



Town of Mount Holly Planning Commission

Town Office & Remote Electronic – Regular Meeting

Tuesday, May 19, 2026

6:30 PM

Attendance: Jon McCann, Jim Seward, Andrew Schulz (via zoom), Ron Unterman, Stephen Michel

Also present: Faith Tempest, Walter Siegordner, Janice Slagle, Marina Huyler (via Zoom), Steven McDonald (via Zoom)

1. Call to order: 6.30pm
2. Changes to agenda: none.
3. Approval of minutes: Commissioner Michel moved to approve the minutes of the subdivision hearing March 17th, Commissioner Schulz second, approved unanimously. For the minutes of April 21st Chair asked for changes for clarity regarding the language relating to lot mergers; Commissioner Schulz proposed language. Commissioner Unterman asked for changes to language regarding the Wastewater committee, and to language regarding Act 181. With those changes the minutes were approved unanimously.
4. Reports & Announcements
 - a. Administrative Officer:

BCRs: Murphy, Fowler Brook Road, 56'x38' barn/ADU, existing WW permit.

Lynch, Indian Brook Road, 22'x24' two story addition, existing WW permit Cole,

Cole Road, 26'x46' house, existing WW permit.

The AO had received a WW permit for a property on Hortonville Road (Gilmore), for a 4 bedroom SFR. No BCR has been received yet.

The AO reported her exchange with Mr Longobardo, Sawyer Hill Road. Mr Longobardo has confirmed that he is in communication with the Act 250 Coordinator regarding the construction on his property and whether it would be subject to Act 250.
 - b. Planning Commission Chair: RRPC are holding the final regional plan hearing this evening.
 - c. Belmont Village Wastewater Planning Subcommittee (Jeff Chase). No update.
5. Development review
 - a. Walter Siegordner sketch plan review—Roger Hill Road: Mr Siegordner presented a proposal for a subdivision of a 14acre parcel on Roger Hill Road into 4 lots, each of approximately 3.5 acres and with access from Roger Hill Road and from Rte 103, with each access shared by two parcels. Access permits from the Town and the State have been granted. There has been an initial review by a septic engineer, and the sketch proposes house and septic locations. Chair asked about wetlands on the site; Mr Siegordner noted a wet area close to Rte 103 but construction would not encroach. Chair asked if Commissioners would be interested in a site visit, though he felt that would be premature until a hearing. Mr Siegordner stated that septic design will be for 4-bedroom houses, he may build a 3-bedroom house. Chair asked if a shared septic was considered – Mr Siegordner noted people's concerns about this. AO noted it would be a major subdivision. Chair suggested to Mr Siegordner that he review the sub-division regulations and stated that it would help to address some housing constraints. Mr Siegordner noted this would not be affordable housing, though he has another property which may be more useful for a cluster housing approach with communal wastewater. Chair and all Commissioners agreed they are content with the concept.
 - b. McDonald/Huyler/Carney sketch plan review—Loop Road: Commissioner Schulz recused himself. This Boundary Line Adjustment is of a 1.5 acre property which was the result of a previous subdivision in the 1960s. Chair noted that Mount Holly does not have any law which automatically merges lots and so pre-existing lots do not need to be explicitly divided by the actions of the Planning Commission. Specifically in relation to this proposal, the recent survey proposes an equal division of the 1.5 acre lot and does not appear to propose using the former boundaries which would give a slightly unequal division of the lot amongst the three owners, but which would reinstate the earlier boundaries in the case of two of the three owners of the property. Mr McDonald clarified that the surveyor had set

new stakes to define boundaries but would defer to the surveyor to confirm if these are new or match the earlier boundaries.

Commissioner Unterman noted that the proposed lots are of exactly the same size, suggesting these are new boundaries. Chair stated that however this is presented would not affect the merits of the application but would impact how the application is considered. If the earlier boundaries are adopted there may not need to be multiple boundary line adjustments, rather a lot merger in the case of two of the proposed lots and a boundary line adjustment for the third. Chair noted that the issue is whether there is a reference deed which would allow conveying today; the survey of the proposed division does not reference that. This would affect how the Planning Commission considers the standard of review for the sub-division. Mr McDonald asked if the surveyor could clarify this at the hearing. Chair proposed scheduling a hearing if the surveyor could confirm the division line of lot 3 is precisely the division line of the deed owned by Carney, and if that can be attested to by the surveyor on the plat; alternatively a new plat will be required which adjusts the boundaries to match the original 5A and 6A boundaries. Chair noted that all owners would need to agree. Chair asked the AO to contact the surveyor to clarify the questions and to confirm with Mr McDonald and the other owners how they wish to proceed. If there is clarity, and if needed a new survey, by 28th May, the hearing could be scheduled for 16th June. If not, the issue would need to come back to the regular meeting on 16th June.

6. New business

- a. Administrative Officer recommendation: Chair noted that one application had been received from Faith Tempest, the current AO. Chair moved to communicate to SB Faith Tempest's reappointment, seconded Commissioner Unterman, approved unanimously.
- b. Review draft updated "BCR" ordinance: Chair noted that the draft circulated sets out the rationale for the update, and asked if Commissioners wanted to discuss specific issues. Commissioner Michel noted that it could be more succinct, and also he felt it was not appropriate to share with Select Board yet. Chair noted the ex officio role of Select Board and that he now copies them on Planning Commission business. Commissioner Unterman asked if there had been a request to change the current ordinance? Chair replied no, and responded that this proposal solves legal issues, specifically the lack of legal basis for the current ordinance, and the process which allows property owners to start work immediately upon submission which is contrary to State law; this presents risks to the Town. The current approach also gives very limited guidance to applicants. An updated ordinance needs to be clear that Town is a facilitator of permit or regulatory obligations, with the AO role to guide people through the state requirements as well as Town requirements.

Commissioner Michel gave an example of simplification, section 3d in which the AO has two different roles (consulting and asking for determinations) and this could be simplified. Commissioner Schulz noted the difference between consulting and asking for a determination. Chair agreed and noted that there is value in having this stated explicitly, supported by the AO. Commissioner Unterman asked if the proposed bylaw would bring a new permit, and if so would it create push back from Town residents? Commissioner Unterman noted that it is unclear when this would need to be used, raising the example of a shed. Chair responded that it would depend, eg a shed in a flood hazard area may need a permit. Commissioner Schulz noted that this is intended to help residents to avoid running afoul of the requirements of both Town and State. Commissioner Unterman commented that the information requirements are onerous; and that it may not appear that this is in fact helpful, leading to pushback. Chair noted that the PC needs to take action to support the role of AO, enabling the AO to support Town residents before they go ahead with a project rather than after the fact; builders also note that the Town does not give clear guidance on what to do. Commissioner Michel noted that the ordinance does not give guidance on when/how to go to the State; he also asked why there is scope for revisions in the future. Chair responded that this section is written to prevent over-reach in the future. Commissioner Michel also asked why there are questions on occupancy. In response Chair noted the value of having data to allow tracking issues such as new housing, new rental units etc which can be stored centrally to support other actions, especially those in the Housing Needs Assessment study. Commissioner Unterman asked about the type of permits noted; Chair responded that the informational permit is not subject to any action by the Town to stop the development going ahead and so in that sense is not a permit. Commissioner Schulz agreed with Commissioner Unterman that the application could have a different name to permit, with clarity that this is not approval but simply an acknowledgement that information has been provided. He noted that regarding the question of renting out a home, there are associated state requirements and this would assist the AO to help residents to know this. Chair agreed there is some merit to considering the name but there is also value in calling it a permit since it creates a pause to allow review and indicates to residents that they need to consider this ahead of time.

Commissioner Seward proposed using the term registration rather than; Chair agreed there may be value to this, but it might not be understood to be different to the current process, and it might be confused with short term rental registries which may be considered by the Town in the future. Other terms proposed were certificate of completeness or disclosure. Commissioner Schulz suggested that Commissioners review the document and make list of revisions to include and circulate ahead of the next meeting for discussion at that time.

- c. Discuss additional ways to implement the Housing Action Plan. Tabled.

7. Unfinished business

- a. Subdivision Bylaws update: review statute/requirements. Chair had circulated a document outlining the legal basis for subdivision and asked if commissioners had any questions about this. Chair reviewed the document and outlined key points including issues which subdivision bylaws should include (mandatory) or could include (optional). He asked Commissioners to review before the next meeting where this will be brought back for discussion. Commissioner Unterman asked whether the Cavendish regulations would be helpful. Chair noted that aspects may be useful but since Cavendish has not had any regulations previously and there are few examples which are in the same situation as Mount Holly.

8. Public comments: none.

9. Upcoming meetings: Public Hearing on 16th June, 5.30pm (to be confirmed). Regular meeting 6.30pm June 16th. 10.

Adjournment: 9.09pm

These minutes are in draft form until approved at the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.