April 20, 2012

TO: City Council President John A. Mitchitson and members of the Haverhill City Council

FROM: William Pillsbury, Jr. Economic Development and Planning Director

SUBJECT: Cluster Special permit for Rosemont Street-6 lots

At its meeting of March 22, 2012, the Haverhill Planning Board voted a conditional favorable recommendation to the City Council for the proposed cluster special permit. The minutes of the public hearing are attached for your review.

The role of the Board was to conduct a public hearing to make a recommendation to the city council relative to the special permit. The proposed project represents a proposal for 6 units of cluster style single family homes along the existing 15+ acre site.

The city departments have reviewed the project and their reports are contained in your packages. The project complies with the zoning requirements for a cluster style development, in particular the requirements for open space treatment, and service by city water and sewer. The developer has additionally committed to convey to the city a portion of the site as dedicated open space, and further will grant to the city a walking trail easement on the open space land reserved for recreational purposes.

The project if approved for a special permit by the city council must then be filed for a full definitive plan with the planning board at which time the detailed design for roadways, water sewer drainage etc. will be presented pursuant to the city of Haverhill subdivision regulations.

Specifically, I recommend that the Council as part of its approval of a special permit include as conditions the following: 1.) letter from the city engineer and water/waste water dept.2.) letter from the fire department 3.) letter from conservation 4.) letter
from the Building Dept. 5.) any additional comments or conditions deemed necessary by the city council, 6.) an umbrella condition that the project comply with all the requirements of zoning code 255-94.

Each of the above specific items if adopted as conditions will be required to be incorporated into and complied with in the definitive plan filing.

As Planning Director, I believe this project is in the best interest of the City of Haverhill in that it balances the density on the site with significant commitment to open space. Additionally the project affords the city the opportunity to own and control open space around and along Little River as a means of expanding our greenbelt and trails opportunities.

Specifically, pursuant to zoning ordinance Ch. 255-80 (as applicable) the following findings must be made relative to the project:

- the request meets all pertinent conditions listed in article XI of the ordinance;
- the request is desirable to the public convenience or welfare;
- the request will not impair the integrity or character of the district or adjoining zones nor be detrimental to the health, morals or welfare and will be in conformity with the goals and policies of the master plan;
- The requested use provides for the convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and in relation to adjacent streets;
- The requested use provides for adequate methods of disposal for sewage refuse and other wastes and adequate methods for storm water and drainage;
- The requested use provides for adequate off street loading and unloading of service vehicles;
- The requested use preserves historical buildings and uses.

**Proposed conditions and stipulations:**

I offer the following recommended conditions be made part of the special permit approval:

- Require that the developer comply with all of the additional requirements of the City’s subdivision regulations for water and sewer and drainage improvements as contained within those regulations and further detailed in the above listed and attached letters from the departments. These items shall be reflected in the definitive plan to be filed with the Planning board.
**Recommendation**

As Planning Director, I concur with the favorable recommendation based on an assumption that all items in the letters from the City Departments along with all requirements for special permits would be made part of the special permit for the project.

This project with the incorporation of the recommended conditions is generally in conformity with the City’s master plan as well as providing sufficiently for traffic, public safety and other utility considerations. The project as proposed appears to conform to all other special permit requirements. On the basis of adopting the proposed conditions/stipulations, I recommend that the council act favorably on this project.
MEMO TO: President John A. Michitson and Councilors
COPY TO: William Pillsbury, Economic Development and Planning Director (via email)
         Margaret Toomey, City Clerk
FROM: Robert E. Moore, Jr., Environmental Health Technician
DATE: April 20, 2012
RE: Special Permit – Cluster Residential Subdivision
    Bradford Unlimited Corp. for Rosemont Street – “Perls Way”
    Site Plan dated revised April 16, 2012

The Conservation Commission recently performed a preliminary review of this project and generally found it acceptable. The applicant and his consultants have spent significant time walking the site and working with me to maximize future public access to Little River and an abutting open space parcel to the south. The revisions on this plan were made to address my concerns in this regard.

I support the granting of this special permit and recommend the City’s acceptance of the related open space parcel.
April 19, 2012

To: William Pillsbury
    Planning Director

Subject: Special Permit Cluster residential Development Rosemont Street Revised Letter
         Project ID# 651-610-18

The Water and Wastewater Divisions have reviewed the above mention item and have the
following concerns:

Wastewater Division

- The five (5) lots shall have an individual household ejector, with one lot by gravity.
- Developer to pay per lot, to be paid in total prior to first house occupancy permit,
  improvements to Alvanios Drive Pump Station
- The above two items shall be included in a revised Definitive Plan.

Water Division

The Water Department has no objection to the issuance of a Special Permit for this project. The
Applicant shall be advised that the project shall be served by City Water and a water main
location shall be depicted on the Definitive Plans in accordance with the Subdivision Rules and
Regulations. A hydrant located at the end of the main is preferred to a standard blow off
configuration.

Water and Wastewater Divisions do not object to the special permit and request this letter be part
of City Council approval. Water and Wastewater Divisions shall provide additional comments
after the submission of a site plan.

If you have any questions call my office 978-374-2382.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Jessel
Collection System Supervisor

File#: 120027
Project ID: 651-610-18
cc: Bob Ward, W/WWTP
    John Pettis, III City Engineer
    John D'Aoust, Water Treatment
    Anthony Capachietti, Water Maintenance
    Chris Sparages: csparages@wsengineers.com
April 18, 2012

MEMO TO: HAVERHILL PLANNING BOARD

Subject: Special Permit Cluster Development, Rosemont Street (Perrls Way Subdivision)

I have met on-site with the Project Engineer, Paul Jessel from Wastewater Department and Police Office Ed Watson. Our two previous concerns have been addressed. First, the plans are to be revised to show all homes that cannot tie-in to sewer by gravity will have their own separate force main to SMH. Second, the plans will have a note that the Developer will forward to the City $600 per unit to be used for Traffic Mitigation (this will be used for line-of-sight improvements that Officer Watson had identified and for traffic control cabinet upgrade at the Rosemont Street/Main Street intersection).

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John H. Pettis III, P.E.
City Engineer

C: Stankovich, Ward, Moore, Jessel, Watson
csparages@wsengineers.com
March 22, 2012

City Council President John A. Mitchitson
& City Councilors
City of Haverhill

RE: Rosemont Street Special Permit Cluster Development
Applicant: Bradford Unlimited Corp;
Williams & Sparages prepared the plans

Members Present: Timothy Connors, Celeste Hynick, Roy Wright, James Cronin, Jack Everette, Joseph Sullivan, Bob Driscoll, and Paul B. Howard

Members Absent: none
Also Present: William Pillsbury, Director of Economic Development & Planning
Lori A. Woodsum, Office Mgr./Board Clerk, Planning D.E.P.artment

Dear City Council President and City Councilors:

The Haverhill Planning Board at its meeting held on 3/14/12, Wednesday Evening, at 7:00
P.M. in Room 202, Haverhill City Hall reviewed the above-cited petition for Special Permit
Cluster Development for Rosemont Street. Member Jack Everette read the rules into the
record. Chairman Paul B. Howard chaired the meeting and asked the petitioner to come
forward.

Attorney Robert Harb, 17 West Street, Haverhill, came forward to speak. It was noted that
he represented the developer, Bradford unlimited Corp. and noted that Mr. Steve Defeo is
the president and treasurer. Also present is Chris Sparages the engineer for the project.
They were before the board tonight for a recommendation to city council for a cluster
residential special permit. He believed that the applicant and the application to the city
Council have shown the city council that it is met all of the requirements for cluster
residential developments to be allowed in this area. He explained that they had a tracked
of land that is over 15 acres that is on Rosemont Street. We have designed six small
individual homes to be located in this area using RH Code. The lots comply with the
number of lots that you could have had if we had built a regular subdivision under the
regular code. However, it was noted that in the effort to preserve open space as you can
see by the Little River and to preserve the Little River along with preserving open space,
and to preserve any wetlands on the property is how they designed this plan. Attorney
Harb noted that he probably should interject that the Duffy Family has owned this property
for a number of years. The father died when they were working with the estate and now
would like to close the estate. It was also noted that because over the number of years
before Mr. Duffy died Mr. Pillsbury will attest that he had been working with the Planning

4 Summer Street--Room 201, Haverhill, MA 01830 www.ci.haverhill.ma.us
D.E.P.artment and Mr. Pillsbury on many different possible uses for the site. They focused in on probably the best use for this site which is a cluster development. You should also note that we had a preliminary review of our plans before conservation to ask for determination and did not file the order of conditions until they were done with the city council and then back to you again with the definitive. They had given them the go ahead. They have worked with Mr. Moore about trails to go out back and the open space and what they would do with it, so as part of their plan but not part of the special permit the developer owned another lot of land not part of this plan that he is also going to be donating to either a wetland preservation group for the City of Haverhill or whoever may wish it from the conservation committee. We have a piece of property that the six houses as you will see and was sure that their engineer will mention that it fit in with the neighborhood. They also fit in with the homes on Alvanos Drive which is around the corner and it was really the best use of this space. It preserves the open space and they did meet the requirements of open space land from non-wetlands and uplands and those percentages all required by our code. They would be complying with the requirements of the city D.E.P. The city D.E.P., he believed, filed favorable approvals of this subdivision of the special permit. They did ask that we continue our discussions with Water/Wastewater D.E.P. regarding the sewer pumping station which we will do shortly after this hearing and continue with that. It was noted that because they centered on this best use of the property the applicant did send letters to all the abutters and we received, he was told, no responses. They did give them copies of the plan. It was noted that one of the abutters here tonight did talk with them tonight and that abutter believed who he believed lived on the corner of Rosemont to the left of the open space. If he was reading the plans correctly it should be Mr. Grant. Mr. Grant was concerned with a buffer. When the developer said that he would like to give him a buffer and Attorney Harb had looked at the plan and looked at the space next to his lot that was actually dedicated open space. There is a 10 foot right of way that accesses land out back that they certainly could not impact by planting trees in someone else’s right of way. Behind that was part of the open space that will remain open. So that may address his concern having a house near him because there would not be a house near him because there is a right of way and an open space that goes around it. They have tried in the past... this developer has done a cluster development in town before and has done other developments, duplex developments in the city. He has done a lot of work in the city and he would like to say that he as done good work and no one has complained about him. He always fulfills all his obligations. You can tell that he is kind of young, he’s younger than me but he has been building quite a few houses during this time and he is proud of the houses that he builds. It was noted that he has been Steve’s lawyer for many years. He thought that Steve was a good developer. This is a development that fits with the neighborhood and it was working with conservation, the city planning director for two years and hoped that the board could forward a favorable recommendation so we can go back to city council with that favorable recommendation. Attorney Harb turned the hearing over to their engineer that could give the board and the abutters a little more information about the plan. He believed that they have all seen it. He asked Chris Sparages to come forward.

Chris Sparages, a registered professional engineer with offices at Williams & Sparages on Rt. 114 in Middleton came forward to speak. He has been practicing as a professional
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eengineer working on residential and commercial subdivisions of this kind for more than 17 years now. He has gotten the chance to get to know Steve since he started working on this project. We have been working with him for quite awhile. This is not the first time that you have seen this plan. We were before the planning board once before with an A&R Plan that allowed them to create 15.5 acre parcel. The back land that Attorney Harb was referring to is beyond the project to the south. He just wanted to give the board a little bit of background on the property and the lay of the land. Rosemont Street is on the northern part of the property, which is where their frontage is located on this 15.5 acre parcel. They were in the watershed of the Little River which you see off to the west. The land (inaudible) slopes away from Rosemont Street south into the property and you can see that we were proposing a short cul-de-sac roadway that you can see is approximately 360’ long that is going to create frontage for these six relatively small homes and lots. Just beyond the end of the cul-de-sac you will see a green line just to the south that runs east west that runs east west across the property that represents the limit of the bordering of the vegetated wetland on the property. Much of the back land is below the wetland line. He pointed out some wetland islands but noted that once you got below the wetland line and get closer to the river, the Little River has a flood plain associated with it and much of the property lies within that floodplain. He noted that they were not proposing any work within the floodplain for the proposed development. They were proposing to try to meet the appropriate setback requirements from those wetland resources as described in the wetland ordinance for the city. They will be working with the conservation commission on that as they move forward.

Chairman Paul Howard asked if that north arrow rotated 90 degrees would that be...

Mr. Sparages noted it is... normally he is right next to the plan. He point out where north was located on the plan.

The chairman asked if the north arrow should be turned 90 degrees. He was looking at the north arrow... (Someone said that’s the logo) …the chairman asked if that was just the logo.

Mr. Sparages noted that is the logo.

The chairman was looking at that and noted nothing is making sense.

Mr. Sparages referred to that logo and noted that if you notice there is a “W” and an “S”... (The first initials of Williams and Sparages.)

The chairman along with other members now see what he was talking about.

Mr. Sparages referring back to the lay of the land that once you get below the wetland line he referred to a series of trails throughout the 15.5 acre parcel and beyond that parcel into the backland that Attorney Harb described. It was noted that Mr. Defeo intended to also put up some sort of donation in care of the city possibly a protected agency like the Essex County Greenbelt that isn’t shown on the plan as you head south there were other bodies
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of water on this backland. This property was used historically to make clay bricks and that
was the historical use of the property and the clay was mined out of those areas as a result
there are bodies of water here and there in that backland. There are some really neat trails
that we were able to walk with Rob Moore to try to figure out how best to access this open
space. Getting back to the development... again...

Chairman Howard thought that all the board members have a plan and noted that he did
not think that the audience could not see the displayed plan.

The planner asked the engineer to move the plan to the other side so that the abutters
could get a better look at that plan. The board members have their plans to review.

Mr. Sparages noted that there is also a small stream that runs under Rosemont Street near
their entrance. It was fed by a larger wetland system north of their property and it crosses
in a very old culvert under Rosemont Street and onto our property before going onto the
neighboring property. There is a small wetland associated with that and that is near the
front of the property at the north end. They were also trying to limit their activities near that
small wetland as well. Another notable feature on the property was that there was a high
pressure gas easement that runs through the property. There is an easement that runs
through the middle of Alvanos Drive development as well. There were two high pressured
gas lines that run inside the easement and we designed the subdivision such that we were
working around that easement and we have already were entering into discussions with the
folks at Tennessee Gas in order to make sure that we comply with all of their regulations.

The proposed construction of the roadway they were proposing to make sure that
they meet all the planning board rules and regulations in terms of right of way width at 50
feet as well as the pavement and curbing and cul-de-sac all in accordance with the
planning board rules and regulations and in terms of storm water management. It was
noted that because portions of our property lied within 100 feet of a wetland they were not
only required to meet the storm water requirements under the planning board rules and
regulations but we also had to meet D.E.P.'s storm water management regulations under
the review and guidance of not only the city engineer but the conservation commission as
well. Storm water from this relatively short road will be handled using best management
practices following D.E.P. storm water management regulations.

Mr. Sparages noted that they were showing a schematic design at this point on the
plan. It was a relatively short roadway, which was just over 350' long and were proposing a
double set of catch basins at the end of the cul-de-sac which will then be routed to a small
storm water management area just to the south of the proposed cul-de-sac and that should
be enough to handle a pervious surface that they were going to create. Other utilities,
obviously, they were proposing to provide public water and sewer to the project. It was
noted that Attorney Harb touched on some of the comments that we received back from
engineering and wastewater/water D.E.P.. We are proposing to tie into the existing water
main and provide a hydrant at the end of the cul-de-sac for the new roadway. One way or
another they would have a situation because of the grade that slopes back into the property
they were going to have to pump our sewerage from these homes up to a manhole
relatively close to Rosemont Street before it could flow by gravity back into the system.
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Mr. Sparages noted that concluded his presentation on the technical aspects but between Attorney Hart and himself they would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Chairman Paul Howard wanted to know if there was any thought given to using some low impact development.

Mr. Sparages asked if it were in terms of storm water management. He noted that they had... he had talked about that and had discussions with Rob Moore about that as well. It is a relatively small amount of impervious surface... we have not approached the subject with the planning board when you talk about low impact development techniques are one of the things that they try to get away from is the use of curbing on a roadway like this but did not know how long the planning board would be willing to consider the reduction or the elimination of curbing and possibly the narrowing of the amount of pavement in the roadway in order to help to even go towards the...

The planner noted that the means to propose that would be waivers on the plan. He thought in previous discussions Mr. Defeo decided to go without waivers and probably thought that was probably why we are proceeding in those directions. The process to do that, if that is what they wanted to do, to go in the direction of a L.I.D. would be, because we do not have a LID ordinance or ordinance language in place, to propose them as waivers before the board.

Chairman Howard thought that it seemed like this would be a project where it would make a lot of sense to do that.

Member Celeste Hynick asked about the architectural drawings and if they were prepared by a registered architect.

Mr. Sparages noted that this was a residential subdivision with single family homes. Attorney Harb could speak to the nature of the special permit. He would let him answer this question.

Attorney Harb noted that as they did in their last presentation about 3 or 4 years ago for a special permit they would like the board to have a rough idea of what kind of houses and what they were going to look like... the developer did not hire an architect to draw the plans. He has plan books and noted they might not be the exact houses that they will want to build because it was a single family development unlike what I heard in the first petition which was a 5 unit building that required architectural buildings and they were asking for a permit for 5 units. He noted they were only asking for a permit to put single family houses in the cluster. So were they stamped officially? He believed that they really got them from his architectural book... he builds and these are the kinds of houses that he builds. He uses those plans to build. He has many throughout the city using the architectural books.
The planner thought what you were dealing with is the section of the code, that's the cluster section, 255-94, as opposed to the regular... the multifamily special permit and thought that was the distinction.

Member Celeste Hynick asked if they were required...

The planner's response was not at this stage. When they come back with a definitive plan stage that is when that type of information is provided. It is different because under our ordinance as Attorney Harb has said there is a separate section that deals with multifamily development and those do not even come under the subdivision regulations per se until we get to the definitive plan stage... zoning backs it in but this is coming into us under the subdivision control regulation as a single family development. The relief is in the form of a cluster configuration.

The chairman noted if they were all done with the presentation then he would open it up to the public. He asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on this project.

Wendy McGill, 20 Alvanos Drive, came forward do speak. She takes exception that this fits into the neighborhood of Alvanos Drive. She did not agree. Her concerns dealt with water and drainage. Her backyard did not show any wetlands on any maps but there was a fair amount of water much of the year. Concerned with putting a cluster development behind there would do... it would be forcing more water back onto us. She also sits on an easement for the city and has a pumping station that is right in line with her property. She was concerned with how that will effect the wastewater which they have enough problems with that wastewater station. She has lived there since 1985 and have had 2 or 3 occasions where there has been pretty catastrophic events because of a malfunction with that pumping station. She was really concerned about it. She really wanted there to be a lot of time and attention and due diligence made to making sure that this is proper and safe. Many of them at her end of the street believe that what they bought their homes they were told that this was conservation land don't worry no one will build on it because it is wetlands so you are all set. She was shocked to find out that they planned on building on this tiny piece of paper and there was notice that there was a public hearing so she decided that her interest would be best served to come forward at a public hearing make my needs known and you folks were much more expert than she was... she was not trying to make trouble for anyone but she sure... (TAPE CHANGE TO SIDE 2)

Member Timothy Connors asked Wendy McGill to elaborate on the statement... “that the proposed cluster development does not conform to your house or the other dwellings on Alvanos Drive.”

Wendy McGill—She did not know whether they conformed or did not but just thought that you would not necessary get us to say that we think that it will be suitable for the neighborhood so she did not think that we are particularly interested in having that... you
can’t tell… if you saw it on and 8 X 10… shrink what you have down to an 8X10 and see if you can read it.

Member Connors noted that single family dwellings all on Alvanos Street.

Wendy McGill answered yes we are. She noted that at the top of Rosemont there is probably those 4 or 5 duplexes right along the top of Alvanos and Rosemont… we are all single family… Ms. McGill returned to her seat.

Frank Grant, 70 Rosemont Street, came forward to speak. His property sits at the corner of Alvanos and Rosemont. He had a couple of issues with the development. One is the access road coming off of Rosemont Street. From looking at the paper print Rosemont does not look like a big street but that is a very dangerous corner and now you are adding more traffic to it. His house only has a stone wall in it and it gets hit 2 or 3 times a year from people coming around the corner. Now you are adding another access road to bring up more traffic. There is also… putting my house in a situation where his house is surrounded by 3 streets. He know that they had that small piece of open land… he is going to have a house on one side, this new road on another side and Rosemont right in front of me. This is where my house sits and I worry about the effect of the resale of his house. The value of his house and what this property would do to it, and the property being close to my… as you go down the first house is sitting right next to his property too. It is affecting his setbacks and all of that stuff. When he bought his house nine years ago that was wetland owned by the city that was auctioned off and now this development is coming in and it is going to… first house will abut his backyard, the second one will be right on top of houses on Alvanos right as you go down the road. He worries about the property value and things of that nature for himself and for the other owners. There is also the wet problem too, the wetland problem… there is a lot of water saturation as she mentioned and wanted to know if this development would make it better or worse. These were the things that concerned him. He thanked the board and returned to his seat.

Jim Lantagne, 18 Alvanos Drive, came forward to speak. He lived there his whole life and also studying land use and development issues in college so this is the kind of thing that really interested him. He did not like the idea of this because he was concerned about the long term impact of this on the city financially. This is a new public street that will have to be plowed. There is new city water and sewer lines that will have to be maintained in the future. Police and Fire will now have to serve this street. Also being single family homes this will bring children into the city. The single family homes will be at least one or two kids on average so that is more children in the school system which is already a huge drain on the city. Also the words cluster development and open space sound nice but as for open space there is no open space to preserve there. There are woods and there is nothing there. There is no reason to go in there. There are no recreational opportunities there so they were saying that part of it was going to be preserved for open space does not really mean anything. As far as walking trails that are there… those are pretty much non-existent. He used to walk there when he was really little with friends and there were little paths covered with weeds and by now those are long gone. So this is no in an area with
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walking paths that the city can enjoy for recreation. Also, the corner that this new street
would be located on... when you approach that corner from either direction on Rosemont
Street you cannot see around the corner. It is a sharp corner which you cannot tell by
looking at the drawing so when you add this new street in there will be cars going in and
out, even if it is only a small amount, it will make it much more dangerous than it is right
now. He had nothing else to say... thanked the board and returned to his seat.

Kathy Brown, 21 Alvanos Drive, came forward to speak. She lives directly across the street
from Ms. McGill and the Lantagne's. Her husband, who could not be here tonight, and
herself were very strenuously unhappy about this development going in. One of the selling
points when they bought their house six years ago was that the land behind the Lantagne’s
and the McGill’s and all along there was conservation land and it would not be built upon.
They were really happy about that because it would be preserving some wildlife, there is
open space, there is protection of wetlands and I find out about this development. It use to
be a place where clay bricks were made so the land there the soil is quite compact it was
literally clay. Her yard is clay. It holds water and she has some kind of underground
stream going under most of her yard that comes up under her driveway and going across
the street to the sewer line. When the water table rises for any reason she gets water in
her basement every single time. She did not want to see any more problems with the water
table shifting because of a development going in there. She did not want to see that sewer
pump in Ms. McGill's front yard directly across the street from her house and next to the
Lantagne's blow up again because it could not handle what is being thrown at it. The
sewer treatment plant in the city is pretty much maxing out at this point and it needs some
serious help. And adding any more houses and development would be adding more to the
sewer lines and the water treatment plant are going to cause problems. You may not think
that 5 or 6 houses is going to be a problem but it could be just that little bit that tips things in
the way of... we have a problem. So there were a whole bunch of issues that do not make
us happy about having this development going in. That road... Rosemont Street where the
entrance to that is located is nearly a 90 degree turn when you come around that corner
and right at the elbow of the 90 degree is where that opening is... now having living on that
street for six years I could tell you when coming up from the train tracks and going to turn
right onto her street she has nearly been rear ended with a minimum of once a week
because of the way that traffic runs on that road. That road is at the worse position and is
at the worse part of the turn and that scares her. There will be accidents there. There will
be more accidents and with traffic coming in and out of there... she is very concerned with
safety. She has seen that gentleman's wall get hit by people trying to make that turn. In
wintertime that will only get worse so someone needs to take a good look at the... the
engineers need to take a very good look at the soil quality that they will be building on
because that is all clay which holds water. And who is going to keep paying if I have to
keep pumping out my cellar and start to have damage... will I have to have flood insurance
because of a development that causes a the water table to rise and causes my cellar to
flood repeatedly? She did not agree with this development at this point and she hoped that
the planning board will take a very close look again at where this is located. I would invite
everyone of you to come into our neighborhood and see exactly what they are talking about
and our concerns. She would be happy to take you on a tour to show you where
everything is that is not quite accurate in terms of how the houses lie... it doesn't even show the shape of the road... there is a curve in the road and there is a low point a the bottom of the street there are two low points and that is going to come in at the very low point which is where her house, the Lantagnes and the McGill’s houses are and there is going to be a water problems. If you would like...

Member Connors... he mentioned the intersection that the abutter mentioned as being dangerous and asked her if there were stops signs at that...

Kathy Brown, the abutter, noted that there were no stop signs at the end of Alvanos Drive and there never have been. She mentioned that there is a posted warning sign, “Dangerous Curve”, which no one pays attention to and nobody can see it because it is covered over with trees that have not been trimmed... it is a nightmare!

Someone from their seat was speaking which is inaudible.

Kathy Brown asked if any of the members had been on Rosemont come up that hill and take that curve. You can see the little flags on the tree where that road is going and it's going to be a nightmare especially in the winter. So please consider carefully... she thanked the board and returned to her seat.

People speaking from their seats... inaudible.

Member Connors wanted to know if there was a speed limit posting of 20-30 mph.

People in the audience agreed. Someone from their seat said that it was a cut through from Hilldale to Rt. 125. Conversation continued but was inaudible.

Member Connors stated that the road is frequently used, correct?

People in that audience answered yes. Hilldale and 125 yes...

People keep talking from their seats... inaudible.

(Ms. Brown possibly?)... No name given... She noted that she had a corner with those little kids...

Another person, no name given, noted that people are using that road coming down Rt. 125 into Plaistow... they are using the back way in, so we have seen a great increase in traffic down Rosemont.

Attorney Harb came forward and noted that he was going to ask the engineer to talk about the good questions about the water and the drainage and the question about site access and road access because I asked him the same question. The attorney went out... very rarely that lawyers go out and look at real estate but I went out and looked at this and they
pointed out where the road would be and we looked both ways. So I am going to let the engineer look at that road access safety.

He just wanted to mention a few things. Good question about financial impact but these six houses are going to bring taxes in and you heard Attorney Waldron speak at the previous hearing about when their homes are built that it would bring in taxes. The property at one point taken from some parties… the city owned it and then the city put it up for auction. Mr. Duffy bought it at the auction. Anyone could have bought it at the auction so he bought it. They had a title search done and it did not say anything about any dedication of open space and wetlands. He thought a good questions on this side of the board was if you were to look at Alvanos Drive the size of the lots and the single families that is what they were developing… the same size of lots and single families and noted that is why he mentioned for the neighbors that it complies with the neighborhood. It was noted that we did not come in and try to do multifamily housing. We did not look for an apartment house. We did not do a commercial storage. We are not looking for any businesses there. We looked at just what would fit when you go to “Google Earth” then you can punch in and look at the neighborhood and see what an overview of Google Earth looks like and you look at the houses and noted that six is not a lot of houses for 15 acres. So the financial issue is there. Respectfully I say to you that we are just here for a recommendation. We meet the requirements of a special permit so we can go back to the city council, get an approval to have a special permit but perhaps the neighbors don’t understand that we need to come back before the planning board again for a definitive. He noted that all these issues regarding access, specifications of the road, drainage, and the engineering can be reviewed by the city engineer, which will all come before the board again in more detail. Tonight they just need to go to city council so that we can take 15 acres and plus of land and maybe put in a six family if we can meet all of your definitive requirements when we come back again. He asked them to look at the area again in the neighborhood there are a few duplexes in the neighborhood as they mentioned. Alvanos Drive is like a curve… a circle and in the front they built some duplexes and thought that was in the 70’s and everything else is pretty well single families. The attorney noted it was not like I was coming in and wanting to do duplexes and triplexes and things like that.

The attorney noted that their concerns were legitimate and they will be addressed by the definitive and we will also tonight try to answer them but the important questions are about water drainage and that load safety. He asked Mr. Sparages to talk about that.

Mr. Chris Sparages came forward to speak. He took good notes from the people that spoke and noted that they had a lot of similar comments on many development properties that we work on but let’s try to tackle them because every property is different.

In regards to the proposed development he mentioned the need for a sewer pump station of some kind. They need to pump the sewerage up to Rosemont Street. But Mr. Defeo does not have control or rights over any of the lots on Alvanos and noted that our sewer system is going to be independent of anything that happens or is happening at Alvanos. This proposal was to take care of our own sewerage, lift it up to a manhole that will then direct it by gravity into Rosemont Street at the top of the proposed roadway. In terms of drainage and the lay of the land... they have a topographical survey that was an instrument survey that allows them to take a look at what the lay of the land looks like and
we use these types of surveys to determine which way the water flows analyzing the existing conditions and use that information when we do a final design on a roadway for a project of any kind. As he mentioned earlier in the presentation the lay of the land is basically from Rosemont Street which is the high point on this property and flows directly back relatively perpendicular to the wetland line which he pointed out is the long green line that runs east/west and follows very closely or very close to the gas easement. The roadway and our storm water management areas are going to be directed to that wetland which then flows in to the flood plain of the Little River and then flows westward, if you will, into that wetland system and out to Little River which is in the opposite direction of the folks over at Alvanos Drive. No doubt the homes that are constructed on Alvanos Drive as Kathy mentioned from 21 Alvanos Drive many homes that were constructed years ago may not have been constructed the way they are today. In other words to give you an idea of... where is the ground water... people had a hard time understanding what those principles in the 40's and 50's when a lot of those homes were built. Mr. Sparages lived in a neighborhood where folks got flooded out regularly because of that reason. There was not enough foresight put into the siding of some homes. He suggested to the board and to the neighbors that for this project that we do look at ground water. We have a huge focus on storm water management these days more so than ever especially because where we are proposing we are relatively close to a resource area. So we have through our drainage analyses and our topographic surveys through the instrument server we are able to figure out which way the water flows in the existing condition and then set up control devices to hold back the water and let it out slowly to try and match those pre-existing conditions so that we do not cause off site flooding impact. He mentioned the D.E.P. Storm Water Management Regulations... they were only guidelines a few years ago and over the last couple of years the state adopted them into the wetlands protection regulations. There are 10 standards in a storm water management form that has to be filled out. There are 10 standards that we have to speak to and noted that one of them was to sign this form and put our stamp on it, but one of the standards is that the project cannot cause off site flooding impacts for storm events that we analyze so we take these things very seriously when we are proposing a development of any kind. We have to try to use these best management practices things like storm water management areas, catch basins, swales and things of that nature to hold back the water, help infiltrate it back into the ground if possible and hold it back to that... we try to match the way the water flowed before the development goes in. Mr. Sparages noted that is his response or more of an explanation on how we approach storm water and ground water issues.

Finally he wanted to touch upon traffic and thought they would be a little surprised about what he was going to say but he thought this is a good opportunity actually to improve the existing condition at this curve that these folks were talking about. He explained further noting that they were interesting enough their frontage just happened to come into Rosemont Street at this curve so we were outside this curve and Rosemont Street goes in opposite directions away from us. We sort of have a unique situation regarding site distance. We use these words to describe the ability of on coming vehicles to see... let's say our vehicles as they exit left and right out of the proposed development. Geometrically speaking because of where they are on the outside of the curb at this turn we actually have a unique opportunity to actually see all the way down to the intersecting
street coming up left or west out of the proposed roadway. We can see for a long distance back the other way, eastbound, towards Rt. 125. It is just that way that it is at this particular location. What he believed would happen as a result of that is that... people as they are traveling now along Rosemont Street they come along and look around that curve however fast they happen to be going. We know from the preliminary analysis is that we have adequate site distance in both directions. However, he believed that what will happen based on his previous experience in projects like this was that the folks that were coming down Rosemont Street are going to have a new street and will have it in their visual field coming from both directions. The folks that pull out or pull towards the end of our street at Rosemont Street not only are the on coming vehicles in both directions will be able to see us and in fact he believed that because of that the speed after development with these cars having the ability to come to this intersection and sit there will slow the vehicles down on Rosemont Street because of that fact. Right now it is based on the geometry of where their road will be coming into Rosemont Street and the fact is that we do have tremendous site distance in both directions. He noted that is the reason why at this point based on their preliminary review as Attorney Harb mentioned we all have gone out there and Mr. Sparages noted that he himself walked it with at least one city official. He did not think that it will be an issue that they will have to worry about. It was certainly something that they will have to address and put into writing and describe these findings through... we sort of do a preliminary traffic study that analyzes trip generation and site distance that is part of the definitive plan process any way. Based on their preliminary plan review we did not believe that this was going to be an unsafe condition because of those things.

Someone from the audience from their seat said that you have not seen the cars that have gone exactly where the entrance to where that street is.... She has seen in six years 3 cars go slipping off right into the woods where the entrance of where that site is going to be located. It is exactly what happens and this is on dry roads. She has seen it on a wet road and during a snow storm.

Someone else from the audience spoke out noting... you do not know about it report wise because people will end up hitting a tree and then pull out. So there would be no list of accidents... (Inaudible) ...people are coming off... (Inaudible) ...tree... (Inaudible) ...then they back up and I come home and there is a pile of rocks...

Chairman Howard told the people in the audience that if they wanted to speak they would have to come up to the microphone. Nevertheless, the chairman thought that what he was saying was in a situation where that would have happened that those vehicles would have gone off the road and with a street there that they could actually go onto or they would slow down for that. He told the people in that audience again that they just cannot keep speaking out the way that they have been and if they have a comment to make that they needed to go up to the podium and speak in the microphone.

Attorney Harb noted that the developer would like to say a few words.
Steve Defeo, the developer, came forward to speak. He apologized to the abutters if he had offended them in any way. He wanted to just send a letter. He apologized that the plan he sent was too small for them to review. He probably should have mailed a few big plans but he was trying to generate a meeting so he could show up with his engineer with some big copies of the big plans and try to work out some of these details. He apologized to the board members and to the abutters. He hoped that they could meet to work out some of the details. He was a local gentleman and was just looking to do a nice project and was not looking to step on anyone’s toes. He would love to meet with them with Chris (Sparages-engineer) who has the expertise and try to work out some of these details so they feel comfortable. He also wanted to work with the various boards as Bill knows and the developments next door. He was really sorry for sending out the small plans. He only has a little copier at home... he is just a small outfit. He thanked the board and returned to his seat.

Attorney Harb came forward to say that this concluded their rebuttal and again requested conceptual approval of going to the city council for the cluster development special permit for these single family homes. Then they would be back before you and in the meantime they would work with the neighbors and when they come back for the definitive plan then you will see all that was addressed and more technical detail.

The planner, Bill Pillsbury, asked Attorney Harb and to their engineer regarding the information that was referred to relative to traffic in terms of the accident analysis or things like that... He did not know whether they had done any of that research yet. It was mentioned that it would be done as part of the definitive stage but asked if there would be a willingness to present some of that information at the time of the city council hearing.

Mr. Sparages noted that would not be a problem. It was simpler to do a simple speed study and take a look at the accident data and to make a reasonable presentation somewhat as they would do as part of the definitive...

Planning Director Pillsbury hoped if they could have that reviewed with the city engineer and inform the Traffic & Safety Officer from the Police Department prior to the city council hearing would be some useful time spent. You could make a presentation at the city council... he knew it would be before the definitive but thought it would be useful to have that for the city council presentation and have some definitive answers there for those particular questions relative to that roadway. He knew that they had adequate line of sight that was not an issue but some of the other issues regarding geometry and how that geometry was effected with the speed history that is out there. He was sure that it was not 30 mph. He has been on that road also. It was noted that those were some of those things they could look at between now and the council hearing and then this discussion perhaps could be continued at the city council hearing and certainly would be continued at the definitive plan stage if we should get that far.
Attorney Harb came forward to say that the developer suggested if it is the wish of the board to make that part of its conditional approval of the special permit request to do so then we would comply with that.

Someone from the audience came forward and did not give his name. He apologized to the board noting this was all new to him and was not sure how it all worked. He mentioned the line of site that was just brought up... it kind of sounds good but he is a person that lives there and noted that they would not get a lot of accident reports as he mentioned. He said that people hit his wall, they go into the woods, hit the tree, and you see them back up and they just keep driving. It is not like people are calling cops because they came around the corner and ran into each other. Theoretically you might get some but there will not be a lot as much as it happens out there. Secondly, he does not do research on roadways but he knew that people come around that corner and as he is trying to back out his driveway someone is trying to pull out of Alvanos and they're not slowing down... they do not care... he asked the board if they knew what he meant and noted by adding more traffic he could not picture that... One more entrance... he felt that would not make people go slower just because there was another entrance. He felt that the signs marked dangerous curve... does not help. They reposted signs or (inaudible) and people just zip right through. In a perfect world maybe it would help maybe it would do it but it is a 40 to 50 mph road. Someone was hit on a motorcycle a little ways down the road. A couple of years ago someone was killed going 80 mph. It is a drag way and there were things to consider and felt that the police reports may not tell the true story. He thanked the board and returned to his seat.

Someone came forward to speak and that person did not mention her name (Possibly Kathy Brown of 21 Alvanos) but she did apologized for speaking out away from the microphone earlier. She was a little out spoken and tends to be a little passionate about what she believes in. She requested a plan that was larger than what she had (8X10) so that her husband could read it. (Note: one of the board members gave her a plan.) She thanked that board member. She wanted someone to take a very, very good look at the traffic. And if you were to stand in that corner (referring to the plan on display) and basic physics says when you are whipping around that corner what is the place that you are going to hit. When you go to slide you are going next to where that street is going. Please take a really good look at the traffic.

Planning Director Pillsbury to the abutter thought he heard the applicant offer an opportunity for a meeting and asked if the neighbors were amenable to that type of situation.

The abutter believed so. There were some of her neighbors that can't make these meetings because some of them work late and some of them are just getting home when these meetings start like her husband who works strange hours and sometimes cannot be up late in the night. He could not be here tonight for one of those reasons.

The planner was suggesting...
The abutter was suggesting an earlier meeting say around 7:00 p.m. would probably help to get more of the residents in for that meeting.

Chairman Paul Howard noted if they could try to set something up that would be ad minimal to the neighborhood maybe on a weekend or...

Steve Defeo from his seat... the weekend would be fine.

The chairman noted maybe on a Saturday or a Sunday morning where it is light and you can see what you are talking about.

The planner noted to cease the moment maybe before you all leave this evening you could try to come up with a day. It would be something that happen... obviously trying to anticipate all of this get resolved before the council hearing.

The abutter thanked the board and returned to her seat.

Someone approached the podium with a few comments and did not give his name and address. He wanted to talk more about the line of sight. An engineering study might tell you that if you are on this new proposed street that you have a clear line of sight both left on Rosemont and right on Rosemont because you are on the outside of the curve so you can see both directions. But if you are on Rosemont approaching this new street on your right you cannot see around the corner. So you could not see someone traveling the opposite direction and turning left into the new street. So if you are on the new street you might be able to see all the way here and all the way here (referring to the displayed plan) but if you are approaching the new street on Rosemont and the new street is on your right you cannot see around the corner. You cannot see anyone making a left turn into the street. Also commented that this developer might be bringing taxes into the city but noted that he could buy a one foot square piece of dirt in the city and pay a couple of cents in property taxes but saying that is going to bring taxes to the city does not mean anything unless you compare it to what it will cost the city in the long term as far as children, the school system, a new bus route, trash pick up, plowing in the winter, fire and police service and things like that.

Chairman Howard asked if what he was saying was now that he was a resident of the city that we should shut down development in the city. He noted to the abutter so now that you have your home everyone one else should not have an opportunity to come to our city.

The abutter, who did not give his name, answered no. He loved development and went to college and majored in environmental planning because he loved seeing new exciting things get built. However, different types of development affect the city in different ways. Mayor Fiorentini in the past was really enthusiastic about the redevelopment downtown and the old warehouses and things because those are condos and apartments that typically young couples that do not have children so it does not affect the school system. He noted
that these were single family homes so that is completely different impact on the city. Saying that they choose single family homes over condos or storage units or any other thing does not make it better. The argument doesn't really make a point.

The chairman noted that it did not make it worse either. Everyone has their own opinion.

The abutter answered I guess and thanked the board and returned to his seat.

Member Timothy Connors mentioned that they had a topographical survey done as well as a drainage analysis in respect to the proposed cluster development, correct?

Mr. Sparages noted that there was an existing topographical survey that we have and we just shared with one of the neighbors. It is that Sheet 3 of that special permit plan set. We got a preliminary look at the proposed drainage design but the topography on the site is not complicated. It pretty much slopes in one direction and we know where the wetland is located. We know that the road is going to slope back towards the wetland and we know how long the road approximately was going to be so the drainage design is going to be simple that much we know. They have not done the detail design yet which will come later as part of the definitive plan preparation.

Member Connors thought that he stated that before but maybe he miss communicated wanted to know if he had a drainage analysis performed with respect to this property.

Mr. Sparages answered not yet.

Chairman Howard thought that they said they took a quick preliminary look at it and knew how they will approach the design in the definitive stage.

Member Connors was all set with that response from the chairman and said thank you.

The chairman asked if there were any other questions from the board. There were no other questions. The chairman asked if there were any other questions from the people in the audience. No one else had any other questions. There was not one else in favor that wanted to speak and no one else came forward in opposition. The chairman closed the public portion of the hearing and turned it over to the planning director for his comments.

Planning Director William Pillsbury wanted to take a minute and discuss the due process side of this to make sure that everyone from the neighborhood side and also the board are familiar and right up to speed with what we are doing this evening and how that fits into where this project goes from here. It was noted that as part of the special permit requirements for a cluster development under our zoning there is this requirement in there for a recommendation from the planning board. The purpose of that is to take the submissions at a special permit level of detail which not a definitive plan level of detail which the planning board members are used to seeing. The planning board receives very detailed drawings and analyses and engineering at the definitive plan stage of any project.
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Where we are this evening is that we are looking at the preliminary stage or really the
element of a conceptual plan that has to go to the city council first to receive the approval
as to whether this project is feasible under zoning. Then and only then would they be able
to go through the detail engineering analysis that is required to be submitted to the
Conservation Commission to deal with the drainage and the water and the wetlands and all
of those issues and to comply with the subdivision regulations which are in detail as it is
related to the layout of the roadway, the configuration, the geometry, the size of the
roadway, the size of the pipes, and all of those various infrastructure issues. So what you
are looking at and what the board is looking at this evening is really the concept of whether
this project complies with the requirements of the zoning ordinance section and Attorney
Harb has gone through in detail and listed out what those requirements are and that is what
the city departments have looked at, at this stage. That is what they have looked at to see
if conceptually this project fits that zoning construct. Again... at this point the next step
beyond this recommendation this evening is that the city council will hold a hearing on its
requirement to issue the special permit and they can add conditions as this planning board
this board this evening can add any conditions that the planning board chooses to have
added as requirements that would go forward to the city council. The city council can then
add additional requirements that would become part of the definitive plan whether it were
those such things that may come out of the traffic analysis which will be conducted or if
there were issues raised relative to the conceptual engineering concerns that will be
discussed tonight which we have discussed and also at the city council level. The planner
just wanted to give the abutters a sense of where... this action tonight by the planning
board does not authorize anyone to build anything. It did not authorize anything except the
opportunity to go before the city council with a recommendation from this board.

The planner noted again that we have had the departments look at it. The departments
have commented and their reviews and comments are in the packages. Specifically there
were comments from the Fire Department, the City Engineer, Water/Wastewater D.E.P.,
Conservation... they have all raised concerns in their letters. The planner recommended
and he recommended that it become a part of the recommendation to the city council
verbatim that they would be contained in there would be conditions of the recommendation
of the planning board to the city council. Beyond that there would be a sense that the
developer follow through on the commitment to meet with the neighbors in the meantime
before the city council meeting and could report it at the city council hearing. Also that
there would be a discussion of traffic in a more detailed traffic analysis presentation made
at the city council hearing as well and thought would go a long way towards addressing
some of the technical issues relative to traffic. Regarding water and sewer... you will not
get a final design stage but to get as much of that information as you could and maybe
some detailed information based on what you have done at conservation so far. The
planer thought that would be useful to present at the city council and suggested that be a
condition as well.

The planner recommended a conditional favorable recommendation to the city
council on this project as it relates to its compliance with the cluster regulations. Those
conditions that he recommended would include the incorporations of all the city department
letters as he listed them before and the other requirements relative to the meeting with the
neighbors and further details relative to issues on engineering and design as it relates to drainage. Also the clearing up of the issue relative to... he did not think that they had an issue relative to the architectural but thought that maybe a statement on that, to Attorney Harb, to the building inspector would be appropriate. He noted that was his recommendation.

Chairman Paul Howard asked if one of the neighbors wanted to take... this is a (inaudible) that shows what it could be as a conventional subdivision 14 lots and what it is reduces by going into a cluster down to the six lots that they are showing...

Someone from the audience... no name and was inaudible.

The chairman noted that it was good information to see and it has the layout so if any of the neighbors would like to take the package home...

Member Connors also gave them his copy.

The chairman asked for a motion.

**MOTION**
After board consideration, Member Bob Driscoll motioned to accept the recommendations of the planning director and to forward a conditional favorable recommendation to the City Council for the Rosemont Street Special Permit Cluster. Member Celeste Hynick seconded the motion. Members that voted in favor of the continuance were the following: Timothy Connors, Celeste Hynick, Roy Wright, James C. Cronin, Jack Everette, Joseph Sullivan, Bob Driscoll and Paul B. Howard. No members were absent. **Motion passed to forward a conditional favorable recommendation to the City Council.**

Signed,

[Signature]
Paul B. Howard
Chairman

Attachments: City D.E.P.artment Reports

Cc: Rosemont Street Special Permit Cluster File
Mayor Fiorentini
Owner/Applicant
Robert Harb, Esquire
William D. Cox, City Solicitor
City Council
City Clerk
City Engineer John Pettis—Room 214
April 5, 2012

Haverhill City Council
C/O Mr. John A. Michitson, President
4 Summer Street
Haverhill, MA 01830

Re: Special permit For A Cluster Residential Development &
Applicable Waiver of Affordable Housing Component
Rosemont Street
Council Hearing Scheduled April 10, 2012

Request For Continuance To April 24, 2012

Dear President Michitson:

It is my understanding that there will not be a full Council present at the scheduled hearing of the
above matter on April 10, 2012.

Therefore, in an effort to insure a hearing before the entire Council, I respectfully request the
hearing be continued for two weeks until April 24, 2012 when all Councilors are expected to be
present.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Bradford Unlimited, Corp.

By: Stephen Defeo, President

IN CITY COUNCIL: April 10 2012
CONTINUED TO APRIL 24 2012

Attest: [Signature]

City Clerk
MEMO TO: Haverhill Planning Board

Subject: Special Permit Cluster Development, Rosemont Street (Perls Way Subdivision)

I have reviewed the submitted plan and have no objection to the Special Permit being granted. My only comment at this time is that the method of handling sewer from most of the proposed dwellings (all tied into a single forcemain) is not consistent with City of Haverhill policy. It is recommended that the applicant’s engineer meet with Wastewater Department’s Paul Jessel and me to discuss alternatives.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

John H. Pettis III, P.E.
City Engineer

C: Stankovich, Ward, Moore, Jessel
csparages@wsengineers.com
March 14, 2012

Mr. Paul B. Howard, Chairman
Haverhill Planning Board
4 Summer Street, Room 201
Haverhill, MA 01830

Dear Chairman Howard and Board Members:

Please be advised that we have received payment on the following parcels:

River Street Special Permit – Joseph DiPrimo Map 534, Block 4, Lot 19.

Rosemont Street Special Permit Cluster Development – Bradford Unlimited Corp/Stephen DeLeo Applicant – Map 636, Block 1, Lot 10

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mary E. Roy, CMMT/CMMC
Treasurer-Collector
FISCAL YEAR 2012 REAL ESTATE TAX BILL
Based on Assessment as of January 1, 2011 your REAL ESTATE TAX for the fiscal year ending July 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2012 on the parcel of REAL ESTATE described below is as follows:

ROSEMONT ST
Parcel: 636.1.10
Book Page: 24461.59
Acreage: 11.2800
Class: RRS
Land: 208,500
Valuation: 208,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX RATE PER $1000</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26236

DUFFY JOSEPH G
97 LOVEJOY RD
ANDOVER MA 01810-4525

CITY OF HAVERHILL
PAID
2.68 INT
MAR 14 2012
825.31
MARY E. ROY
COLLECTOR

This form is approved by the Commissioner of Revenue
THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BILL NO. 26236
TAX PAYEE'S COPY

Real estate tax: 3,077.46
Preliminary tax: 1,452.20
Preliminary payments: 1,452.20
3rd Qtr. Tax due 02/03/12: 812.63
4th Qtr. Tax due 05/01/12: 812.63

RECEIVED
MAR 14 2012
Econ Dev, Plan & B.O.A.

mcV
February 6, 2012

William Pillsbury, Planning Director
4 Summer Street, room 201
Haverhill, MA 01830

Re: Cluster Development/ 636, 651-1, 610-10, 18/ Rosemont Street Special Permit

The planning, design and construction of new buildings, renovation of existing buildings and structures to provide egress facilities, fire protection and built-in fire protection equipment shall be in accordance with 780 CMR; and any alterations, additions or changes in buildings required by the provisions of 527 CMR which in the scope of 780 CMR, 8th edition, shall be made in accordance therewith. (527 CMR 1.04(4) and 780 CMR 101.2)

Plans approved by the fire department are approved with the intent they comply in all respects to 780 CMR, 527 CMR, MGL Chapter 148 and any City of Haverhill ordinance. Any omissions or errors on the plans do not relieve the applicant of complying with applicable requirements.

I have reviewed the submitted plans for the address stated above and in the interest of public safety, have the following comments:

- Public Safety Design Standards
  - The Planning Board shall consider in addition to all roadway access considerations for fire safety, the following criteria when approving a preliminary or definitive plan:
    - When fire safety response time to a proposed subdivision exceeds four (4) minutes from a manned fire station facility, then residential sprinklers shall be required to be installed in each unit; and or
    - If response distance exceeds 1.5 miles for an engine company or 2.5 miles for a ladder company from a manned fire station facility, then residential sprinklers shall be installed in each unit.

The Public Safety Design Standard of City of Haverhill's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land requires the installation of residential sprinklers in each unit of this proposed cluster development project.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

William F. Laliberty
Deputy Fire Chief
March 13, 2012

To: William Pillsbury
   Planning Director

Subject: Special Permit Cluster residential Development Rosemont Street
         Project ID# 651-610-18

The Water and Wastewater Divisions have reviewed the above mentioned item and have the following concerns:

**Wastewater Division**

- Plans show notation “FM” is this forecast?
- The developer shall be required to install a sewer lift station acceptable the Wastewater Division
- The developer shall work with the abutter at 20 Alvanios Drive in the hopes to run a gravity sewer from an existing lift station into this new lift station.

**Water Division**

The Water Department has no objection to the issuance of a Special Permit for this project. The Applicant shall be advised that the project shall be served by City Water and a water main location shall be depicted on the Definitive Plans in accordance with the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. A hydrant located at the end of the main is preferred to a standard blow off configuration.

Water and Wastewater Divisions do not object to the special permit and request this letter be part of City Council approval. Water and Wastewater Divisions shall provide additional comments after the submission of a site plan.
If you have any questions call my office 978-374-2382.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Jessel
Collection System Supervisor

File#: 120027
Project ID: 651-610-18
cc: Bob Ward, W/WWTP
    John Pettis, III City Engineer
    John D’Aoust, Water Treatment
    Anthony Capachelli, Water Maintenance
    Chris Sparages: csparages@wsengineers.com
March 9, 2012

Mr. Paul B. Howard, Chairman
Haverhill Planning Board
4 Summer Street, Room 201
Haverhill, MA 01830

Dear Chairman Howard and Board Members:

In reviewing the Planning Board Agenda for the March 14, 2012 meeting I noted an account that has taxes due this office:

Rosemont Street Special Permit Cluster Development – Bradford Unlimited Corp/Stephen Defeo applicant – Map 636, Block 1, Lot 10. The third quarter taxes for Fiscal 2012 which were due February 3, 2012 in the amount of $812.63 plus interest to date of payment remain unpaid.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mary E. Roy, CMMT, CMMC
Treasurer-Collector

4 Summer Street, Room 114 Haverhill, MA 01830  www.ci.haverhill.ma.us
February 6, 2012

William Pillsbury, Planning Director
4 Summer Street, room 201
Haverhill, MA 01830

Re:  Cluster Development/ 636, 651-1, 610-10, 18/ Rosemont Street Special Permit

The planning, design and construction of new buildings, renovation of existing buildings and structures to provide egress facilities, fire protection and built-in fire protection equipment shall be in accordance with 780 CMR; and any alterations, additions or changes in buildings required by the provisions of 527 CMR which in the scope of 780 CMR, 8th edition, shall be made in accordance therewith. (527 CMR 1.04(4) and 780 CMR 101.2)

Plans approved by the fire department are approved with the intent they comply in all respects to 780 CMR, 527 CMR, MGL Chapter 148 and any City of Haverhill ordinance. Any omissions or errors on the plans do not relieve the applicant of complying with applicable requirements.

I have reviewed the submitted plans for the address stated above and in the interest of public safety, have the following comments:

- **Public Safety Design Standards**
  - The Planning Board shall consider in addition to all roadway access considerations for fire safety, the following criteria when approving a preliminary or definitive plan:
    - When fire safety response time to a proposed subdivision exceeds four (4) minutes from a manned fire station facility, then residential sprinklers shall be required to be installed in each unit; and or
    - If response distance exceeds 1.5 miles for an engine company or 2.5 miles for a ladder company from a manned fire station facility, then residential sprinklers shall be installed in each unit.

The Public Safety Design Standard of City of Haverhill's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land requires the installation of residential sprinklers in each unit of this proposed cluster development project.

Respectfully,

William F. Laliberty
Deputy Fire Chief