



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

Correct + file

P.O. BOX 729
CARLISLE, MA 01741
(508) 369-9702

Minutes: Meeting of May 24, 1993

Chair Ernstoff opened the meeting at 8:04. Chaput, Evans, Hughes, Duscha, Colman and Yanofsky were present. Also present were George Foote and Mr. Loutrel.

Minutes of May 10 and hearing minutes (special permit -Blumenreich accessory apartment) of May 10 were approved.

Landtech meeting Peter Parent of Landtech met with the Board to respond to the Board's question as to what additional services Landtech can offer now that the Board no longer has an engineer member. George Foote had filled the roll of technical liaison, pointing out potential problem areas in a proposed plan so that Landtech could focus on that area immediately. It appears that the Board will need more extensive evaluation and advice from Landtech in the future, both on specific plans and on our rules and regs. Parent explained that Landtech is a full service engineering and project management firm. They have experience in reviewing plans for conformance with rules and regs and bylaws, and generally they do a two tier review. The first review is a broad one for gross departure from bylaws and regs, assuming the information given by the engineering firm of the applicant is valid. The second level of review would go into checking calculations. Chaput asked if the firm could be proactive as well as reactive; Parent assured the Board Landtech could. Colman explained that he, unknowledgable about engineering, would be the Board's liaison to Landtech, and therefore would need to be educated. Foote emphasized that the Board needs not just technical compliance, but also constructive suggestions as to better design than the applicant may be proposing. Parent asked the Board to give him further direction as to what styles of development the Board finds desirable. Hughes stated the overriding precept in Carlisle is: preserve rurality. Parent asked whether we'd used cluster. Hughes replied that the option hasn't been used as much as the Board would like, possibly because developers are unsure of how to use it and we haven't offered design help. Chaput asked whether Landtech can offer bylaw development assistance. Parent replied that they had done this type of work in Westford.

Worth ANR On a motion by Evans and a second by Colman, the Board approved and signed an ANR for Walter Worth of 283 Baldwin St. Mr. Loutrel explained that he is to purchase the parcel being divided off, and that he will add it to his abutting lot.

Brown ANR Foote explained to the Board that this ANR, with a nonsubstantive difference, is the same one the Board disapproved in November of 1992, and that the Board denied that plan because it didn't have the frontage required by the zoning bylaw at

that time. Nothing has changed regarding frontage. Section 81-L of Chapter 41 was cited. Chaput explained that she had reviewed Section 81-L trying to see both sides of the discussion. She pointed out that the zoning officer reviews plans for zoning compliance, not the Board. She also pointed out, as an example, that the Worth lot was different in that the divided lot has adequate frontage and acreage after the division. Yanofsky and Duscha noted that the nonconforming aspect, the frontage, is not being reduced. Foote pointed out that one must look at acreage to determine if the frontage is adequate; District B allows two different lot acreage/frontage possibilities. Colman agreed that the nonconforming aspect is not being changed, but commented that we can't get to that stage of consideration if the frontage isn't adequate. Yanofsky pointed out that two opposing lawyers had agreed, and therefore wondered if we shouldn't ^{take} their advice. Ernstoff and Colman suggested that we speak with Town Counsel again. Chaput will speak with Cutler. A straw vote revealed that Evans, Duscha, Chaput and Colman would vote to deny if they had to vote that night, the timing of which vote would be required without an extension of the 21 day decision period. Mr. Gardner, legal representative for the applicant, was informed of this situation and he requested an extension to the day after the next meeting, which would mean through June 8, so that the Board might consult more fully with Town Counsel. The P. A. was asked to fax Gardner a letter of agreement the next day, asking that he respond by 5:00 P.M. if the letter did not express his intent.

correct,

Burak ANR The ANR for Genevieve Burak of 175 Brook St. was approved on a motion from Hughes, seconded by Colman, pending the addition of a statement that the Planning Board's approval does not imply conformance with zoning. At issue is a large but undimensioned shed within the sideyard setback.

Blumenreich Decision Draft The Board reviewed the decision drafted by the P. A. Colman wondered if the decision needed the level of detail given; Evans replied he felt it just right, and useful for future reference. The absence of a statement emphasizing the finding that the dwelling would retain the single family dwelling appearance was noted, and the P. A. was asked to add that. The Board approved the draft as amended.

Draft Subdivision Rules Changes The Board discussed changes suggested by the P. A.; she will redraft them and advertise a hearing.

Master Plan The Board agreed to schedule the discussion of process for an early hour on June 7; all boards will be invited to the June 21st meeting, as will the Fire Chief, Police Chief, and Building Inspector.

Overview of Planning Board's Work Chaput discussed the Board's responsibility under the Subdivision Law and under the Zoning Act, and under local bylaws and rules.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40.

Sandy Bayne, Planning Assistant