



# Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of  
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 14, 1981

PRESENT: Coulter, Kulmala, Raftery, Sauer, Sillers, Hannaford,  
and Chaput

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M.

The minutes of August 24, 1981 were approved as submitted.

## Definitive Plan for Canterbury Court

Roger Corbin appeared to present the changes to the Definitive Plan required as conditions to the approval given on August 10, 1981.

Hal Sauer brought up the Planning Board Rule and Regulation relative to fire holes (Section 4.F). Based on the September water level of 162 feet, and the detention basin's lowest level of 160 feet, the probable capacity of the basin will make it adequate as a fire pond.

The proposed road has been narrowed to accommodate the bicycle/foot path.

Covenants for the Subdivision were accepted by the Board and will be forwarded for review by Town Counsel (Neil Melone).

The Planning Board endorsed the Definitive Plan of Subdivision.

## Common Driveways for Canterbury Court

Deck House presented a new set of covenants for the common driveways. They were acceptable to the Board.

## Housing for Elderly Status

The application has been approved by Farmers' Home, but nothing has been received in writing. Notification has been verbal from Senator Amick's office.

Approval is conditional on their being an upper limit on income of persons occupying the dwellings. No units will be offered at full market value without regard to income.

The architect has requested the Board to forward to him any concerns we have based on the preliminary submission.

There is a possible conflict of interest in that CV&P drew the original plans and probably should not be the reviewing agent. The Board may want to hire another engineer to review the plans.

#### Draft/Cluster Zoning By-Law Review

Some suggestions by Kay Kulmala on first draft of OSRD amendment:

Reorganize outline somewhat for clarity; e.g.:

#### 5.I. OSRD

1. Purpose (include reference to Special Permit)
  2. Definitions (add "buildable land" here)
  3. General Requirements and Restrictions
    - A. Minimum Tract Area (?)
    - B. Basic Number of Dwelling Units
    - C. Minimum Open Space . . .
    - D. Permitted Residential Uses
    - E. Permitted Uses of Open Space . . .
  4. Bonus Options
  5. Design Requirements
    - A. Dimensions, Residential Lots
      1. Single-family
      2. Multi-family
    - B. Design of Open Space
      1. Percentage to be "buildable"
      2. Access
      3. Contiguity, shape
    - C. Standards of Improvements
  6. Special Permit by Planning Board
  7. Procedures
    - A. Pre-Application Review
    - B. Contents of Application (give standards for phasing, if any)
    - C. Review by other Boards
    - D. Board of Health Findings
    - E. Findings of Planning Board
  8. Associated Regulations, Planning Board and Board of Health
- 

Some questions for early debate (leaving details of wording, points, numbers, etc. for later):

1. Should "Purposes" include mention of housing variety as to type and/or cost? Preservation of active and/or potential

agriculture? Energy efficiency? Bonuses for the latter as well?

2. May this option be given to ANR as well as to subdivision developments?
  3. Why the distinction between "Open Space" and "Common Land"?
  4. Should there be a minimum tract area? May parts (e.g. Open Space in excess of the minimum required) be on separate parcels?
  5. Is it necessary to segregate OSRD's from one another or to limit the number of dwelling units in OSRD's (especially if a minimum tract size is adopted)?
  6. What is the philosophy on allowable density -- exact correspondence with what is possible under zoning applied to that tract? A small tilt as incentive to developer (what this proposal does)? Should density increase bonuses be contingent upon hydrogeological study, absolutely? Is the low density resulting from Common Driveways sufficient offset to potentially higher density in clusters?
- 

Next steps and schedule: (internal reviews and revision; reviews with boards most concerned, e.g. Health, ConsCom; discussion with local developers; experience of other towns; informal public meetings; public hearing. . .)

Hal Sauer asked a key question of "Why would a developer want to do this?" We need some examples of how this benefits the Town and attracts a developer at the same time.

The issue was raised of whether the subdivision road would have to be built to the existing standard.

Preservation of open space really should be deeded to the Town or given to the ConsCom so that the space really will remain "open" via perpetual maintenance (mowing, at a minimum).

Tom Raftery will distribute copies of the draft bylaw to parties that might be interested in commenting. He will ask potential commenters to respond to such issues as (1) where economic benefits to developers are within the draft, (2) suggestions to improve economic benefits, (3) suggestions to increase protection of open spaces. Any recommendations on who should receive the draft should be forwarded to Tom.

We are suggesting an open meeting early in November (not on a Monday night) to bring this up to the public.

R & R Amendments

Vivian Chaput has suggested wording for Section 4.A.1.b.(c) to allow a narrower width road in subdivisions.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Coulter  
Chairman

Gould: Common Driveway Permit

A motion was made and seconded to renew the Common Driveway permit granted to Albert and Betsy Gould on September 8, 1980 for Lots 58 and 59 for a period of one (1) year from this date, September 28, 1981.

Kay will issue an amended notice of this extension of the permit.

Nickerson: Release of Lot 15 of Hemlock Hill Estates

George Nickerson presented as-built drawings for Hemlock Hill Road, as well as a list of things left to do on the upper subdivision (Hemlock Estates).

This lot (#15) is the last lot held in Hemlock Hill Estates. The Board still holds three lots in the upper subdivision.

A motion was made to release Lot 15 of Hemlock Hill Estates.

The motion passed: 4 in favor 0 opposed.

Minutes of September 14, 1981

Under the heading "R&R Amendments", add a second sentence: "Such a change to a narrower width would also require a modification of the General Bylaws, which is outside the Board's purview."

Approved as amended.

Hazardous Waste Disposal

The Westford site was discussed by Kay Kulmala. Only direct impact to Carlisle might be trucks bearing hazardous wastes through the town.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard R. Coulter  
Chairman