

**MEETING MINUTES
ST. ALBANS CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
ST. ALBANS CITY HALL, 100 NORTH MAIN STREET
5:30 PM MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2021**

Approved September 20, 2021

Board Members Present: Denise Smith, Chair; Stan Bradeen, Vice-Chair; Luke Richter, Alternate; Zac Nuse; Amy Paradis; Lauren Dees-Erickson, Alternate.

Board Members Absent: Michael Gawne.

Staff Members Present: Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning Development and Minute Taker

Public Present: Brandy Saxton and Max Villanueva, consultants.

1. **Open Meeting. Chair D.Smith opened the meeting at 5:35 PM.**
 - a. Introduction of attendees – Introductions were made.
 - b. Public Comment on issues not on agenda – None.
 - c. Discuss additions or deletions to agenda – None.

2. Approval of Minutes.

Motion by A.Paradis to approve the minutes of June 21, 2021, as presented. Second by D.Smith and Approved with all in favor, except for abstentions by S.Bradeen, L.Richter, and Z.Nuse.

Motion by S.Bradeen to approve the minutes of July 19, 2021, as presented. Second by L.Richter and Approved with all in favor.

3. Update on Residential Data Tool project.

B.Saxton and M.Villanueva presented the neighborhood “blocks,” as currently delineated by the Residential Data Tool project, and some summary statistics, based on 80th percentiles for dwelling units, density, etc.

The consultants also demonstrated the current iteration of the GIS tool which, allows the user to set different dimensional standards for zoning districts, sub-districts and blocks and see what the effects are on conformity.

PC members showed general interest in seeing the density median cut-offs calculated at the City’s density limits, e.g. 5,000 sqft per multi-family unit and 12,000 sqft per duplex.

C.Sawyer will send stormwater utility impervious data to Brandy and Max.

There was some discussion about how the data could help property owners understand that changes to zoning may not change their neighborhoods, if it makes lots generally

more conforming. Also, there were some reservations expressed by PC members about turning grandfathered multi-family uses into conforming uses with proposed regulatory changes.

The next substantial presentation by the consultants would be in October. Then there should be a discussion about whether and how there is a public presentation.

S.Bradeen expressed interest in finessing some of the blocks, especially for across-the-street differences.

Z.Nuse wanted to make sure that the PC would know when the last chance is to talk with the consultants.

4. Regulatory proposals.

- a. Continue discussion on 12 North Elm zoning district / planned unit development.

C.Sawyer summarized the current situation with 12 No. Elm as well as the City's existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulations.

A change to the Zoning District to the property that allows multi-family at 5,000 sq.ft. in lot size per unit would allow the property owners to build 8 more units on the property. However, past efforts to change the zoning district in that area were met with neighborhood opposition, and the PC did not want to just change the zone for 12 No. Elm alone.

The PC discussed past efforts, possibilities of extending High-Density Residential or Residential-Professional zoning to the lot, and the importance of changing the names of the residential districts. There were no strong feelings expressed on "spot-zoning" 12 No. Elm or attempting a change that is larger in scope.

Changes to the PUD rules could also allow the 8 units at 12 No. Elm. Plus it could fix other issues with the current PUD rules.

C.Sawyer summarized some comments and proposed suggestions for the PUD rules.

S.Bradeen suggested thinking about what the City's goals for PUDs should be and reframing the rules based on those goals.

C.Sawyer suggested that perhaps PUDs could be used for large, unique lots like 12 No. Elm, which already have large buildings on them and/or are in transitional areas between districts.

D.Smith clarified that any PUD would still have to go before the DRB, even if the PC changes the rules to allow more development.

There was conversation about whether design review standards should be added to the PUD. Especially for consistency with the neighborhood.

PC members generally agreed with setting a “floor” size for lots that are eligible for PUDs, but also wanted to see if it should be larger than C.Sawyer’s proposal of 20,000 sq.ft.

S.Bradeen stated that he would like to see a % limit on how much of a waiver the DRB can allow for dimensional standards.

Z.Nuse stated a level of discomfort with the amount of discretionary lee-way that the DRB is given to grant waivers or other conditions in the PUD rules.

There was general discussion among PC members that rules should be written clearly, but that the DRB should also be given the ability to respond to concerns and input raised during application hearings.

L.Dees-Erickson mentioned that the amount of discretion granted to the DRB in the PUD rules should match the level of discretion they are granted in other sections of the Regulations.

S.Bradeen suggested that perhaps the City’s PUD rules should be re-written entirely.

- b. Design Review and other aspects of Residential-Professional proposal.

There was not enough time to discuss this proposal. PC members asked that this be put at the top of the agenda for next month and that C.Sawyer consider combining everything into one proposal packet.

- c. Other – There was none.

5. General Business.

- a. Planning & Development update - None.
- b. Next Planning Commission priorities check-in - None.
- c. Review next meeting date and format - No changes to meeting schedule and format were discussed.
- d. Other – C.Sawyer mentioned that a local resident had requested that the PC put climate change resilience planning on its agenda.

6. Adjourn.

Motion by Z.Nuse to Adjourn. Second by S.Bradeen and Approved with all in favor at 7:37 PM.