

MINUTES
ST. ALBANS CITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET
6:30 PM, MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2023
DRAFT

Members of the Board Present: IN PERSON: Rebecca Pfeiffer, Chair; Tanner McCuin, Vice Chair; Rick Coon; Emily Biron; Richard Thayer; Janis Appel, Alternate 2

Members of the Board Absent: Becky Manahan

Members of City Staff Present: Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning & Development; Katie Haseltine, Minute Taker

Members of the Public Present: James Chase (55 Barlow), Derick Read (Krebs & Lansing), Sam Beall (Duncan Wisniewski Architecture), Lauren Marino (22 Cathedral Square).

1. **BEGIN RECORDING AND OPEN MEETING** - Called to order at 6:38 PM
 1. Pledge of Allegiance
 2. Assign Alternates (as necessary)
 3. Consider any additions or deletions to agenda.
2. **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SEGMENT - PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 1. **Continuation: Case 2023-004 for Site Plan Review / St. Mary's Parish Charitable Trust / 36 Fairfield St. / Parcel 14031036.** To establish a school on the property and related site improvements. This property is located in the Residential 7500 Zoning District.
 1. Requested a recess until November.
 2. Meeting on November 6th at 6:30 PM. D. Thayer motions to approve. E. Burion seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
 2. **Continuation: Case 2023-011 for ZA Decision Appeal / James Chase / 55 Barlow St. / Parcel 25087070.** Appeal of Zoning Administrator Notice of Violation. This property is located in the Residential 9500 Zoning District.
 1. R. Pfeifer re-opens case 2023-011 and states that R. Coon was not present at original meeting, as well as J. Appel but she was not yet appointed to the board. R. Pfeiffer asks J. Chase if he approves of appointing R. Coon and J. Appel to his case. J. Chase approves.
 2. J. Chase notes that, by the state's definition, his trailer is considered a semi-trailer.
 3. S. Bennett reads the response from the City of St. Albans on Case 2023-011. R. Pfeiffer asks if the driveway was included in the original sale. S. Bennett confirms and that the extension of the driveway was included in the NOV.
 4. J. Chase states that he stores his riding lawn tractor to keep it in good running shape. When he washes it off on the trailer, some water does run off onto the asphalt and it does soak into that asphalt slightly. Since then, he has put down some topsoil/stone mixture to help with that drainage and prevent mud tracking to the sidewalk and Barlow Street. J. Chase is curious if previous regulations grandfather his case in. J. Pfeiffer states that when the new house was built, the regulations were included in that new build.
 5. J. Pfeiffer recalls that in the first hearing, and asks S. Bennett if the regulations around the set-back areas was in place prior to or after the build of the new house. C. Sawyer doesn't recall any changes in his tenure.
 6. Ed asks what is under the trailer. J. Chase states it is on asphalt, but on washing his tractor, it has accumulated dirt. So, now it is a mixture of soil and rocks (asphalt). Ed asks what else he utilizes that area for. J. Chase states he occasionally parks his truck there, and uses it for overflow parking when family/friends come to visit.
 7. E. Burion asks when the asphalt was installed. J. Chase states the new home was built in 2017 and about 3-4 years ago, Premier Paving, installed the asphalt.

8. S. Bennett asks if there is any public comment. There is none. S. Bennett asks board members if they have any comment. There is none. S. Bennett asks J. Chase if he has any further comment. J. Chase has none. T. McCuin motions to close case 2023-011. E. Burion seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
3. **Case 2023-012 for Sketch Plan Review/ St. Albans Cemetery Association / 145 North Main Street / Parcel 25079145.** To subdivide the parcel into 9 lots. This portion of the property is located in the Residential 9500 Zoning District.
 1. R. Pfeiffer opens case 2023-012 and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. C. Sawyer & S. Bennett take their oath.
 2. R. Pfeiffer asks S. Bennett to read the highlighted parts and other necessary notes of importance. S. Bennett reads off parts of the report based on R. Pfeiffer’s request.
 3. R. Pfeiffer asks for clarification on the 9 lots, there are 7 lots going on Upper Gilman, and 2 lots (with potential for easements or deeding) referred to on South Main Street, that is really Lincoln Ave? S. Bennette’s confirms that is her understanding. C. Sawyer states there are the 9 total lots consisting of the 7 new lots, an area of consideration for boundary line adjustment with neighbor, and the existing cemetery. C. Sawyer also shares that the Cemetery has a South Main Street address, but may shift to a Lincoln Ave address.
 4. C.Sawyer shares that the City has agreed to go in with the St. Albans Cemetery on this project. The lots are sized at the required dimensions by city regulations of 8,700 square feet. Various additional requests, that may likely be waiver request could include: contours, building envelopes, or utilities. There may also likely be a request to combine the preliminary request with the request for the main hearing for the major subdivision. C. Sawyer is also requesting to correct any missing technical information of any future subdivision proposal that may come after this sketch plan is approved. R. Pfeiffer asks if S. Bennett received any public comments by mail or e-mail. T. McCuin asks if the lot is currently a park: J. Appel recalls that the lawn area used to be a community garden. C. Sawyer confirms it is not and just a big lawn.
 5. R. Pfeiffer goes through the 5 steps in the sketch plan the DRB is meant to do while also listing what requests C. Sawyer has come with.
 1. Determination of whether the project is a major or minor subdivision
 - a. Request for contours, building envelopes, storm water
 - b. To combine the main subdivision hearing with the preliminary request.
 - c. Allow to make corrections to draft being presented tonight
 2. The granting or denial of requested waiver provisions;
 3. The granting or denial of any request to combine Preliminary and Final Review for a Major Subdivision
 - a. Already Discussed
 4. A preliminary determination of whether or not the proposed Subdivision plan generally conforms to applicable Subdivision review standard or would be in conflict with the Comprehensive Municipal Plan and other municipal regulations currently in effect.
 - a. The group has the staff report on that, no questions at this time.
 5. Recommendations for proposed changes in subsequent submissions, including any requests for additional studies or supporting documentation.
 - a. Already Discussed
 6. E. Burion motions to close hearing. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
 7. Ed departs the meeting at 7:31 PM.
4. **Case 2023-013 for Subdivision/ City of St. Albans / 15 Lower Newton St./ Parcel 22054015.** To subdivide parcel into 2 lots. This property is located in the S-IND – Service-Industrial Zoning

District and the MDOD – Multi-Dwelling Overlay Zoning District and the DR3-Residential Design Review District.

1. R. Pfeiffer opens case 2023-013 and states there was a sketch review in the September 6th, 2023 hearing. C. Sawyer & S. Bennett take their oath. R. Pfeiffer asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does.
 2. R. Pfeiffer asks S. Bennett to summarize the staff report including changes on table 8.1 and other notes of importance. S. Bennett reads the report based on R. Pfeiffer’s request. R. Pfeiffer asks if there was any public comment. S. Bennett said they did not.
 3. C. Sawyer states that the City does not want to own the Fonda Project anymore. In order to move forward with that, the City needs to subdivide the property, which the City is the applicant for. Two lots have been proposed, that are both more than conforming with the service industrial district, with some existing impervious around the set-backs, but that is because it will be associated with the shared access and parking that is allowed under the multiple dwelling district.
 4. R. Pfeiffer asks plot and final plan approval related to regulations. C. Sawyer reflects that the current subdivision regulations are very cookie cutter and the City needs to re-visit that and consider changing and updating those regulations. R. Pfeiffer asks about the time frame expected. C. Sawyer hopes within 3 years but is happy to file extension paperwork if needed.
 5. E. Burion motions to close the hearing. R. Coon seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
5. **Case 2023-014 for Conditional Use Review and Case 2023-015 for Site Plan Review/ City of St. Albans / 15 Lower Newton St./ Parcel 22054015.** To create a new multi-family residential development consisting of 33 dwelling units. This property is located in the S-IND – Service-Industrial Zoning District and the MDOD – Multi-Dwelling Overlay Zoning District and the DR3-Residential Design Review District.
1. R. Pfeiffer opens case 2023-014 and asks if any board members have any experte communication or conflict of interest. No one does. C. Sawyer, S. Bennett, S. Beall, L. Marino, and D. Read take their oath.
 2. S. Bennett reads the staff report, highlighted portion and other notes of importance.
 3. L. Marino provides a brief background on the Cathedral Square project stating it is an affordable housing non-profit. Reid Commons is focusing on providing housing opportunities for elderly and has been doing so since 1977 for Chittenden and Franklin counties. Currently, the own over 1,000 units and started the SASH (Supporting Affordable Services at Home) program that is federally recognized. Reid Commons also has a dedicated maintenance team to keep the property operating smoothly. This property is located within the Fonda site and will pair well with the Multi-Modal Connector that is being proposed by the city which connects the site to downtown. The Cathedral Square project will include (27) 1-Bedroom Apartments, (6) 2-Bedroom Apartments, and rent will be set at 50-80% of the median area income level.
 4. R. Pfeiffer asks about noise, parking, and traffic increases. D. Read states they looked at traffic trends for senior housing and the data shows increased traffic around 11 am and 11 pm. S. Read states they don’t believe those times are going to cause a large impact on overall traffic. S. Beall shares that from his experience, many seniors who live in these developments often do not bring a car.
 5. J. Appel asks about traffic in regard to Lower Newton and the 3-way stop and stoplight at the top of the street which already gets congested. D. Read states that they altered the structure of the property to allow for better ADA compliant entrances to the building. J. Appel concerned about the traffic both with cars and pedestrians. Since it is her first meeting, J. Appel is unsure if this concern should be addressed elsewhere. R. Pfeiffer believes that is better served in the Site Review plan. This is just a conditional review.
 6. R. Pfeiffer summarizes the site plan review requirements and what those entail. R. Pfeiffer shares that typically cases are reviewed and closed in the same meeting, but for

larger plans it is not uncommon for the board to request a second meeting or more. The representatives for this case are accepting of that potential.

7. R. Pfeiffer asks about the multiple dwelling overlay district and parking. D. Read shares that they have a one-way entrance into the sight (which isn't fully visible in the visual shared) right off Lower Newton and the parking will all be connected. S. Beall states that D. Read's design is great in that the west side of the property can be fairly flexible in design. D. Read shares that given the previous use for the lot being industrial, they have focused on creating a nice buffer/fencing with a mix of hardwoods and softwoods. D. Read also states that senior housing tends to be quieter.
8. R. Pfeiffer shares that this case does not need to be closed in order to open the next case, but if the board would like to, they can. Hearing no concern with that, the board moves to the second case 2023-015. S. Bennett reads the highlighted portions of the staff report as well as the Design Advisory Board's favorable recommendation.
9. T. McCuin asks C. Sawyer if the City has any plans for traffic. C. Sawyer states that the plan is to have a stoplight (at Federal street) installed with a pedestrian phase and includes an update to the stoplight at Lower Newton and Main Street. The City plans to issue Cathedral Square the requisite easement to access Lower Newton or the new city street for two-way traffic. J. Appel happy to hear about the planned update to the stoplight at Lower Newton and Main Street and asks if that will be done before the project is finished. C. Sawyer shares that is the plan and the DRB can ensure that happens.
10. T. McCuin asks C. Sawyer where the new proposed road will be. C. Sawyer shares it will be a cul-de-sac and entrance and exit will be the same. The initial thought of doing a full road through the site was not permitted.
11. R. Pfeiffer moves to the site review presentation. D. Read shares the proposed development is a 3-story building with the first floor being primarily parking and other operational needs. Gathering/seating at the north side of the building. Smoking shelter at the bottom of the hill which is at the north of the building (standard for all Cathedral Square site plans). Trash is under the building at the lowest level. There is substantial landscaping to help with screening to neighboring residences. In addition, there are many ADA accessible paths to ensure proper travel for residents.
12. S. Beall shows the photometry of the site plan which complies with lighting regulations. The open parking garage allows them to not ventilate, since there will be open air flow, which helps to reduce costs. S. Beall shares the various aspects of the site plan: landscaping, community spaces, mailroom, bike storage, office space, trash, planters for residents to do some gardening, etc. The rooftop equipment of ventilation units will hopefully go away if the geo-thermal route come in on budget. R. Pfeiffer asks about the screening. S. Beall shares the screening has to be raised to prevent snow buildup and the units have to be on stands for weather purposes as well, but the actual visual of the units will be screened in.
13. D. Read shares that the purpose behind the one-way entrance is mainly for pick up and drop off. Getting to the entrance from the southwest corner of the site made the most sense, with the design allowing for the passenger side of vehicles to be where the entrance to the building is. S. Beal reflects that it is likely also beneficial for emergency vehicles gaining quick access into the building without 2-way traffic being there.
14. R. Pfeiffer asks about the easement for the adjacent property to Cathedral Square. S. Beall refers to C. Sawyer in regard to an office easement. C. Sawyer states that has not yet been written up. That will be addressed in the building phase.
15. S. Beall asks if the board would like to see the materials. S. Beall shares those materials and colors. E. Burion asks how they will construct/address seams in the case that the 16" siding doesn't exactly fit the area. S. Beall states they would have to introduce an additional material to make up that gap in the case the 16" siding doesn't fit exactly.

16. R. Pfeiffer asks about snow storage. D. Read shares that there are a couple landscape/green belt areas where snow storage can be. She also asks about permit distinction, D. Read shares there is already drainage in place and by doing a cutoff storm system within their site (since they are high enough) they can get to the existing system fairly easily which will likely improve on the amount of waste.
17. E. Burion asks for clarification on the one-way entrance and the exit location. D. Read and S. Beal clarify that for her.
18. D. Thayer reflects that the proposed stoplight at Federal Street could help with traffic flow if they are synced up. T. McCuin wonders what is the sense of who is responsible for those traffic concerns and likely the reason why the board would like to do a continuation on the case.
19. S. Beall asks for more clarification on what is being requested since this is meant to be an affordable housing site and the potential of a traffic study increases costs. R. Pfeiffer shares that the board is not requesting a traffic study, just a potential narrative on their historical knowledge from previous projects. R. Pfeiffer understands and isn't requested them to do a traffic study, but to utilize their existing knowledge to provide some potential information around traffic (both car and pedestrian) changes from these types of developments. R. Pfeiffer is also thinking about continuing both cases to allow the board time to digest what was heard in this meeting and to look over materials and ask any final questions at the continuation hearing.
20. D. Thayer motions to continue the two cases to November 6th, 2023 at 6:30 pm. T. McCuin seconds. Motion passes with all in favor

3. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Planning & Development update.
 1. S. Bennett no update.
 2. Enforcement update.
 1. S. Bennet no update.
 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes.
 1. R. Pfeiffer mentions that Matthew was listed as a board member who was absent. He is no longer on the board, so that should be removed.
 2. T. McCuin motions to table approval until the next meeting. R. Pfeiffer seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.
 4. Confirm next meeting date and time. - Monday, November 6th, 2023.
 5. Other.
4. PUBLIC COMMENT - None
5. ENTER DELIBERATIVE SESSION
1. T. McCuin motions that we wrap up and end public meeting at 9:08 PM. E. Burion seconds. Motion passes with all in favor.