

**MINUTES**  
**ST. ALBANS CITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET**  
**6:30 PM, MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2024**

**DRAFT**

**Members of the Board Present:** IN PERSON: Rebecca Pfeiffer, Chair; Dick Thayer; Rick Coon; Janis Appel, Alternate; Becky Manahan, Alternate VIA ZOOM: Tanner McCuin, Chair

**Members of the Board Absent:** Emily Biron

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

**Members of the Public Present:** Mathias Leblanc; Clement Nadal; Steven DesLauriers; Alan Mayhew; Mark Gosselin; Nicole Gosselin; David Mullin; Cristian Jablenski; Peter Mazurka; Grant Butterfield; Alan Tatro VIA ZOOM: Robin Pierce; Eric Jutras

A. BEGIN RECORDING AND OPEN MEETING - R. Pfeiffer called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM.

1. Pledge of Allegiance - R. Pfeiffer led the pledge of allegiance.
2. Assign Alternates (as necessary) - J. Appel and B. Manahan assigned as alternates. J. Appel already assigned to the Lasalle Street case.
3. Consider any additions or deletions to agenda. - None

B. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SEGMENT - PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **\*\*\*Continuation: Case 2024-003 for Site Plan Review & Case 2024-008 for Conditional Use Review / Grant Butterfield - 18-22 Lasalle Street / Parcel 23049177.** Creation of a 28-unit apartment building. This property is located in the B1 - Central Business District and the DR2-Downtown Expansion Design Review District.
  - a. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and explains to the applicant that she has reviewed the case since her absence at the last meeting and asks if they are okay with R. Pfeiffer being assigned to the case along with J. Appel. The applicant approves. R. Pfeiffer asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. R. Pfeiffer, J. Appel, and P. Mazurak take their oath.
  - b. S. Bennett does not have any update from the staff report summary at the last meeting. G. Butterfield apologizes for connection problems at the last meeting. P. Mazurak summarizes that highlighted concerns in the staff report have now been added to the site plan. S. Bennett notes that parcel numbers for abutting neighbors within 100 feet are missing, P. Mazurak explains that he has listed the owners of those abutting neighbors, but not the parcel numbers. P. Mazurak notes that an entrance from Lasalle Street is being proposed to enter below the building. G. Butterfield explains that there is an entrance/exit off of Maple Street, which visitors and residents can exit from, but entrance from the Maple Street side will only be authorized for emergency vehicles and trash vehicles only.
  - c. P. Mazurak explains that he has added a 30 foot setback buffer abutting the Stevens Brook River. P. Mazurak explains that lighting marks have been added to the site plan. G. Butterfield explains that they are planning to use the minimum voltage/wattage that was requested by the DAB. R. Pfeiffer confirms understanding that the lighting is following recommendation made by the DAB. G. Butterfield confirms. S. Bennett summarizes the recommendations made by the DAB noting the timing of lighting and the shut off times. G. Butterfield explains that the lighting points downward to light the side of the building and does not display light outwardly.
  - d. G. Butterfield explains that they chose Maple Street due to the updates the city plans to do that street and likely ease of connecting with the water line there, noting that the City has plans to

- test the fire hydrants along that street. G. Butterfield shares that if they aren't able to access on the Maple Street side, they will plan to access from Lake Street.
- e. R. Pfeiffer asks about the building timeline and explains that a DRB decision is only good for 2 years. G. Butterfield shares that he thinks they might like to be considered for a 3-year permit, noting a start date of Spring 2026 and completion 15 months following that. R. Pfeiffer acknowledges that and will note that for when the DRB makes their decision. G. Butterfield, R. Pfeiffer, and S. Bennett discuss timeline specifics in relation to the requirements of the board. G. Butterfield and R. Pfeiffer land on final completion being by the end of 2028. That being said, the board will consider that extension in their approval.
  - f. R. Pfeiffer asks about the height of the building. E. Jutras estimates that it will be less than 55 feet, which falls in compliance with the regulations. G. Butterfield believes this was addressed at the last meeting. S. Bennett provides R. Pfeiffer with the updated site plans that have the correct measurements.
  - g. R. Pfeiffer asks about the parking. P. Mazurak explains that the spaces have been updated to include their measurements of 9'x18', and the handicapped space will include an extra 5 feet for hash marks and room for loading/unloading the vehicle.
  - h. R. Pfeiffer asks about the landscaping/vegetation plan and explains that part of site plan review (and it being a performance bond) requires this be addressed. The performance bond outlines the minimum required space for greenery. R. Pfeiffer notes that some site plans are very detailed with type and species, while others have been more general, so the requirement is very open ended for the applicant. P. Mazurak can add landscaping details to the site plan for the board.
  - i. G. Butterfield explains that 18 Maple is considering adjusting their boundary line so a buffer can be added to that. 10-foot buffer wouldn't be required for Lot 1, but would be required for 18 Maple. P. Mazurak explains that the regulations do not require a buffer in this area. R. Pfeiffer confirms that a buffer is not required.
  - j. R. Pfeiffer asks about the pedestrian traffic areas. P. Mazurak and G. Butterfield provide an update on that noting that there is a walkway along the east side of the lot and residents can access sidewalk area along Lasalle Street.
  - k. R. Pfeiffer asks if the board has any questions.
  - l. B. Manahan asks if there is a fence between the lots. G. Butterfield confirms there will be a fence around lot 1 along Maple Street, south along lot 1, and then around the back of Lot 3 (Midas), but will not be installed until closer to the completion of Phase 1 since it would hinder further construction progress otherwise.
  - m. R. Pfeiffer asks about fencing around the dumpster. G. Butterfield confirms there will be fencing around 3 sides, and it will remain open to the south side for ease of trash pickup.
  - n. B. Manahan motions to close the hearing. R. Coon seconds. R. Pfeiffer asks if there is any public comment. There is none. Motion passes with all in favor.
2. **Case 2024-009 for Conditional Use Review / Mathias Leblanc / 91 South Main Street / Parcel 26079091.** Request for approval of change in use to a Veterinary Clinic. This property is located in the B2 - Transitional Business District.
- a. 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 M. Leblanc take their oath.
  - b. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report. S. Bennett notes that the address listed is incorrect, 36 Fairfield Street, it should be 91 South Main Street. R. Pfeiffer clarifies that the existing first floor use are doctors' offices, and it is being proposed to change that use into veterinary offices. S. Bennett confirms.
  - c. R. Pfeiffer asks if S. Bennett knows what parking exists currently. S. Bennett does not.
  - d. M. Leblanc summarizes their proposal noting that the clinic is meant to be for outpatient work only and no boarding will take place. He makes that note to ensure that the board understands there should be minimal noise disturbance. M. Leblanc notes the traffic should be fairly minimal.

- M. Leblanc is proposing at least 18 parking spaces all to be built in the back of the building with visitors entering in the rear.
- e. R. Pfeiffer asks if the board has any questions. There is none.
  - f. R. Pfeifer asks if there is any public comment. There is none. B. Manahan motions to close the hearing. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
3. **Case 2024-010 for Conditional Use Review / Green Mountain Habitat for Humanity / 134 Lincoln Avenue/ Parcel 25052134.** Construction of a new duplex on a vacant lot. This property is located in the R95 - Residential 9500 Zoning District.
- a. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. S. Bennett, R. Pierce, and D. Mullin take their oath.
  - b. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarification around the setback. S. Bennett explains that since it is a corner lot, there are 2 setback areas of 20 feet each.
  - c. D. Mullin introduces himself and provides a summary of the project sharing that this project is meant to provide two more home ownership properties in the City of St. Albans.
  - d. B. Manahan asks about parking and access to the building. D. Mullin explains that gravel/stone walkways to the entrance of each porch would be included.
  - e. R. Pfeiffer asks about trash removal. D. Mullin explains that the owners are typically responsible for their own trash removal. S. Bennett asks if those would be the typical trash totes. D. Mullin confirms.
  - f. D. Thayer asks if there are secondary entrances/exits. D. Mullin explains that there is not, but that could be considered if it was requested.
  - g. B. Manahan asks about construction timeline. D. Mullin shares they would like to start mid-summer and from there it typically takes them about 12 months.
  - h. R. Coon asks about the Section 303 Zoning District Standards and the Maximum Building Height of 28 feet being exceeded by the site plan showing 32 feet. R. Pierce believes they discussed that with S. Bennett previously. R. Pfeiffer explains that the DRB does not have the authority to waive the maximum building height in this district. R. Pierce believes they can adjust to fit within the 28 foot maximum requirement.
  - i. R. Pfeiffer asks if the board has any questions. No one does.
  - j. R. Pfeiffer asks if there is any public comment. S. DesLauriers explains his neighbor, on Upper Gilman, said there was a hedge between his property and the proposed lot. In addition, S. DesLauriers notes that most homes in this area are single family homes and expresses concern around character of the neighborhood. C. Sawyer explains that character considerations cannot impact a decision by the DRB on a property with 4 or fewer units.
  - k. D. Thayer motions to close the hearing. J. Appel seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
4. **Case 2024-011 for Conditional Use Review / Mark and Nicole Gosselin / 151 Pearl Street / Parcel 22067151.** Request for review of a Planned Unit Development on two contiguous properties, creating 2 principal structure on one lot and a multifamily dwelling on one lot. This property is located in the R95 - Residential 9500 Zoning District.
- a. R. Pfeiffer opens the case and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. S. Bennett, C. Sawyer, M. Gosselin, N. Gosselin, and C. Jeblenski take their oath.
  - b. S. Bennett summarizes the staff report for the case. S. Bennett shares additions that were not included in her staff report.
  - c. R. Pfeiffer asks if the north boundary line borders the service industrial district. S. Bennett confirms.
  - d. C. Jeblenski summarizes that the proposal is for three lots. Ten parking spaces have been proposed, but that is more than enough for the area. C. Jeblenski asks S. Bennett about the setback that couldn't be located for lot 2. S. Bennett clarifies and C. Jeblenski explains that exact measurements are not shown for every piece but he can add a scale if the board requests.

- e. R. Pfeiffer asks if the proposed units will be for sale or rental. N. Gosselin explains that the purpose is to be rental units. R. Pfeiffer asks if A, B, and C will be 2-bedroom units. N. Gosselin confirms. B. Manahan asks if the proposed second floor unit in the barn will be a 2-bedroom. N. Gosselin confirms. R. Pfeiffer asks if the house is a 4-bedroom. N. Gosselin explains that since there is a closet in another room, the building is considered a 5-bedroom home.
- f. R. Pfeiffer asks if there is a timeline. C. Jeblenski explains that timing is pending approval of this hearing. M. Gosselin would start tomorrow if it was approved. M. Gosselin estimates that finishing by the end of 2026 is a good timeline. R. Pfeiffer makes that note.
- g. S. Bennett notes that changes to the performance bond requirements. R. Pfeiffer clarifies those changes. R. Pfeiffer asks about the chain-link fence along the west side of the property. C. Jeblenski explains that the fence had been installed by M. Gosselin's father and there is potential encroachment as the fence approaches the industrial line of the property.
- h. R. Pfeiffer asks if there is any public comment. A. Mayhew asks if the triplex will be single story, N. Gosselin confirms. A. Mayhew asks about the unit proposed on the upper level of the barn.
- i. A. Mayhew shares concerns around tractor trailer traffic and concern around frequent bottleneck and build up for that area. N. Gosselin explains that their requirements for renters are limited to no more than 7 days and hopes that reduces some of A. Mayhew's concerns. A. Mayhew is concerned about pedestrian traffic combined with the one-lane driveway. A. Mayhew asks about trash removal. N. Gosselin confirms a dumpster would be on the property. A. Mayhew asks if pets would be permitted. N. Gosselin shares that pets would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- j. A. Mayhew is mainly concerned that the project is too large for the street, traffic, etc and suggests a smaller.
- k. S. Bennett reads a public comment that was submitted which shares concern around:
  - i. Stormwater runoff/flooding,
  - ii. fence encroachment on the neighbor to the west,
  - iii. barn and garage need boundary variances because they do not meet the current setback requirements for a planned unit development, and
  - iv. confusion around if the barn is single family home or multi-family.
- l. C. Jeblenski addresses the stormwater concern. M. Gosselin explains that the / N. Gosselin shares that this is very much a personal disagreement between parties and concerns are rooted in hopes of delaying or stopping this project.
- m. R. Coon motions to close the hearing. D. Thayer seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.

## C. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Planning & Development update.
  - a. C. Sawyer and members of the DRB discuss concern around the definition of an accessory structure. C. Sawyer believes the fundamental functions of zoning is piece through separation. The intent of the rule is that if someone is going to use the structure, then it should be considered a structure. R. Pfeiffer shares that this conversation sparked potential opportunity for change in the wording. T. McCuin shares the interpretation by the board versus the applicant's interpretation can be very different and the wording lends to vague specificity suggesting that the wording be updated. C. Sawyer highlights changes at the state level that may lend the board and city to reconsider the definition of development in general and not just the definition of a structure. C. Sawyer shares that it is hard to get into specifics without boxing the board into an area where they cannot make case by case considerations for unique projects. J. Appel mentions the City Plan and if consideration will be taken for that regarding future development and density. C. Sawyer said that will be considered. C. Sawyer will continue to think about this and will discuss with the board later pending any developments.
- 2. Enforcement update.
  - a. S. Bennett does not have any.
- 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes.

- a. 11/6/2023 Minutes - T. McCuin motions to approve with noted changes. J. Appel seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
  - b. 1/3/2024 Minutes - B. Manahan motions to approve with noted changes. D. Thayer seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
  - c. 2/5/2024 Minutes - B. Manahan motions to approve with noted changes. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor. J. Appel and D. Thayer abstain.
  - d. 3/4/2024 Minutes - D. Thayer motions to approve with noted changes. J. Appel seconds. Motion passes with all in favor. R. Pfeiffer abstains.
4. Confirm next meeting date and time – Monday, May 6th, 2024.
  5. Other – None.
- D. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
- E. ENTER DELIBERATIVE SESSION
1. T. McCuin motions to enter deliberative session. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
  2. R. Pfeiffer adjourns the meeting at 9:43 PM and enters deliberative session.

DRAFT