



# Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

*PLANNING BOARD*

**CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER  
872 WESTFORD STREET**

## **MINUTES; MEETING AUGUST 23, 1993**

The meeting was opened at 8:02 by acting chair Hughes. Present were Board members Chaput, Yanofsky and Colman; absent were Ernstoff, Evans and Duscha. Also present were ANR applicants named below.

**ANR/Nathan Rd./Congregational/ Unitarian Churches, dated 7/14/93:** Jill Natola, speaking for the churches, explained that the lot lines of two parcels were being changed to allow each one adequate acreage and frontage to meet present zoning requirements for acreage and frontage. On a motion from Colman, seconded by Yanofsky, the Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan.

**ANR/Berry Corner Lane/Therrien, dated 8/13/93:** Therrien, assisted by abuttor and part owner of Berry Corner Lane, Dick Wells, and accompanied by architect Hadjian and Brenda Hicks, explained that this ANR records the lot lines of a parcel of land which constitutes the last of five allowed building lots on Berry Corner Lane, a private road, permitted in 1968 under the then Small Subdivision regulations. This ANR eliminates the line which created two lots on a 1977 ANR, thereby eliminating one lot. The Board, on a motion from Colman, seconded by Yanofsky, voted unanimously to endorse the plan, noting that this is the last lot to be allowed to use Berry Corner Lane as frontage under the Small Subdivision regulations, which no longer exist.

The Board unanimously approved the minutes of August 9, 1993 as amended. Bills were approved for payment as submitted. In two cases, the Board authorized partial payment (Kopelman and Paige, which billed us for expenses incurred by the Conscom and Board of Health; NET, because Conscom has agreed to pay the fax installation.)

The Board asked the P.A. to send a memo to Health and Conscom outlining our agreement about use of the fax, and to post a log by the machine.

As a result of an offer made to Hughes, the Board asked the P.A. to ascertain whether the Assessors would allow a volunteer cartographer to enter data into their system which might be used to create topographical and geological maps for the Town, and to ascertain whether the computer is able to do this.

**Building/occupancy permits in subdivisions:** The Board discussed the packet of information sent to them by the P.A. in response to questions from Hughes at our last

meeting. Hughes had asked: How do we prevent building or occupancy permits in subdivisions in which required subdivision infrastructure is not complete? What is the Board's liability? Hughes asked the P.A. whether she recommended any action. The P.A. suggested that the Board could incorporate the language suggested by Counsel Cutler in 1992 as part of our M.P. strategy under the safety category; it would be one simple implementation. Chaput asked the P.A. to create a list of "boiler plate" subdivision conditions which would not have to be recreated from scratch in the rush to meet statutory deadlines for approval. Hughes asked that the P.A. do a summary of the issues.

**Master Plan Process:** The members discussed the agenda and process for the upcoming public meeting on rurality. As an unthreatening way to get participants to begin to refine the meaning of the word rurality, the Board agreed to try to formulate a Visual Quality Survey. In this process, some two dozen photos of scenes, including some showing development, would be evaluated by participants as to where they fall on the very -to- not -rural scale. These would be pinned up on the walls, so that when they arrive, participants could write their answers on notecards. The P. A. will attempt to find existing photos of other towns, as it was agreed photos of Carlisle might be threatening. Chaput will ask Midge Eliassen if she would be willing to take some photos. The agenda for Sept. 13, which will be finalized by Chaput and Yanofsky and sent to the P.A. for circulation by August 30, will call for Chaput, as moderator, to: 1) present the overall picture into which the rurality discussion fits, 2) describe our M.P. meeting schedule, 3) tell the group that we expect to come up with a synthesis of goals as a result of the evening's meeting, and 4) introduce the concept of Visual Quality Survey which participants have just completed. For Sept. 13, the P.A. will mail the category list, the minutes of August 9, and the agenda to all boards and committees and department heads. She will mail a postcard invitation, script as circulated at the meeting, to all clubs and chapter 61 people. She will send the letter of invitation to The Mosquito for the Sept. 3 issue as the paper will not have a Sept. 10 issue. The agenda and minutes will be placed in the library. It was agreed that all members would review the Tug Hill Commission and the State of Vermont Reports for their ideas and excellent graphics showing alternate uses on the same piece of land. The P.A. will ask those bodies for permission to reproduce their drawings to illustrate implementation strategies at Community Planning Day. The P.A. reported on her search for assistance among MAPC, EOCD, MMA, MIT conflict resolution group, and UMass land use planning department. She will send a letter to UMass asking formally for their assistance, hoping to get the attention of the Center for Rural Mass. branch of that department. The P.A. will research the court case which upheld two acre zoning for water protection where there are no public wells or sewers.

The Board agreed to ask John Ballantine to allow his hearing of Sept. 13 to be continued to Oct. 4, as the agenda will be very full with the rurality discussion. The Board will open the hearing that night and continue it; Ballantine's presence on Sept. 13 is not required.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04.

Sandy Bayne, Planner Assistant