

October 16, 2025 PC Public Hearing on LUR Amendments

Public Comments:

1. East Side of Route 7 Conditional Uses removed from Table 2.3

Peter Carreiro found that some of the permitted uses that are up for elimination in this section, such as vehicle repair shops, gas stations, or contractor's yard, would be beneficial to remain listed as ~~permitted use~~ (incorrectly stated as permitted use while it used to be Conditional Use in the West Charlotte Village East of Route 7 Only Conditional Use section). Peter noted that removing options devalues property and reduces ability for mixed use.

Reason Uses Originally Removed:

1. It streamlines this table and avoids spot zoning
2. They were previously only allowed on parcels where they were infeasible, indicating the Town didn't really want them to happen here.
3. They would consume a large amount of limited Village land area with relatively low-value uses inconsistent with the goals of the district.
4. They are also allowed in other nearby districts.

Suggested Considerations:

1. Planning Commission should consider reinstating Gasoline Station and Motor Vehicle Sales and Services as Conditional Use in West Charlotte Village Commercial District.
2. Planning Commission should consider keeping Parking Facility as Conditional Use, not Permitted Use per the reason above—Parking Facility would consume large amount of limited Village land area with relatively low-value uses inconsistent with the goals of the district.

2. Peter Joslin asked about the rationale behind keeping restrictions in place for residential but not commercial.

Suggested Consideration:

This language was not changed and was what was in the LURs previously. Thus, the Planning Commission did keep the restrictions for non-residential uses in the East and West Charlotte Village Commercial Districts such that there is no density restriction but there are other dimensional standards such as setback and frontage requirements.

3. JD Herlihy discussed the issue with enforcement of mixed use. Such that how does the town prevent someone from using mixed use density for residential alone?

Suggested Consideration:

Since this only applies to the East and West Village Commercial Districts, the Planning Commission should consider revising zoning district tables 2.3 and 2.4. The edits should include adding *(F) District Standards (4) A single certificate of occupancy will be issued for mixed use parcels once the non-residential and residential requirements have been satisfied.*

4. Resulting suggestion based on JD Herlihy conversation is to address how to treat parcels in two

zoning districts.

Suggested Consideration:

The Planning Commission should consider adding language to Section 2.2 Interpretation of District Boundaries, such that it appears in D moving D and E to E and F respectively. The language should read, The regulations for each zoning district apply only to the portion of the parcel that lies within that district. For example, if a parcel is split between Village District and a Village Commercial District, each portion of the parcel must adhere to the overlaying zoning district standards.

5. Frank Tenney asked about how to decipher between what is residential versus commercial.

Suggested Consideration:

One of the proposed edits included in the PC Public Hearing on proposed LUR amendments was such that the definition of Mixed Use in Section 10.2 was changed to, *A building or parcel containing residential uses and non-residential uses (e.g., office, commercial, industrial, institutional) which are otherwise allowed as permitted or conditional uses in the district in which the building or parcel is located (see Section 4.12). Also see Planned Unit Development.* Otherwise, we must entrust that the DRB is able to decipher what is residential versus non-residential.