

CARLISLE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

OCTOBER 14, 1991

Present:

Phyllis W. Hughes, Chairman
Vivian F. Chaput
George B. Foote
Jill A. Natola
Scott T. Evans
Kenneth H. Ernstoff
Paula M. Trebino
Elaine H. Olden,
Planner Assistant

Meeting called to order at 8:12 p.m.

Preliminary Plan A off Prospect Street

Chairman Hughes introduced a review of a plan entitled "Preliminary Plan A in Concord (and Carlisle), Mass. (Middlesex County) Prepared for: John Hill" dated Sept. 16, 1991, by Stamski and McNary, Inc., Acton, Mass. by saying that this review is to advise the applicant of the Board's expectations for any definitive plan he may submit later and that the Board wishes to collect information to supplement its review. She pointed out for the benefit of the number of interested members of the public present that the Board is aware of the special character of the Prospect Street neighborhood and requested that speakers refrain from reiterating that point but instead offer constructive suggestions regarding safety.

Mr. Foote summarized the Board's policy that although no public hearing is required or held for a preliminary plan, input to the developer early in the process of a development is most effective in helping shape the design of the development.

Joseph March, engineer for the applicant, made the following statements on behalf of the applicant:

His firm prepared the plan for John Hill, whose rights in the project have recently been taken over by William Costello. The site is 75 acres in Concord for which 30 lots are proposed. The Concord development will be accessed by two independent road systems, with one access off Prospect Street in Carlisle. A previous plan which proposed 24 lots with one access was denied by the Concord Planning Board because it violated a regulation limiting the number of lots per access. Wetlands on the property flow onto Monument Street. The Carlisle portion of the plan is one lot on which there is a house which will be razed and a 22' wide

CARLISLE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 1991
PAGE 2

road built. There will be a sidewalk on one edge of the roads throughout the entire system. Drainage will be controlled by detention basins from which the water will be released into the wetlands. The sight lines at Prospect Street are adequate according to a standard which requires 200 feet at 25 miles per hour because there are actually 300-400 feet. Most of the traffic will probably use the access road in Concord; Prospect Street is an extra entrance expected to be used for emergency and similar uses.

Questions asked by members of the public and questions and comments by Board members elicited information as follows:

(Ruth Toscano, Fiske Street) - The Carlisle lot was 88,000 square feet and is now 63,000 square feet.

(Ms. Chaput) - The location of the road leaves open area, and is not necessary for sight distance.

(Mr. Foote) - The Carlisle lot can be a building lot, and the house does not need to be razed. The measured width of Prospect Street at the entrance is 12-14 feet of pavement, with variable widths between stonewalls for the right-of-way.

(Ms. Natola) - The turn onto Prospect Street from the subdivision road will comply with regulations.

(Ms. Chaput) - The applicant would consider relocating the road in order to buffer the abutters.

(Mr. Foote) - There are two lots from which the distance traveling toward Carlisle would be shorter through Prospect Street.

(Mr. Ernstoff, Mr. Foote) - If Carlisle does not accept the proposed road, a Homeowners Association should assume responsibility for it.

(Ms. Trebino) - The parcel next to Parcel A is #97 Prospect Street; #65 is the house to be razed.

(Mrs. Williams) - There are no plans to increase the width of Prospect Street.

Phyllis Nei asked what Carlisle benefits from this development and suggested that Carlisle property will be devalued and traffic will be a problem. She pointed out that her lot will be affected by the new road, although it is not shown on the plan.

Al Peckham said he had put his questions in writing to the Board

and asked permission to post photographs demonstrating the width and condition of Prospect Street. His photos were posted on an easel. He said that the first question on his written list was about zoning bylaws or subdivision regulations authorize access from the Town of Carlisle to another town and question #10 recommended referral of the proposal to the Board of Selectmen and Town Meeting. He said that Parcel A with the house left on it would produce \$107,000 in tax revenue in 10 years. He recommended that Prospect Street should be a scenic road and asked about a similar situation at Log Hill Road. He mentioned the narrow pavement on Prospect Street and asked if Town Counsel's advice would be sought by the Board.

Douglas Deyoe, 554 River Road, said that River Road is very narrow at Prospect Street and the Prospect Street is deteriorating.

Coleman Ridge, 586 River Road, recommended a surety bond for the applicant to reconstruct Prospect Street after construction and a traffic study because of the influx of traffic at school time and the truck and car traffic. He said that the Prospect Street and Monument Street intersection radius is inadequate for fire trucks and school buses, the grade at the entrance to Prospect Street is difficult in winter, that the entrance is not proper for a subdivision, and that he is not in favor of the reconstruction of Prospect Street and Monument Street.

When Mr. Foote asked if anyone had a suggestions about the proposed road if it were to be constructed off Prospect Street, Wanda Milik said that although she is not in favor of the road, if it is built it should be in the middle of the parcel.

Phyllis Nei said that there will be a tax loss if the road is in the center of the lot and mentioned possible damage if blasting is done during road construction. In response to questions about the location of the proposed road, she drew the location of her house and other buildings on the plan.

Matt Caires, 153 Prospect St., said that there is a drop across the road from the proposed road which would be a danger for fast moving trucks.

Mr. March explained that the applicant prefers a single access but that the Concord Planning Board denied the single-access plan. He displayed a plan which had been submitted to the Concord Planning Board.

Stephen Davis, 206 Prospect Street said that there is one building lot available at the end of Prospect Street with the possibility of 4-5 more; that Prospect Street for emergency use

CARLISLE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 1991
PAGE 4

is unwise; that he is not in favor of improving Prospect Street, and that he notes no attempt by the developer to appease the abutters, particularly concerning the placement of the road on the lot. He suggested probing an alternate school bus turnaround; said that the sightlines were an issue in a Zoning Board of Appeals denial for a permit in the area; and that the neighbors are willing to help with traffic counts.

(Michael Benfield, 285 Fiske Street) - At the only possible second access in Concord, there are wetlands.

Mr. Costello outlined the history of proposed development plans for the Concord site and said he has prepared a third submission to the Concord Planning Board, which he posted for view, to include a conservation restriction and trail easement and leaving the field at Monument Street intact. This plan, which would need two Special Permits and a waiver from the Concord Planning Board, shows less density and less constructed roadbed.

(Al Peckham) - Monument Street is cut off from the parcel by wetlands.

Jack Caires, 153 Prospect Street, inquired if the plan must be approved by the Planning Board, as a recent article in the Mosquito seemed to imply. During brief discussion of this question, Chairman Hughes made it clear that the Planning Board has not seen the plan before tonight and has made no decision about the plan. Ms. Chaput cautioned the members of the public that there are limits to the Board's power in plan review.

(Nancy Ridge, River Road) - Planning Board members often visit sites.

Dick Taylor, director of Harvard University's Estabrook Woods, said that it is not in keeping with the goals and purposes of the university, which are conservation purposes, to consider development of Estabrook Woods. He said he supports the buffer proposed by Mr. Costello.

On motion by Mr. Foote seconded by Mr. Evans, the members voted unanimously to request a traffic study of the relevant area. On motion duly made and seconded, the members voted unanimously to authorize Mr. Foote to negotiate with LandTech, Inc., to conduct a traffic study.

Chairman Hughes instructed Mrs. Olden to write to former Planning Board member Terry Herndon to inquire about Log Hill Road.

On motion by Mr. Ernstoff seconded by Mr. Evans, the members voted unanimously to instruct Mrs. Olden to write to Town Counsel

CARLISLE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 1991
PAGE 5

for an opinion as to whether there is any basis in the subdivision control law for denying a subdivision road whose sole purpose is to access a subdivision in an adjacent town.

Ice Pond Road Extension of Approval

Mr. Ernstoff absented himself from a discussion of a request to extend the approval for the Ice Pond Definitive Plan because he is an abuttor. After noting the receipt of plans for a fire cistern and an easement to access the fire protection equipment easement, the members instructed Mrs. Olden to arrange for review of the submitted materials. On motion by Mr. Foote seconded by Ms. Trebino, the members voted unanimously to extend the approval until December 2, 1991. The members instructed Mrs. Olden to write to the applicant that they expect the following schedule: the review reports will be sent to the applicant in time for preparation of the materials in recordable form for presentation to the Board on November 4; with the Board's approval of these materials, recording of these materials by the applicant and presentation of evidence of recording to the Board by December 2.

Release of Property on Curve Street from Chapter 61A

On motion by Mr. Foote seconded by Mr. Ernstoff, the members voted to take no action concerning a notice that property at Map 30, Parcel 1 on Curve Street is to be removed from the provisions of Chapter 61A.

Bills

The members authorized payment of bills as presented.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine H. Olden
Planner Assistant