



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MEETING OF APRIL 14, 1986

Present: Chaput, Sherr, Raftery, Sillers, Leask and Clarke

The meeting convened punctually upon the eighth strike of the Town Office clock.

Elizabeth Ridge

Mr. Fleming suggested a walk with the Board upon the land at Elizabeth Ridge at 5:00 P.M. Sunday, April 20. The Board agreed and plans were made to meet at the end of Sunset Road.

Cleverdon, Varney and Pike

Visiting us was Dick Doherty from CV&P. They have been our engineers for 16 years. He presented a promotional package describing their team approach to representing the Town. With him we discussed liaison between the Board and CV&P and cost control. Mr. Doherty requested a list of present Board members which we agreed to provide. Joe March was identified as another CV&P contact. Material sent by the Town is reviewed by both Joe and Dick. Of concern was the ability of developers to call the engineers without permission of the Board. CV&P obtains Board permission first unless it's an emergency. Peter Donahue is a Senior Civil Engineer. Linda Campbell is also a person at CV&P familiar with Carlisle.

Public Hearings

It being 8:15 P.M. it was suggested that the meeting could be moved to Wilkins School, but it appears that all fit in the Town Hall. There being no movement to Wilkins, the hearings began at the times indicated in the following text.

8:15 P.M. - Rezoning at Lot #5 on Concord Road for the Postal Facility

Robert Santomena represented Mr. Palmer and presented a slide show with respect to the site plan. The proposal is to change the site to a business zone. The stated purpose is to serve a post office, but that limitation is not being suggested for the rezoning. Apparently, Palmer has been going through site review with the Post Office Department prior to informing the Town. Why rezone? According to Santomena, rezoning is needed to assure at least a 10 year lease term. At the end of 10 years there is no guarantee that the Post Office will stay. If the Post Office leaves after 10 years, Palmer wants to use it for other commercial purposes. Design is dictated by the Post Office, but allegedly there is some flexibility (but for whom was left unsaid). The proposed zone would extend about 250 feet back from Concord Road. Mr. Mulvey from the Post Office was here to answer questions. Questions followed. Mr. Leask asked about the concrete structures in back. Palmer said they are not in commercial

use. There are no traffic studies, but Palmer has said he has calculated site distances at over 400 feet. The Post Office stated its policy is not to have a traffic study done. Santomenna stated it will handle the present traffic in use at the present site. The building is designed to meet the full growth of the Town. The design is a hip roofed, wood building. Area is 3400 square feet in the building and the Post Office can sublease if it desires. It may be subject to a site plan review process by the Selectmen as provided in the Business Zone now. The Post Office representative could not state how many people 3400 square feet could serve. Bob Buxbaum of Palmer Way wanted to know if the back was going to be used residentially and a variance could be sought. The response was that balance of lot is in residential area and use is tenuous. for other than residential. Pat Cutter asked about the 10 year lease and the costs of construction. She believes that Palmer is asking for a guarantee of commercialness for the property in case the Post Office departs. Jack Anderegg spoke to the issue of the economics of a 10 year lease. Neils Larsen of Concord Road spoke to what could happen in 10 years time and the inability to predict what will come. George Stenke of School Street asked if postal service would be jeopardized if this building were not approved. The Post Office representative did not know. Theone Mark spoke to lot value and impact of building on the Eden Valley lots. She also spoke to the dangerous exit to and entrance from Concord Road. Bill Churchill also spoke to the dangerous traffic from first hand experience as a close resident. Mr. Buxbaum added to discussion about the danger and the reasons why the Board approved the common driveway. He stated that it does not have good sightlines evidenced by the fact that the police radar trap is often placed at the site. He did question the impact upon pedestrian traffic and he asked about the option to use the Hensleigh property as from time to time proposed. Janet Churchill said that Eden Valley entrance was not clearly seen on Concord Road. Mr. Larsen echoed the traffic concern. He opined that the Post Office ought to be located in the center. The present resident of the Berry house decried the sightline. The site ought to be viewed as though it were put to its highest commercial use. A question was asked if sorting could be done elsewhere and retain the present Post Office. Member Clarke asked about the feasibility of serving Carlisle from other towns. The Post Office could not answer. Member Leask queried whether the Post Office would put the building on land provided by the Town. Still no answer. A decision whether to recommend the site depends on more information from the proponent which the Board requested, i.e., traffic, sightlines and building design. A final question on screening was asked and answered. Palmer will supply information to us prior to April 28. Dick Coulter of Virginia Farme indicated that higher traffic at the Post Office seems to occur at high traffic points during the day. The limiting factor to building size is the number of parking spaces and it appears that the building could double.

9:36 P.M. - Rezoning of Old Congregational Church for Post Office, i.e., Business Zone

The article has been withdrawn. Thus, no hearing will be held.

Zoning Amendment to Deal with Parking Lot Problem

This, too, has been withdrawn.

9:40 P.M. - Residence District P and Change of Land on Bedford Road to Residence District P

Doug Edwards made the presentation. The proposed bylaw is now different than originally presented to the various Town boards. Mr. Edwards read the proposal to those in attendance. They have tried to stay within the 2 acre zoning concept. No other side was considered because of the Woodward's interest in promoting the project. It was suggested that there should be a requirement for a finding that the site is appropriate for this type of facility. This law may not be stringent enough. George Foote questioned the definition of "younger people" and "Town families". Mr. Edwards suggested that rules and limitations can be placed. Purpose B.5.J.1. is not a purpose. The increase in density by 25% is taken from Residence District M. It was suggested that that was a drafting error. George suggested 2 bedrooms is the maximum limit and that the use of wetlands on the calculations should be limited. The buildings will be built by a group which would make a profit for that group. Hal Sauer asked if the property could be developed if the density were reduced to 2 acres. "No," responded Mr. Edwards. Kay Kulmala suggested that density calculations could be factored into a bylaw. George Senkler asked about building a project on just special permit. Skip Anderegg severely criticized the proposal as ill-prepared and ill-timed and ill-noticed. She suggested the bylaw was riddled with loopholes. Businesses, accessory buildings, etc. were not considered. Skip said, "Everybody is in favor of motherhood until your teenage daughter gets pregnant." The allusion referred to the purpose of the proposed bylaw versus its execution. Hal Sauer expressed sympathy with the goal, but advised that this proposal must be reviewed carefully in a process similarly arduous to that used in Residence District M. A resident opined that this project will not create low cost housing, but merely create a change in the character of the town. Debra Morse of Maple Street was concerned about the threat to the character of the Town, e.g., 50 parking spaces. This hearing will be continued until April 21, 1986.

11:50 P.M. - Change in Road Width Requirements

Gladys Pannell of West Street asked for the proposal to be read, which it was. Pat Cutter spoke in favor of the proposed change citing its advantages to the Town. Eileen Broudy spoke to the issue of giving the Planning Board more flexibility. David Stewart asked if it would promote subdivisions versus common driveways. Mary DeGarmo supported bike/footpaths on behalf of the League of Women Voters and opposed the proposed bylaws. The elimination of the bylaw requirement should be carefully scrutinized and thought out. George Foote responded that the Bylaw Review Committee has checked with Town Departments and the width is adequate for passing vehicles and that the Subdivision Rules and Regulations still require bike/footpaths. This hearing closed at 12:02 A.M.

12:03 A.M. - Lot Shape Requirements

Chairperson Chaput read the proposed changes to the zoning bylaw. George Foote spoke for the proposal. Frontage is now defined. He went on to speak about the 40 foot setback, expertly drawing illustrations as he progressed. This drew comment and criticism from Joe Gardner. The purpose was to avoid situations such as on Virginia Farme. George Senkler was concerned about odd shapes dictated by old walls. The question was asked, "Why are we here?" To eliminage abuses of frontage and lot shapes. Joe Gardner says that 60 to 70 percent of

two acre lots would become non-conforming. The purpose is to avoid champagne glass shaped 2 acre porkchop lots. This hearing ended on the note that the issue should go back to the drawing board. We turned to the dry area issue. The dry area is the recharge area for the well. Group discussion broke out showing the essence of participatory democracy. The purpose of this change is to protect the dry land recharge area. The 1.25 acres is the area required for recharge of 220 gallons per person per day. Hal Sauer suggested that we limit the changes for presentation to Town Meeting.

Items 8, 9 and 10

Items 8, 9 and 10 were opened as public hearings and continued to April 21, 1986 at 8:00 P.M. All public hearings not closed were continued to the 21st.

ANR Plans

Mr. Williams presented two ANR Plans: (1) Plan dated February 20, 1986 on Stearns Street drawn by Stamski and McNary for land owned by Soucy and Williams, and (2) Plan dated February 20, 1986 on Baldwin Road for land owned by Williams and Martini drawn by the same engineers. Both were approved upon unanimous vote of the Board

A motion was made to adjourn at 12:35 A.M. whereupon it passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Raftery