



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

P.O. Box 729
Ph. 369-9702
Fax 369-4521

CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER
872 WESTFORD ST.
MINUTES MEETING JAN. 24, 1994

Chair Ernstoff opened the meeting at 8:12. Attending were board members Duscha, Hughes, Yanofsky, Chaput and Colman, Bill Costello of Concord, Ruth Toscano, Tara Hengeveld, Mike Benfield, and Housing Options Committee members Kay and Walt Woodward, Hal Sauer, and David Stewart.

Community Day Survey and Master Plan Ernstoff opened the floor to comments from attendees regarding the Master Plan process, the Community Day follow-up survey, and the proposal by the board to place certain bylaw changes on the warrant for spring town meeting. The period from 8-8:30 had been publicized as a time set aside by the board for such comment. No one spoke to the survey or master plan process.

Senior Housing Dave Stewart, who had been invited to comment on a board proposal to create a senior housing bylaw, explained that as the cluster bylaw is now written, homes cannot be placed closely enough to allow the feeling of community and security the seniors would presumably wish. He said further that Carlisle has a substantial number of "house rich" citizens who may be forced to leave town because they cannot afford to maintain their large valuable houses. These are people who have long been contributing members of the community, and do not want to leave. He suggested two changes which would be needed. One would allow for reduction or elimination of side set-back so homes could be very close. The second would allow the reduction of the requirement for 50% of the open space to be outside the Wetland/Flood Hazard District.

Sauer commented that we could maintain two acre density, while pulling homes together for lower cost and companionability. It could be an overlay Residence M by Special Permit from the Planning Board.

Chaput pointed out that the problem with the Zone M bylaw is that town meeting passed it only because it was limited to one site. It doesn't jeopardize water quality because the number of bedrooms was limited to the number which might have been built in the "by right" one acre underlying zone. She suggested another way to achieve the goal might be to allow conservation cluster with zero side yard set-backs with triangular lot shapes fanning out from the drive way. The 250 foot circle requirement for the proof "by right" plan might have to be eliminated too. She referred favorably to the traditional New England rambling home which was added to as the need arose, wing by wing. There are several of these in Carlisle.

Stewart added that the biggest problem is the cost of land. To counteract that limitation, and to protect water quality, he suggested we might control such a complex by bedroom

count and septic capacity rather than by acreage, thus allowing less than 2 acres per home for senior housing on appropriate land.

Walter Woodward mentioned the linkage concept. He remembered that in permitting Residence M, the greater density of homes there was considered to be balanced by the open space of the nearby ballfield. But the likelihood of the town allowing such a trade-off if applied to separate parts of town was deemed by some members of the board to be low. The unacceptability of that idea would be based on general NIMBY type fears and the potential to undermine water quality.

Hughes suggested a group of interested people visit good examples in other towns and determine how Carlisle could achieve the same results. Kay Woodward will provide a list of such examples to the P.A. Hughes is very impressed with Audubon Hills in Acton, which is limited not by income but by minimum age.

Sauer commented that relaxing the conservation cluster requirements may do it; but he warned we need unanimity on the part of the boards. Stewart mentioned the O'Rourke land as a site which they had considered. They found the cost vs. usable space ratio was not favorable enough. He added that phasing, allowing approximately 15 units per phase, would probably make financial sense. Yanofsky asked if 15 units were needed. Stewart replied that the human need is there and economies of scale require such grouping.

Costello spoke as a developer about the low feasibility of such a project being done on market rate land. It is hard for a developer to choose a two acre density senior housing option because each unit is worth so much less than the standard single family home on two acres and the land can't be bought cheaply enough to support that difference. He suggests permitting based on the square footage usually built by right on our two acre lots, and then allowing comparable square footage regardless of the number of units.

Chaput recalled that, in an earlier round of discussions, the ConsCom had been reluctant to support permitting based on bedroom counts. Benfield did not recall that concern. Chaput said she thought it was based on the idea that kitchens may be more pollution producing than bedrooms and their attendant bathrooms. Benfield suggested that this would be more likely to be a Board of Health concern.

Ernstoff outlined the number and general content of the four warrant articles the board has agreed to reserve for town meeting. Chaput suggested she and the Housing Options group meet with the ConsCom and Health Board immediately after the Planning Board's Feb. 14th meeting. The next step would be a meeting with the Selectmen.

Yanofsky asked the minimum number of units and bedrooms the group would propose. Stewart replied 18 units and 36 bedrooms. Sauer stated that many people are leaving town now; that number of units is definitely needed. The board will meet with the Housing Options Committee again on Feb. 14 at 8:00 P.M.

Tall Pines Ernstoff invited Costello to discuss the standing of the Tall Pines subdivision and the process which is occurring now involving ConsCom, Tall Pines, and the Friends of the Tall Pines. Costello explained that the subdivision remained the same as the one approved by the board; the two plans submitted under the Wetland Protection Act to D.E.P. and to Conscom do nothing to change that recorded plan. There are two plans under the Notice of Intent process; if either is denied, they will effectively both be denied. He explained that when the superseding order had been issued by the state, all the

conditions set by the ConsCom were automatically eliminated. D.E.P. asked him to present his plan again to the local board. That was not done officially because ConsCom did not open hearings in the 21 day time limit for action. But a subcommittee, composed of ConsCom members, Friends of the Tall Pines, and he, is working to create a set of conditions. He is mindful, though, of the 90 day window he has to answer to the state on the appeals filed by The Friends because the ConsCom did not hold hearings.

Toscano added that the subcommittee, of which she is a part, is trying to reach a voluntary agreement whereby this large subdivision has conditions which go a long way toward satisfying each of the three parties, but that each will have to compromise.

Duscha asked if Costello is intending to go forward on the first section without the second. He answered no.

He also addressed the idea of reconfiguring Barnes Place, the cul-de-sac which comes closest to the Tall Pines. He felt he would like to eliminate the road, create a cluster, and provide a two hundred foot fee buffer for the pines. He is prohibited from doing that by the requirements of the cluster bylaw. The sections which cause problems are 5.5.2.4.1, which when he proposed Tall Pines required the 250 foot circle, and the confusing question of whether the bylaw contradicts itself regarding the necessity of a common driveway for clusters. It was determined that the bylaw had been changed regarding the circle requirements since he had reviewed it. As to the common driveway, section 5.5.2.8 says "Wherever possible, all building lots...shall be served by common driveways".

Costello seemed satisfied with the board's explanations.

Master Plan The P.A. raised the issue of the amount of time required to prepare bylaws for town meeting and the number of hours she has been spending on regulatory work; she is concerned that there be a realistic assessment of the possibilities of what can be accomplished. She will prepare a time line for the next meeting, including meetings with other land use boards, the need for town counsel review, and public hearings. She asked that board members review the Land Use Manager notebook, the Pioneer Valley planning notebook, all previous Carlisle surveys, and tabulate results of the dozen surveys so far returned. Duscha will tabulate. Yanofsky, Duscha and Chaput will review the notebooks. She mentioned her concern, too, about the acceptability of the format of article 2 ("direct the board"), and that the board needs to know what it is the board would study under that direction from the town.

Chaput mentioned the possibility of wrapping article 2 into the report on this year's process on the master plan to be prepared for article 1. This would have the double effect of providing more substance in the report, and encouraging people who wish to vote to support the master planning process to also support the research on growth limitations, open space preservation, and senior housing options. The board would be pledging, in this arrangement, that nothing we propose will contradict or undermine those three major values. Ernstoff questioned whether the board would then still wish to include the assertion that the planning board should be given greater flexibility in considering special permits. The board seemed to feel that should come under the specific proposals to be presented at a later town meeting.

Chaput will talk with the Town Moderator about the format of our proposed articles. Should the report be only a handout which people are not asked to accept, followed by an article which asks for direction? Should there be a report article and a direction article? As for the direction article, Yanofsky will create a list of questions which may be asked about it, and to which the board needs to have answers.

Ice Pond The P.A.'s report on the issue of the tree cutting prohibition on lot A and Extra Land X was discussed. The board agreed that it appears its enforcement powers are limited. The question will be put to town counsel when the situation actually arises.

Special Permit Decisions The board agreed the chair and one other designated board member will review each decision before it is filed with the town clerk. The P.A. also suggested the board spell out its findings more specifically when doing special permit hearings.

Budget Colman submitted a draft; the board discussed it and approved it. Colman will be meeting with the FinCom on Jan. 27.
The meeting was adjourned at 11:14.

Sandy Bayne, Planner Assistant