

1
2
3 **Town of Charlotte**
4 **PLANNING COMMISSION**
5 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**
6 **October 23, 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, Ashley Berliner. Absent: Linda Radimer.

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

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

13
14 **Posted Agenda:**

15 6:30 PM Call to Order
16 6:31 PM Changes to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)
17 6:33 PM Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: October 9 meeting and October 16 Public
18 Hearing
19 6:35 PM Address comments from the Public Hearing on Proposed LUR Amendments
20 7:45 PM Discuss Town Plan work plan and timeline
21 8:15 PM Draft next agenda
22 8:20 PM Updates from around Town
23 8:30 PM Adjourn

24
25 **Call to Order:**

26 Matt Krasnow called the meeting to order at 6:33pm.

27
28 **Changes to Agenda (if any); Public Comment (for items not on the agenda):**

29 No changes to the agenda. No public comment.

30
31 **Review & approve draft PC meeting minutes: October 9 meeting and October 16 Public Hearing:**

32 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Matt Krasnow, to approve the PC meeting**
33 **minutes for October 9, 2025, as amended. VOTE: 6 ayes, motion carried.** Linda Radimer was
34 absent.

35 **MOTION by Robert Bloch; seconded by Ashley Berliner, to approve the PC Public**
36 **Hearing minutes for October 16, 2025, as amended. VOTE: 6 ayes, motion carried.**

37
38 **Address comments from the Public Hearing on Proposed LUR Amendments:**

39 Lindsay Kahn read from the memo that she had prepared for the Planning Commission which
40 outlined public comments made during the hearing. The first comment was made by Peter Carreiro.
41 Peter found that some of the permitted uses that are up for elimination in this section, such as vehicle
42 repair shops, gas stations, or contractor's yard, would be beneficial to remain listed as permitted use.
43 Peter noted that removing options devalues property and reduces ability for mixed use. Lindsay
44 reviewed the rationale behind the proposed changes as previously summarized by Darren Schibler,
45 Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC). Lindsay then presented her suggestions in
46 response to Peter's comments. The first suggestion, the Planning Commission should consider
47 reinstating gasoline station and motor vehicle sales and services as conditional use in West Charlotte
48 Village Commercial District. The second, Planning Commission should consider keeping parking

49 facility as conditional use, not permitted because parking facility would consume large amounts of
50 limited Village land area with relatively low value uses inconsistent with the goals of the district.

51 Bill Stuono reminded the Planning Commission of the 2017 application to open a Maplefields in
52 West Charlotte Village East of Route 7 which encountered obstacles with septic, access, abutter
53 concern, and was ultimately withdrawn.

54 Frank Tenney questioned where gas stations are permitted in nearby districts. Lindsay responded
55 in the East Charlotte Commercial District. Frank then asked if the only place gas stations would be
56 permitted is in the East Charlotte Commercial District and if so, questioned if that would be considered
57 spot zoning. Lindsay clarified that her suggestion is to retain gas stations under conditional use. To this,
58 Frank wondered about the definition of gas stations. Matt agreed that the definition should be considered
59 in the future. Charles Russell favored the retention of motor vehicle sales and services as a conditional
60 use in the West Charlotte Village Commercial District. Bill then said he is not in favor of retaining gas
61 stations as conditional use until the Planning Commission determines what type of gas stations would be
62 permitted.

63 Ashley stated discomfort with removing certain conditional uses for West Charlotte Village East
64 of Route 7. Robert asked why the CCRPC suggested striking. Lindsay responded due to concern over
65 spot zoning. Robert said in his opinion the Maplefields example illustrates guardrails that are in place
66 and did not favor devaluing someone's land by changing the LURs. Ken Smith agreed with Robert's
67 point that guardrails are in place and spoke about what would be desirable in such a highly visible
68 location.

69 Matt proposed a straw poll for each item in the applicable table to determine what should be
70 retained or struck as conditional use. Agricultural equipment sales and service – remain struck as
71 proposed. Frank asked, and it was confirmed, that the designation for West Charlotte Village East of
72 Route 7 had been eliminated. Robert questioned if Peter Carreiro understood that when he made his
73 public comment at the hearing. Matt returned to the list for straw poll. Boat sales and services – remain
74 struck as proposed. Robert suggested that with the combining of the West Charlotte Village East of
75 Route 7 designation with the West Charlotte Village Commercial District, all items on the straw poll list
76 could be struck. Ken agreed. Ashley questioned striking gas stations. Robert then said that he was okay
77 with retaining gas stations. Bill questioned why automotive service centers wouldn't be included and
78 stated preference for adding parameters on gas stations if retained. Ashley asked Lindsay if it would be
79 possible to add parameters such as one set of pumps, no bright lights, in the applicable section of the
80 LURs. Robert summarized that there was consensus for gas stations/automotive service centers with
81 additional parameters added to LURs.

82 Matt moved to Lindsay's suggestion for keeping parking facility listed as a conditional use, not
83 permitted use. Consensus to do so.

84 Lindsay then summarized the second public comment made by Peter Joslin. Peter asked about
85 the rationale behind keeping restrictions in place for residential but not commercial. Lindsay's suggested
86 considerations to this comment: This language was not changed and was what was in the LURs
87 previously. Thus, the Planning Commission did keep the restrictions for non-residential uses in the East
88 and West Charlotte Village Commercial Districts such that there is no density restriction but there are
89 other dimensional standards such as setback and frontage requirements. Matt said he did not see any
90 necessary action resulting from Peter's comment.

91 Lindsay then read the third public comment made by JD Herlihy. JD discussed the issue with
92 enforcement of mixed use. Such that how does the Town prevent someone from using mixed use density
93 for residential alone. Lindsay's suggested considerations to this comment: Since this only applies to the
94 East and West Village Commercial Districts, the Planning Commission should consider revising zoning
95 district tables 2.3 and 2.4. The edits should include adding (F) District standards (4) A single certificate
96 of occupancy will be issued for mixed use parcels once the non-residential and residential requirements
97 have been satisfied.

98 Through discussion it was determined that the density bonus for residential would occur only
99 after the commercial use is constructed. Ken said he views 1 acre in the Commercial Village District as
100 one building that combines residential and commercial. Matt asked about restricting to one building with
101 larger parcels. To this, Lindsay suggested parcels that are 1-5 acres in the West Village Commercial
102 District and 2-5 acres in the East Village Commercial District would be issued a single certificate of
103 occupancy for mixed-use parcels. Lindsey pointed out that lots at or exceeding 5 acres currently allows
104 for residential. Charles asked how this addresses the possibility of a large residential component being
105 built and occupied, with a tiny commercial component being built but not truly intended for use. Matt
106 said other towns issue temporary certificates of occupancy.

107 Robert pointed out that if a landowner is not arbitrarily allowed to convert the unused
108 commercial space in the mixed-use project, that would address JD's concern. Charles said that the issue
109 would then be residential zoning at 1 acre. Robert then proposed that the commercial aspect be required
110 for the residential density. Frank questioned what happens to existing small lots where 1 acre residential
111 is permitted from existing rights. Bill then asked about the scenario where someone obtains non-
112 residential and residential permits and then abandons the commercial use.

113 Ken asked about the possibility of equal space for both commercial and residential or even
114 mostly commercial. Matt felt that creating proportional requirements leads to planning out the capacity
115 for mixed use. Frank suggested a square footage requirement for the commercial component. Charles
116 proposed a requirement for advertising the commercial component. Lindsay pointed out that height
117 restrictions are in place. Through discussion it was determined that 3 stories are possible with height
118 restrictions. Bill suggested that commercial percentage could be based on height. For instance, 35%
119 commercial with 3 stories. Robert favored a commercial component that is sufficient but allows the
120 developer the flexibility to make judgments based on the assessment of market conditions and
121 appropriate conditions. Ashley stated preference for street level commercial. Frank felt that creating
122 proportional requirements devalues properties and reiterated concern that existing small lots become
123 conforming with the proposed amendments.

124 Consensus to return to the agenda item at the next meeting due to time constraints.
125

126 **Discuss Town Plan work plan and timeline:**

127 Matt reported that Lindsay had a discussion with the CCRPC. The state's Land Use Review
128 Board (LURB) has asked the CCRPC to assume duties. This has limited the capacity for the CCRPC to
129 review the Town Plan update in a timely manner, with a potential delay until January.

130 Matt outlined that the current Town Plan expires five days after Town Meeting Day in 2026.
131 Recommendations from the CCRPC can be used as a bare minimum update and voted on during Town
132 Meeting Day. The CCRPC's recommendations could then be combined with the Town Plan champion
133 efforts that Lindsay has been spearheading, and voted on, later, such as in November 2026. Another
134 option, allow the Town Plan to lapse, and vote on the CCRPC's recommendations and Town Plan
135 champion efforts in November. Bill favored an updated Town Plan with the minimum CCRPC
136 recommendations to prevent a lapse. Lindsay spoke about the potential ramifications of allowing a lapse
137 and what needs to occur for a vote to take place on Town Meeting Day. Consensus to move forward
138 with the minimum updates to prevent a lapse.
139

140 **Draft next agenda:**

141 Continue addressing comments from the Public Hearing on proposed LUR amendments. Review
142 updates to the Town Plan.
143

144 **Updates from around Town:**

145 None.
146

147 **Adjourn:**

148 **MOTION by Robert Bloch seconded by Ashley Berliner, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 6**
149 **ayes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:41p.m.

150

151 Minutes respectfully submitted:

152 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary