

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

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

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

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

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

13  
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: April 17 meeting  
18 7:10 PM Review of LUR Updates to Prepare for Vote & Presentation to Selectboard  
19 8:00 PM Discussion on CCRPC's presentations on LUR Updates  
20 8:30 PM Discussion on Act 181 and Future Land Use (FLU)  
21 8:45PM Discussion on possible alternate times for Planning Commission meetings  
22 8:50 PM Draft PC Agenda for May 15 meeting  
23 8:55 PM Updates from around Town  
24 9:00 PM Adjourn

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

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

29 Robert Bloch reminded the Planning Commission that they had previously agreed to revisit the  
30 Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair in May and suggested that item be added to an upcoming  
31 agenda. Matt thought that it could be added to the agenda for the night. Matt added an update on the  
32 search for a Town Planner.

33  
34 **Public Comment:** None.

35  
36 **Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: April 17 meeting:**

37 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Linda Radimer to approve the PC meeting**  
38 **minutes for April 17, 2025, as written. VOTE: 7 ayes, motion carried.**

39  
40 **Review of LUR Updates to Prepare for Vote & Presentation to Selectboard:**

41 Bill Stuono asked to discuss Section 3.8.B 2). Specifically, the addition of *reconstruction retains*  
42 *at least 10% of the original footprint of the existing structure*. Ashley Berliner asked for the rationale  
43 behind the retention of 10% of the original footprint and why a structure couldn't be completely  
44 relocated if nonconformance remained but was decreased. Robert gave an example of this, a structure  
45 built close to the road could be relocated further back on a parcel if not for the 10% retention. Charles  
46 Russell, Chair of the Development Review Board (DRB), agreed that if the intent is to decrease  
47 nonconformance, the 10% retention does not make sense. Matt suggested that the Development Review  
48 Board may have asked for guidance with this item. In current Land Use Regulations (LURs) there are no  
49 guidelines.

50 Bill called attention to another problematic statement in Section 3.8.B 2) *as measured by total*  
51 *area of the new structure built into the setbacks before vs. after reconstruction*. Bill felt this relates to  
52 tear downs that are rebuilt much larger, which generally is an increase in nonconformance. Bill asked  
53 Charles how the DRB handles rebuilds that are much larger. Charles responded that LURs limit lot  
54 coverage.

55 Bill asked Charles for feedback on proposed edits to 3.8.B 2). Charles felt the proposed edits  
56 seek to reduce the amount of the structure within the setback, and lot coverage governs larger rebuilds.  
57 Matt added that the proposed edits would be useful when a DRB decision is appealed, and the 10%  
58 footprint retention prevents a rebuild from being in a completely different location.

59 Ashley circled back to the fact that the proposed edits prevent permitting a more conforming  
60 structure, unless 10% footprint retention. Matt responded that without 10% footprint retention, the  
61 applicant would be creating a new nonconformity and reiterated that the DRB sought guidance with this  
62 item. Bill noted that moving houses on Thompson's Point is often controversial, and for that District, the  
63 10% footprint retention is fair.

64 Frank Tenney presented his personal scenario, his request to center his home on an existing small  
65 lot where no structure could be conforming, which would be beneficial to all neighbors. The request was  
66 denied. Ken Smith pointed out that the 10% retention reduces flexibility. Charles suggested language to  
67 enable the DRB to evaluate impact on neighboring properties. Matt proposed striking the sentence that  
68 requires 10% retention of the existing footprint. In response, Bill questioned how more conforming  
69 would be defined, especially as it pertains to impact on neighbors. Bill then suggested that the 10%  
70 clause remain and be made exclusive to Thompson's Point; consensus reached to do so.

71 Matt moved to Section 3.8.C. Ashley stated she felt that 3.8.C is redundant. Matt explained that  
72 the intent is to establish an enforceable timeframe to repair, restore, or reconstruct an existing  
73 nonconforming structure before nonconforming rights are forfeited.

74 Matt then reviewed the revised definition for *Setback*. Robert noted that edits explain the  
75 rationale behind setbacks.

76 Matt moved on to review Section 3.1 Damaged Structures. Bill noted 3.1.1) references the need  
77 to *stabilize within a reasonable amount of time* and asked how reasonable amount is defined. Nate  
78 Bareham commented on the procedure. The Zoning Administrator would deem a structure unsafe and  
79 would then determine what timeframe is reasonable. Ashley suggested adding *as determined by the*  
80 *Zoning Administrator*.

81 Matt then reviewed Section 5.4 Conditional Use Review. No discussion or opposition to the  
82 proposed edits. The same for EV Charging.

83 Edits to Section 4.12 Mixed Use was questioned by Bill. Specifically, Bill felt the editing would  
84 allow for mixed use in the Rural District which contradicts current LURs. Consensus to add the Rural  
85 District back in.

86 Matt moved to Section 8.2 Applicability. Consensus to strike these edits from presentation to the  
87 Selectboard. The same was decided for Section 9.7 Setback Modifications and Variances.

88

### 89 **Discussion on CCRPC's presentations on LUR Updates:**

90 Bill stated concern that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) was  
91 intentionally misleading. The Planning Commission was clear with the CCRPC that openness to  
92 changing to 1-acre lots was limited to the Village Commercial District, which was not reflected in the  
93 presentation. Robert recalled that he had previously stated to the CCRPC that limiting changes to the  
94 Village Commercial District did not match the scope of the project. Matt recalled that the Planning  
95 Commission agreed on a reduction to 1-acre residential lots within the Village Commercial Districts  
96 provided it's a mixed used. Bill also noted that CCRPC lumped the East and West Villages together  
97 despite being asked to separate proposed changes.

98 Bill referenced the CCRPC survey that was distributed to the Planning Commission for  
99 individual completion. Proposal made for collective review. Robert suggested a memo in response to  
100 survey questions. Matt suggested feedback be provided to the CCRPC during the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.  
101 Matt will notify the CCRPC that the survey will go unanswered and the Planning Commission will have  
102 a discussion with the CCRPC on the 15<sup>th</sup> instead.  
103

104 **Discussion on Act 181 and Future Land Use (FLU):**

105 Nate opened the discussion and noted that Charlotte's housing targets are relatively low; 176-530  
106 new units by 2050. Historical data obtained over the past 23 years indicates that Charlotte averages  
107 approximately 6 new units per year. To hit the low end of the 2050 target, 7 units per year are needed.  
108 Bill asked if a year-by-year breakdown is available. Nate was not certain, but did not believe so. Robert  
109 found that on the surface, housing targets are reasonable, and at this point not enforceable. However,  
110 towns must take reasonable measures to meet targets.

111 Nate noted a link to mapping software and an opportunity to provide feedback. Bill suggested  
112 that each Planning Commission member review mapping of their neighborhood to ensure accuracy. In  
113 response, Nate said that the intent of the mapping is to illustrate where housing opportunities exist.

114 Nate discussed that at a later stage in the process the CCRPC will be putting forth a  
115 recommendation to the Land Use Review Board for Act 250 exemptions. Exemptions will incentivize  
116 growth within villages. The Planning Commission will informally recommend Act 250 exemptions to  
117 the Selectboard. The Selectboard has final decision over exemptions. Nate emphasized that all LURs  
118 would remain applicable, as exemptions are from State Act 250 review. Bill pointed out that the Village  
119 Commercial Districts aren't separately depicted from the Villages on mapping and asked if that is  
120 possible. Nate suggested that the question be asked of the CCRPC.  
121

122 **Discussion on possible alternate times for Planning Commission meetings:**

123 Matt noted that Thursday meetings are historic for the Planning Commission. Matt suggested  
124 each Planning Commission member provide feedback. Matt said Thursdays work for him, Thursdays  
125 provide consistency, and Thursdays do not conflict with any other Boards. Bill questioned if Mondays  
126 on the off weeks when the Selectboard is not meeting would work. Nate responded that when the  
127 Selectboard holds special meetings, they are typically on off-week Mondays. Bill said the Selectboard  
128 special meetings tend to be impromptu and held any given day of the week. Robert said he's available  
129 any day other than Fridays. Carrie Spear said she is only available on Thursdays. Ken said he is  
130 available Tuesdays, Wednesdays, or Thursdays. Ashley said Tuesdays or Thursdays. Linda Radimer  
131 said any day of the week is an option for her. Bill noted that public participation may be limited by  
132 meetings being held on Thursdays as it conflicts with other community events. Matt felt Zoom provides  
133 easy access and participation is higher when a contentious item is on the agenda. Tuesdays identified as  
134 an option. Nate said the Trails Committee, Energy Committee, and Conservation Commission all meet  
135 on various Tuesdays throughout the month, and that a change in the Planning Commission scheduled  
136 meeting day would require an amendment to Rules and Procedures. Consensus for meetings to remain  
137 on Thursdays.  
138

139 **Search for a Town Planner:**

140 Matt asked Nate if the position had been posted. Nate said it will be posted on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Matt said  
141 it will be a 32 hour/week position, and minor adjustments were made to the job description. Robert  
142 noted that the position may exceed 32 hours per week. Matt said there was discussion about creating a  
143 search committee made up of one member of the Development Review Board, one member of the  
144 Planning Commission, and two members of the Selectboard. Bill emphasized that the Planning  
145 Commission works closely with the Town Planner and the importance of a good working relationship.  
146 Matt said he would like the Selectboard to establish interview candidates and the Planning Commission

147 to collectively interview. Ashley suggested a special meeting to interview candidates. Nate said  
148 collective interviewing may be administratively cumbersome. Ashley then asked about the possibility of  
149 the Planning Commission reviewing cover letters and resumes. Nate said that should be possible,  
150 provided there is an understanding that these documents are private, not public. Nate asked for final  
151 input to provide to the Selectboard. Robert responded that all Planning Commission members review  
152 cover letters and resumes. Three Planning Commission members interview the final candidates in a  
153 second interview. Bill said a Planning Commission member should be involved in the entire interview  
154 process. Matt said that the Planning Commission Chair or designee would be. Bill said he and another  
155 Planning Commission member participated in the entire interview process for the hiring of the previous  
156 Town Planner. Nate said this would be his preference and this would eliminate the need for a second  
157 interview with three Planning Commission members.

158 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Ken Smith, to nominate Matt Krasnow and Bill**  
159 **Stuono to represent the Planning Commission in the hiring process of the Town Planner. VOTE: 7**  
160 **ayes, motion carried.**

161  
162 **Reorganization of the Planning Commission:**

163 Agenda item tabled due to time constraints.

164  
165 **Drafting PC Agenda for May 15 Meeting:**

166 Matt said the bulk of meeting would be designated for the CCRPC presentation. Robert  
167 suggested reorganization of the Planning Commission and the remaining LURs not yet reviewed for  
168 Selectboard presentation. Ashley suggested an update on the hiring process for the Town Planner.

169  
170 **Updates from around Town:**

171 None.

172  
173 **Adjournment:**

174 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Linda Radimer, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 7**  
175 **ayes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:24p.m.

176  
177 Minutes respectfully submitted:

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