

Draft

Minutes Monday, March 20, 1995

Vivian Chaput, chair of the master plan subcommittee, opened the meeting at 8:05 at the Carlisle Education Center, Westford Street, Carlisle, at 8:00 pm. In attendance were members LaLiberte, Hengeveld, Evans and Duscha.

The working session began with discussion of the organizational problems of the draft master plan. Hengeveld felt that unclear transitions made parts of the report difficult to follow e.g. chart of community values.

Chaput and Hengeveld agreed that calling the long range planning document a study plan rather than a master plan better connotes a living, changing plan. Townspeople might be more inclined to accept a study plan at town meeting.

Duscha suggested that the various authors were converging on an organization of 1. outlining existing conditions, 2. future vision, and 3. action recommendations. It was agreed that all sections be organized in a similar manner.

Hengeveld stated that the lists of objectives need to be concise. While input from CPD participants is valuable, the planning board needs to show that it has done some analysis and refinement of the objectives. Maybe the objectives should lead to more recommendations if they cannot be cut back. Duscha voiced concern about what information was used to generate the objectives because in some cases the exact wording was from CPD 92 and did not reflect data collected later.

Then members began addressing specific sections, issues, and missing information.

- regional issues unaddressed
- business district should not be enlarged per Community Planning Day participants' wishes
- schools given priority in Services section
- Title V section needs clarification
- maintain aquifers and monitor for contaminants
- identifying dangerous roads is a liability for the town
- sidewalks one mile from center of town arbitrary
- address ADA requirements/opportunities town-wide
- lack of town center parking
- town hall focused on the green

All agreed that the description of the cost benefit analysis of residential development and purchasing conservation lands needs to be strengthened. Chaput responded that a Fincom member had illustrated the point by going through the rough costs of an additional school pupil. Hengeveld suggested that the debt service of buying conservation land needed to be included and suggested that the concept of buying conservation land was analogous to a fixed mortgage and that housing development to a variable mortgage.

The work session was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Submitted by Sally Duscha