

Minutes - Carlisle Planning Board  
August 12, 1968

Present were: H. Hosmer J. Macone D. Spaulding  
C. Evans R. McAllister T. Herndon

The meeting began with a discussion of Mr. Perley's consulting costs to the Board, and it was decided that the Treasurer should keep a separate total on such engineering fees in order that the Board could readily keep track of its expenses in this area.

A general appraisal of the hearing on Roads in Carlisle resulted in the consensus that a definite split exists between residents as to what new roads widths should be, and what should be done to existing roads. It was also agreed that the Planning Board, having no clear cut popular mandate on road widths, must take the lead in determining widths, as well as possibly initiating a program for mapping out and placing priorities on improvements of existing roads. Mr. Spaulding noted his impression of the hearing was that a two road width requirement was appropriate. Mr. McAllister felt that most people in town generally leaned toward desiring roads which were rural in character. Mr. Macone noted that the town's main roads (Westford-Bedford and Lowell-Concord Roads) were the ones with the highest accident records. However, he pointed out that these roads also carried the bulk of the high-speed traffic through town, and that there was no data as to number of accidents per passenger or vehicle mile.

During this discussion of roads in general, Mr. Hosmer reminded the Board that the subject of abandoning unused Town Ways had still not been resolved, and should be acted on at an early date. He noted that he had corresponded with the Selectmen on several occasions concerning this matter, and although they generally agreed with the proposal, there was some doubt as to how it should be done. Mr. Hosmer said that such an undertaking could be costly, and Town Counsel's preliminary investigation of procedure indicated that abandonment might also be extremely complex. After some general discussion, it was decided that this matter should be fully explored with the Selectmen at a joint meeting which was tentatively set for Sept. 9.

The Clerk then read a letter from the Peerless Insurance Co. stating their desire to have the bond on Peter Hans Road released by the Board. Mr. Macone noted that the construction of that road had been completed, and that in a discussion with the late Highway Surveyor, Mr. J. Clark, Mr. Clark had stated that the road was satisfactorily constructed. The Board instructed the Clerk to release the bond on Peter Hans Road.

The Clerk then reported that the Ogden subdivision (North Road) and the Nielsen subdivision (East Street) had been verbally approved by Mr. Perley, as to proper engineering and drainage aspects. The Board decided not to approve the definitive plans until a written approval had been received from Mr. Perley.

The Clerk noted that Mr. Connelly of Tricon Homes desired an early hearing on his definitive plan for 21 lots off of Westford Road. He said that Mr. Perley had gone over the engineering aspects of the plan and, with a few minor exceptions felt that the plan was satisfactory engineering wise. It was decided to plan for a hearing on August 26, unless the Sept 9th joint meeting could not be arranged. In the latter case, the Connelly hearing should be scheduled for Sept. 9.

The Board then took up the suggested revisions to its Rules and Regulations. Under Section 5B item 5, the Clerk reported that he had obtained from Mr. Perley an estimate of costs of oil and stone surfacing versus paved (bituminous asphalt) roads. Oil and stone surface costs approximately fifty cents per square yard,

while paving costs one dollar and twenty-five cents per square yard. After discussing the relative longevity of such surfaces, during which the Clerk reported that the oil and gravel surface requires reoiling and sanding at 3-6 year intervals while blacktop paving does not need any maintenance for a considerably longer period of time, the Board decided to require bituminous asphalt paving only on subdivisions roads.

#### Section 5D - Side Slopes

1. Instead of having the side slopes start at the outer limit of the right of way, as suggested by Mr. Perley, the Board decided that such slopes should start some 4' to 6' back for the edge of the pavement, This would give sufficient space for pushing snow off of the pavement, and would not make the road into an excessively wide boulevard in appearance. The Clerk was instructed to ask Mr. Perley for his opinion as to what setback from the pavement would adequate for snow plowing.

#### Section 5E - Storm Drainage

1. Instead of deleting the phrase "where necessary" it was decided to modify it to "where necessary in the opinion of the Planning Board". Also the Board decided to add the requirement that the maximum distance between inlets to the drainage system shall not exceed 300 feet.

#### Section 5 - Addition

- a. The Board agreed to require the developer to show all details, in general, on his plans.
- b. The Board was unsure as to the necessity of concrete pipe instead of galvanized iron pipe for drainage, and decided to seek other professional opinions on the relative lifetimes of the two types of pipe.
- c. It was agreed to require all drainage calculations and contour lines on subdivision plans. The elevation interval of the contour lines was left open until additional data could be gathered as to what interval would be suitable.

#### Section 6A - Small Subdivisions.

- 1a. The Board agreed not to require paving on such small subdivision roads.
- 1b. The Board had previously adopted the standard street right of way (40 feet) for small subdivisions.
- 1c. It was agreed to require the legend "PrivateWay" be put on the small subdivision road as delineated on the plan.

#### OTHER SUGGESTED ADDITIONS AND MODIFICATIONS.

The Board had previously agreed to delete, under section 2, relative to scale of plans, the wording, "or other scale as the Board may approve to show details clearly and adequately".

The Board had previously agreed to increase the Filing Fee to \$15.00 per lot and \$25.00 per subdivision plan.

The Board had previously agreed to require numbering of houses in new developments.

The Board had previously agreed to clarify the wording of the Lot Size Regulation section which spells out frontage requirements in the Town By-Laws. (Section 5, page 18 in the 1962 version)

The Chairman noted that the Board had agreed with the Board of Health to place a legend on all plans, stating that "No lot shall be built upon until all requirements of the applicable regulations of the Town of Carlisle are complied with." (Page 2 of minutes for Nov. 13, 1967 meeting).

The question of how to prevent "pork chop" lots from being automatically created and approved by the Board's requiring easements for extensions from turnabouts to boundary lines was discussed briefly. The sense of the meeting indicated that this was a potentially serious problem, which should be corrected if possible.

The meeting was then adjourned

Respectfully submitted

Terry Herndon

July 31

To Members of the Planning Board:

There will be a Planning Board meeting on August 12 at 8:00 p.m. at the Selectmen's Office. This is our regular meeting time, and since there is no subdivision business, I hope that we can spend an hour or so on the Rules and Regulations changes, and perhaps finish that item of business.

Sincerely,  
Terry O. Herndon