

Public Hearing on Definitive Plan of

"Tricon Homes, Inc. "

Aug. 26, 1968

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

Mr. Hosmer opened the hearing by describing the location of the proposed subdivision, its size and asking for questions from the audience. Mr. Roger Robertson, an abutter, asked where the proposed drainage ditch running from the Westford Road area would come relative to his property, Mr. Ralph Nelson, the engineer for Tricon Homes, explained that the ditch would run back from the intersection of the subdivision property, and would not be on or affect Mr. Robertson's property. Mr. Nelson explained that a set of basins or small ponds was originally contemplated to catch the drainage water from that area, and possibly then drain overland and/or through an existing culvert under Westford Road. However, Tricon Homes had opted for the ditch arrangement after studying the situation further.

Mr. Evans asked if such a basin could be used as a fire hole, and would Mr. Connelly the developer, be interested in such an arrangement. Mr. Connelly said that he would be happy to put in such a firehole, so long as some provision was made, presumably by the Town, to eliminate the hazard of children possibly falling in such a firehole. Mr. Evans enquired whose responsibility a fire hole would be, and Mr Hosmer noted that he doubted if the landowner would be responsible for a firehole on his property. Mr. Hosmer suggested that the Board should talk with the Fire Chief and Selectmen about whether a firehole would be advisable for this location.

Mr. Evans then asked what provision was planned for running the brook in the subdivision under the road. Mr. Nelson said that they proposed to install 12 inch diameter concrete pipe to accomodate the brook.

Mr. Hosmer, noting the Board's receipt of a letter from Mr. W. J. Smith, an abutter, in which Mr. Smith expressed his concern over his land becoming landlocked by the subdivision, asked Mr. Nelson if Mr. Smith's property lay in the path of the road easement running easterly from the proposed subdivision road. Mr. Nelson said that Mr. Smith's property would have access on that easement. Mr. Evans asked how far apart the catch basins were, and Mr. Nelson said that they averaged a spacing of approx. 400 feet. Mr. Spaulding asked, where the slope of the land was steep, how far back from the edge of the pavement the cuts would be made. Mr. Nelson felt that this was up to the Board, and suggested that a 5' level area from the pavement to where the 2:1 cuts would start might be appropriate.

Mr. Hosmer then inquired why the name Virginia Farme had been selected of the road, and Mr. Connelly said that the property had been willed to "daughter Virginia" by a Willard of Concord in Colonial times, and it had been a "farme" in those days. Mr. Hosmer asked if Mr. Connelly planned to complete the road all at once, or do it piecemeal. Mr. Connelly thought that he would do it all at once, and perhaps get lot by lot releases as work progressed. Mr. Hosmer commented that if house construction was to start prior to hot topping the road, the Board would require a bond for completion of that portion of road, and Mr. Connelly said that he understood.

Mr. Hosmer suggested that house numbers be put on the plan, and Mr. Connelly agreed to do this. The Hearing was then adjourned.

A Mr. Richard L. McGlinchey submitted a subdivision plan for 8 lots with frontage in Chelmsford, and which had back land in Carlisle, for Planning Board Approval Not Required signature. The Board pondered over the problem of how to prevent structures from being built on those portions of the lots lying in Carlisle, such portions having insufficient frontage and area to comply with Carlisle zoning regulations. It was decided that the legend "--provided that no structure shall

be erected on lots 14a, 15a, 16a, 17a, 18a, 19a, 20a, and 21a without approval by the Carlisle Planning Board be added after the Planning Board Approval Not Required legend. The lots 14a thr 21a, were defined on the plan as those portions of each building lot which lay in Carlisle, Mr. McGlinchey inked in the legend and the Clerk signed the plan. Mr. McGlinchey said that he would send the Clerk copies of the modified plan. The regular meeting was then adjourned, and the Board went into Executive Session.

The Board reviewed Mr. Perley's comments on the Tricorn Homes subdivision and took the following action:

1. At turnaround end of the subdivision road, Mr. Perley suggested that the Board require a drainage easement for the catch basins located there, and also that riprap and possibly a channel for some distance down the slope from the head-wall should be required. The Board concurred on these requirements.
2. Mr. Perley commented that no drainage provision had been made for the road easement running easterly from the subdivision road, and that if a road were ever built over that easement, additional drainage would be required. Mr Perley suggested the installation of a catch basin to take care of such an eventuality. The Board felt that the catch basin shown as lying some 50 to 80 feet south of the road easement would be adequate for such drainage, and decided not to require any additional drainage.
3. Mr Perley suggested that a cross section detail of the road and right of way be required on the plan in order that no confusion would arise as to width of shoulders and location of pavement. The Board agreed to require such a detail.
4. Riprap, consisting of stones laid in cement for 10 to 12 feet from the drainage headwalls on down the slopes to prevent erosion of the soil by water flowing from the drainage pipes was suggested. The Board felt this was a good idea, but decided to ask for clarification from Mr. Perley as to cost, and criteria for such an installation.
5. Mr. Perley recommended that the following legend be required on the plan: "Any additional subsurface and/or slope drainage shall be constructed by the developer to meet field conditions as required." Mr. Perley felt that this would prevent any misunderstanding between the developer and the Board, should additional drainage be necessary due to unforeseen circumstances which might arise after construction had started. The Board agreed to require such a legend.
6. The Clerk then outlined the Board of Health's request that adequate drainage along the road be provided to take care of the possibility of "perimeter drains" being required around the septic tank and leaching fields on those lots lying above the elevation of the road. Such drains would be necessary if heavy ground water were encountered, and would intercept such ground water before it reached the sanitary fields, and carry it on down the hill, possibly on to the road. Mr. Perley had been informed of this, and had talked with the health inspector. Mr. Perley's comment was that since how many such interceptor drains would be needed, and how much water they might discharge in the vicinity of the road, it was extremely difficult to determine what additional drainage would be required along the road. He had felt that the 4" diameter perforated pipe proposed along the high side of the road would handle some of this water, but did not know how much. The Board decided that it a moderate amount of additional drainage could be installed at the time the road was being built, at a reasonable cost to the developer, it would be proper to request such an installation. This would work both to the benefit of the Town and developer, by providing a sort of insurance against the road being damaged by the additional water, and the developer having to engineer and install an extra drainage system at a later date. Mr. Evans suggested that perhaps two pipes could be laid to accomodate the unknown amount of additional water. The Board instructed the Clerk to find out from Mr. Perley what a reasonable solution might be, and what it would cost..

The Clerk then informed the Board that he had released the two lots in the DeBonis subdivision, inexchange for a bank book and transfer agreement from Maynide, Inc., as had been discussed at the previous meeting. A short discussion of whether or not frontage for lot should stop at the beginning of the curve where two roads intersect at the lot corner, or should include the intersection of the two lot lines which would normally exist were the curve not there. Certain problems were found to exist if a general definition was attempted, and it was agreed that the Board would decide on such matters on an individual case basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Herndon