



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

OPEN MEETING: HOME OCCUPATIONS IN CARLISLE (25 people involved)

NOVEMBER 8, 1982

Tom Raftery opened the meeting at 8:40 P.M. To address the issue of home occupations, which has come up occasionally during the last year, the Planning Board decided to hold an open meeting to listen to citizen inputs, pro and con.

The first input was from Janet Liessner of Bellows Hill Road, who had a bakery in her home from 1969 to 1979. She had converted her garage into a bakery, producing wholesale items which she delivered. This was done under Board of Health permit, renewed each year. She felt that there was no impact on her neighbors, and was grateful for having the zoning bylaws of Carlisle such that they allow this.

Brigitta Senkler spoke in favor of the Town's permitting such activities, in contrast to neighboring towns such as Bedford and Acton.

Margot Arnold was also in favor, but questioned where one draws the line between small and large. The current standards of noise and traffic concerns are subjective, and create emotional arguments in favor and opposed. The questions should be more objectively resolvable as to where limits are.

A suggestion was made to have a percent increase in traffic or a decibel level as limits to apply in determining when a business is too big.

Mr. Goldlust of Tophet Road said that day care (or some such activity) cannot have fully quantified measurements.

Eleanor Cochran, Town Clerk, said that she gets many calls on Section 3.B.1.k.(5) of the Zoning Bylaws which calls out "customary home occupations." She is at a loss for a workable definition of this phrase. She also discussed what should be done about the seasonal selling of Christmas trees in town. This is not allowed under the Zoning Bylaws. She also spoke in favor of requiring special permits for all home occupations, to allow a review by the Board of Appeals. The specific phrase "customary home occupation" was added in the 1960's. Prior to that, only the specific occupations mentioned were allowed by right, dating back to the 1930's.

Kay Kulmala listed all of the home occupations with which she was personally familiar:

Christmas tree sales	computer consultant
kennel	actuary
music teacher	real estate
building equipment	surveyor
school bus storage	<u>Carlisle Gazette</u>
nursery	snow plowing
engineer	gallery

plant sales

Tom Raftery brought up the issue of whether home occupations should be more restrictive with respect to homes on common driveways.

Margot Arnold spoke in favor of having some upper bound on growth, so that at least the neighbors would know when expansion of an industry was over.

Kay Kulmala suggested that absolute noise limits were not possible, since the background noise already there is a factor.

Hal Sauer asked whether existing problems or projected problems really warrant more regulations.

Nancy Leonard, Carlton Road, said that the issue was one of finding a workable definition of "customary home occupation".

Pat Cutter agreed with Eleanor Cochran: all of the home occupations should come under the Board of Appeals review. She did not envision that the review process would be either difficult or expensive, or cumbersome.

Lenny Clarke suggested that there was still a definitional problem of nailing down who was required to ask for a special permit. What about occasional or seasonal home occupation, such as an accountant?

Pat Cutter said that any home occupation that increased traffic at all on a regular basis ought to be required to have a Special Permit.

A problem was mentioned that the existing Bylaws are not being uniformly enforced. Only if there is a complaint do the Selectmen get involved, and occasionally fail to take action because of how widespread a practice may be.

Kay Kulmala suggested that certain occupations only be allowed on streets of a certain width.

Mr. DeBenedictis stated that he approved of the current Board of Appeals process and had faith in their abilities. He suggested that a woman should be appointed to the Board of Appeals.

Tim Morse spoke in favor of having some process for eliminating troublesome situations, some form of binding decision from the Board of Appeals. He was against any over-regulation of the process of home occupations.

Tom Raftery made a partial summing up to this point by saying that he had not heard any reason yet for a change in the existing Bylaws.

Dick Coulter suggested to the audience that they review the Zoning Bylaws and recommend any major or minor revisions they can think of to improve their application.

Dr. Hendrie told the group that doctors tend to place their businesses on main roads, so that the spectre of a doctor on a quiet street is just not going to happen. She said that making a doctor apply for a special permit might keep him from moving into the Town at all.

The Open Meeting ended at 10:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard R. Coulter

738 Maple St
Carlisle, MA 01741
November 3, 1982

Dear Sir,

I will not be able to attend the Planning Board meeting on November 8. I am therefore writing to express my opinion regarding businesses being operated in homes in Carlisle.

I feel that any activity that increases traffic and noise in a residential area is an unfair and unjust burden to put on the other neighbors.

When people bought their homes in Carlisle, they did so knowing of the excellent zoning laws in existence in this town. These same people should continue to be assured that their neighbors will not be allowed to turn a part of their home into a restaurant, store, school, law office etc.

Sincerely

Tom McElligott

W. David Watkins, M.D., Ph.D.
80 Carleton Road
Carlisle, Massachusetts 01741

November 7, 1982

Planning Board
Town of Carlisle
Carlisle, Mass.

Dear Sirs:

This letter is written in my absence to voice my objection to proposed regulations which allow the conduct of commercial enterprise in the neighborhoods of Carlisle. I believe it is important to distinguish and provide for those small business-related activities which are limited physically to within the home, and do not alter the outward appearance of the home, nor result in increased noise, traffic, nuisance or safety hazards. This latter type of extremely limited business activity is of particular utility to many of the residents of Carlisle, yet does nothing to modify the Town's peaceful, uncluttered, noncommercial, rural character.

The residents of Carlisle have considered at length those businesses which impact negatively on the ambient noise level, privacy, safety to children, residents and pedestrians, and the general attractiveness of our residential areas (e.g., construction companies, child-care facilities, etc).

If it is felt by The Planning Board that Carlisle must consider seriously the proposal of individuals to expand beyond the strict limits of their private homes, I strongly suggest that it is in the best interest of all Carlisle residents to localize those business interests to nonresidential, commercially or institutionally-zoned facilities. I see no reason why individuals who wish to locate and operate these expanded activities, regardless of their possible utility to the Town of Carlisle, should be immune from conventional commercial taxation, rent, building codes and other necessary regulations to which most of us who live in Carlisle must subscribe.

I suggest that The Board use this opportunity to modify or strengthen the by-laws to resolve and clarify this continuing, disruptive issue, and thereby direct the general interests and energies of The Board and the residents of Carlisle to more productive endeavors.

Sincerely,

W. David Watkins