



# Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of  
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

October 23, 1978

Present: Zielinski, Kulmala, Young, Hannaford, Raftery, Sauer

At 7:30 a Public Hearing on the Flood Insurance Rate Study was called to order. Kay Kulmala introduced the members of the FIA study group. They explained how the study, which was funded by the FIA, was made and showed a work map indicating which areas fell into Zone A, 100 year storm; Zone B, 500 year storm; and Zone 3, no flooding. These maps are used for flood plain management, wetlands zoning and to indicate areas to be considered for public ownership for conservation purposes. They are also used by bankers, insurance agents, etc. Kay Kulmala showed a Carlisle map which had been updated with this new information.

It was explained that in accepting this study, Carlisle agreed to meet certain minimum standards and, in fact has exceeded them. The new code will not meet all the requirements for building in a flood hazard zone. It calls for a residential structure in Zone A or B to be built above the designated level, either by filling or elevating. There are rules regarding encroaching, i.e., so as not to raise the water level above a foot or increase velocity downstream. Carlisle already has a regulation prohibiting building below the high water level of the 1962 flood.

A member of the public asked how the Code would prevent further encroachment in subsequent years. It was explained that these are minimum standards and enforcement would be the responsibility of the Town (Board of Health). After the date of acceptance of the Code, insurance rates would be based on actuarial rates for a 10-100 year flood. Insurance would be required for town building of municipal facilities within the flood hazard areas or to sell such a building already existing. The detailed survey maps were explained and how they can be used with the reports and charts.

Publications of the proposed elevations will occur in November. Following this Hearing there will be a 90-day appeal period. Each appeal will be reviewed and a letter of determination sent to each appellant. Publication of the final elevations will then be made. Kay Kulmala was chosen as the contact person for zoning bylaw changes, if needed to conform to the regulations.

The Hearing adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

The Minutes of the October 9 meeting were accepted as read.

Edward J. Talbot, Russell Street, appeared for discussion on his driveway permit application. He presented the covenant which will be recorded as a lien on Lots B and C signed by Parker, owner of Lot B.

Parker also presented a new plan showing Lot C-1 containing 4.31 acres and Lot C-2 containing 28.3 acres and including Parcel X of 3.28 acres "formerly part of Lot C, now part of Lot C-2." Talbot stressed that this revised plan was submitted only because the Board had requested a revision to give "the remaining land of DenHartog" legal access to Russell Street.

A problem was seen with the possibility of Talbot's getting a building permit for Lot C-1 since it would not share in the maintenance agreement. Talbot's position was that the owner of Lot C (himself) would convey the benefit (and the obligations of maintaining) to Lot C-1 and C-2 (himself). In any event, after discussion it was felt that since there was an agreement between two lot owners to maintain the shared driveway, that was all the Board required. It was not the Board's function to see that all users of the driveway shared in its maintenance. If two parties shared responsibilities for driveway maintenance and agreed to let a third lot share it without also sharing the responsibilities, that was their business.

It was moved, seconded and voted unanimously to approve the driveway permit application for Talbot. The plan was signed as to Lot C-1 under Approval Not Required.

An October 23 draft of the Procedural Rules for Driveway Permits was submitted by Tom Raftery for review and discussion at the next meeting.

The revised maintenance covenant for Charbonneau's common driveway on South Street was reviewed. Tom Raftery suggested additional language to Article III, Paragraph G: "but which shall not diminish or lessen the obligation of the owners of said lots to maintain the common driveway so as to provide to each lot year-round access for all emergency, fire, rescue, police, moving, construction and maintenance vehicles." Most members of the Board had had an opportunity to walk the land with a particular view toward the safety aspects of the driveway access onto South Street. It was felt that the location of this shared driveway was far preferable to six individual driveways and that a suggestion might be made to the DPW that the rise should be shaved and a "hidden driveway" sign erected.

On the condition that an 8 1/2 x 11 plan showing the location of the driveway and a corrected covenant containing the above language both be provided and providing the permit is recorded within one year, it was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve Charbonneau's application for a common driveway permit.

At the request of Walter White's attorney, the minutes of the July 10, 1978, meeting were reviewed with a view toward possible "amplification" of the Board's position regarding the 40-foot wide access to White's land behind Virginia Farme. The minutes will remain as written and no amplification could be made. No votes were taken, or called for, at the time. Tom Raftery stated that if the question had been presented for a vote, he, for one, would have voted against. He pointed out that the 40-foot access is one step in a series of steps and he didn't want to handle it piecemeal. A Yes vote on this question could come back to haunt the Board if and when White came back to the Board with a plan for something like 36 houses to be accessed only through Virginia Farme. Another problem is the absence of one of the two needed slope easements on the access strip.

In general discussion of single-access development, Bob Zielinski distributed a graph showing numbers of such developments in Carlisle. It was suggested that the Board get some input from the DPW, Fire and Police departments as to problems they encounter or foresee with large numbers of houses on a dead-end street. It was felt that some limits should be set.

Kay Kulmala distributed a first draft of the Summary of the Open Space and Recreation Plan. She reported that the budget for printing the report would be \$900-\$1200 and requested from the Board an additional \$400 to cover these expenses. It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve \$400 as the Planning Board's share of the expenses of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Meredith DeLong  
Secretary to the Board