



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 729 027
CARLISLE, MA 01741
(508) 369-9702

CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER
872 WESTFORD ST.

MINUTES: MEETING OF FEB 28, 1994

Chair Ernstoff opened the meeting at 8:13. Present were board members Chaput, Hughes, Yanofsky, and Duscha; also present were Hal Sauer, Dave Stewart and Kay Woodward of the Housing Options group, George Foote, and briefly, Bob Koning, Building Inspector.

Senior housing bylaw In order to accommodate the Housing Options group, the discussion on the senior housing bylaw was moved up. The P.A. had distributed a draft, dated 2/28, which names the bylaw the Senior Residential Open Space Community, emphasizing the triple good to be achieved. This refers to the preservation of open space, the provision of housing for seniors and the enhancement of community, at least for seniors in this community. Stewart reported that Howard Hensleigh had researched the state law which allows a bylaw to select seniors; the restrictions are that the parcel must be at least 5 acres, and the age may be as low as 55; the Housing Options group would prefer the age of 62.

Foote suggested that the open space requirement of 60% would force land owners with large parcels to sell off part of the parcel to meet the 60%, counteracting the intent of the bylaw, which is to control as much land as possible. He suggests instead a ratio of open space to density of development; the bylaw would say something like ---acres of open space will be provided for every dwelling unit. Ernstoff postponed the balance of this discussion until after meetings scheduled for 8:30 and 9:00.

Kydd land Mr. Kydd and his attorney Joe Shanahan, both of Chelmsford, asked the board for direction regarding the development of Mr. Kydd's 27 acre parcel of land off the end of Nickles Lane. They presented a road layout and lotting plan which would connect Nickles to Oak Hill Rd., and which showed nine lots. They stated that seven lots have perked, and eight would make the construction of the road financially feasible. The wetlands had been mapped and shown on the plan, and the crossing done at what they believe is the narrowest point. They asked the board, as they had earlier in the year, whether it would prefer the through road, as shown, or extensions, in cul-de-sac form from the two existing roads, or from either one. Mr. Kydd is willing to give up some lots rather than have to build a through road. Questioning revealed that there would be a 50 foot drop in elevation over the 400 foot run from Oak Hill into the new road, a grade of approximately 12 %. Mr. Shanahan pointed out the grade could be designed over a longer run. He stated that fill in wetlands would not exceed the 5,000 square feet limit under the wetlands bylaw. The board reminded Kydd and Shanahan that the Subdivision Rules and

Regs do not allow cul-de-sacs of over 1000', and that the prohibition stems from concern for public safety in the case of a fire or other emergency occurring simultaneously with an accident or blow down which blocks access to the emergency. If a through road can be built according to the rules and regs, then the board is willing to approve it, and, in fact, must approve it.

Tall Pines Mr. Costello updated the board on the progress of the subdivision through negotiations with the ConsCom and the Friends of the Tall Pines. ConsCom and Costello have agreed to reimpose 72 conditions on the subdivision, with the condition set by Costello that the Friends agree not to appeal again. So far, that condition has not been agreed to. He reported further that two building lots have been lost and eight more restricted through the Natural Heritage Foundation. Although the board and he had discussed the possibility of clustering Bruce Lane, his examination of the lotting has revealed it won't work; however, he is willing to give lot 10, the one closest to the Tall Pines, to the town. The deadline for an agreement is June 1; he hopes to begin building this year.

Senior housing, cont'd. Mr. Costello offered comment on the senior housing bylaw. He suggested a sunset provision in the bylaw, which would effect an expiration of the bylaw in a named number of years, and a limit on the total number of units which could be built town wide, as we have in the accessory apartment bylaw. He mentioned that it is so expensive to do the paperwork for Comprehensive Permits that few are done, but if we wanted to provide some subsidized units, we could add a bonus for density. If the development is done without federal funding, then Carlisle residents and relatives of Carlisle residents could be given favored status to receive units. He further suggested that we review and publicize how many parcels remain in town which are feasible for this type of development; he feels it is very few, perhaps a half dozen. Sauer mentioned MAGIC statistics which evaluate Carlisle to be approximately 90% built out.

Regarding density, Foote mentioned that whereas a standard subdivision lot in Carlisle averages 2.2 acres, it takes 2.6 acres to create a conservation cluster lot. Overall, it takes an average of 3 acres per dwelling tract wide to create a subdivision in either case. He felt the method proposed in the draft for calculating density is inadvisable. He suggests we reach the same density goals by simply saying divide the number of acres by two; for example, on 30 acres, you may have 15 dwelling units. If we feel it is necessary for the feasibility of such a development, we could simply add a density factor, such as allowing one unit per 1.8 acres. Stewart noted that not having to do a demonstration subdivision plan would save the proponent development costs and provide a slight density increase. This in turn allows them to buy less valuable land, making development costs less. He suggested the board might take the position that it is in the public interest to provide senior housing, and therefore, slightly increased density could be supportable. Ernstoff expressed his reluctance to do away with the demonstration plan; he would rather know the number of lots which might realistically be approved, and then grant an increased density under the bylaw because of the public benefit of senior housing. As an example, the group applied both methods to a piece of land which the Senior Options group had examined. This 100 acre parcel has only 30 buildable acres because so much is wet, so

most likely in a standard subdivision there would be 10 lots. For senior housing, under the first method, 100 would be divided by 2, obtaining 50 lots, and consequently, 50 dwelling units (averaging 100 bedrooms). Under the second method, the 30 acres would result in 10 lots or dwelling units, and a density factor, yet to be determined, would be granted. If it were 50%, the number of d.u.'s would be 15. This number will be based on the board's research into the minimum density required to make a senior housing development feasible financially. However, in either case, the tract wide density must remain no greater than 2 acres per unit.

Regarding the natural resource protection criteria, Foote suggests that the conservation cluster criteria should be reserved only for cluster, and that a different and less demanding list of criteria should be developed for this bylaw. The provision of senior housing is in itself one of the preservation aspects. He also felt the cluster open space requirement which stipulates a border of open space around the cluster should be carried into this bylaw to prevent any portion of the Community from being sold off and redeveloped. Yanofsky asked whether the board should spell out the meaning of the second purpose; she also suggested a required finding might be that adequate access has been provided to all residential buildings, given that the ways will be privately owned.

Foote questioned the need for the 50' setbacks of residential buildings from ways; senior citizens will want to be close to the driveways and parking.

The issue of whether the death of a 62 year old purchaser would require his 60 year old wife to move was resolved by wording stipulating that one member of a family must have attained the age of 62 by the time of purchase.

It was also suggested that septic fields and wells not be allowed in the open space.

The board will consider further what type of plans to require, and whether they should be requirements of the bylaw or of the rules and regs under the bylaw. The bylaw itself might simply stipulate that plans sufficient in the opinion of the planning board will need to be submitted, both for a demonstration plan and for the Senior Residential Open Space Community plan. Rules and regs will be required, and would be written after the bylaw passes.

The board expects that the ways will be private, and the ZBL limitation restricting a private way to one lot needs to be waived. The construction of the private way would be permitted under the rules and regs. It was agreed that a definitive subdivision plan requirement is unnecessary, but Ernstoff reiterated that a demonstration plan which Health and ConsCom review is essential.

The P.A. was asked to work on a revised draft with Stewart, Ernstoff and Foote in the next week.

Bills were approved for payment as submitted.

Ice Pond security release The P.A. has been advised by the Fire Chief that the cistern has not yet passed a pump test; therefore the board voted unanimously not to release funds.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20.

Sandy Bayne, P.A.