

Carlisle Planning Board  
Minutes  
April 23, 1968

Present were: H. Hosmer                    D. Spaulding  
                  J. Macene                                T. Herndon  
                  R. W. McAllister

The special meeting opened with Mr. DeBemis stating that he understood that Mr. Perley had agreed with Mr. Skane that the latter's drainage plan was adequate, and that Mr. Perley's requirements were based on Concord's regulations, which were not necessarily those of Carlisle. He went on to cite two reasons why he didn't feel that catch basins were necessary. First, Mr. DeBemis reiterated that Mr. Skane's drainage system was more than adequate to handle any problems which might arise, and secondly, he noted that he had "bent over backwards" to try to produce a good subdivision and felt that he had done more than the Board could legally require in order to satisfy the Board and Town. He observed that the original plan was a perfectly good subdivision, and that he felt that a court would have compelled the Board to accept the original plan, had he wished to take legal action, and not have permitted the Board to require his purchase of additional land. Mr. Hosmer replied that, as Mr. DeBemis knew, there was not agreement between Mr. Perley and Mr. Skane, and that the Board had expressed a decided inclination to require Mr. Perley's system of catch basins and connecting pipes. Also, Mr. Hosmer corrected Mr. DeBemis by stating that the Board had not required him to purchase land, but had rather presented the opportunity for him to do so, if Mr. DeBemis wished to. Mr. Hosmer went on to say that if the Board had not been well convinced of legality of its actions, it would not have insisted on the road layout which was being considered, and the Board had yielded on its Regulations insofar as reducing the radius requirement of the bend in the road where it turned southerly into the main part of the subdivision. The Chairman further stated that since the Board had run into problems in the past by trying to do its own engineering, it had engaged Mr. Perley to assist in this matter, and would rely heavily on his expert advice.

Mr. McAllister asked what the cost difference would be between Mr. Perley's plan and that of Mr. Skane's. Mr. DeBemis observed that each catch basin would cost \$500 - 700 each, plus the cost of the interconnecting pipe. He said that Skane's system was much less expensive, was as good as the catch basins, and would not entail as much maintenance. Mr. Perley thought that the catch basin cost estimate was perhaps high, and felt that \$300 - 400 each would be more accurate. Mr. Skane said that there were many boulders and perhaps ledge on the property, and that he was assuming added costs due to these problems for the catch basins.

Mr. Hosmer asked Mr. Perley to outline his proposal and reasons therefore. Mr. Perley noted that the surface water from the southerly entrance on Baldwin Road would be taken care of by the culvert proposed under the development road in that area. Then, drainage from that vicinity up to station 6+0 would collect in the region of station 6+0 to 6+25 and that there was no way for water to drain out of this low point without flowing across the road. Mr. Skane remarked that it was his opinion that the water from station 4+50 would flow overland on northward, and proposed a stone or bituminous gutter from this vicinity to station 6 to accommodate the flow. He said that the land is flat along the road, and drainage into gutters would suffice, by carrying the water on to the region around stations 6+50 to 7+50. Mr. Perley replied that he felt that the area would have to be "smoothed out" to permit this. Mr. Hosmer asked Mr. Perley if adequate gutters were built in this area, would they provide adequate drainage. Mr. Perley noted that he did not like that approach, since although it might work in warm weather, snow clogging could result in winter which would cause icing on the road unless such ditches were maintained by the Town during the winter and spring. Mr. Skane felt that catch basin systems often didn't work in the winter either, as they could clog up just as readily as the ditches.

Mr. Perley said that he suggested that the catch basins be installed in the pavement with their outermost edges flush with the edge of the pavement. This would ensure that they would be kept open by normal snow plowing operations, without additional maintenance.

Mr. Skane said that he had been involved in the design of many ditch type drainage systems connected with New England Nike site installations, and that they had worked very well. He mentioned one such site in Bedford, and Mr. Hesmer asked him if this system was still in existence. Mr. Skane replied that he didn't know. Mr. Hesmer noted that some one would have to show why Mr. Perley's recommendations were too elaborate to convince the Board that it should not abide by them. Mr. DeBenis asked if his were adequate. Mr. Hesmer asked the Board members for their thoughts. Mr. Macone said that he would have to agree with Mr. Perley's plan, since such a system had been installed in the "FoxHill" development off of South Street and there certainly had been no difficulty with that.

Mr. DeBenis asked if the catch basin system proposed would involve surface drainage, or require an underground pipe arrangement. Mr. Perley then outlined his proposal completely, which involved 2 catch basins at the low point (Station 6) with underground pipes going to the culvert at Station 7. Then, 2 catch basins at the culvert (Station 7) to take care of the water from Station 12 back to Station 7. From Station 12 to approximately Station 20+55 (some 900 feet) 2 catch basins should be installed in the vicinity of Station 16 with underground pipes to carry the water on down to Station 20+55. At Station 20+55, 2 more catch basins should be installed, in addition to gutter along the road in that area. Finally, 2 catch basins approximately half way down the steep grade on Bickford's land would be necessary, with underground pipes connecting them with the natural drainage area at Station 20+55.

Mr. Skane argued that, at Station 6, it would be just as good to have the catch basins discharge overland. Mr. Perley said that this would give two discharge areas (Station 6 and 7) which was not as satisfactory. Mr. Skane then said that the area from Station 12 to Station 20+55 could be drained just as well by ditches, since it is all downhill in that area. Mr. Perley replied that such a distance was too great to safely run water in ditches. Mr. Skane asked why it would not be satisfactory to have gutters along the edge of the pavement in this area, and Mr. Perley noted that there would be no way for water to get off of the road. Mr. DeBenis stated that he wanted an adequate drainage system as much as anyone else, but did not feel that it was necessary to have the buried pipe system. He proposed the elimination of all buried pipe and the 2 catch basins at Station 16. Mr. Hesmer felt that 900 feet was an excessive distance to have no drainage provisions on. Mr. Skane said that it was a very slight grade in this area, and Mr. Perley replied that this was so, and that the water would thus <sup>flow</sup> slowly, resulting in areas of standing water which was not good. Mr. DeBenis felt that he had gone out of his way to comply with the Board's requests, and that he should be entitled to some consideration in this matter. Mr. Hesmer replied that the Board could certainly use its discretion in this matter, and that there had been problems of an unusual and time consuming nature. However, he felt that adequate drainage should be assured, and that Mr. Perley was using his professional point of view in this regard for the benefit of the Board. Mr. Hesmer concluded that he would not see the wisdom of eliminating the catch basin at Station 16. Mr. DeBenis replied that such a catch basin would not work without the underground pipe. Mr. Hesmer asked Mr. Perley how adequate the drainage in the Station 16 area would be with an elaborate gutter arrangement and higher road crown. Mr. Perley said that he had given his opinion on such an arrangement, and that its drawbacks included higher maintenance to the Town.

Mr. McAllister observed that the Board would have to face up to acting as "judge and jury" in this situation, since two experts differed in the proper solution to the problem. Mr. Spaulding asked about how much consideration the Board should

give to the cooperation of the developer in the previous problems mentioned. Mr. Hesmer felt that such cooperation should rightfully have a bearing on the Beard's decision. Mr. Macone also felt that if a compromise could be struck which would be satisfactory from an engineering standpoint, it should be done. Mr. Herndon asked about the possible risk of requiring Mr. Perley's plan causing Mr. DeBonis to revert to his original subdivision plan and ~~ask~~ the Town to accept that proposal. Mr. Hesmer said that this should not concern the Beard at all, as it had thoroughly checked out its rights in the matter and felt that it was acting within these rights. Mr. Macone asked what the additional cost of the buried pipe would be. Mr. DeBonis guessed that 10000 feet of 12 inch pipe, installed, would cost in vicinity of \$4,000 to 6,000. Mr. Macone noted that this was not a net cost, as the ditch scheme would cost something. Mr. DeBonis said that such a system would be very inexpensive. Mr. McAllister commented that a reasonable compromise should be sought. Mr. Spaulding asked Mr. Perley to outline a compromise plan which would be acceptable to Mr. Perley.

Mr. Perley then proposed 2 catch basins at Station 6, connected by pipe beneath the road and discharging overland. At Station 7+50, he proposed 2 catch basins, connected together and discharging into the natural watercourse. Then at Station 16, there would be 2 catch basins, again connected together and discharging overland, at the low side of the road. At Station 20, 2 more catch basins, connected together and discharging into the natural watercourse there. Then, eliminate any catch basins on the steep grade on Bickford's land, and have standard 8 inch bituminous curb all the way down the road to the catch basins at Station 20. A berm, perhaps of the Cape Cod variety, should be installed from Station 11 down to Station 7. Finally easements for all water discharge areas, plus detail of the catch basin chambers, headwalls, and berm or curb should be required. Mr. Perley noted that such a system would fully protect the road, and would require less maintenance to the Town than his original plan. Mr. Skane asked if the depth of the catch basin chambers could be reduced in areas of ledge, and Mr. Hesmer replied that this could be taken up if and when such ledge were encountered.

Mr. DeBonis asked if the Beard would approve his plan if it were modified to fit this last set of requirements. The Beard agreed unanimously that it would accept the plan if it conformed to Mr. Perley's modified drainage system. Mr. DeBonis said that he would make such modifications. Mr. Hesmer suggested that he do this in consultation with Mr. Perley, and that once the Beard had received the revised plan and had Mr. Perley's verbal acceptance of it, the Clerk would sign the plan approved. Mr. DeBonis then requested an additional extension to May 15, and the Beard agreed. He revised and initialled the previous extension he had submitted.

The Beard then discussed briefly the proposal for the Town to acquire the Towle Land and adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Terry Herndon