

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**ST. ALBANS CITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET, ST. ALBANS, VT**  
**6:30 PM MONDAY, JULY 6, 2020**  
**Via REMOTE TELECONFERENCE**

***APPROVED***

**Board Members:** Denis LaPointe; Owen Manahan, Vice-Chair; Rebecca Pfeiffer, Chair; Dick Thayer, Tanner McCuin

**Staff Members Present:** David Southwick, Planning & Permitting Administrator; Tammi DiFranco, Property Services Assistant, taking Minutes; Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning and Development

**Public Present:** Grant Butterfield, Jeremy Marrier, Jeager Nedde, Chris Snyder, Amy Demetrowitz, Kirsten Shapiro

- A. OPEN MEETING R.Pfeiffer opened the meeting at 6:30 PM
1. Pledge of Allegiance – The Pledge was recited
  2. Consider any additions or deletions to agenda –
    - i. **O.Manhan moved to automatically recess the meeting to July 20, 2020 at 6:30 pm if there are any technical difficulties or the meeting is interrupted. Second by D.Thayer and approved with all in favor.**

B. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SEGMENT – PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Case #2020-007 / Champlain Housing Trust / 20 Congress Street / Parcel #11022020 Continuation** Applicant seeks an amendment to a design element in DRB Case #2018-018. This property is located in the Business 1 (B1) Zoning District, The Traditional Downtown (DR-1) Review District, and the St Albans Historic District.

D.Southwick introduced the application and submitted the staff report for the record (*including the recommendation from the Design Advisory Board*).

R.Pfeiffer invited the applicants to come forward and swore in those wishing to submit testimony. Applicants present are Chris Snyder, Amy Demetrowitz, and Kirsten Shapiro.

C.Snyder started by thanking everyone for their time and efforts on this project.

A.Demetrowitz thanked the board for their patience as they have been looking at materials. She thinks that the presented Cemfort Siding is going to be able to hold up over the years and will maintain the warm wood look that was approved. The one change they are asking for is to have the back, which is the west side, of the building the same painted siding all the way down to the garage in order to save costs.

T.McCuin asked if there are any case studies of this material where it has been used elsewhere. D.Southwick stated that there are not. C.Snyder stated that they have not been able to source any local examples. The material is like Hardie board with a photo on top of the concrete.

T.McCuin asked if the back, where it will remain the cement board only, will only be seen from the parking lot. D.Southwick confirmed that the back faces other buildings only and cannot be seen from the street, only the parking lot.

D.LaPointe asked what the guarantee is on the material if it starts to fall apart. C.Snyder stated that he was not sure, but that he will look into it and pass the information to the board. Typically hardie board that has been painted has a 15 year guarantee and he is assuming that this would be the same. D.LaPointe asked if the seller could give information on previous projects that have used the product and information on how long the technology has been around. T.McCuin requested that the applicant get some more information about the product. R.Pfeiffer asked if T.McCuin was asking for a continuation. T.McCuin stated no, that he just wanted to have more information. K.Shapiro posted a link to the warranty information in the Zoom chat function.

O.Manahan asked if the material is replaceable in segments. C.Snyder answered that it can be replaced on a piece by piece manner.

R.Pfeiffer asked for public comment.

C.Sawyer wanted to follow up on the discussion about the warranty on the product being presented. It is not something that the board or city makes an issue when approving material. In a Design Review District, if the property falls out of the original design and aesthetic due to weathering or lack of maintenance, then the city can come and say that they need to do what it takes to restore the material to the way it is supposed to look as presented when approval was received.

A.Demetrowitz wanted to ensure that they want the building to be a really handsome and good looking building. They will be maintaining the building to hold up those standards.

**With no further comments, R.Pfeiffer closed the hearing.**

2. **Case #2020-008 / Grant Butterfield / 10 Maiden Lane / Parcel # 14056010** Applicant seeks approval an increase in the maximum height of a structure and the addition of rooftop terrace. This property is located in the Business 1 (B1) Zoning District, The Traditional Downtown (DR-1) Review District, and the St Albans Historic District.

R.Pfeiffer invited the applicants to come forward and swore in those wishing to submit testimony. The applicant present is Grant Butterfield.

D.Southwick introduced the application and submitted the staff report for the record (*including the recommendation from the Design Advisory Board*).

R.Pfeiffer stated that the drawings that the board is considering are A-1 through A-5 plus the roof top sketch. D.LaPointe asked if the visible structure of the elevator shaft is to be risen. D.Southwick stated that the applicant was planning to discuss the elevator shaft.

G.Butterfield stated that he had presented raising the height of the elevator shaft to the DAB. Since that meeting, he has obtained the estimated budget for that part of the project. The increase in the budget is exorbitant, so he has decided to leave it as previously approved. He is now just asking for approval for a private roof top terrace. There are only stairs coming up to the terrace, which is limited to 473 square feet in size.

O.Manahan asked if the only stairs are from near the hot tub in the sketch. G.Butterfield confirmed that as the location of the stairs. O.Manahan asked for confirmation that the elevation from the elevator is no longer relevant. G.Butterfield confirmed that he is no longer asking for a height waiver for the elevator. He is only looking for approval of the roof top terrace; everything else is to remain the same as previously approved. R.Pfeiffer asked if the stairway height is the same as previously approved. G.Butterfield stated that it will increase in height to within 4 feet of the maximum, but it is still under the maximum height allowance.

R.Pfeiffer stated that it would be accessible only by stairs to a limited number of residents. G.Butterfield confirmed her statement.

R.Pfeiffer asked for public comment.

C.Sawyer stated that from the city administration stand point, bringing the 63 in total housing units to downtown is a real coup. It is also great that it is the full mix of housing needs that were identified in the 2015 housing study: subsidized, work force housing, and market rate housing. To have all this in the two buildings is a big deal. The city supports the idea of knowing the market and the amenities that might be wanted at the higher end that the developer has proposed something that might make the whole enterprise more successful for all the types of units that are going to be offered.

R.Pfeiffer stated that the DAB had already given approval to the previous design, which is not being presented. She asked if this would need to go back to the DAB before DRB approval. D.Southwick clarified that the case was closed by the DAB. They approved the concept of the roof top terrace. Their request is for the applicant to come back later with the final design and details. R.Pfeiffer stated that since the DAB has seen everything being presented that the DRB should be able to move ahead.

G.Butterfield explained the size of the rooftop terrace. It is allowed to be 473 square feet which does not include anything affixed to the roof, like the hot tub and seating. There was also a time when they were discussing the correct railing system for the roof. They are planning on a glass railing that will match the rest of the building.

**With no further comments, R.Pfeiffer continued the hearing to July 20, 2020 at 6:30 pm.**

3. **Case #2020-009 / BNY, LLC / 6-16 North Main Street / Parcel # 23063006** Applicant seeks approval for a Conditional Use. This property is located in the Business 1 (B1) Zoning District, The Traditional Downtown (DR-1) Review District, and the St Albans Historic District.

R.Pfeiffer invited the applicants to come forward and swore in those wishing to submit testimony. Applicants present are Jeremy Marrier and Jeager Nedde.

D.Southwick introduced the application and submitted the staff report for the record.

D.LaPointe asked staff to clarify what the lot size is. It says 3,970 square feet, but he was not sure if that was just the building. D.Southwick stated that the lot size also includes the parking lot. D.LaPointe asked what the building square footage is. D.Southwick stated that the lot size is .1035 acres, which is 4,508 square feet. R.Pfeiffer stated that the building size will be the floor plan presented times four for the four floors. D.LaPointe stated that the 4,508 is really what they should be looking at for how many units they can fit into it without approval. D.Southwick stated that it will be denser than what is allowed with just a permit. Once the unit density exceeds the permitted use, it becomes a conditional use. D.LaPointe asked for confirmation that what they were looking at is 4 new units in the existing space. D.Southwick confirmed.

O.Manahan asked for a brief explanation of the current use of the building. D.Southwick stated that the first and second floor are commercial; the first floor is retail and the second floor is for office space. The third and fourth floor are currently zoned for multifamily units. The proposal is to convert the office space of the second floor to additional residential. O.Manahan asked how many apartments are on the third and fourth floors. D.Southwick deferred the question to the applicants.

J.Nedde stated that there are eight units already on the third and fourth floors. The proposal for the second floor is almost the same floor plan with a few minor changes to fit it to the space. O.Manahan asked if the bedroom count will be the same. J.Nedde stated yes: there are two 2-bedroom apartments, one single bedroom apartment, one studio apartment.

R.Pfeiffer pointed out that the sketch is labeled as the third floor. J.Nedde confirmed that it is the exact same foot print and that it is mislabeled. It should state that it is the second floor.

J.Nedde and J.Marrier both stated that there were unsuccessful at leasing the office space. They are looking to fill up the space and think it will be more successful as residential apartments.

R.Pfeiffer asked for public comment. There was none.

D.LaPointe asked for clarification that what is being presented is the same that is already present on the third and fourth floor; there will be four units. J.Nedde stated yes.

**With no further comments, R.Pfeiffer continued the hearing to July 20, 2020 at 6:30 pm.**

### C. OTHER BUSINESS

#### 1. Planning & Development update

- i. Permits are down a little bit from last June, but we have been busy. No indication of a return to the office soon. Tammi is in the office Monday-Friday from 9am-1pm. There has also been some new legislation that was introduced that could be interesting.

#### 2. Enforcement update

- i. 239 North Main Street has started construction on their housing project. There have been complaints from the neighbors about a hedge and some conditions. D.Southwick has drafted up a letter to the Parents (owners of 239 N Main) reminding them of the conditions and their obligations.
- ii. Beverage Mart will be coming in hopefully sometime in the near future to present a new snow removal plan that includes their new property purchases at 7 & 9 Spruce Street. They have also begun removing the garages without a permit. The owner is planning on removing the homes after Hoss's Snack Bar is closed for the season.

#### 3. Approval of June 1, 2020 Meeting Minutes – D&V

**Motion by D.LaPointe to approve the minutes of June 1, 2020 as presented. Second by D.Thayer and approved with all in favor.**

#### 4. Confirm next meeting date and time. **Monday, July 20, 2020 6:30 PM**

#### 5. Other

- i. Discussion on why the board is currently recessing every case. R.Pfeiffer reminded everyone that it is something they are doing at the advisement of the state since everything is currently remote. It gives individuals a chance to have their voice heard if they have some sort of technology problem at the time of the meeting. D.LaPoint asked if there was any reason why they could not deliberate on the cases and make a decision, then go back to add any additional information later if there is any. O.Manahan suggested that they could deliberate and make a decision but not issue the decision until after the continuation and the possibility of new information.

### D. PUBLIC COMMENT- None

### E. ENTER DELIBERATIVE SESSION – D&V

**Motion by O.Manahan to move into Deliberative Session. Second by D.LaPointe and approved with all in favor at 7:45 PM.**