

**MINUTES OF A HEARING HELD ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2011 REGARDING DOCUMENT #100 of 2010 – A PETITION FROM ATTORNEY MICHAEL MIGLIORI FOR JOHN P. GIORDANO, REQUESTING A SPECIAL PERMIT TO BUILD A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AT 90 AMESBURY RD. WITHIN 500' OF A WATER SUPPLY; ASSESSOR'S MAP 465, BLOCK 3, LOT 2A**

**SUBJECT:** Document #100/2010- A petition from Attorney Michael Migliori for John P. Giordano requesting a special permit to build a single family residence at 90 Amesbury Rd. within 500' of a water supply; assessor's map 465, block 3, lot 2A

Present: Council President Michael Hart, Robert Scatamacchia, William Ryan, Michael Young, David E. Hall, Colin LePage, Mary Ellen Daly O' Brien, Sven Amirian, and William Macek

City Clerk Margaret A. Toomey: **Document 100 of 2010** - A petition has been received from Attorney Migliori for John P. Giordano requesting a special permit to build a single family residence at 90 Amesbury Rd. within 500' of a water supply; assessor's map 465, block 3, lot 2A.

Good evening Mr. President and members of the City Council, my name is Michael Migliori. I'm an attorney in Haverhill, 18 Essex Street. I am representing Mr. Giordano, the owner of land located at 90 Amesbury Road. It's approximate 4 acre parcel. Mr. Giordano hopes to build a home on this property.

President Hart: Excuse me one moment Mr. Migliori, in going through the history of this thing. This would be considered a continuance of a hearing that we had back in January. Atty. Migliori: I think it was November. President Hart: Okay in January you wanted more of a, okay, so it's a continuation. You are speaking for the applicant? Atty. Migliori –yes. President Hart – proceed.

Atty. Migliori: Just in summary, because a portion of the property is located within 500' of Kenoza Lake, he is required to obtain a special permit from the Council. Again, this matter was postponed at the end of 2010 in order for the parties to obtain more information on the requested proposal. Again, just as a way to refresh everybody's recollection, the ordinance, Ch. 255 Section 90, says in part "that such permit may be granted if the City Council finds the proposed building does not have an adverse affect on the public water supply." Since that postponement in November Mr. Giordano has received a finding from the Massachusetts National Heritage and Endangered Species Program, that states that the site preparation will not adversely affect the actual resource area habitat of the State protected rare wildlife species. You have been given that document along with a lot of other information on this project and the history of the site. In addition, Mr. Giordano has been dealing with the Conservation Commission. There have been a number of meetings held since last year. That matter has not been resolved. Those hearings will continue for some time regarding the site. Hopefully we will get some order of conditions before the end of the year. I'd like to take a minute to highlight a number of facts that were discussed at the prior hearing or can be found in the reports/ documents which have been supplied to the Council. First is the fact that everyone who has reviewed this proposal agrees that this property is not in the Kenoza Lake watershed. There are people out there who disagree with that but the experts all agree that this property is not in the Kenoza Lake watershed. The parcel and any home constructed on it would have no adverse impact on the public water supply based on the fact that it is not even located in the watershed. Second item, I think we can hopefully agree on is that the two city departments that should have the most say over this matter would be the Water Department and the Conservation Department. This is obviously based upon the language in the ordinance which has this Council determining whether the home will have "an adverse affect on the water supply". Mr. Jessel, supervisor of the Water Department, who in my opinion is a well respected long time employee of the city, in his report has cited that he has no objection to the proposal to build a home on the site. He found no adverse affect on the public water supply and clearly states that the

land again “is not within the water supply watershed”. He did have some comments which he asked to be incorporated into any vote that the Council takes and we don’t have any objection to the rest of his comments in his letter basically meeting other City standards which obviously we’d have to do. Again, this review is from the Water Department and I would ask who is better to determine whether something would have an adverse affect on the water supply than the Water Department and the Water Department clearly states that this proposal would not. Next are the findings which come from Conservation. Here’s where things tend to get a little sticky because Conservation wants to address many more items than what the ordinance we are proceeding under requires to be addressed. The ordinance, again, states whether the proposed building would have an adverse affect on the public water supply. If we remain on that issue, the adverse affect issue, you’ll find in the report from Mr. Moore the following: “In conclusion, it is my opinion that the implementation of the Massachusetts and Haverhill wetlands protection requirements and the Mass. Endangered Species Act will sufficiently vet this project to ensure the protection of the City’s natural resources”. That’s in his report of November 5, 2010. In his report June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2011, he restates his finding that “this project can be allowed while ensuring the protection of the city’s natural resources”. Also, in this report Mr. Moore notes that and acknowledges that the Water Department had no opposition to this request. Therefore the project leads him to believe that this in not a significant concern. Again, he’s discussing some subsurface hydrology. As I mentioned earlier, conservation review is where things get a little sticky and become confused. The Conservation report and comments contained therein deal with a number of issues unrelated to whether the project has an adverse affect on the public water supply. We know this project will not have an adverse affect on the water supply because we’ve been told that by the Water Department and the Conservation Department. We don’t mind addressing all of those other issues that Conservation wants discussed. It is our opinion it should be discussed in a proper forum. I don’t believe that by asking the City Council to act as a Conservation Commission and attach twenty conditions to this proposal is appropriate. We are more than ready and eager to deal with all of the conditions that Mr. Moore has suggested in front of the Conservation Commission. Therefore, at this point in time I don’t believe those conditions should be part of any decision that the Council makes because, again, I think it’s limited to whether or not we are going to have a negative impact on the water supply. That’s been shown not to be correct at all. I am hoping that the Council can distinguish between what its role is as set out in the ordinance and what it would like its role to be which are two different things. I think I am going to end my presentation at this point and certainly here with Mr. Giordano to answer any questions.

President Hart: Is there anyone else here speaking in favor of this petition? Anyone else in favor? Is there anyone here who wishes to speak in opposition to this petition? Please just give us your name and address.

Mr. President and members of the City Council, my name is King Davis. I live at 14 Concord Street in Haverhill, Mass. and I am in opposition to the efforts as presented by Attorney Migliori. It is my opinion for many reasons that it is not suitable for any structure to be built on this piece of land which has been filled by the current owner I’m told and the quality of the fills I understand is in question. The area is within the 500’ of our most important asset, Kenoza Lake. That in itself, in my opinion is justification for declining the proposal. Secondly, Amesbury Road and Rte. 110 is one of our most attractive approaches to the City of Haverhill. It shouldn’t be built upon. This parcel of land should not be built upon by an out of town speculator, who in my judgment, bought a hunk of land that only holds the road together and required fill in what I understand is wetlands. He must have known when he purchased the property and if he didn’t know, he should have known before he went through with the acquisition. I trust that you will protect the area from development not only for our current residents but for the future generations. I want you all to know that I do live on Round Pond, Pentucket Lake. My house was built some forty odd years ago prior to the lake being used as a water source for the City. My neighbor has a house there too. That house to the best of my knowledge was built prior to the lake being connected to Kenoza Lake. I want to acknowledge that fact and I request that you not only look upon this decision tonight as a current decision but also look on it as you think about the future generations for the City of Haverhill. Thank you.

President Hart: Thank you. Is there anyone else here who wishes to speak in opposition? I am going to close the hearing. Councillors, does anyone wish to make a motion?

Councillor Ryan: I'll make a motion to put it on the table for a final vote. Move the, second by Co. Daly O'Brien.

President Hart: Motion to approve the petition Councillor Ryan, second Councillor Daly O'Brien.

Councillor Ryan: Obviously I put this on the agenda so we can discuss it. I've driven by and I feel for Mr. Giordano. He's invested some money obviously in purchasing this and trying to make work. It really doesn't look to me, and I go by it over and over again, it's not an appropriate place to build a house. Not only is it in the watershed close to Kenoza Lake and we need to do everything to protect that. It's also a beautiful vista as Mr. Davis pointed out. Coming into the city looking out over Hale's swamp, it's a beautiful vista that everybody enjoys every day. When I was young, that was a hamburg stand there. How that, obviously before approvals were necessary, that was there for a few year and it finally closed down. The sign was up for many years. But I just don't think its appropriate use of this land. Everyone I have talked to feels the same way. It doesn't make any sense. The site, I've got out and walked up and down. I can't figure out where you can build a house and not have it sinking into Hale's swamp. It's a very narrow stretch. You don't want to be too close to the road. You don't want to be close to the water. There's no room. I'm sure you can get somebody to do a plan to show I can build a house on this narrow strip. It just doesn't make any sense to me. I think in today's standards that we put in protecting the environment I just could not vote for this. I am sympathetic with the person trying to build it. Good luck if you can get the votes to build it. It's going to be a great location to build a house and look out on Kenoza Lake and Hale's swamp. I don't think I could vote for this in good conscience and do what I think what's in the best interest of the City of Haverhill. I'd be voting no on this Mr. President.

Councillor Daly O'Brien: Mr. Migliori, could I ask you a couple of questions. The interpretation is that the water that would be located to the side and behind this project, it doesn't matter if there's a house near that.

There's a large body of water, he refers to it as a swamp but it hasn't looked like a swamp for a long long time. It's seems to have gotten bigger and developed a real body of water appearance. Having lived in Haverhill all my life it certainly doesn't look like it did when I was growing up. I am surprised to hear was the Councillor was alive when they first developed hamburgers down there. Anyways, I'm just going by, I have driven on that road so many times. It just appears to me that it looks much different now than it did say thirty or forty years ago. It looks like a body of water. Now that doesn't count, the fact that we have that water there? It doesn't influence this project at all? Atty. Migliori – no. Co. Daly O'Brien, in reviewing your information, part of the argument if you will, is there are these other houses that are very close to ponds and lakes in Haverhill. Atty. Migliori – King Davis' for example. Co. Daly O'Brien – is that part of your argument? Atty. Migliori – part of my argument is that all of these houses that are within 500' of various bodies of water in Haverhill, to my knowledge have never caused a problem. For you to be able to come up here and say, well my house was built forty years so I am okay living on Round Pond is a bit hypocritical I think. Co. Daly O'Brien – I think the point though, that I see, I didn't think of it in those terms, was the fact that since the bodies of water have been connected to provide back up systems to our water system, nobody has built on any of those lakes and ponds. It hasn't been allowed. There hasn't been anything that close. Atty. Migliori – there have been additions. I know of home additions. Co. Daly O'Brien – but nobody's built, nobody has built a new home on any of those ponds. Atty. Migiori – I don't know the answer. Co. Daly O'Brien – well, I did some research and the answer is no. That's where I am coming from. I'm concerned that we are going to establish a precedent that we may not be happy with in the future, that's my concern. Nothing that I've read in the material provided to me has convinced me otherwise. That's where I stand right now. I'm still listening though. Not disavowing you but I just feel

there is something about the tone. I think that when Mr. Moore is telling us the wetland protection requirements in the endangered species act will sufficiently vet this project, I think you may not end up with what you are looking for. Atty. Migliori – we may not. That’s the reason the Conservation Commission is the appropriate forum in my opinion to vet this whole thing. Not the City Council acting as a Conservation Commission. Co. Daly O’Brien – Unfortunately, the way the City has established the chain, we go before they go. Atty. Migliori – It’s a very arbitrary ordinance that someone decided years ago let’s pick 500’ from any body of water and if somebody wants to build, and Conservation has even acknowledged that the 500’ mark is arbitrary. They were not in favor of that. You need to go back to what your role is under the ordinance you’re acting. Because what I see is pretty much what I anticipated when we talk about a beautiful vista, it’s not an appropriate place. You don’t find those things in the ordinance, Chapter 255 – Section 90, is there any adverse impact. Co. Daly O’Brien – I haven’t said that. Atty. Migliori – I know you haven’t. Co. Daly O’Brien – So my thoughts are coming from another place. I have to act as the Council is directed. Right now I have been given this body of material and have tried to see where I should be convinced that this is a project that should go forth and I’m not seeing that. I’m seeing other issues brought up about where things happened years ago. It doesn’t convince me about what’s going on today. And one of the things I’m concerned about is what’s happened behind and next to that property with that body of water that is called a swamp because it hasn’t looked like a swamp in a very very long time. That concerns me. That means that the land has changed. Maybe it changed because of the building of 495. I’m assuming that that had an affect on it, I really don’t know. It seems like that is what happened over time that has become a more significant body of water. So that is my concern. I really don’t have anything else to say Mr. President.

President Hart: Just for a point of information for the Councillors as they are directing their questions to Attorney Migliori. Attorney Migliori is correct in terms of the special permit and what the special permit requirement says for the protection of the public water supply, no building shall be constructed within 500’. But, we can or you can come to the conclusion, if you wish, through the reviewing of all this material that in your opinion, you feel that with the information in front of you, that a building taking place in this particular spot could possibly be or would definitely be a threat or not healthy to the public water supply. In coming to that conclusion, you have made a decision within the bounds and the language of that particular ordinance. So I think that’s what the attorney is directing us at and keeping that in mind as you go forward with your questions. There is the parameter of the statute.

Councillor Macek: My comments on this particular special permit are along the lines that I am looking at it as a unique filling. I am not looking at the historic construction in the city whether it be at the hundred foot previous limit for the 500’ limit that came in the middle eighties when I was sitting on the Council. At the time I remember the dialogue and I think Councillor Mary Ellen Daly O’Brien is correct that there hasn’t been anything before this body for any exemption from that regulation since it was put into place. This particular application I have reviewed it numerous times. While I may agree that it may seem that the cart is in front of the horse, with the conservation issues not being settled, I do believe this Council on special permits always looks at recommendations from departments and will attach special conditions to special permits so I don’t think we would be out of line should we choose to do that this evening. I also think, with all that being said, I would like to move at the appropriate time Mr. President to add the twenty conditions that came from Rob Moore just in case this should be passed this evening, as a safeguard, to the applicant’s request for the special permit. However, what troubles me most is not anything that’s been said tonight but what was said at the first hearing. And that’s that the size of the house was in question. I remember having the conversation with the proposed developer/owner whether it was a 100’ long house for 50’ long house. He couldn’t tell me. I remember discussing what the use of the large out building believe, I believe it’s 15x30 and we were talking about, if I remember correctly, his wife has had horses and like horses and was it going to be used for dogs, was it going to be used for horses? What’s going to be the system if we do have animals of any kind on that property? What’s the clean up? While the expert reports do somewhat reflect that the water does not go across the street but

leaves to the rear of 110. I have my own concerns as to what may happen in the future because, as we have seen as Co. Daly O'Brien has mentioned, we've seen a change in that area, at least in my lifetime it's changed considerable as to the amount of water its currently holding and what might happen. I also see an exhibit 15 that came along with an old report that there's large chunks of asphalt on that land. I don't know if they are still present but that shows a disregard if that's a kind of fill that's already been brought in. I do have a concern as to what may, and I'm not sure that we can cross all the T's and dot all the I's to protect the City's water and we have great water here in Haverhill. I don't want to risk that. I think that what we have is a protective ordinance is there for a reason. For the reasons that I stated before I really can't (change in tape) as much as I would probably like to because I believe people should have a right to use their property. I would like to mention a couple of other things that came in, the last thing. There is still talk in your application that you might want to use septic or use a holding tank. You won't commit to using City services. You won't commit to using a force main. It's those kind of things that worry me about what concerns there really are for our drinking water and for that area of our City. At this point I've heard nothing to convince me that I should go forward with going along with this request. I would like to move at the appropriate time of this hearing. Would you like me to do that now Mr. President? President Hart: Let's get the comments and then we will. Co. Macek – okay, fine. Thank you very much.

Councillor Young: Attorney Migliori you cite the watershed act, endangered species act and I'm not a lawyer, but I am not sure that they override this 500' buffer zone ordinance that we have here in the City. I don't think, my personal, that the benefit of this one individual in this project should risk the water supply of our entire City and all our citizens. So, I will be voting against this as well. Thank you.

Councillor Hall: From day one I was against this project. I think it's terrible. I think it's a disgrace to the neighborhood down there. What I am basing it on is this. I can remember as a kid in back of where this proposed house was, there was an area where it was considered wetlands. Once they put that project up there on Newton Road the whole thing changed. This is like a little lake down in back of your client's property. If you go down there in the wintertime and you see the traffic situation down there right on that curve that is coming from that lake. I guarantee you if you are allowed to put a residence in there or any kind of a building, it's going make more of a danger to the public safety in this City. Now 110 is a state routed highway. It's maintained by the State of Massachusetts. When you see the average person out there listening sees where this proposed house is going to be, it's a total disgrace to the neighborhood down there. It's going to be a bump in the log when you see what's there. I can remember last summer, not this summer but last summer, when the Essex County Gas Company was doing excavations, they were dumping all that fill that they were digging up onto this gentlemen's property. All of a sudden, his property enlarged. I don't know if it was from this debris that was taken from the streets. It was gone. This gentleman down there worked this property. I used to go by there everyday because my daughter lives on the next street so I am very familiar with the area. When I heard somebody talk, I think Co. Ryan talked, when I was a kid I used to go to the Lakeview Restaurant that was there. Subsequently when it went down, there was no problem then. Like I said, the water situation is going to create more of a danger now to the motorists in the city. I think it's within the 500' buffer zone. Like I said, I was against this from day one and I am going to vote against it tonight. Thank you.

Councillor Scatamacchia: Sometimes this process works very well and sometimes it doesn't. I think sometimes it's backwards. I think this one of those backwards situations where we have a lot of questions. We really don't have, and to your credit, you tried to answer these questions by going to the appropriate boards. I'm just wondering. I could support this if these twenty stipulations from Rob Moore were included in the special permit. I think these are all concerns that even if we pass it and you go to conservation you are still going to have to comply with it. What difference would it make if we attach them as conditions for the special permit or the Conservation Commission does? Atty. Migliori – I don't have any problem with the conditions being attached as long as the Conservation Commission is given

the ability to modify these things because a number of these things in the abstract just don't make any sense. I think one of them is to "within sixty days of granting of this special permit the applicant shall deed the eastern portion of lot 1.8 acres to the City of Haverhill, Conservation Commission". That's not reasonable. We are willing to donate land to the City of Haverhill. You can't do it within 60 days of a special permit being granted because we've got another six months or a year with conservation. As somebody pointed out, we may not even get the right to build the house once conservation is finished. We don't know. As long as you give flexibility back to Conservation to change some of these where it is appropriate, I don't mind attaching them for now so long as they do have the ability. Just to throw these twenty on that really came from Rob Moore without being vetted by the Conservation Commission, his thoughts, more of his than the Conservation Commission. Some of them are just not appropriate. I don't mind them being attached with the understanding or the additional language that Conservation Commission may modify any or all of the twenty conditions. Co. Scatamacchia – I think that's fair. You came before us back in November and we asked you to do certain things and you did. You came back with these recommendations. I think everybody here wants to protect the water in the area. But you did what we told you to do. As long as these are part of the special permit and as long as there is some flexibility so that the Conservation Commission can, has some latitude as far as approving it or extending time limits or doing some of the things that they think that should be done to protect the area. Only because you did what we told you to do and you came back and like I said, I could support this. Thank you Mr. President

Atty. Migliori: I would just point out your Water Department and Conservation Department has stated, they put it in writing that this project will have no adverse impact on the water supply.

Councillor Amirian: Thank you Attorney Migliori I appreciate your clarification of the special permit and what we are voting on tonight is different from some of the other issues that cloud this application. That being said, back when we first heard this, there were many concerns that the Council had. I had recommended that we postpone this and give you more time to come back to us with some more information. What I was hoping for tonight and certainly in this span that we've had was to really see a more complete presentation. I still have lots of questions as to what is really going to be built there. Initially on the plans there was a 30x100 foot residence proposed as well as an out building. That out building may have held horses, it may have held dogs. We weren't sure at this point. I really wanted something to knock my socks off and address environmental concerns on your own. I see these orders of conditions that Rob Moore has suggested that we place on this special permit. A lot of them I agree with. There are some that maybe aren't appropriate but I feel that had you come back with some of these on your own accord, and a complete plan of what's actually going to happen here, that really would have settled my mind a whole lot better. I've lived in Haverhill all my life. I grew up on East Broadway and have travelled that section of 110 hundreds of times if not thousands of times and I often see spring floods come across the roadway to a depth of almost a foot in some cases. I'm not convinced there isn't a potential for the swamp to, for some of that water to leech across the street through the walls that hold Kenoza Lake back. I'm thinking about those floods. I'm thinking about what happens if a house is sitting there. If these orders of condition are not placed on this house, even if they are, what happens if the ejector pump breaks? What happens if the holding tank breeches? What happens if during a flood all these things happen at once? It's not inconceivable to have a disaster like that happen and then that gets into our water supply. Now I understand they are not in the same drainage plain or whatever, but we don't have subsurface hydrology reports, anything really to put my mind at rest. I am really having a hard time getting my brain around this and seeing that a house there couldn't have the potential to harm our water supply. Atty. Migliori – So I understand it Councillor, the reports from the City departments, you have absolutely no faith in? That's what it sounds like. Co. Amirian – Well, if that's the way you want to read it, I guess you can read it that way. I am not saying that. I have the evidence in front of me and I'm making my own decision. I am one of nine and that's the way it's going.

Councillor LePage: Attorney Migliori when you were here in front of us back in November, I asked just a couple of questions and some of my fellow Councillors have asked some of these questions that were actually asked in answer to these questions. One of the first questions I had was on this site we were given a map, it was very detailed on the western section but the eastern portion of his lot. Has anything been done as far as describing or showing how much area is on the eastern portion of the lot. Atty. Migliori – No. Discussions have taken place with Conservation about deeding the parcel, putting a conservation restriction on it of trails. We are amenable to those things but we are in early discussions on those and this putting the cart before the horse. We have no objection to doing that. We haven't invested any money and any additional plans on that parcel because that parcel is really is kind of worthless. Co. LePage – The portion of the parcel is all one parcel. Atty. Migliori – The easternly portion I think is about 1.8 acres is the parcel that Mr. Giordano is willing to either transfer to the city or I know there is a trail agency over there. To do something, whatever conservation wants us to do with it he's amenable to doing it. Co. LePage – Having a conversation with Rob Moore on this a few times and actually his resubmittal on June 20<sup>th</sup> he writes "he questioned whether eastern portion of lot was reviewed as a building (mumbled)..so the applicant could reap the development of developing the lot while complying with the 500' offset of Kenoza Lake". I asked that question in November, that hasn't happened. It hasn't been looked at. Another question I asked was what is allowed by the special permit and that has been explained. I asked have any other special permits been approved since implementation of 255-90, again, this is my second year on the Council. I believe Councillor Daly O'Brien answered that that hasn't happened and others concurred. Atty. Migliori – No, I mean that's not totally true. It may be true with respect to new construction. But there maybe people who put on additions to existing homes that have required this special permit. Co. LePage – And that is written up in a lot of the documentation that was given to us about how this originated back in 1986 and there are some revisions in '97. My last question and what I proposed to you also is adjacent City property to the eastern portion of this land. It is parcel 465-2-12, I was hoping to have a conversation of a land trust transfer or something like that's outside of the 500'. I have a quick little thing that I got from City Engineering that seems to show a lot more available space than wetland to build on. Is that been considered or looked at to possibly work with the City do what I talked about back in November? Atty. Migliori – To moving it away to outside of the 500'. Is that what you are talking about? Co. LePage – The City owned property is well outside of the 500'. Atty. Migliori – Are you talking about trading with the City, land? Co. LePage – Or some kind of conversation, I asked that question back in November, that's not been discussed at all? Atty. Migliori – I think in a situation like this the City would be disinclined to give up any land over there. I don't think that's going to happen. Co. LePage – You haven't discussed a possibility of it. I mean Rob Moore talks about a possible land swap on the eastern portion. So it was never explored to look at possibly building outside of the 500' and just swapping some portion of land with the City. Atty. Migliori – We can't build outside of the 500' it's a problem. Co. LePage – You can't? Atty. Migliori – we can not. Co. LePage – Why? Atty. Migliori – Because the land isn't suitable. Co. LePage – You said it but you haven't actually gone out and surveyed it. Atty. Migliori – It's been looked at. The eastern portion is not suitable for construction of a single family home. Co. LePage – You don't need to do any surveying to that effect? Atty. Migliori – It's been researched. Co. LePage – I'm asking because it was asked for and it's not part of this drawing that was provided the first time doesn't show the eastern portion. It's just blank. It shows where a proposed house might be, where a driveway might be, where a second building might be, where a (inaudible) stock pile is, but the rest of the land, the other half of the land doesn't give us the information as far as the wetland boundaries or any of that information. It's hard to make an informed decision without the information. Atty. Migliori – Make an informed decision on what. Co. LePage – You're just telling me that the eastern portion is unbuildable but you haven't shown me or given anything me that says that. Atty. Migliori – Do you really think we'd be here before you tonight looking for a special permit if we could build on this site outside of the 500 foot. Do you really think we would come looking for a special permit just for the kicks? Co. LePage – I don't know. I'm not saying that. When I asked you back in November if there is any other potential possibilities any other solutions that could be made that would accommodate. Atty. Migliori – And there aren't any. Co. LePage – Okay, thank you. Atty. Migliori – You're welcome.

President Hart: My point here is that this letter that we got from Robert Moore, our environmental health technology expert in the city who guides the Conservation Commission as their expert also; I don't read his letter as saying that this building would not pose any threat to the water supply. I believe what he is saying is that he thinks Con Com could sufficiently vet the project to see that it didn't but then he gives us twenty conditions that he'd like to see us attach to it and because of the severity of those conditions and what those conditions represent, I would say he's concerned with the public water supply wanting all these conditions put in place. Even though we can make an amendment to attach these conditions, several of the conditions as Atty. Migliori pointed out might be either impossible to enforce or might be outside our ability to enforce them as being legal such as requiring, unless they agree to it, the deeding of some of their land within a period of time that is too short obviously. The insistence that the sanitary sewer service associated with the project be connected to the municipal system. The things that he is asking for, I think, would be to protect the public water supply and I think there is a concern on his part by asking us to put these conditions in; and he's asking us to put these conditions in. And then I look at some of these and the City's ability to enforce these conditions in the future concerning roof runoff and making sure there are no discharges that could possibly go to the river. Who's going to enforce them when we don't have the people out there that can do it? We can put it in, as a condition, but it could be easily just overlooked or just avoided. We have to worry about the future too. There will be future owners. How does this get, we actually have to get it as a deed restriction in order to make sure it applied in the future. But even then, the enforceability of it. Based on the above, I am going to read this because this is going to be my reason for my vote, "based on the request for conditions and the information contained in the communication received from Robert Moore, the City Environmental Health Technician, dated June 28, 2011, I believe the proposed building poses a direct threat to the City's water supply".

President Hart: Co. Macek, do you want to make your amendment?

Co. Macek: I would like to do that and let me just preface by saying the reason I'd like to attach these conditions to the special permit in case the petitioner does seek any appeal rights that he may have so these would also be moving forward with the special permit denial. I would move that the conditions as proposed by Robert Moore be added to the special permit and that in number 5, on the first line after no septic, we add the language "or holding tank or tanks". That number 6 not be included. That on number 17 a period be placed on the first line after "any wetland resource area"; and "for the purpose of lawn maintenance" be removed/stricken. Also, that language at the bottom after the conditions be added "should any of the conditions be determined to be unenforceable or illegal in whole or in part that shall not effect any of the other conditions. The conditions may only be altered or deleted with a six vote approval of the City Council". Second by Councillor Young.

President Hart: Okay, that's the motion to amend. I know Madame Clerk there's no way could have gotten it. Co. Macek – I have it. President Hart – Co. Macek has it and he will provide it to you. He's been working on the language. His motion to amend by us conditioning the special permit with the conditions that were submitted by Robert Moore as amended by him is on the table, seconded by Co. Young. Co. LePage – I am not sure if it's appropriate but I see City Solicitor Cox is in the room, I don't know if there are any questions that he could answer. President Hart – I don't think, unless he wants to get up here. I don't think we need that right now. Unless he wants to get up here, I didn't think so. Co. LePage – I just want to make sure everything is appropriate for the City. Thank you.

President Hart: Call the roll on the amendment please.

City Clerk: Co. Scatamacchia-yes, Co. Ryan-yes, Co. Young-yes, Co. Hall-yes, Co. LePage-yes, Co. Daly O'Brien-yes, Co. Amirian-yes, Co. Macek-yes, President Hart-yes. 9 Yeas, 0 Nays

President Hart: Now please call the roll on the application to the special permit as amended.

City Clerk: Co. Scatamacchia-yes, Co. Ryan-no, Co. Young-no, Co. Hall-no, Co. LePage-no, Co. Daly O'Brien-no, Co. Amirian-no, Co. Macek-no, President Hart-no. 1 Yea, 8 Nays.

Atty. Migliori – Thank you for your time.

President Hart – Thank you. Thank you Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara S. Arthur  
Administrative Assistant to the City Council

September 9, 2011

**Petition from Attorney Migliori for John P. Giordano requesting a Special Permit to build a single family residence at 90 Amesbury Road within 500' of a Water Supply, Map 462, Block 3, Lot 2A**

**REASON FOR VOTE**

In granting the Special Permit, those members voting in favor found that the application fulfills all of the general conditions contained in 255 of the Haverhill Zoning Ordinances.

President Hart: Based on the request for conditions and the information contained in the communication received from Robert Moore, the City Environmental Health Technician, dated June 28, 2011, I believe the proposed building poses a direct threat to the City's water supply.

Councillor Scatamacchia: I voted for the special permit because the developer had complied with all the conditions imposed by the Council. Also, that the Council agreed to attach all the conditions proposed by the Conservation officer.

Councillor Ryan: The proposed house is not suited for this site and it is within 500' of the water supply area.

Councillor Young: I voted no because it did not satisfy my concerns relative to the 500' ordinance restriction.

Councillor Hall: I voted no because it is within 500' of the City water supply and because of traffic and safety issues.

Councillor LePage: I voted no on this special permit because I believe it could have an adverse effect on the public water supply.

Councillor Daly O'Brien: I voted no on this special permit because I believe this project could threaten our City water supply. The applicant did not provide sufficient information and details about the possible buildings where they might be sited, their actual size, and the usage of the out buildings.

Councillor Amirian: I voted against the special permit based on the report from Rob Moore and the special conditions he advised we placed on the permit in the event it should go forward. There was enough evidence to convince me that a potential danger could be posed to the public water supply at Kenoza Lake.

Councillor Macek: My vote was based upon the applicant's failure to present any comprehensive evidence that the request was viable and that permitting the request would definitely not impact in any way the City's drink water supply located within the protected area as defined in the ordinance in question.