

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

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

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

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

12 **OTHERS:** Paul Plante, Frank Tenney, Charles Russell, JD Herlihy.

13 ***Posted Agenda:***

14 7:00 PM Call to Order
15 7:01 PM Changes to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)
16 7:02 PM Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: March 20 meeting
17 7:10 PM Discussion on CCRPC's presentations on LUR Updates
18 7:40PM Review CCRPC March 27, 2025 Memo & Discuss Next Steps with CCRPC
19 8:25PM Review of LUR Updates to Prepare for Vote & Presentation to Selectboard
20 8:50 PM Draft PC Agenda for April 17 Meeting
21 8:55 PM Updates from around Town
22 9:00 PM Adjourn

23
24 **Call to Order:** Matt Krasnow called the meeting to order at 7:03p.m.

25
26 **Changes to Agenda (if any):**

27 Bill Stuono added a review of housing targets recently released by the Chittenden County
28 Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC).

29
30 **Public Comment:**

31 Frank Tenney commented on public outreach to educate residents on what can be done with
32 affordable housing under current zoning bylaws.

33
34 **Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: March 20 meeting:**

35 **MOTION by Bill Stuono; seconded by Robert Bloch, to approve the PC meeting minutes**
36 **for March 20, 2025, as amended. VOTE: 7 ayes, motion carried.**

37
38 **Discussion on CCRPC's presentations on LUR Updates:**

39 Bill pointed out that clarity is needed as to whether proposed changes are to the East and West
40 Village Commercial Districts or the East and West Village Districts at large. Matt responded to this with
41 the assumption that residents would be more open to increased density within the East and West Village
42 Commercial Districts, given an existing perception of a denser settlement pattern. Linda Radimer
43 provided historical context and noted that Village Commercial Districts were strategically placed in
44 proximity to wetlands to prevent expansion.

45 Ashley Berliner questioned the Planning Commission's approach to proposing updates to Land
46 Use Regulations (LURs); less controversial or comprehensive. Matt stated preference for less
47 controversial to satisfy obligations of the Bylaw Modernization Grant and ease into changes.

48 Ken Smith asked about the current LURs for the Village Commercial Districts. Bill responded 1
49 acre for commercial use, the proposed changes pertaining to the residential component. Matt added

50 allowing residential use, on 1 acre. Ken asked about the current residential standard within the Village
51 Commercial Districts, Bill responded 5 acres.

52 Robert Bloch questioned whether the Planning Commission should narrow LUR updates to the
53 Village Commercial Districts given that was not the focus of the East and West Villages Report. Bill
54 responded that the East and West Villages Report included much more than density. Ashley asked if it
55 felt too controversial to expand the proposed residential change, beyond the Village Commercial
56 Districts, to include the East and West Village Districts. In response, Matt said in 2020, the most recent
57 polling, the recommendation to increase density was voted down.

58 Ashley said she would be in favor of reducing residential requirements to 1 acre as it would
59 increase conformance with current development patterns and increase the likelihood of additional
60 amenities. Bill responded that commercial use is currently permitted with 1 acre, the proposed change is
61 for residential. Frank and Matt then spoke about the creation of viable amenities through mixed use,
62 combining store fronts and rentals. Ashley asked what would need to be done to amend LURs to allow
63 for the type of mixed-use scenarios Frank and Matt discussed. Robert responded that the CCRPC would
64 determine such.

65 Bill reminded the Planning Commission that residents of the East Village have been very vocal
66 about the desire for increased amenities, not housing. Matt questioned if proposing two identical articles
67 for the East and West Village Commercial Districts should be the approach. Bill suggested reducing to 2
68 acres might be a better approach for the East Village Commercial District.

69 Paul Plante pointed out that Village Commercial Districts in both Villages are small. Reducing
70 residential to 1 acre, in just the Village Commercial Districts, would increase housing, not amenities,
71 and would be piecemeal. Bill agreed with Paul's comment and noted that he has asked the CCRPC to
72 address mixed-used capabilities. Perhaps even mandatory mixed use in the Village Commercial
73 Districts. Ken questioned if residential belongs in the Village Commercial Districts.

74 Ashley asked if under current LURs more than one commercial use is permitted on 1 acre. This
75 was confirmed through various examples. Ashley stated support for the suggestion presented by Bill for
76 a mixed-use requirement in the Village Commercial Districts.

77 Matt summarized feedback for the CCRPC. Develop language to propose, for the Village
78 Commercial Districts, to allow 1 acre per residential unit, as long as it's a mixed-use with at least 1 non-
79 residential use.

80 Matt moved the discussion to density and the CCRPC's question as to whether it should be
81 removed or reduced to 1 unit per acre. Ken questioned if it was a 1:1 ratio. Matt responded with an
82 example based on the mixed-use parameter previously discussed. A 3-acre lot could support (1) non-
83 residential use and (3) residential units or could be subdivided into (3) 1 acre lots each with a non-
84 residential use and residential unit. Building on Matt's example, Bill pointed out that residential units
85 are likely going to be behind the non-residential use, not above, separate buildings. This led to
86 discussion of whether 1 acre could allow for (1) non-residential and (1) residential unit or (1) non-
87 residential and (2) residential units. Robert suggested allowing (2) residential units might increase the
88 viability for amenities.

89
90 **Review CCRPC March 27, 2025 Memo & Discuss Next Steps with CCRPC:**

91 Matt summarized the above discussion as it will be presented to the CCRPC. The first item being
92 clarity on whether proposed changes to LURs will be for the Village Commercial Districts only. The
93 second item, agreement for a reduction to 1-acre residential lots within the Village Commercial Districts
94 provided it's a mixed used. Regarding density within the Village Commercial Districts, a 1:1 ratio. This
95 led to discussion of duplexes and whether the residential unit could be converted into a duplex. The
96 CCRPC to clarify.

97
98

99 Review of LUR Updates to Prepare for Vote & Presentation to Selectboard:

100 Nate Bareham suggested that prior to setting any hearing dates, the Planning Commission
101 delegate to Planning Commission member(s) and/or Staff, the compilation of a report and draft notice of
102 a public hearing. Nate reviewed additional protocols for proposing updates to LURs. Linda volunteered
103 to represent the Planning Commission and collaborate with Staff.

104 Matt recalled an email previously sent by the Planning and Zoning Assistant which outlined
105 LUR updates that are prepared for vote and presentation. The first category being Act 47 mandated
106 changes. The second, to clean up public facilities language in the district standards. Matt reviewed the
107 rationale behind this. Third, the affordable housing provision in Section 4.4. Regarding this item, Bill
108 noted that the Home Act references an additional floor, floor needs to be defined. Matt felt this was a
109 moot point as the additional floor must be supported by public water and wastewater, which Charlotte
110 does not have. Fourth, appeal rights to decisions made by the Zoning Administrator. Fifth, revised
111 definition for dwelling 2 families, which is a duplex. Finally, citing state statutes, rather than including
112 state statute language. Unanimous support for all these items.

113 Drafting PC Agenda for April 17, 2025:

114 Matt outlined the following, 10 minutes call to order, changes to agenda, public comment,
115 review of draft minutes. 30 minutes to continue reviewing LUR updates that are nearly ready for voting
116 and presentation to the Selectboard. The bulk of the meeting will be allocated for the CCRPC's monthly
117 presentation. 5 minutes for agenda building. 5 minutes, to hear any updates from around Town.
118

119 Updates from around Town:

120 Charlotte Conservation Commission would like to present; scheduled for May 1st.

121 Bill said the hiring of the Town Administrator Assistant is on-hold due to the collective
122 bargaining agreement. Nate said when information is available, it will be presented.
123

124 CCRPC's Housing Targets:

125 The CCRPC's housing targets reviewed. Bill said he'd like the CCRPC to discuss low, mid, high
126 targets. Matt pointed out that the market will dictate where growth happens. Ken added topography as an
127 additional factor. Robert questioned when a target becomes a mandate.
128

129 Adjournment:

130 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Linda Radimer, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 7**
131 **eyes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:00p.m.
132

133 Minutes respectfully submitted:

134 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary, with edits by Rebecca Kaplan, Planning and Zoning Assistant.
135