



# Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of  
**PLANNING BOARD**

## MINUTES

Meeting of July 14, 1986

Present: Sherr, Raftery, Sillers, Leask, Chaput, Clarke

### Old Business

A motion was made to approve the amendment approved at the meeting of June 23, 1986 for a modification to the Elderly Housing site plan to allow construction of a gazebo and a flag pole. The previous amendments were approved, but by only the four members present at that meeting. This motion passed upon the unanimous vote of all members present. This is a modification to a special permit which requires a vote of 5 in favor.

### Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of June 23, 1986, were read, discussed and unanimously approved.

### Public Hearing - Common Driveway Application to Serve 5 Lots of Rutland Street

William McNary made the presentation for 5 lots to be served off a new subdivision road to be built off Rutland Street (application of Emmanuel Tripodakis). An island has been added to the plan to ease the transition from the proposed public way to the common driveway. Drainage will be swales where required; low point will be at a brook. A second island will be located in the driveway with a 50' turning radius. The drive will be 16' in width and a surface of bituminous concrete. The presentation included a discussion of the proposed subdivision road also which road was moved northward within the right of way to increase the wetland buffer. This change was made as a result of Conservation Commission requirements. The Board of Health has denied the application for the subdivision plan approval. Mr. McNary said that percolation test areas and leaching field locations were not shown on the plans submitted to the Board of Health, but that is to be corrected with a new plan. He hopes to have an approval at that Board's August 4 meeting. The grades on the proposed public road will range from 2.4 to 6%. The common driveway grades will range from 1% for a considerable length to a 5% portion. Mr. McNary indicated that a written request will be made to extend the time for approval of the subdivision plan until August 11. Trails in the area are limited to one across a corner of the property. Thomas Lane of Billerica spoke to the non-existence of the purported trail. Charlene Skidmore of Rutland Street asked about the culverts on the property. Mr. McNary said two 30" culverts would be placed under the common driveway, but they would not cure any existing problems. The detention area will be planted with wetland species indigenous to the area. The grading of an area closed to Rutland Street will not destroy any trees, but it too will be planted with wetland species indigenous to the area. This public hearing closed at 8:41 P.M.

[Between hearings Mr. McNary presented an ANR plan for Wentzel of Westford Street. The plan was dated July 10, 1986, drawn by Stamski and McNary showing two lots, 1-C and 1-D, for Eric and Rhonda Wentzel at 1184 Westford Street. (This is the previous Belanger property.) No wetlands are present on this property. Mr. McNary says the accuracy is within one square foot. A motion was made to approve the plan. Duly seconded, the discussion dealt with the powers of the Board of Health and anticipation and correction of problems from a Board of Health view. The motion was unanimously approved.]

Public Hearing - Altair Associates - Modification of Existing Common Driveway Permit off Russell Street

Mr. McNary made the presentation for Altair Associates. There is an existing drive serving two lots having a 14' width. They proposed a new 16' width with 2-foot shoulders. Bituminous concrete would be placed on the portion of the drive which serves four homes. It would drop to 12' where only two homes are served. The present surface is crusher run. The existing drive has a 10% grade at the intersection with Russell Street. The two lots to be added are 8-27.05 which has frontage on School Street and 8-27.06 having frontage on Russell Street. The proposed house sites have been presented to and discussed with the Conservation Commission. Certain changes have been made as a result of that discussion. At this point the representatives of the ConsCom were asked if the common driveway was preferable to the School Street access. That commission did not see the option of access through School Street, but it noted that the existing drive did not involve wetlands. Member Clarke requested that no decision be made until the ConsCom view the alternate access from School Street. Ms. French of the ConsCom indicated that they may not be able to prevent access across the wetland for the alternative access to the lots. The concern is whether the lot is built upon at all if the common driveway access were to be denied. Mr. McNary said that economics would probably dictate construction of a driveway through the wetlands should the common driveway be denied. The matter was referred to the ConsCom with a request to view the alternative access and report their recommendation to the Board. The specification will be changed to a 2½ inch paved surface. The public hearing will be continued, adjourned to August 11, 1986.

Public Hearing - Conservation Cluster for Ten Lots off Concord Street

(Member Raftery indicated that he has a conflict in that he is a trustee of the Carlisle Land Trust. To that end, he will not participate in either the discussion or the vote hereon.) [The public hearing on the Common Driveway application was also opened so that common matters could be discussed.] Grant Wilson, Chairman of the Carlisle Land Trust made the presentation. The lots will be approximately 18 acres apiece. The Clarks would retain approximately 10 acres. A significant portion, the open field, would be preserved in open state and agricultural use. This is actually an application for two Conservation Clusters so that one driveway would serve both clusters and thus eight lots. A second driveway was not attractive and would destroy the benefit to the Town, i.e., attractiveness of the open area preserved. Each of the four back lots would have defined building envelopes. Each envelope would be in the forested areas. A second house built in any building envelope would not be seen from the road. Lot 1 has 80+' of frontage. The Clark lot would have 600' of frontage. The next lot is #2 having 80+ feet of frontage. Lot #4 frontage is 290+ feet on School Street. Lot #3 would have 80+ feet frontage on School Street also. The driveway was contemplated for School Street but it was decided that Concord Street was a better access. Member Sherr asked what was the benefit of the proposal to

the Town. Mr. Wilson explained that the open meadow would be preserved in perpetuity. George Foote explained where vegetation was heavy and tree lines were located. Questions were asked with respect to restricting cutting of trees and building locations. The preserved pieces are the open land from School Street to Concord Street. George Foote explained that restrictions would prevent more than two buildings (i.e., divisions) of any lots. The proposed surface of the driveway was discussed. The proposed surface is gravel and not bituminous concrete. The proposed common driveway is 1700 feet long. Mr. Wilson indicated that at least five potential purchasers have discussed the lots, all of which want to be able to subdivide the lots. The price of each lot is more than double the average price of a lot in the Town. There was some discussion concerning the restrictions and potential pool of buyers who might not further divide the lots purchased. A suggestion was made to ask the Town Counsel if two Conservation Clusters could be put together as proposed. [Fortunately, Town Counsel walked into the room at this point and upon her was laid the question.] The public hearings were continued for a period of two weeks until July 28.

#### Crestview Subdivision

A revised covenant was presented to the Board. The modified covenant had the addition of Ledgewood Associates. It was acceptable to the Board. The Plan was executed by all.

#### Elizabeth Ridge

Eric Fleming showed plans for beautification of the transfer station access to the property. A resident questioned whether Sunset Road would soon be improved. A motion was made and duly seconded to approve the subdivision plan upon the following conditions:

1. That the proposed construction of the roadway from the subdivision to Lowell Street of improvements thereto be under the direction, supervision and approval of the Department of Public Works;
2. That the Selectmen approve, to the extent they deem required, the use of the way serving the transfer station and the D.P.W. by the developer;
3. That a stipulation of dismissal, with prejudice, be executed by M.S.B., Inc. or its successors in the actions pending against the Town in which M.S.B., Inc. was or is plaintiff including, but not limited to Cases. No. 112427 and and 108,305 pending in the Middlesex Land Court;
4. That to the extent not required for construction of the connection of Elizabeth Ridge Road to Sunset Road, the developer limit access for construction vehicles and related equipment to the Transfer Station Road;
5. That the following waivers to Sections A.3.b and A.3.c be allowed:  
Specifically:
  - A.3.c - Angle of intersection at Transfer/DPW area =  $56^{\circ}-35'-42''$  (approx.  $56^{\circ}$ )
  - A.3.b - ~~E~~ radius less than 300.00 at
    - Station 7+0 to 10+0 ~~E~~ R = 170.00'
    - Station 10+0 to 11+50 ~~E~~ R = 160.00'
    - Station 18+50 to 21+0 ~~E~~ R = 200.00'
    - Station 27+36.24 to 28+62.41 R = 160.00

6. That the beautification of the Transfer Station Road be substantially constructed in accordance with the attached plans;
7. That the developer grant to the Town such rights, Title and interests as it may have in the land shown on the Subdivision Plan as a strip of land of Perry and Angell running from Sunset Road to the Transfer Station/DPW (Town of Carlisle) area, such grant to be used for conservation of a footpath corridor and trail system within the Town and for such purposes and uses common to such trails; and
8. That the connection between Elizabeth Ridge Road and Sunset Road be comparables in quality and appearance to the improvements made by the developer at the Transfer Station/DPW area.

The motion unanimously passed.

With regard to driveways (especially common driveways), ConsCom has requested that as much as feasible be left gravel or bluestone surface. Only the steep part of one drive will be paved.

A motion was made to approve the Special Permit for a common driveway to serve Lots 37, 39 and 40. It was unanimously approved.

A motion was made to approve the Special Permit for a common driveway to serve Lots 31, 32, 33 and 34. It was unanimously approved.

A motion was made to approve the Special Permit for a common driveway to serve Lots 28 and 26. It was unanimously approved.

#### Ludwin Land - Woodbine Subdivision

The Board received a letter from the Conservation Commission stating problems and asking that the lots not be released. Mr. Schecter asked that the sidewalk be removed, at least on the portion of the old Woodbine Road. Various items on Mr. and Mrs. Schecters' memorandum dated July 8, 1986, were discussed. Mr. Clarke discussed his conversations with CV&P. The sidewalk was built abutting the roadway and the developer's concern was deterioration of the bike/footpath from water, etc. getting into the space between the path and the roadway. Mr. Clarke expressed the opinion that, if he had to do it over again, he would not approve it, but he believes it can be corrected to minimize its impact. He believed that removal would probably create more damage than may be acceptable. He believes that trees have to be welled and that pavement should be connected to the roadway. Mr. and Mrs. Schecter desire that the bike path be removed by hand. CV&P has not recommended removal of the bike footpath. A motion was made to ask the developer to remove the sidewalk on the old Woodbine Road. The motion was seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

#### Irwin Properth Discussion

A preliminary subdivision plan was filed for Hayes Farm. The lots are 10 in number served by a 2200 foot road. The parcel is 40 acres, i.e., average density of 4 acres per lot. Two waivers will be needed: one for a curve radius and the road length.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Raftery