



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

FRANK E. HANNAFORD, Clerk
201 Prospect St.
CARLISLE, MASS. 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF HEARING ON ZONING BYLAW CHANGES

April 29, 1974

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bridges, Hannaford, Kulmala, Pugmire and Thomson

Candidates Present: Engquist and Sauer

Also Present - 2 reporters and 9 interested people

Mr. Pugmire, who chaired the Hearing, explained that Article 1 as proposed for the Special Town Meeting on May 14, 1974 was not creating any new business district but it was a matter of redefining within a category. The main thrust of the amendment to Section 2.C. was to restrict some of the business uses within the Center. After Mr. Pugmire reviewed Article 1, he opened the meeting to questions.

Mr. Engquist was confused on the "storage of school buses" items. This was explained to the group.

Mr. George Senkler requested definitions of several items including, "general merchandise". He also questioned having 2.C.1.c. (limiting storage of building supplies to floor samples) spelled out in the Bylaws. He felt that as long as a retail establishment kept its inventory in the building and under cover, no restrictions should be put on the quantity. He thought perhaps it would be better to restrict the size of the building.

Mrs. Kulmala pointed out that the Board was interested in attracting businesses that would supply services to local residents but not attract customers from the outside. Mr. Don Spigarelli supported Mr. Senkler and was interested in a definition of "floor samples". Mr. Senkler said there was not a single business listed in the permitted uses that could survive on only the patronage of Carlisle residents. It was pointed out that the proposed wording was taken from the current Bylaws. Mr. Donald Cochran felt that keeping building supplies in stock would require trucking out as well as trucking merchandise in which was not necessarily desirable in Carlisle. Mr. Senkler agreed with this logic. Mr. Thomson said that from the questionnaires sent out by the Master Planning Commission it was felt that people did not wish to have all of these services within the town.

The question was also asked as to the definitions of open recreation (drive-in movies & miniature golf) and light manufacturing (in 2.C.2.h.)

April 29, 1974

Mr. Spigarelli wanted to know if 2.D.2.e. would interfere with Mr. Daisy's operation of his filling station - currently this is as of right but it would be under special permit if any change in his operation was made. The scope is the same in both the old Bylaws and the new.

Mrs. Jean Berry wanted to know about the Russell building (where Mr. C. Sleeper had his business) and she was told that if a business of similar type went into this building within a year there would be no question - after that period of time they would have to apply for permission to operate.

It was pointed out that proposed Article 2 spells out more clearly the requirements for off-street parking than we have had in the past.

The following changes must be made in the "copy" of the proposed Bylaw changes before Town Meeting:

Page 4 of the Planning Board members' copy - Article 2: to read: to amend Section 3.E.

Page 5 - Article 2 - 3.E.1.e. last word of paragraph should be "above"

Page 6 - Article 2 - 3.E.1.g. angle of parking - 30-45 degrees

7 - Article 3 - 3.F.2.d. to read: . . . snow plowing and removal of snow

7 - Article 3 - 3.F.5. - first line to read . . . and completed by

8 - Article 4 - Correct spelling of word soldiers in Soldier's Monument

Regarding Proposed Article 3, Mrs. Penhune spoke and said that the Planning Board would be the more logical Board to make the decision on site plans. Mr. Cochran, Clerk of the Board of Appeals, also felt that this was a good idea and would require a review and decision from an additional town board. Mr. Senkler said he also felt this was a good change and what in his case (as owner of the Parke Math Lab building and the old "Candy House") must take place to require submission of a new site plan. He was told that a substantially different type of usage would require such a plan.

Regarding Proposed Article 4, it was mentioned that 600' actually is inclusive of all of the districts involved as the farthest dimension was scaled to encompass everything.

On Page 14 of the current Bylaws, 7.D. - "Findings for Special

April 29, 1974

Permits", Mr. Cochran questioned the necessity of keeping that phrase in parenthesis that reads "other than under Section 3.E.1.(c). Mr. Thomson feels that those portions in parenthesis are only administrative explanations.

The Hearing was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Patricia A. Macqueene". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Patricia A. Macqueene
Secretary