2022. E. Biron confirms. R. Pfeiffer asks if this is coming before the board because of intention to convert into residential housing. S. Bennett confirms.
4. E. Biron shares that her and her husband bought the property a little over a year ago and have decided, with the housing crisis, to convert this single-family home into to 4 residential units, to allow more housing options to the City. R. Pfeiffer asks about the footprint of the property and that it looks like the only major change will be that the garage is going to be removed. E. Biron confirms and explains that the garage is in rough shape and the first thing they plan to do is demolish and remove that structure.
5. R. Pfeiffer asks about a potential timeline. E. Biron shares they are planning to use state funding and pending receiving grant funding, they would start sometime this summer. Without grant funding, the project would likely not start until fall. R. Pfeiffer asks about how long they expect for the project to last. E. Biron shares that depending on grant funding, the project would take anywhere from 12-18 months.
6. R. Coon motions to close the case. B. Manahan seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
7. R. Coon motions to re-open the case for public comment. B. Manahan seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
8. R. Coon motions to close the case. B. Manahan seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.

4. Case 2024-006 for Section 521 Review / Donald Conn, SR / 11 Savage Street / Parcel 22075011.

Request for approval of an additional accessory structure. This property is located in the R95 - Residential 9500 Zoning District.

1. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. S. Bennett and D. Conn take their oath.
2. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report for the case.
3. R. Pfeiffer confirms that the location of the 10' x 10' storage shed (approved Permit 057002) is next to the garage with the applicant, D. Conn.
4. D. Conn was told by a previous member that if the structure is moveable, you did not need a permit. D. Conn shares that the shed has runners so it is moveable.
5. W. Jaycox shares that he has never seen D. Conn move the shed. D. Conn believes this structure isn't an issue because it is moveable and there for not considered a structure. T. McCuin reminds that the board discussed earlier what was considered a structure and shared that it was determined there is some uncertainty around that, so further clarification needs to be determined by the board and city staff. D. Conn has no problem getting the permit and putting this case behind him.
6. B. Manahan asks for clarification on permitting and why the applicant has to come before the board. S. Bennett clarifies that the additional structure has to come to the board for approval first, and then the applicant can obtain the permit. D. Conn asks why the structure takes up 30% of his property. S. Bennett clarifies that the 30% encompasses all structures on his property, including his home, not just the accessory structure in this case.
7. E. Biron motions to close the hearing. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Planning & Development update.
 1. S. Bennett does not have any.
2. Enforcement update.
 1. S. Bennett does not have any.
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes. T. McCuin motions to table approving the minutes until the next meeting. B. Manahan seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
 1. 11/6/2023 Minutes - tabled until March 4th meeting
 2. 1/3/2024 Minutes - tabled until March 4th meeting
4. Confirm next meeting date and time. - Monday, March 4th, 2024.
5. Other.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

E. ENTER DELIBERATIVE SESSION

- A. E. Biron motions to enter deliberative session. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
- B. R. Pfeiffer adjourns the meeting at 8:35 PM and enters deliberative session.

DRAFT