



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Meeting of September 22, 1986

Present: Chaput, Sherr, Leask, Davis, Raftery. Clarke arrived later.

Minutes and Mail

CV&P has viewed Suffolk Lane and reported as to status and progress. We have not yet appointed the other member to the HAC (earlier we decided on the Reverend Widrick). It was suggested that Jeff Sauer be this Board's second nominee. He was duly nominated, seconded and unanimously approved. Mrs. Chaput will notify the Selectmen of the two appointments by the Board.

Master Planning Committee ("MPC")

Approximately six months ago, the Selectmen sought advice from the MPC concerning a site for a new town office building. A summary of its findings were presented to the Board and are included in the file copy of these minutes. The two sites most favored were Lot #16 next to St. Irene's and the Meeting House. Hal Sauer questioned the method of making a summary decision on site favorability from the chart of site factors. Harold Tincher spoke on behalf of the MPC about the near unanimity of opinion on the MPC. It was suggested that the worksheets used by the MPC members might be helpful and illustrative. Since the compilation, there was some information that a second floor on the fire station might be an attractive site and that, structurally, the project could be accomplished. The Board received a note from the Historical Commission that a building on the school property would be unacceptable. The Selectmen indicated that little activity has taken place with respect to the relocation, if at all, of the Post Office. Mr. Sherr questioned the summary in that the Meeting House had a high cost in one instance and none in another. Mr. Tincher explained the difference as purchase versus lease. The Conant Land was perceived as not close to the center despite its actual proximity. (Note the key work is "perceived.") The sites selected were perceived as being part of the center, easily accessible by walkway. Tom Nigro questioned the adequacy of parking at the Meeting House and the assumptions behind it. The consensus was that the Meeting House was preferable as town offices only and below average if used for both post office and town office use. Mr. Leask questioned parking, physical size, fire safety and handicap access. Mr. Tincher indicated that the MPC did try to look 5 to 7 years out, but that the MPC could not quantify a good deal of information. The next step would be quantifying needs of various departments. Mrs. Simonds indicated that the charge to the MPC was only to recommend sites, not to quantify data or to begin site and building design. She also suggested that the Planning Board and Conservation Commissions have their specific roles and tasks to perform and they should not venture into other requirements for which they need not worry. Mr. Leask responded that size is an important consideration in determining site impact. Hal Sauer indicated that the Planning Board selected the Meeting House

as an appropriate site during the 1970's. Tom Nigro warned that it would be folly to consider the town office building without considering post office, elderly housing and affordable housing (as that term is often used by the Executive Branch of the Commonwealth). He reminded those present of one of the reasons for purchase of the Conant Land, i.e., expansion for town facilities. He recommended a careful consideration of 5 to 7 year needs. Mr. Tincher agreed with Mr. Nigro and pointed out that traditionally town offices have looked out upon town greens and the MPC tried to maintain that flavor. Katharine Kulmala, erstwhile editor of the "Carlisle Mosquito", suggested that the town also consider purchase of Lot #16 next to St. Irene's for a combined town office and police station building. She provided several written advantages of her proposal; she did point out disadvantages also, but she felt the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. She provided a thumbnail sketch of her proposal. Mr. Tincher believed that the MPC felt that Lot #16 did not "feel" as far as the Conant Land. True, Kay Kulmala agreed, Lot 16 is 800 feet versus 1200-1300 feet from the center. Kate Simonds vigorously opposed changing the police station site at this late stage. Kay Kulmala stated that Lot 16 would be a good site for a post office alone. At 9:00 P.M. Mrs. Chaput suggested that the Planning Board take the material, thanking the MPC for their work, and begin to select the sites for a town office building and post office.

Historical Commission Review of Town Buildings

Jim Davis suggested that the Historic District be expanded to include Highland School and square up the district. He inquired whether the Planning Board had any other suggestions. He suggested monies may be available for the brick and Highland School buildings. His second suggestion was a town building design review committee to determine whether designs are acceptable, at least aesthetically. He did report the Historical Commission's opposition to development of the corner of Church and School Streets. The Commission was hoping for a consensus of various town boards before seeking approval of town meeting. The advantage to the town is state aid for certain repairs on the aforesaid school buildings. Perhaps one house would be added to the district. The Highland Building appears to qualify for historical building status. This does not mean rezoning, but rather expansion of the historic district. There seemed to be no objection by the Board members but there seemed to be a lack of analysis of the impact. It was suggested that this Board consider this idea and respond to the Historical Commission. The concept of the review function would be to provide a watchdog committee on design and compliance to design presented to townspeople when they vote to fund town facility construction. At this point, there is little the Historical Commission can do with respect to buildings that lie outside, but impact upon the historic district. Harold Tincher supported Jim Davis' proposals for a review committee.

Common Driveway - Kane off Martin Street

Mr. Sherr represented that only minor grading is required. An as-built plan has been delivered to the Board.

Rodgers Road Subdivision

Mr. Williams suggested that a lien on two lots be substituted for his covenant not to construct. Mrs. Chaput will contact CV&P to determine the costs of construction; Mr. Raftery will review the proposed lien and this item will be included as an agenda item for the October 6th meeting.

To: Planning Board
From: The Master Planning Committee
Re: Potential Sites for Town Offices

The Master Planning Committee has evaluated 10 potential sites for town offices.

It is our feeling that only two of these sites properly meets most of the criteria as established by all of our committee for a potential town office site. These two sites, as judged above average are:

1. Lot #16, next to St. Irenes Parish.
2. Meeting House, for town offices only.

Four sites were judged average. They are:

1. Construction of a new floor or story, over the present fire station.
2. Corner lot, Church and School Streets
3. Highland Building
4. Conant Land behind Police Station

The following two sites were judged below average:

1. Davis Land
2. Meeting House, combining both the post office and town office.

Four sites were not evaluated, or considered unacceptable.

1. Bates Land -unacceptable
2. Palmer Land -unacceptable
3. Behind/beside library -unacceptable
4. Private residences, if available not evaluated

These results already are known to most of you as three members of the Planning Board were members of our committee. These persons were Vivian Chaput, Tom Rafferty and Sylvia Sillers.

I hope that this information is helpful to you.

Harold Tincher
Chairman, MPC

Harold Tincher

EVALUATION CRITERIA
FOR TOWN OFFICE SITE
by Carlisle Master
Planning Committee
September 16, 1986

except cost if feasible but unacceptable due to feasibility and other constraints (average) average Davis Mtg. Hs. parking w/ variance for 18 spaces Highland Mtg. Hs. TO + PD Average TO + PD

	Lot 16	Behind Police	Over Fire	Behind Library	School & Church Sts.	Davis Land	Mtg. Hs. TO Only	Highland	Mtg. Hs. TO + PD
1. Cost Factors									
a. Land Acquisition	> avg. FMV	> avg.	> avg.?	wetland	avg.	0	high	0	0
b. Site Development	avg.	avg.	< avg.?	avg.	avg.	avg.	minor	minor	< avg.
c. New Building	> avg.	> avg.	< avg.	avg.	avg.	avg.	(in rent) unknown but could be quite low	high	unknown
d. Rehab Old Building	close	yes	close	yes	yes	no	yes	close	yes
e. Total Costs	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	no (but potential)	yes
2. General Location	yes	no/?	yes	slightly neg.	yes	?	easy to find	no	yes
a. In/Close to Center	no	minor	yes	neutral	adv. avg.	possibly	no	no	yes
b. Historic District	no	?	no	?	?	no	no	no	unknown
c. Main Road, Visible	yes	neutral	yes	exc.	exc.	no	yes	yes	yes
d. Traffic Problems: (vol., sight, speed)	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	marginal	no
e. Impact on Center's water quant., qual.	yes	?	yes	exc. yes	probably OK	no	no	yes	yes
f. Easy Walk	yes	yes	yes	no	probably OK	no	no	no	unknown
3. Specific Lot Factors									
a. Room to build, park	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
b. Access Frontage OK	yes	?	yes	OK	yes	doubtful	yes	yes	yes
c. Problems with SDS	no	?	no	uncertain	probably OK	no	no	no	unknown
d. Water Supply Problem	no	?	no	no	probably OK	no	no	no	unknown
e. Impact on Neighbors (noise, cam, flight, etc.)	2 nhrs.	2 nhrs.	2 nhrs.	none	1 neighbor	no	3 neighbor	2 nhrs.	3 nhrs.
f. Interface w/ other public bldgs.	-	yes	yes	no	avg.	no	-	no	-
g. Zoning changes nec.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
h. Good/best use of Site (v. Conserv.)	yes	controversial	yes	wooded background	wooded background, children's view from green	no	yes	arts or town services	?
i. Legal restrictions	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no
j. Overflow park'g near	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
k. Other	P.O. too if rezoned
4. Esthetic Impact									
a. Historic look of present building	-	-	uncertain	-	-	-	yes	yes	unknown if bldg. expanded
b. Open space frame	OK	negative	negative	-	negative	negative	OK	OK	negative
5. If An Exist'g Bldg.:									
a. Town owned or leased	-	-	poss.	-	-	-	lease?	own	lease
b. Room for Mtg. Rooms	-	-	-	-	-	-	yes	yes	temporarily only
c. Effect of other use in bldg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	negative
d. Suitability of bldg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	good	needs rehab.	marginal

Bates land unacceptable