



CITY OF RUTLAND, VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ZONING

City Hall – 52 Washington St. – Rutland, VT 05701
Mailing Address: P. O. Box 969 – Rutland, VT 05702
Phone: 802-773-1800 X8 Website: rutlandcity.org

CITY OF RUTLAND VT REC'D FOR RECORDING
DATE 5-1-26 TIME 8:45 AM
BOOK 155 PAGE 1040-1044
[Signature] ASST. CLERK
10+7

April 29, 2026

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Findings and Decision

Applicant: Cornerstone Housing Partners LLC
27 Wales St, Suite 201
Rutland, VT 0571

Landowner: Roman Catholic Diocese
55 Joy Drive
South Burlington, VT 05403

Hearing Date: March 18, 2026

Property Address: 59 Meadow St, Rutland, VT 05701 (ID # 540-170-20041)

Zoning District: Park District (P)

Application Type: Conditional Use Review (Unlisted Use)

Decision: Approved with conditions (see Part III)

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The submitted application concerns the request to convert a portion of a former Residential Healthcare Facility (Loretto Home) into a 16-Unit, Multi-Unit Dwelling. “Multi-Unit Dwelling” is not a listed use within the Park District (P); however, it is a listed use within the abutting zoning district, the Mixed Residential District (MR-1). In accordance with §31-414 Unlisted Use, uses that are not listed, but substantially similar in nature and impact to a use permitted within the immediate neighborhood may be reviewed by the DRB as a Conditional Use. The review of the submitted application is subject to the criteria under §31-208, §31-210, and Article IV of the Rutland City *Land Development Regulations*.

The Staff Report concerning this application and its attachments, as well as all other application-related documents, are available for public review in the 59 Meadow Street Conditional Use Review file in the City of Rutland’s Department of Planning & Zoning office.

II. FACTUAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 4464, the DRB finds that all Public Notice Requirements have been satisfied for the subject hearing. Please refer to the DRB’s Meeting Minutes of March 18, 2026, for an

overview of the testimony provided, as well as a record of attendance for the subject hearing. The meeting was also recorded and is available by contacting the City of Rutland, Department of Planning & Zoning or visiting the city's website.

Based on the submitted application, testimony, materials and evidence, the DRB makes the following findings under the requirements of the City of Rutland *Land Development Regulations*, as adopted November 17, 2025.

§ 31-203 – EXEMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The Board finds that the Emergency Shelter portion of the project, referenced in the applicant's project narrative, is submitted on a separate zoning permit application. The Board finds that the separate application is subject to limitations in accordance with 24 V.S.A. §4413 and is not subject to DRB review.

§ 31-208 - CONDITIONAL USES (SUBSECTION A)

The capacity of existing or planned community facilities

The Board finds that the proposed multi-unit dwelling will not have an adverse impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities.

The Board finds that the proposed water connection, as well as water usage shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to occupancy.

The character of the area affected, as defined by the purpose or purposes of the zoning district within which the project is located, and specifically stated in the municipal plan.

The property is located in the Park District. The project has been brought before the Board as a conditional use under §31-414 Unlisted Use. The Board finds that the project shall be reviewed against the purpose statement of the Mixed Residential -1 (MR-1) district within the municipal plan.

The Board finds that this neighborhood contains a mix of single-unit, multi-unit, and low-impact commercial development. The Board finds that the property has historically existed as a part of the St. Peter's-Mount St. Joseph Complex (as noted on the National Register of Historic Places). The Board finds that the entirety of the historic complex (excluding the subject property) is located within the MR-1 district in the immediate neighborhood. The Board finds that no external modifications to the existing structure are proposed and that the proposed project will not adversely impact the character of the area.

Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity

The proposed use is anticipated to have 5-6 vehicles on site. The Board finds that the proposed use will not have an adverse impact on traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.

Bylaws then in effect

See analysis under Article IV – General Regulations.

Utilization of renewable energy resources.

The Board finds that proposed multi-unit dwelling will not have an adverse impact on the potential to utilize renewable energy resources.

The DRB finds the criterion under §31-208 satisfied.

§ 31-210 - SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND REVIEW (SUBSECTION B)

Access, circulation, parking, and connection to adjoining properties and transportation facilities (existing and proposed)

The existing building is served by a parking area towards the west of the structure. The Board finds that existing parking location, access point, and historical circulation pattern will be utilized. The Board finds that an existing Bus Stop is across the street from the property. The Board finds that additional connections to adjoining properties and transportation facilities are unlikely. The Board finds that the project is not likely to result in adverse impact to access, circulation and parking.

Landscaping, screening, and exterior lighting

The property currently contains landscaping throughout. The Board finds that the existing landscaping on the property is sufficient. No additional landscaping, screening, or exterior lighting is proposed.

The utilization of renewable energy resources and energy conservation

The Board finds that the proposed multi-unit dwelling will not impact the potential to utilize renewable energy resources on the site. The Board finds the proposed renovations will positively impact energy conservation by increasing the energy efficiency of the building.

Aesthetic relationship between proposed uses and existing surrounding uses

The Board finds that no external modifications to the existing structure at 59 Meadow Street are proposed. The relationship between the proposed use and existing surrounding uses will likely remain unchanged.

Drainage, stormwater management, protection of soils, wetlands and streams

The Board finds that the proposed project involves minimal site work that would result in an adverse impact on drainage, stormwater management, protection of soils, wetlands and streams.

Protection of agriculture and forestry resources

The Board finds that the proposed project utilizes an existing structure and municipal infrastructure, contributing to the protection of agriculture and forestry resources.

Preservation of historic sites and natural areas

The Board finds that the property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Board finds that exterior modifications are not proposed, and the project will result in preserving a historic site. The Board finds that project will not have an adverse impact on natural areas.

Public and private utility services.

The Board finds that the proposed project will utilize existing infrastructure and does not anticipate an adverse impact on public and private utility services.

Education and government services

The Board finds that the proposed project is unlikely to have an adverse impact on education and government services.

The DRB finds the criterion under §31-210 satisfied.

ARTICLE IV – GENERAL REGULATIONS

§31-404 NON-CONFORMITIES

The Board finds that the subject structure is nonconforming in height while being reviewed under the Park (P) and Mixed Residential – 1 (MR-1) District’s dimensional standards. The Board finds that the front setback of the structure is nonconforming when reviewed under the Park (P) District’s dimensional standards. The Board finds that the building is not proposed to be expanded. The Board finds that the structure predates zoning and is considered preexisting nonconforming.

§31-408 BUFFERING

The Board finds that there is natural buffering along portions of the north, south, and western property lines. The Board finds that the installation of additional buffering is not required.

§31-409 SETBACK RELIEF

The Board finds that the building is not proposed to be expanded; therefore, this section is not applicable. See §31-404 non-conformities for additional analysis.

§ 31-414 – UNLISTED USE

The Board finds that the property is located in the Park District (P). The Board finds that the properties across the street, and the surrounding neighborhood are located in the Mixed Residential District (MR-1). The Board finds that multi-unit dwellings are not listed as a use in the Park District (P). The Board finds that multi-unit dwellings are listed as a use in the Mixed Residential – 1 District. The Board finds that the proposed use at 59 Meadow Street is substantially similar in nature and impacted to a use permitted in the immediate neighborhood; therefore, this use may be reviewed as a conditional use.

§31-415 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The Board finds that the proposed use is unlikely to result in nuisance or undue adverse effect with respect to:

- Exterior lighting
- Vibration
- Dust, fumes, vapors, gases and odors.
- Erosion
- Stormwater Run-Off
- Contaminants.
- Refuse Disposal
- Explosive Flammable Materials

The DRB finds the criterion under Article IV – General Regulations satisfied.

APPENDIX C – FLOOD HAZARD AREA AND RIVER CORRIDORS

The DRB finds that the property contains a 100-Yr Floodplain towards the western and northern portions of the property. The Board finds that the floodplain is not located within the project’s vicinity and review under this section is not applicable.

III. DECISION AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Based upon the findings above, and subject to the conditions below, the Development Review Board grants approval (4 members in favor, 0 members opposed, and 1 abstention (Jim Pell)) of the submitted application, as presented in the application and at the hearing with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant/Landowner shall complete the project in accordance with this decision and conditions of approval and as presented in the submitted application and during Conditional Use public hearing on March 18, 2026.
2. The Applicant/Landowner must obtain all required state permits and licenses prior to occupancy.
3. The proposed water connection and water/sewer usage shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to occupancy.

4. Existing landscaping shall be maintained over time as needed to maintain the health of plants.
5. Any dumpster or waste receptacle shall be placed in an unobtrusive location and screened from the public right away, as indicated on the submitted plans.
6. Any future lighting installed shall be downcast, fully shielded, and dark sky compliant to minimize visual glare to adjacent properties.
7. Any expansion of parking area, other than the parking area shown on the submitted plans, shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Department for determination of eligibility for administrative review and/or amendment.
8. Any evidence presented by the Applicant in the form of testimony as listed in the findings or depicted in materials submitted and not modified by these conditions or enumerated in these conditions, are a part of the approval even though not specifically set forth in the conditions.
9. The DRB authorizes the Zoning Administrator to approve minor alterations or modifications to the submitted and approved application so long as the proposed changes are consistent with this decision and conditions herein. Should the Zoning Administrator find that a proposed change is significant, that modification shall be presented to the DRB for further approval.

Dated at Rutland, Vermont this 21st Day of April 2026.



Michael McClallen, Chair, Development Review Board

NOTICE: This decision may be appealed to the Vermont Environmental Court by an interested person who participated in the proceeding(s) before the Development Review Board. Such appeal must be taken within 30 days of the date of this decision, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. 4471 and Rule 5(b) of the Vermont Rules for Environmental Court Proceedings.