

Charlotte East & West Villages Report

Remaining comments from Steering Committee / PC – CCRPC responses highlighted

Bill's comments

- Strike from page 3. No evidence to support this. And the “proportion” statement is wrong, too
 - *Denser village development [may] help reduce development pressure on the more rural and open portions of Charlotte, which have received a significant amount of development over the last several decades.*
 - **Open to striking this but would like to discuss, particularly the second half of the sentence. *EDIT COMPLETE 2/13/25 by adding track changes language from above.***
- Strike on page 3. This is not possible:
 - *A gravel path or expanded shoulder along Spear Street would connect from Sheehan Green to the Our Lady of Mount Carmel Catholic Church; scoping or other further study of this project would help determine feasibility.*
 - **Can we discuss why before striking? If it is possible and desired by the community, it's still worth including in case challenges can be overcome. *EDIT COMPLETE 2/13/25 by adding track changes language from above.***
- Add statement on page 5, after third paragraph:
 - *"However, it is important to note that the Village acreage constitutes only approximately 2% of Charlotte's land area, and 29 housing units out of a total of 452 total units is 6.5%, which means percentagewise more housing units were actually built in our Villages during that time"*
 - *Delete paragraphs 3 and 4 except last sentence. “Increasing flexibility for property owners within the villages...” Rewrite last sentence, then put it in paragraph 5.*
 - **This may be mathematically true, but this still indicates significant growth in Charlotte’s rural area. The proposed statement seems to miss the larger point that the Town plan calls for concentrating development in the Villages and limiting development outside them. Seems like the issue at hand is the proportion of growth in each that is desired. *EDIT COMPLETE 2/13/25 by adding track changes language from above.***
- Strike this paragraph from page 5, as it also then makes no sense, because the trend actually shows a higher percentage in our Villages based upon land area.
 - *Charlotte's existing Land Use Regulations will likely to continue to promote this existing trend, further fragmenting the rural lands of Charlotte. If the trend*

continues it will mean 200-300 new housing units in Charlotte's rural areas over the next 20-30 years. At the moment, the zoning regulations mean that Charlotte village areas are unable to grow in any substantial way due to the existing Land Use Regulations, regardless of any water or wastewater regulations.

- See comment above – let's discuss. **Addressed with the edit (deletion) described above.**
- Page 6. I don't think this paragraph statement below is entirely accurate. Just what is a "contact"? I believe it is overstating participation. Consider editing it down. The "15" also does not match the "14" stated later.
 - *This section summarizes ideas gleaned from over 500 resident contacts, including two town-wide surveys, 15 "listening sessions," two design workshops, and several Planning Commission discussions The engagement was above and beyond the intended scope of this project and started the conversations for the 2026 Town Plan update.*
 - Let's discuss. The term "contact" is an attempt to be transparent about participation, indicating that we made contact over 500 times but some of those may have been the same resident in multiple avenues.
 - And yes, let's fix the number of listening sessions to 15. Here's the breakdown:
 - 10 groups on 1/11/24: Grange, Library, Senior Center, PTO Board, Sustainable Charlotte, Central School staff, Charlotte Land Trust, Lewis Creek Association, Food Shelf, and Business Owners
 - Charlotte Children's Center 1/26/24
 - Charlotte Congregational Church 1/29/24
 - Boards and Commissions 2/14/24
 - 2 Village resident sessions (East & West), both on 4/11/24
- And this on page 10, as well. I'd edit this down substantially:
 - *From January through April, the project Steering Committee reached hundreds of Charlotters through a variety of methods. More than 85 residents participated in 15 listening sessions held in various venues across town. Another 68 participants joined two design workshops, one in-person and the other virtual (online). There were 300 responses to two online surveys. In addition, the Charlotte Planning & Zoning Office provided five project updates to a mailing list of over 97 residents in February, May (2), and August. The Charlotte News also published articles on January 18, February 22, May 2, May 31, and August 8, 2024. Project posters and information were placed at*

the East Charlotte Store, Old Brick Store, Senior Center, Library, and Town Hall.

- **Why does this need to be edited down? We felt it was important to document the various methods and results of participation considering the level of scrutiny this project received. 2/13/25 - Edited this section to remove dates, condense the summary, and make reference to the Appendix for further information.**
- Strike or modify on page 10. I do not think this is true. “Strongly”? This is NOT what I heard from residents. Perhaps try this instead “Most residents seem to support some housing growth”, but I heard loud and clear the desire for more stores, services, and amenities.
 - *Most residents strongly support enabling more housing*
 - **This makes sense. Taking both your suggestions, let’s edit this to “Most residents seem to support some housing growth, but there is a clear desire for more stores, services, and amenities.” 2/13/25 -Deleted “strong” from descriptions of housing preferences. Updated other section per recommendation above.**
- Add on page 10, 11th paragraph, please:
 - *"East Charlotte Village residents particularly mentioned that they see little difference between their Village and the Rural District development pattern, and didn’t think of the area as a village or know its boundaries."*
 - **Happy to try and add something to this effect, but there may not be space on the page for this exact wording. Addressed with the edit described above.**
- Add two bullet points on page 12 (at the end):
 - *"Many residents stressed they liked the area as it is." and "The impact of development on wildlife was a major concern."*
 - **Will add this 2/13/25 - added**
- Add sentence on page 22:
 - *"It is important to note, though, that Charlotte's Village areas are only 2% of total land acreage in Town, which can explain much of this. Plus, many residents actually want to live in a rural location." "Living in rural locations is one of the things that is desirable to some residents."*
 - **Definitely worth mentioning these factors in the development history context. 2/13/25 - Done**
- Strike on page 23. This is misleading and irrelevant:
 - *Charlotte currently has over 30% of its land conserved, well ahead of the State's goal of 30% of all land in Vermont to be conserved by 2030.*

- Fine to strike this, but curious why you think it's misleading. Also, we added it because Maggie specifically asked to include something about Act 59 / Act 171.
- **Struck reference to Charlotte's specific % of land conserved and its link to the state goal, and added a clause that "Charlotte has taken many steps toward conservation and will continue to do so."**
- Darren's suggestion: Keep mention of state goal to be responsive to Maggie's request. Take out reference about whether Charlotte has met state goal. Convey that Charlotte has done some work, and will continue to do so. This would not include anything about what Charlotte has done from a numeric perspective.
 - Strike "Charlotte currently has over 30% of land conserved."
- Strike on page 30. This statement has no evidence to support it...there are many reasons why our rural areas are growing. It implies cause and effect. Plus, the footnoted link does not work:
 - *pushing new homes to be built in other areas of town. 1*
 - Can we perhaps edit this statement to the following: "...the current zoning regulations leave little room for additional growth in Charlotte's Villages, which can be one of several reasons for the development pressure in Charlotte's more rural areas." **2/13/25 - Edit made**
- On page 43 update map of Sheehan Green to show the blue 6-acre parcel is actually part of the open space, as it contains the community's septic mounds.
 - I don't think we have the ability to edit this map since it was generated by D&K. However, we will ask and this will be noted regardless. **CCRPC cannot edit this map. A disclaimer was added acknowledging that there may be errors on the map.**
- Strike this on page 45. for reasons mentioned above. It is a false or misleading cause and effect.
 - *These factors are part of the reason why only 29 new homes have been built in Charlotte's Village zoning districts in the last 30 years, while 452 homes have been built in the remainder of town*
 - Suggested edit noted in track changes above **2/13/25 - edit above complete.**
- On page 71 the proposed bike lanes and pedestrian paths are simply not feasible without major road widening and reconstruction, and significant stormwater infrastructure being built...there's area major drop-off at the edge of the roads.
 - Let's discuss. The goal of the planning report is to communicate desired changes, so we'd like to keep this here even if it's later determined not to be

feasible. 2/13/25 - Added a note that feasibility would need to be determined.

Maggie's comments (from September)

- P. 2: **Local Partners and Leaders:** Could we list everyone's names, including D&K and CCRPC representatives? I feel a little anxious including names without roles. Could we clarify responsibilities, powers, etc. of these local partners and leaders – both in this document and internally? I'm still unclear about how everyone's input shapes decision-making processes. Should the Steering Committee vote on anything?
 - Steering Committee members (including staff) are listed with role in the latest version on p.4. Happy to discuss role of SC. **Addressed in edits.**
- P. 4: **Public Engagement:** On page 6, the report notes that "it is community feedback that drives this project". Could we clarify the role of public input and feedback in this project? What does it mean to be a collaborative, community-led planning and design project? What is the [step on Sherry Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation](#)? What are the next steps for public feedback and input moving forward? I think it's important to include how people can still get involved with commenting on this draft report and throughout the bylaw drafting process.
 - Let's discuss - some of this has been addressed in "About the Project" and in the [FAQs](#) posted to the Planning for our Future page. **Addressed through discussion**
- P. 4: **Growth Potential:** I have not yet seen a goal like this. The project website and outreach communicated that it was up to the community to decide what kind of growth, if any, that they wanted. The public framing of this project as a vision for the next 20-30 years also seems new. I think the public outreach process could have included flood and climate resilience. I also wonder if people may have answered questions differently if they were aware of the 20–30-year framing.
 - Let's discuss **Addressed through discussion how challenging it has been to explain and maintain the scope of this project.**
- P. 4: **Public Spaces and Community Building:** Could this connect to Charlotte and this project more specifically?
 - **Addressed in the latest version of the report**

- P. 5: **Background:** This sentence is broad and could suggest that anything is on the table: “In 2023, the state of Vermont awarded a Bylaw Modernization Grant of \$13,400 to Charlotte to fund a comprehensive rewrite of the Land Use Regulations to help bring the Town's permitting rules in line with the policy goals set forth in Charlotte's voter-adopted 2018 Town Plan.” The original project outreach was also broad and asked people for a community vision. Over the course of this project, multiple items have become out of scope. I think this report needs to be clear about what is in or out of scope and why. I’m still unclear myself. If the report does not do this, it could mislead people about what can be accomplished in this project.

- Yes, clarifying scope was a challenge for this project. Let’s discuss.

Discussed and will leave as is.

- P. 5: **Purpose and Need:** Could the report provide data to support that the village areas are unable to grow in any substantial way? How is substantial growth supported by public engagement or the Town Plan? How will this project prevent development in the rural areas over the next 20-30 years without increased rural protections? How will this project directly create affordable and senior housing? How will the new bylaws further incentivize these housing options? Why are the current incentives not working?

- Lots of questions here, each with complex responses. But to summarize, this project was initiated due to the significant growth in Charlotte’s rural areas relative to the Villages, which contradicts the goals of the Town Plan. CCRPC identified significant barriers to Village-style development in the regulations in addition to infrastructure limitations. *Addressed through discussion.*

- P. 5: **Data Gathering and Public Engagement:** This is the first mention of the Steering Committee. To my earlier point for page 2, I think the report needs to provide more details about the Steering Committee (who, what, roles, etc.)

- Steering Committee members (including staff) are listed with role in the latest version on p.4. *Addressed.*

- P. 10-12: **Conserved Land, Wetlands, Wildlife Habitat:** I am glad these natural resource maps acknowledge these valuable resources, but the narratives seem to minimize their importance (e.g., the extent of wetland values). Over a third of Vermont’s wetlands have been lost and they provide critical functions. A Town Plan policy prohibits development in wetlands and their buffers (p. 1-4). As I’ve said before, I don’t think we should weaken our Town’s wetland protections. What is the purpose of this sentence on p. 11: “Such may be the case in and around Charlotte's

Villages” and this sentence on p. 12: "Not all land can be conserved in perpetuity, and Charlotte residents value the ability to make informed choices"?

- These sentences were removed from the latest version. But happy to continue addressing any concerns about wetland regulation. **Addressed – we removed the section that was causing concern.**
- P. 15: **Water and Wastewater:** The report notes: "It is not a question if Charlotte’s villages will need additional water and wastewater capacity to grow, but how much, and where." Should this report recommend a capacity study before new bylaws are adopted given the legitimate concerns and fears of community members with failing or inadequate water or wastewater systems? Could the report mention the HOME Act and how various options increase density requirements to increase public awareness and ensure informed community decision-making?
 - Yes, a capacity study is recommended before making changes to the regulations that would require additional wastewater treatment capacity than currently exists. We didn’t mention the HOME Act’s density minimums in zoning because it’s only relevant if the Town decides to provide public water AND sewer, which seems unlikely at this juncture. **2/13/25 - On page 10, I added a sentence: “A capacity study would help provide additional, needed information.”**
- P. 24: **Visual Preference Survey:** I think the report relies a lot on the visual preference survey results. With a ~5% response rate (~3,800 residents, 184 respondents), the survey might not meet the criteria for representative samples (between 10 and 30%). I feel a little uneasy suggesting densities based on this survey because it didn't include direct questions about what kind of density people would like. I think this underscores the importance of continued public feedback and discussion.
 - Understood that this was not a statistically valid survey, nor was it meant to be. The goal was to generate design ideas that had general acceptance among survey respondents, then bring that to the full community. Ultimately, any policy change goes through the PC and the public hearing / adoption process.
 - The survey did attempt to get feedback on density through the last set of questions. It’s a complex topic and difficult to address adequately in a survey, so this is just one point of feedback. It led us to the conclusion that

Charlotte wants limited total growth, but may be open to more compact (i.e., higher density) within defined limits.

- **P. 28: Public Engagement Themes:** It is great to see Conservation as a theme! For the “need for affordable housing” theme, how does helping landowners make decisions help? Is there any data that supports that the current land use regulations do not support affordable housing? Could the report or other project documents include the buildout maps under current zoning and different proposed zoning scenarios? I thought we had discussed de-emphasizing these maps but still including them for public awareness and information. I think the current buildout map showed that there were a lot of units still possible. I am also curious how different buildout scenarios will impact our rural designation and desire to remain a rural town (please see my email from July 25 for more information on that).
 - There is lots of info on how restrictive development regulations impact housing affordability. CCRPC’s Economics of Housing Summit is a good primer: <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/housing/#convenings>
 - We did move away from the buildout analysis for several reasons, but CCRPC analysis indicated that the current LURs allow only a couple dozen new units, not accounting for development restrictions (e.g., wetlands) and infrastructure limitations. They would also be exclusively ADUs and single-unit homes, which does not provide much housing choice or flexibility in how units are developed. D&K’s analysis assumed that the LURs would be changed to allow 1 unit per acre instead of 5.
 - Yes, maintaining rural landscapes outside the Village is definitely a recurring topic and worthy of addressing in future work, but fully addressing it is outside the scope of this project.
 - **Affordable housing:**
 - **p. 10 – Engagement summary – kept reference because it’s in the context of diverse housing types.**
 - **p. 11 – Changed “more affordable housing” to “more housing choice” in “Charlotte Library” section.**
 - **p. 11 – Kept reference to “housing that is more affordable” in context of “Charlotte Central School” and family needs.**

- p. 11 – Kept reference to “housing that is affordable and conservation are equal goals...” in reference to VHCB, because that describes VHCB’s mission.
 - p. 13 – Kept in green sidebar because it’s a quote. Then in third column of general text/summary, changed to reference “lack of housing variety and choice.”
 - p. 14 – removed affordable in “...likely reflecting a preference for affordable, small-scale housing options...”
 - p. 16 – Kept reference to affordable housing because it was a specific conclusion of the in person design workshop – the specific question of having housing that’s affordable, but lack of certainty about how to achieve it.
 - p. 17 – kept reference to affordable housing because it says “housing, including affordable housing...”
 - p. 21 – kept references because it’s a quote from the town plan
 - p. 33 – Visual Preference Survey – use of “affordable” describes feedback received, and it’s in the context of diverse housing options.
 - P. 34 – deleted “affordable” and focus on housing variety instead.
- P. 33: **Introduction:** Could the report include data to support this statement: "current zoning regulations leave little room for additional growth in Charlotte’s Villages, pushing new homes to be built in other areas of town"? This connects to my previous comment for p. 28 about the current buildout map.
 - This was assumed going into this project based on feedback from Larry and the PC, and the development history of the Villages. But it would be good to support this with better data. ***Addressed with the edits from Bill’s comments.***
 - P. 34: **Change Over Time:** Please see my email from July 25 with a note on future demographics, particularly given that this project is planning for the next 20-30 years. This statement resonated with me: "Planning best serves a community when it is conducted via an open and inclusive process that is accountable to current and future residents." Early on in this project, I asked about Open Meeting Laws. I think it would be great to allow the public more access to this project by opening our

steering committee meetings. I don't think we would need a public comment period, but it feels important for openness, inclusion, and accountability.

- The first sentence of this comment alludes to the “demographic cliff” projected between 2030 and 2050, and its implications for Village development. Definitely an important consideration that will be discussed in the upcoming Act 181 / future land use map / housing targets work.
- It's too late now, but still happy to discuss decisions around public access to the steering committee. It was not a decision to exclude, but rather to be efficient, since all material would ultimately be presented in public forum. All documentation is available as a public record. **Addressed through discussion.**
- P. 41: **Conceptual Lot Diagram and Illustration #1:** I like the recommendation to avoid environmentally sensitive features like mature trees.
- P. 40 – 43: **Conceptual Lot Diagrams:** The lot diagrams seem a bit sprawly. Could the report suggest more clustering to reduce impervious surface and fragmentation? What about conserving a percentage of open space and ensuring new open space connects with other open space if possible? What about further limiting parking?
 - All good suggestions that we will be considering during the LUR work. Also, sounds like more clustering = more density? **Addressed through discussion.**
- P. 44: **Land Use Regulations Draft Outline of Recommended Amendments:** I like #3 on avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating adverse environmental impacts. I also like that the recommendations are tied to needs. Could this report either create (or recommend that the PC create) increased protections for rural areas? Will the amendments include design standards (e.g., requiring pitched roofs)? Please see my email from July 25 for additional design standard suggestions.
 - Yes, we are working on most of these as part of the LUR update work. We may not get to building design standards with this project, but it's a potential area of future work. **Addressed through discussion.**
- P. 57: **Regional Context:** Should this mention the ferry service between Essex, NY and Charlotte?
 - Included in latest version of the report. **Addressed.**

- P. 59 – 60: **Trails:** Could the report note the importance of minimizing the adverse environmental and ecological impacts of trails (Town Plan, p. 1-39)?
 - Perhaps not as direct, but the “Future Roads” section on p. 60 of the latest version notes that future transportation options must be explored in the context of habitat connection / fragmentation and other considerations. Is that sufficient, or should there be a specific statement about impacts of trails?
 - Retitle to “future transportation connections” *Edit made.*
- P. 67: **Multi-Modal Transportation and Village Connections:** How does this recommendation support reducing fragmentation and sprawl: "Considering the locations of new roads in the future will allow for the potential of more dense development, reaching the rear of existing deep lots that property owners could choose to subdivide"? Isn't development in the rear of existing deep lots and the creation of roads in green fields highly discouraged statewide?
 - Understandable that this can sound contradictory. The intent here is to maximize compact development within the defined area planned for growth, rather than patchy development that results in sprawl. Developing “greenfields” within the growth area is a better alternative than allowing that same development to happen outside the growth area. It does require coordinated regulation of both village and rural areas.
- **Tone:** I found the report’s tone to be slightly inconsistent, with some parts being less formal and informational than others.
- **Steep Slopes:** Could this report or other project documents mention steep slopes? The current land use regulations discourage or prohibit development on steep and very steep slopes.
 - These were not mentioned because there are no significant areas of steep slopes (15-25%) or very steep slopes (>25%) present in the Villages.
- **Conservation Topics of Note:** Could this report or other project documents touch on how this project will address the climate and biodiversity crises? How will this plan integrate with and promote Act 171 to prevent forest fragmentation and Act 59 to protect biodiversity?
 - Added in the latest version of the report on p.23. This should also be addressed in the 2026 Town Plan.

- **NIMBYs:** Recently, and over the course of this project, I have heard community members referred to as NIMBYs, naysayers, anti-growth, etc. I think a more productive and respectful process considers all points of view and tries to limit labeling groups of community members.
 - Agreed – the report does not use these terms or paint any member of the community in this fashion.

- **Regulatory / zoning barriers:** This report refers to these types of barriers a couple of times. I still think this suggests that regulations are generally negative. However, many regulations are positive and good for the public interest and one of the outcomes of this project is to create new regulations. Could the word barrier be replaced?
 - Let's discuss this. Even if the LURs are good as a whole, we think it's important to be clear that the LURs do restrict development in ways that may not be necessary or meet the goals of the community. ***No specific change, but by addressing some of Bill's comments above re: "blaming" the rural development on village zoning, I hope we have changed the tone.***

- **Village Resident Committees:** To better engage village residents and include their input moving forward, could the Steering Committee recommend forming village resident committees to advise the Steering Committee?
 - This is a good suggestion if there's interest in the community, though since the Steering Committee is associated specifically with this project, it might be better to have the Village resident committees work directly with the Planning Commission.

- **Increased Light Pollution, Reduced Wildlife, and Increased Surface Runoff:** These were reported as concerns during public engagement but are not really mentioned in this report. Could the report, other project documents, or future bylaws address these concerns?
 - Wildlife impacts are mentioned throughout the report, including as a public engagement concern, though it's a little outside scope to address in LUR updates (beyond what's already regulated). Stormwater is addressed generally in the report, but will be a consideration in LUR updates. Light pollution should be more prominently noted as a public concern, since this came up in multiple different conversations. It is already addressed in the LURs; what more do you think is needed? ***Addressed light pollution.***

Deidre's comments (from September)

- "Background" on page 5: Could we add the CCRPC transportation study grant applied for by the Charlotte Energy Committee? And add that funding (\$12,000 - grant plus local match covered by energy committee) to the project's total budget?
 - o Added in the latest report version **Done**
- "Project Purpose" on page 5: Can we rewrite the sentences so that the numbers do not have to be written out?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version **Done**
- "Public Engagement Themes - Traffic and Safety" on page 28: Would you consider replacing the word "pedestrian" with "person" - it makes it more relatable, and less clinical, but I think speeding concerns also include people in vehicles.
 - o Addressed in the latest version - retained the word "pedestrian" to distinguish from car users. **Changed to "people walking and people driving."**
- "Public Engagement Themes - Energy Reduction" on page 28: Could we replace "inform" with "cause"? And could we add "solo" or "single-occupant" in front of driving?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version
- Page 42: Is that much parking needed in the diagram? Can we introduce shared parking and/or elimination of parking minimums? And can the design of the multi-unit structures be more Charlottey? Such as the conversation we had about converted barns or at least that kind of look?
 - o Parking was reduced slightly and buildings were redesigned with gable roofs in the latest report version. But these are still important issues for discussion!
- Pages 51, 52: I wonder if the illustrations could be replaced by photo simulations for consistency and I think easier to understand suggestions.
 - o Illustrations were updated in the latest version of the report.
- Page 57: This is picky, but wondering if there is a way to remove the second bus from the photo? There will not be 2 buses in Charlotte.
 - o Addressed in the latest report version
- Page 58: Do we make a recommendation encouraging increased school bus ridership over individual drop off/pickups, and the traffic congestion on Hinesburg Road as well as the additional emissions from driving and idling?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version

- Page 69: Is there a way to make the legend easier to read? And can the existing crosswalk be shown differently from the proposed crosswalks?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version
- Page 70: Are you suggesting a rotary for the Greenbush/Ferry Road intersection?
 - o I believe the image of the Middlebury rotary was included to show mountable curbs, not to suggest a rotary at Greenbush / Ferry Road. I'm certain a rotary is not warranted.
- Page 70/71: I think the photo simulation graphics are very effective/helpful.
- Page 72: While I am all for a sidewalk, am I seeing correctly that the sidewalk in front of the Old Brick replaces where there are currently a few parking spaces? If so, I think parking to support this business needs to be considered/commented on as well.
 - o Yes, definitely an important consideration that would be addressed in a scoping study. Hopefully if any on-street parking spaces are lost, they can be replaced with shared parking nearby.
- Page 74: Would you be able to create photo simulations with painted medians and wider fog lines for the graphic on this page?
 - o Looks like this was addressed in the latest version, please confirm!
- Page 75: Is the top photo displaying A and B?
 - o Looks like A (add separate speed limit sign) was not depicted. Is that OK?
- Page 76: Old Steve's Citgo gas station/park&ride/bus stop sold late 2018?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version
- Page 77/78: Tenney's Snack Bar is listed twice. The northern location should be Denton's Excavation?
 - o Addressed in the latest report version
- Can we fit another EV charger into one/some of the recommendations/graphics for East and/or West Villages?
 - o Added to the West / East Village Proposed Transportation Elements (p.62 of latest report version)

Dierdre's Comments (January 2025)

- p. 52 "History of Multi-Modal Transportation" -- it doesn't strike me as a history, more a snapshot of historical photos showing transportation and another of village development (not really transportation). I like the idea of showing sidewalks and more human-scaled transportation as part of the historical picture of the villages,

but I am not sure this page does that. **2/13/25 - Changed to “multimodal transportation over time”**

- p. 52: in the text ¶1: increases should be increase; add pedestrian before safety?; replace are with is. **Made these changes except including “pedestrian”** ¶2: lines should be lined **Made this change**
- on page 52, "Pease's" (2x) should just be Pease Mountain **Updated.**
- p. 53 ¶1: Maybe simplify the bolded sentence? **Simplified slightly.** There is no bus stop although a commuter bus runs through town. There is actually a park & ride at the old train station, although it is not in active use. Last time I was there, there was a Go! Vermont sign though.
- p. 54 ¶ 2: This reads as a long and awkward sentence to me. **Updated.**
- p. 57 ¶ 1: compact village development does not directly protect ag and natural resources. **Softened the language to “...supports preservation of...”** ¶2: I would strike "they might as well be 30 miles" and maybe replace with stating lack of designated bike/ped infrastructure? and/or micro-transit? **Added “...but without a car or safe ways to walk or bike, the distance feels much farther...”** ¶5: an additional objective: address isolation/ enhance mobility for non-drivers/car-owners. **Done.** ¶6: replace kids with students. **Done.**
- p. 58 ¶1: replace kids with students. **Done.**
- p. 61 ¶1: sentence 3: add "a" before sidewalk? Same suggestion in ¶2.
- p. 62 ¶1: " and wheel"? What does that mean? Why are P&R options B and D not listed on map? **Changed “wheel” to “roll” so that they’re all verbs.**
- p. 71: both on map and in text, the country store in East Charlotte should be called "Charlotte General Store" **We aren’t able to update the graphic.**
- p. 74: Can "consider eliminating minimum parking requirements and creating shared parking facilities" be added to considerations for West Village? Can EV charging options be added to the East Village section? **I feel like it is too late to add these recommendations.**
- p. 75: under section Public Spaces and Trans: ¶2 strike "are" **Done.**

Charlie Pughe’s comments from 1/14/2025 e-mail

I have a couple of small edits to request be made to the report. These are for information contained on page 11.

Text as written:

Greenbush Road Residents

- Represented by Damaris Herlihy, who led the initiative for traffic calming along Greenbush Road.
- A speed study found that every day and a half someone travels over 75 mph on Greenbush Road, and someone travels over 75 mph every hour on Ferry Road.
- Limited enforcement is provided; officer found that Charlotte is the fastest town in Chittenden County.
- Received funding for four radar speed signs - two for Greenbush and two for CCS.
- Signs and enforcement are good steps, but are not "calming." Need to have both.

Text as it should be:

Greenbush Road Residents

- Represented by Damaris Herlihy, who led the initiative for traffic calming along Greenbush Road.
 - A Speed studies found that approximately every day and a half someone travels over 75 70 mph on Greenbush Road, and someone travels over 75-70 mph every hour day on Ferry Road.
- Limited enforcement is provided. officer found that Charlotte is the fastest town in Chittenden County.
- Received funding for four radar speed signs - two for Greenbush and two for CCS.
- Signs and enforcement are good steps, but are not "calming." Need to have both.

This is due to the on-going fight in town about dropping the speed limit on Ferry Road. The comments in the original text were provided as off the cuff and not as accurate as they need to be in this case.