



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

19 November 1981

PRESENT: Coulter, Kulmala, Sillers, Raftery

Chairman Richard Coulter called the meeting to order. He explained that the meeting was planned to get input from residents regarding open space and residential development zoning (cluster zoning). The members of the Board were introduced. A letter was read from a resident who was not able to attend; it expressed concern that such zoning would destroy the rural atmosphere of Carlisle. Kay Kulmala made a presentation of the questions which must be answered before a knowledgeable decision can be made regarding a proposed bylaw change to enable this type of subdivision. Townspeople present were then encouraged to participate in the discussion.

Mary DeGarmo questioned the inclusion of multi-family dwellings as part of such zoning. It was explained that it was included for purposes of discussion. Another question raised was how does or will this type of zoning affect the ability of Carlisle to maintain the rationale for two-acre zoning.

George Foote spoke to the "tradeoff" to get, perhaps, more units on a given parcel. There is no information that going over two acres per unit can be permitted. It would be a mistake, he felt, to allow anywhere within the system more than one unit per two acres.

Sam Nuckols said that unless developers get something back, very few would be interested in approaching the cluster zoning concept. The density bonus, reduced width requirements for roads, etc. Lincoln, he reported, seems to be very satisfied with the two types of cluster zoning which it has permitted (one by special permit and another by vote of Town Meeting).

Jack Carpenter agreed with Nuckols' support of this type of development option. Conventional development of some sites in town would be shortsighted. He felt that this type of development would retain the current character of the town.

Marge Getchell asked if cluster would save the developer money.

In answer to a question from Art Milliken, it was estimated that the remaining large parcels in town would be gone in 20 years if subdivided at the same rate seen since 1978. About 30% of Carlisle land is available for residential subdivision.

It was also reported that the rights of frontage for standard two-acre subdivision development must, under state law, still be available to the developer. This zoning bylaw would permit the option of a slightly different type of development.

Charlie Brown felt that the ability to site homes attractively on a parcel was more important than getting the most number of houses on the parcel. Release from the strictures of two-acre zoning would make this possible. Use of shared septic systems would also make the option attractive to developers.

Brigette Senkler said that many people are not interested in having a two-acre parcel and this would attract a different type of people which would be welcome.

Scott Simpson, architect, warned that some developers are only interested in getting the most number of houses on a parcel. He felt that any zoning of this type would be carefully written and carefully monitored. Charlie Brown pointed out that any plan presented under this bylaw could be rejected by the Planning Board if it felt it was not beneficial.

Sally Kahn, Concord Journal, suggested that the available land in Carlisle is known and can be looked at and worst-case and best-case situations envisioned.

Sam Nuckols stressed that the concept of shared septic systems can be very tricky and is one of the ways a developer might cause problems for the town.

Charlie Evans felt that two-acre zoning was certainly a plus factor in the development of the town but he didn't feel that the town should stop there. He can see areas of the town which could have been more attractively developed with a tool like this, efficiently managed.

Jack Carpenter made the point that if this type of zoning had been in effect earlier, the Anderson-Leeland land (8 lots) could have been developed, the open space retained and \$90,000+ of town money saved. He could not, however, think of what type of incentive would have induced a developer to site houses in such a way as to retain the open space.

Sam Nuckols felt that the dilemma was that selling detached homes on one-acre lots was harder than selling them on a two-acre lot. Multi-family, town houses, condominium is a very cost-effective option.

Frank Berry felt that this concept should be very carefully planned.

Marge Getchell asked regarding the ownership of the open land. Some people present felt that giving this land to the town would not be beneficial to the resident of the new development. Connection of open spaces and trails connecting conservation land, however, was felt to be important.

It was repeated that justification for two-acre zoning might be threatened by passage of cluster zoning. Housing for older residents who do not qualify for the Elderly Housing development was seen as beneficial.

It was felt that this type of zoning would maintain the diversity of mix in the town.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith DeLong