

1  
2  
3 **Town of Charlotte**  
4 **PLANNING COMMISSION**  
5 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**  
6 **July 24, 2025**

7  
8 ***DRAFT – subject to approval by the Planning Commission***

9 **Planning Commission:** Matt Krasnow (Chair), Robert Bloch (Vice Chair), Bill Stuono, Ken Smith,  
10 Carrie Spear, Linda Radimer. Absent: Ashley Berliner.

11 **Staff:** Nate Bareham, Town Administrator, Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary.

12 **OTHERS:** Paul Plante, Frank Tenney, Charles Russell, JD Herlihy, Claudia Mucklow, Pete Demick.

13  
14 ***Posted Agenda:***

15 7:00PM Call to Order  
16 7:01PM Change to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)  
17 7:03PM Review & Approve draft PC meeting minutes: July 10, 2025  
18 7:05PM Review CCRPC's final draft of the Land Use Regulations (including clean copy)  
19 7:30PM Discuss Town's Counsel's review of TDR and non-contiguous PRDs  
20 7:50PM Thompson's Point Setback discussion of potential LUR amendment language  
21 8:20PM Follow-up on CCC presentation to the Planning Commission  
22 8:40PM Draft next agenda for August 7th, 2025  
23 8:50PM Updates from around Town  
24 9:00PM Adjourn

25  
26 **Call to Order:**

27 Matt Krasnow called the meeting to order at 7:05p.m.

28  
29 **Changes to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda):**

30 Bill Stuono added discussion of pending Act 250 application to the agenda.

31 Claudia Mucklow discussed the Charlotte Conversation Commission (CCC) goal of securing  
32 updated wildlife corridor mapping and identifying a vendor to complete the update. The CCC had  
33 applied for grant funding which was not awarded. The CCC is requesting the Planning Commission's  
34 support in fundraising efforts. Bill asked Claudia how the CCC is planning to fundraise. The CCC is  
35 looking for a match from the Selectboard. Robert Bloch suggested the CCC raise funds within the  
36 community. Pete Demick said that updated mapping is a requirement for updating the Town Plan. Bill  
37 asked Frank Tenney if the Planning Commission has any funds that could be allocated. Frank spoke  
38 about budget cuts. Robert asked if an updated Town Plan is submitted without updated mapping, would  
39 it be rejected. Nate Bareham responded that lack of updated mapping would not cause an automatic  
40 rejection. Charles Russell noted that the CCC should also consider the Planning Commission's input on  
41 what would be useful when updating mapping is completed. Bill suggested that Claudia's public  
42 comment be added as an agenda item for a future meeting, a motion should not be made without an item  
43 being warned.

44  
45 **Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: July 10 meeting:**

46 **MOTION by Matt Krasnow; seconded by Robert Bloch, to approve the PC meeting**  
47 **minutes for July 10, 2025, as written. VOTE: 5 ayes, motion carried.** Linda Radimer was not yet  
48 present.  
49

50 **Review CCRPC's final draft of the Land Use Regulations (including clean copy):**

51 The clean copy was not included in the meeting packet. Robert proposed that the item be tabled  
52 until the next meeting to allow Planning Commission members time to review. Carrie Spear asked if a  
53 motion is needed before the next meeting in August. Nate spoke about the requirements of the Bylaw  
54 Modernization Grant that Carrie was referring to and the flexibility for a motion to occur during the next  
55 meeting. Robert suggested that one-way comments be forwarded in advance of the meeting. Matt  
56 proposed a deadline for comments and the Planning Commission agreed to August 4<sup>th</sup>.

57  
58 **Discuss Town's Counsel's review of TDR and non-contiguous PRDs:**

59 Matt said he had consulted with the Town's Counsel. A dive into State statute and case law is  
60 necessary. A memo will be prepared for the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Charles suggested that this be an  
61 agenda item for the August 20<sup>th</sup> Joint Meeting between the Planning Commission, Development Review  
62 Board (DRB), and CCC. Matt added that any decision that was based on current Land Use Regulations  
63 (LURs) pertaining to Transferrable Development Rights or non-contiguous Planned Residential  
64 Development (PRD) is barred from legal challenge.

65  
66 **Discussion of pending Act 250 application:**

67 Bill said that a link was forwarded with a current application that had already gone before the  
68 DRB. Bill noted that the comment period for this application closes before the next Planning  
69 Commission meeting, which is why he had requested as an additional agenda item.

70 Matt pointed out that Act 250 is State law and asked Bill what role the Planning Commission has  
71 in the application process. Bill said he'd like to establish a procedure for the Planning Commission to  
72 have input on Act 250 applications.

73 Bill noted for the pending application, it highlights the CCC's concern regarding driveway  
74 length. Claudia clarified that the driveway was existing and dissects Pease Mountain. The CCC had  
75 requested changes to the proposed building envelope. Charles spoke to confusion regarding the building  
76 envelope and whether it had been approved by Act 250.

77 Frank referenced time constraints with the pending application and establishing the Planning  
78 Commission's role in Act 250 applications moving forward. JD Herlihy referenced criteria for Act 250  
79 and suggested that reviewing the criteria *Conformance with Plans* would be the Planning Commission's  
80 role. Bill provided a brief history of Act 250 and how it has changed with the establishment of the Land  
81 Use Board. Regarding the pending application, Bill agreed with JD's assessment that the Planning  
82 Commission should assess the *Conformance with Plans* criteria and noted a possible second criterion for  
83 consideration for the pending application; *Aesthetics and Natural Beauty*. Bill found no issue with  
84 either. Matt said a starting point is for the Planning Commission to receive notice of Act 250  
85 applications in real time.

86  
87 **Thompson's Point Setback discussion of potential LUR amendment language:**

88 Matt proposed that the new Town Planner be asked to draft proposed amendments to LURs to  
89 address the setback issue. Matt asked Nate if he had a good sense of what Thompson's Point  
90 leaseholders are asking for. Nate deferred to Thompson's Point leaseholder, Beth Humstone, that has  
91 planning experience and has offered to consult with the Planning Commission. In addition to consulting  
92 with Beth, Robert suggested reducing setbacks to 25 feet would address many issues.

93 JD said when considering setbacks, the original intent was to lock-in the aesthetics of  
94 Thompson's Point lots and to prevent expansion. Changes to setbacks will result in changes to  
95 aesthetics.

96 Bill recalled that the issue for Thompson's Point leaseholders is that lots are non-conforming. JD  
97 added to Bill's comment that any proposal for changes requires conditional use review. JD pointed out  
98 that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) suggested that conditional use

99 review may not be appropriate to apply to Thompson's Point and perhaps Thompson's Point should  
100 have its own review process. Nate noted concerns with spot-zoning. JD pointed out that leases do not  
101 necessarily require zoning. Bill asked if the concern with conditional use review is cost or the process  
102 itself. JD said he had heard both concerns. Matt suggested that the initial step be consultation with Beth.  
103

104 **Follow-up on CCC presentation to the Planning Commission:**

105 Claudia recapped her main concern from a previous presentation to the Planning Commission,  
106 limiting driveway length to 800 feet with exceptions, when necessary, as approved by the DRB. Claudia  
107 said since that presentation, it has been established that any driveway exceeding 800 feet will go through  
108 Act 250. Carrie spoke to some residents of Charlotte appreciating the privacy that longer driveways  
109 afford. Robert questioned if driveway control could be limited to sensitive areas and proposed that  
110 identifying sensitive areas be included in updated mapping efforts. Linda Radimer said that an  
111 understanding of those sensitive areas would enable efficient planning for housing and driveways.

112 Robert asked Claudia what the CCC's second priority is. Claudia said excluding wetlands,  
113 surface waters, and very steep slopes from density calculations as they are unbuildable areas. Robert  
114 said his concern is that exclusion reduces opportunities for housing. Robert proposed that wetlands,  
115 surface waters, and very steep slopes could be used in density calculations for PRDs only. Frank stated  
116 concern for devaluing land and landowners having choice. Matt said exclusion would create a regulatory  
117 assessment issue.

118 Bill commented that currently, the Zoning Administrator can approve any driveway length  
119 without DRB oversight. This should be corrected to anything over 800 feet requiring DRB approval.  
120 Regarding buildable areas, the impact will be on subdivisions. Bill felt that Claudia's suggestion is  
121 reasonable. Bill also advocated for limiting building envelopes to 1 acre.  
122

123 **Draft next agenda for August 7, 2025:**

124 Matt listed welcoming the new Town Planner, reviewing CCRPC's final draft of the LURs,  
125 resolution to the Selectboard for wildlife mapping (drafting assigned to Bill), and agenda items for the  
126 Joint Meeting.  
127

128 **Updates from around Town:**

129 None.  
130

131 **Adjourn:**

132 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Linda Radimer, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 6**  
133 **eyes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:55p.m.  
134

135 Minutes respectfully submitted:

136 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary, with edits by Rebecca Kaplan, Interim Zoning Administrator.