

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Town of Charlotte
PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing
Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference
October 16, 2025

DRAFT – subject to approval by the Planning Commission

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

Staff: Lindsay Kahn, Town Planner, Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary.

OTHERS: Frank Tenney, Charles Russell, JD Herlihy, Claudia Mucklow, Paul Plante, Alex Bunten, Peter Joslin, Peter Carreiro, Susie Williams.

Posted Agenda:

7:00 PM Call to Order
7:01 PM Changes to Agenda (if any)
7:05 PM Proposed LUR Amendments Presentation
7:15 PM Public Comment Period
8:55 PM Close Public Comment Period
9:00 PM Adjourn

Call to Order:

Matt Krasnow called the meeting to order at 7:12pm.

Changes to Agenda (if any):

Matt added to the agenda, to enter Executive Session to discuss a personnel issue.

Proposed LUR Amendments Presentation:

Matt opened by explaining the process and procedure including that the Planning Commission holds at least one public hearing. The hearing provides an opportunity for the Planning Commission to receive feedback from the public and make changes to the proposed draft. Neighboring towns are then notified. The next step is for the drafted amendments to be reviewed by the town attorney. The Selectboard is then given the opportunity to review, discuss, possibly hold another public hearing. The Selectboard then puts forth proposed amendments to Land Use Regulations (LURs) for the town to vote on. Matt said that it is his understanding that the Selectboard has agreed to not exercise their authority to approve proposed amendments to LURs without a town vote.

Matt moved on to discuss the purpose for the proposed amendments including incremental change to the East and West Village Commercial Districts. Clarification to administrative language. Compliance with newly enacted state statutes. Streamline property owner processes and the capacity of the Development Review Board (DRB).

Matt said the most substantial proposed changes are the dimensional standard language in the East and West Village Commercial Districts. Matt outlined what is being proposed. In the West Commercial Village District, the maximum density for mixed use would be reduced from 5 acres to 1 acre per dwelling unit. In the East Village Commercial District, the maximum density for mixed use would be reduced from 5 acres to 2 acres per dwelling unit. Matt then presented mapping of the East and West Village Commercial Districts for visual context.

49 Matt then discussed the various clarifications to administrative language. These included
50 clarifying the ambiguous dimensional standard language. Moving mixed use dimensional standards to
51 the zoning district tables. Specifying damaged structure requirements for public safety. Redefining the
52 conditional use review requirements.

53 Matt moved on to discuss compliance with newly enacted state statutes. Proposed changes in this
54 category included the following: Act 47 dimensional standards. Matt explained that a duplex is now
55 considered a single unit dwelling. The next was regarding the zoning appeal process; the interested
56 parties definition for appeals to decisions increased from 10 to 20. Third, appeals cannot be based on
57 character of the area for affordable housing. Finally, zoning district tables made to be consistent with
58 state statute. Matt noted that the Planning Commission worked with the Chittenden County Regional
59 Planning Commission on updates to state statutes, leaning on their expertise.

60 The final category of proposed amendments that Matt explained was the streamlining of property
61 owner processes. Specifically, the Planned Urban Development (PUD) will no longer be triggered by
62 unit count. In addition, the redefining of the singular Village Commercial District to a unique East
63 Charlotte Village Commercial and West Charlotte Village Commercial Districts to honor their
64 differences, settlement patterns, natural resources, and capacities for water and septic.

65

66 **Public Comment Period:**

67 Matt noted that the Planning Commission would be taking notes throughout the public comment
68 period but would not have the ability to engage in a work session. Rather, at the next Planning
69 Commission meeting public comments received will be discussed.

70 Peter Carreiro said he is a property owner on the east side of Route 7. Peter asked about the
71 proposal to eliminate a section within the LURs that outlines *east of Route 7 only*. Peter found that some
72 of the permitted uses that are up for elimination in this section, such as vehicle repair shops, gas stations,
73 or contractor's yard, would be beneficial to remain listed as permitted use. Peter noted that removing
74 options devalues property and reduces ability for mixed use.

75 Peter Joslin agreed with treating the East and West Commercial Villages distinctly. Peter asked
76 for clarification on proposed changes to the dimensional standard language in the East and West Village
77 Commercial Districts. Specifically, Peter interprets the proposal to mean that there is no restriction on
78 the number of commercial businesses. Matt confirmed and listed applicable parameters that would limit
79 the number of commercial businesses including lot coverage, water, septic, and parking capacity. Peter
80 then asked about the rationale behind keeping restrictions in place for residential but not commercial.
81 Matt responded that the intent was to maintain existing settlement patterns and reduce nonconformance.
82 To Matt's response, Peter asked why the proposed changes did not expand beyond the East and West
83 Commercial Villages. Ashley Berliner responded with an explanation of the Planning Commission's
84 incremental approach. Bill Stuono agreed with Peter questioning the lack of density restrictions for
85 nonresidential and said the Planning Commission would review further as density typically applies to
86 residential.

87 Frank Tenney asked if a definition for mixed use had been developed. Ashley read the definition.
88 Frank then asked when PUD is triggered based on the number of residential units. Matt confirmed the
89 Planning Commission would review the PUD section. Frank then asked how the Planning Commission
90 intends to put the proposed changes out to the town for a vote. Frank suggested a summary of Act 47
91 and making categories clear. Frank pointed out that the state statute change, regarding that appeals
92 cannot be based on character of the area for affordable housing, extends beyond just affordable housing.
93 Frank suggested further distinction for proposed changes to permitted and conditional uses. Frank
94 disagreed with changes to dimensional standards in the East and West Village Commercial Districts to
95 increase conformity. To this, Peter Joslin said there are 106 properties in the East and West Village
96 Commercial Districts that are under 5 acres, and 30 that are over.

97 JD Herlihy suggested analysis of what the outcome might be with the proposed changes to
98 dimensional standards in the East and West Village Commercial Districts. JD felt the proposed changes
99 have a disconnect between density requirements for residential and mixed used with residential.

100 Susie Williams said she lives on Greenbush Road and asked where she could locate information
101 to determine if her parcel would be impacted by any of the proposed changes. Lindsay Kahn outlined
102 options to obtain the information. Susie made note of the traffic on Greenbush Road and concern over
103 increasing traffic through increased commercial.

104 Bill asked JD to clarify his previous density point. JD discussed the issue with enforcement of
105 mixed use. The effect could be creating more lots that are nonconforming. To JD's point, Charles
106 Russell suggested that permitting be withheld until assurances are in place for the commercial
107 component.

108 Paul Plante asked about the scenario in which someone owns 5 acres in one of the Village
109 Commercial Districts, subdivides the parcel into 5 1-acre lots, builds and rents on each, is that
110 considered commercial. Bill clarified that Paul's scenario would be residential.

111 Frank asked about uses that may not be considered commercial, such as a church, and how that
112 would play into mixed use.

113 Peter Joslin said he favors reducing density requirements but wondered if there are ways to make
114 the process simpler.

115
116 **Close Public Comment Period:**

117 Matt said that notes had been taken, and public comments would be discussed at the next
118 Planning Committee meeting.

119
120 **Executive Session:**

121 **MOTION by Matt Krasnow; seconded by Robert Bloch, to enter Executive Session in**
122 **accordance with VSA 313a3 for the purpose of discussing a personnel issue and to include the**
123 **Town Planner. VOTE: 6 ayes, motion carried.** Linda Radimer was absent.

124 **MOTION by Matt Krasnow; seconded by Ashley Berliner, to exit Executive Session.**
125 **VOTE: 6 ayes, motion carried.**

126
127 **Adjourn:**

128 **MOTION by Robert Bloch seconded by Bill Stuono, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 6 ayes,**
129 **motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:25p.m.

130
131 *Minutes respectfully submitted:*

132 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary