

1  
2  
3 **Town of Charlotte**  
4 **PLANNING COMMISSION**  
5 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**  
6 **March 20, 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, Darren Schibler, Kate McCarthy, Brandon  
13 Tieso, JD Herlihy.

14 ***Posted Agenda:***

15 7:00 PM Call to Order  
16 7:01 PM Changes to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)  
17 7:02 PM Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: March 6 meeting  
18 7:10 PM (CCRPC) Discussion of Villages LUR Updates: Dimensional Standards (continued),  
19 Frontage, Massing, and Parking  
20 7:30 PM Review Topics for Future Meetings with CCRPC  
21 8:15 PM Review of LUR Updates to Prepare for Vote & Presentation to Selectboard  
22 8:55 PM Updates from around Town  
23 9:00 PM Adjourn

24  
25 **Call to Order:** Matt Krasnow called the meeting to order at 7:01p.m.

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

28 Nate Bareham asked to add readoption of support for the Municipal Planning Grant application.  
29 This being necessary because of the recent change in Planning Commission leadership.

30  
31 **Public Comment:** None.

32  
33 **Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: March 6 meeting:**

34 **MOTION by Matt Krasnow; seconded by Robert Bloch, to approve the PC meeting**  
35 **minutes for March 6, 2025, as amended. VOTE: 7 ayes, motion carried.**

36  
37 **(CCRPC) Discussion of Villages LUR Updates: Dimensional Standards (continued), Frontage,**  
38 **Massing, and Parking:**

39 Darren Schibler, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), recapped what  
40 was covered by Darren and his colleague, Kate McCarthy, during the February 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Bill Stuono  
41 updated Darren that the Planning Commission approved the East and West Village Report during the  
42 March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Bill asked Darren if he had been contacted about the CCRPC making a presentation  
43 of the Report to the Selectboard. Darren responded that he had not been contacted but agreed with the  
44 idea. Darren then reviewed goals for the night. Bill pointed out that the Planning Commission has not  
45 had the opportunity to generate feedback for the CCRPC.

46 Darren opened with a review of a table comparing lot dimensions for 5-acre versus 1-acre.  
47 Darren outlined advantages of moving to a 1-acre lot which include consistency with current  
48 development patterns, reduced overall coverage, smaller buildings, shorter driveways, more useable lot  
49 area. Robert Bloch asked for the rationale behind the proposed change to 1-acre lots. Darren said 1-acre

50 lots are the average for existing development patterns and are used for commercial development. Kate  
51 added that stormwater was a consideration. Bill pointed out that not all lots are square with road frontage  
52 and asked how that would be addressed. Darren responded that the idea is to allow for analysis and  
53 planning based on conditions. Bill then asked if the Planned Urban Development (PUD) ordinance  
54 would need to be updated for lots without road frontage. Darren said the topics of PUDs, subdivisions,  
55 and processes are scheduled for discussion during the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. Darren made a general  
56 comment that PUDs are not ideal. Bill responded that the Villages have environmental constraints, such  
57 as wetlands, which will require creative lot layouts to avoid the constraints.

58 Linda Radimer commented on there being little land between housing in the Villages and asked  
59 how the CCRPC envisions increasing housing without changing the character of the area. Darren agreed  
60 that there is not a significant amount of development that is possible in the Villages. The intent is to  
61 modify current Land Use Regulations (LURs) which prevent minor modifications. Matt added that the  
62 role of the Planning Commission is to establish the implications or liabilities of proposed changes to  
63 LURs before they are brought to voters, and to balance that with potential benefits to landowners.  
64 Robert suggested concrete numbers to aid in consideration. This led to discussion of the possible need to  
65 alter Village boundaries. Frank Tenney clarified that Village Commercial falls within the Village  
66 Districts and is governed by different LURs, including setbacks. Darren responded that the CCRPC's  
67 focus is on Village Commercial and the CCRPC has no intent to propose alterations to the Village  
68 boundaries.

69 Darren directed the conversation to density; 5-acre per dwelling or 1-acre per use. The problems  
70 with current density standards include the following: limited options for Village development and  
71 inconsistency with existing subdivision pattern. Changing density standards would allow for simpler  
72 commercial development, restoration of property rights, increased housing choice, easier access to  
73 adaptive reuse/historic preservation, and more efficient use of buildable land. Robert asked what the  
74 strongest reason to argue against changes to density would be. Darren said an argument might be that the  
75 existing development pattern is fine. Matt asked if changes to density could be made with an expiration,  
76 to ease concerns about overdevelopment. Darren said it might be possible but not recommended. Kate  
77 added an unintended consequence could be rapid change. Bill circled back to Robert's question  
78 pertaining to arguments against. Bill said that limited Village/Village Commercial space could be used  
79 for housing instead of amenities or businesses, and concerns for water, septic, stormwater infrastructure.  
80 In the interest of time, and need for grant fulfillment, Darren asked if the Planning Commission is open  
81 to further consideration of the topic of density. Robert said he would like concrete facts before  
82 supporting. Kate suggested the CCRPC draft LUR language and present alongside the facts that Robert  
83 has requested.

84 Darren previewed additional topics that the CCRPC will present on including lot area, lot  
85 coverage, and lot frontage. In response, Frank asked about frontage types. Darren said the CCRPC had  
86 hoped to address regulating frontage types, but due to time constraints, this will be pushed out to the  
87 next meeting. Robert suggested that the CCRPC be allocated additional time. Matt agreed.

88 Darren moved to a slide titled, decisions on dimensional standards, which asked several  
89 questions pertaining to lot area, density, lot coverage, lot frontage, and front setback.

90 Darren then discussed regulating design. Approaches outlined included design review districts,  
91 form-based code, and a hybrid approach. Darren explained each approach and then reviewed the visual  
92 preference survey results. This led to slides and discussions on potential residential and commercial  
93 frontage types. Darren then asked for feedback. Linda spoke to the Design Review Committee that was  
94 disbanded but previously oversaw Thompson's Point. Matt cautioned against form-based codes, Darren  
95 agreed. JD Herlihy suggested a clear goal attached to any proposed changes to LURs. Regarding this,  
96 Darren spoke about the goals of the Bylaw Modernization Grant and as recipients, the Town being  
97 beholden to drafting LUR updates.

98

99 **Review Topics for Future Meetings with CCRPC:**

100 Matt asked if the CCRPC is available on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. Darren wondered if this would allow the  
101 Planning Commission time to generate feedback. Kate suggested the CCRPC be available to answer  
102 questions during the April 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Matt suggested that the CCRPC participate in the first regular  
103 meeting of each month for a small portion of the meeting and continue to run the majority of the second  
104 regular meeting each month.

105

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

107 Agenda item tabled due to time constraints.

108

109 **Readoption of the Municipal Planning Grant application:**

110 **MOTION by Matt Krasnow; seconded by Robert Bloch, for the Planning Commission to**  
111 **recommend applying for the Municipal Planning Grant, as presented. VOTE: 7 ayes, motion**  
112 **carried.**

113

114 **Updates from around Town:**

115 Claudia Mucklow said that the Charlotte Conservation Commission (CCC) had sent out a couple  
116 Request for Proposal (RFP) for updated mapping. One response received; the deadline is end of May.  
117 The CCC is working on generating a list of items they would like to see addressed by the Planning  
118 Commission.

119 Bill asked JD, as a Selectboard member, for an update on affordable housing as the item  
120 appeared on an upcoming Selectboard agenda. Bill asked if an affordable housing committee would be  
121 formed. JD was not certain. Matt spoke about this as someone previously involved in affordable  
122 housing. Matt noted that there is an existing affordable housing fund. Frank discussed accessory  
123 dwelling units being viable affordable housing. Bill said he has a contact at Habitat for Humanity, and  
124 Habitat is open to an additional project in Charlotte.

125 Due to a comment made by Charles Russell regarding Open Meeting Law, Matt asked the  
126 Planning Commission to receive updates, not discuss reciprocally.

127

128 **Drafting PC Agenda for April 3, 2025:**

129 Matt outlined the following, 10 minutes call to order, changes to agenda, public comment,  
130 review of draft minutes. 30 minutes with the CCRPC. Then 45 minutes for the Planning Commission to  
131 independently reflect on the CCRPC's presentations thus far. 25 minutes to review LUR updates that are  
132 nearly ready for voting and presentation to the Selectboard. The next 5 minutes for agenda building. The  
133 last 5 minutes, to hear any updates from around Town.

134

135 **Adjournment:**

136 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Carrie Spear, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 7**  
137 **ayes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

138

139 Minutes respectfully submitted:

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