



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Meeting of September 12, 1983

Present: Sauer, Coulter, Clarke, Chaput, Sillers, Raftery, Hannaford

The minutes of August 8, 1983 and August 29, 1983 were accepted.

Plan of DiPietro for a Common Driveway (Baldwin Road)

The application for a Common Driveway was received at the meeting of August 8, 1983. A public hearing was scheduled for September 26, 1983.

Public Hearing for Conservation Cluster on Ember Lane

The hearing was opened at 8:10 P.M.

Chairman Sauer reviewed the purposes of the recently-enacted zoning bylaw allowing "conservation clusters". He also described the conditions which must be met to qualify as a conservation cluster.

Bill McNary of Joseph W. Moore, Co. presented two plans of the area. The first was a conventional ANP Plan, showing four building lots, with four driveways. The alternate, Conservation Cluster Plan, showed five building lots, each meeting the frontage and acreage requirements. The plan includes 35 acres, total; of this, 20.4 acres would be left as open space. The so-called "Morse Road" would be left untouched, and be available through a trail easement for recreation use. ("Morse Trail").

Nancy Garden asked if there was to be provision for access to Morse Trail from Ember Lane without crossing private property. The proposed plan has 90 feet of open-space frontage on Ember Lane.

Mr. Zaitz of Ember Lane brought up a serious drainage problem of standing water (and ice in winter) that occurs at the cul-de-sac of Ember Lane. He suggested that the proposed house lots and driveway presented an unbuildable engineering problem due to excess wetness/erosion and ledge. Existing owners are said to have had extensive problems with water. He questioned the ability to pass percolation or high-water tests for the building lots.

Mr. Chrest, whose property is "surrounded" by the proposed conservation cluster, spoke next. He suggested that the original plan (March 1965) showed lot layouts that are different from what is currently being proposed.

Ms. Chaput pointed out that the hearing was to determine whether the number of lots should be increased from 4 to 5, by virtue of preserving a particular resource.

Joe Gardner, ConsCom chairman, said that the entire Commission had yet to see this particular plan and had no opinion on its merits.

Nancy Garden spoke in favor of the Conservation Cluster, stating that the chance to preserve Morse Trail was worth the additional lot.

Sandy Scott, Ember Lane, spoke in favor of the Conservation Cluster, for preserving Morse Trail.

Tom Raftery said that the current proposed deed and easement are written in favor of the Carlisle Conservation Foundation. He also brought up the possibility of extending a trail easement through the Stearns and Senkler property, to allow a connection from Sunset Road through to Curve Street.

Lenny Clarke asked how "open" the Open Space really is; i.e., open to the general public or just the residents? The current proposal is that the Open Space be open to the general public.

Eleanor Cochran spoke in favor of the Conservation Cluster, in order to get more conservation land permanently set aside. The Town is buying less and less conservation land in the wake of Proposition 2½.

Mr. Chrest requested that whatever the final development plan might be, there should be a very serious attempt to reduce the number of driveways entering Ember Lane.

Mr. Chrest said that, in the event he has any rights to Morse Road, he would be willing to deed an easement to the Town for trail uses.

The public hearing adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

Public Hearing for Common Driveways off Ember Lane

The hearing was opened at 9:25 P.M.

Mr. McNary of the Joseph Moore Co. presented a plan showing the location and topography of the proposed common driveways. The first common driveway touches Ember Lane before the cul-de-sac (north of the Paul/Chrest lot) and would serve 3 lots. This driveway will be raised slightly above grade, which will create a "damming" effect, somewhat retarding (not accelerating) the flow onto the Paul/Chrest property. There will also be a bump at Ember Lane, preventing water from turning down the driveway from the street. Maximum grade is 7 percent.

The second driveway exits Ember Lane at the cul-de-sac, with a positive slope leaving the street. The maximum grade is 12 percent (as it approaches Morse Trail).

Mr. Zaitz suggested that the second driveway be rounded slightly to permit an easier right turn off the circle. (Otherwise, it makes for a sharp turn.) As a practical matter, owners coming down Ember Lane toward the second driveway will turn left into the driveway. Aesthetics may be the most important issue: cut as few trees as possible. The issue was raised about a turn-out along the common driveways for two cars to pass each other.

Mr. McNary agreed to widen the southernmost common driveway to create a passing-point for cars at the crest of the driveway.

Mr. Chrest requested that the driveway which runs past his lot be placed as far away from his house as possible. Mr. McNary thought that moving the driveway 30 feet farther away from the Chrest lot (for the first 100-200 feet of its run) would not be a problem.

Mr. Chrest requested that the northern driveway be made of a permeable surface (crushed stone) to minimize run-off. Ms. Chaput suggested that both driveways be paved with asphalt, to make them more passable and less subject to erosion in the winter. This is particularly true for the 12 percent slope; it is also important, but less so, for the 7 percent slope. Mr. McNary said that the issue was really dependent on construction and maintenance. In any event, the driveways should be natural material as they cross Morse Trail.

Mr. Chrest requested that an absolute numerical limit be placed on the lots served by the common driveways (2 and 3 respectively). All of the Ember Lane residents present asked that some written expression of their desire to limit future access down the common driveways be incorporated into the minutes of the Public Hearing.

The public hearing adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

ANR Plan off North Road (Nancy Penhune)

A plan of land in Carlisle and Billerica on North Road was presented. The plan is from Nelson Engineering, dated March 30, 1982 and revised on July 20, 1982 and September 12, 1982. The land is owned by Nancy Penhune. The plan defines two parcels: (1) Lot 1A, with 3.26 acres and 353.43 feet of frontage, and (2) "other land", consisting of 14.73 acres (13.65 acres in Carlisle) with 84.99 feet and 66.37 feet (non-contiguous pieces) of frontage on North Road.

The plan was endorsed as Approval Not Required.

ANR Plan off Concord Road and Russell Street

A plan of land owned by Dorothy Poole for land on Russell Street and Concord Road was presented. The plan was prepared by Joseph Moore, dated September 2, 1983. The plan creates two parcels: (1) Lot 8/7, with 2.011 acres and over 250 feet of frontage on Russell Street, and (2) Lot 8/7.01, with 1.695 acres and 318.91 feet of frontage on Concord Road. Lot 8/7.01 is not a building lot; Lot 8/7.01 also has 21.65 feet of frontage on Russell Street.

The plan was endorsed as Approval Not Required.

ANR Plan off West Street (Chris Hart)

A plan of land owned by S. Willard Bridges off West Street was presented by Chris Hart. The plan is by Nelson Engineering, dated September 1, 1983. The plan creates the following parcels:

<u>Parcel</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Frontage (West Street)</u>
A	0.82	---
B	1.77	---
C	0.48	---
D	1.62	---
Lot 1	2.07	250.00'
Lot 2	4.17	42.10'
Lot 3	5.76	42.10'
Lot 4	4.74	40.85'
Lot 5	7.30	495.79'

The Board in general expressed dismay over the shape of the lots as drawn. A suggestion (L. Clarke) was made that a Conservation Cluster would allow more compact lots. A second suggestion was made that the deeds include restrictions that no building be done in the wetlands, or that cross-easements be issued to all owners for equal use of the "common" grounds. A suggestion that a scenic view restriction be placed on the common land was made.

With audible gnashing of teeth, the plan was endorsed as Approval Not Required.

ANR Plan off West Street (J. Arthur and Janet Taylor)

A plan of land belonging to J. Arthur and Janet Taylor on West Street was presented. The plan was drawn by Nelson Engineering, dated September 12, 1983. The following lots are created:

<u>Lot</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Frontage (West Street)</u>
11	0.40	45.96'
12	2.86	250.53'
13	2.46	324.04
14	0.55	41.42

Lots 11 and 14 are not considered building lots, and the plan has a legend to that effect.

The plan was endorsed as Approval Not Required.

ANR Plan off East Street (Pauline Dolan)

A plan of land belonging to Pauline Dolan for land off East Street was presented. The plan is by the Joseph W. Moore Co., dated September 12, 1983. The plan creates the following parcels: (1) Lot 21/53 with 4.17 acres and 212.50 feet of frontage on East Street, and (2) Lot 21/53.01, with 3.20 acres and 250.01 feet of frontage on East Street. (Lot 21/53 is actually a "pork chop" lot.

The plan was endorsed as Approval Not Required.

Common Driveway Revision for Canterbury Court

The owner of Lot 29 of the Canterbury Court Subdivision preferred to be a part of the northerly common driveway. The common driveway covenants were modified to add Lot 29 to the northerly covenant, while Lot 29 remains a party to the southerly covenant. The new covenants were presented. In addition, statements from the owners were received indicating no objection to the changes.

In addition, both the Board and the developers felt that issuing two (2) permits, since there are two (2) driveways, was preferable.

It was moved, seconded and passed (5 in favor, 0 opposed; Sillers and Raftery having left) to consider the following actions as minor: (1) adding Lot 29 to the northerly covenant, and (2) issuing two (2) special permits as a result of any further Board actions.

It was moved, seconded and passed (5 in favor, 0 opposed) to allow the declaration of easements and restrictions as presented tonight (dated May 10, 1983) to supersede those contained in the original application.

It was further moved, seconded and passed (5 in favor, 0 opposed) to grant two (2) special permits, one for each driveway, to supersede the previously issued permit dated August 24, 1981, with the original conditions of filing still applicable.

Extension to Canterbury Court Completion Date

The two-year period for completion of Canterbury Court ends this Month (September 1983). The developers have asked for a one-year extension to this date. In fact, the subdivision is almost complete and the Board has released all but one lot.

Moved, seconded and passed (5 to 0) that the period of time for completion of the Canterbury Court Subdivision be extended until September 12, 1984.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 P.M.

Respectfully (but draggingly) submitted,

Richard R. Coulter