


David Glicksman  
1550 Padanaram Ave.  
New Bedford, MA 02740  
Tel: 508-997-4484 cell: 508-951-5271  
e-mail [dpglix@comcast.net](mailto:dpglix@comcast.net)

June 18, 2014

John G. Radcliffe, Chairman  
City of New Bedford Conservation Commission  
100 William St,  
New Bedford, MA



Re: Conservation Hearing June 17, 2014

Dear Chairman Radcliffe,

I believe your idea that the parties come together and all be made clear as to the understanding of the law and procedures. As good citizens of our City of New Bedford we should all respect and understand one and another's rights and responsibilities.

I will not state my position. This can come at the meeting. It may be sensible to present our individual positions very clearly, first. There are certain terms I would like to add together with the reasoning for this request.

If it is preferred, the City Solicitor can be present as moderator. If the Mayor or any other member of the City Staff wishes to attend this meeting, this will be fine. As long as they come with an open non-committed presence and each question is presented through the moderator. The Mayor, out of respect for the position, can participate as can the President of the New Bedford City Council if either chooses to. Two participants from the two factions will be allowed to participate. Each of the four participants must have an interest, that being ownership in the sub division 17A. I would suggest that the City Solicitor be the moderator if he chooses if not, then there has to be a person certified in the Law present for the City that is agreeable to all parties, they can have no prior working relationship other than relating to a City nature.

Judy MacMullen cannot be a participant. The reason being "evidence Ms. MacMullens has presented is flawed and forwarded as fact. This being her "concept of General Laws of MA Chapter 187 section 3." I did receive this several years ago and I believe I requested Attorney Mathieu to look into it. On speaking to Attorney Jane Medieros Frieman of New Bedford Solicitors office, he said it had no effect on me. When it was interjected at the ConCom meeting of June 18, 2014, I read that portion and found it only refers to notice from an agent, guardian or conservator of the owner of land shall have the same effect as a notice from the owner themselves.


This is not the first time her veracity has been questioned. She claimed FEMA had refused the building of an addition to my house in a meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

If the notification of all the parties of interest is a stipulation, I have no problem. I do prefer that only two people for each party participate.

Historically if there is a big rowdy crowd, disparaging remarks have come from the gallery and if it is memorialized by disk, the disks can be altered and people made to look in very embarrassing positions. Sarah Porter or John Gurney can give you some of their recollections of the results. I would prefer a limited meeting as to size. The participants in the meeting can disseminate the information to the parties with interest in the property. I am feel this is fair. the way Ms. MacMullen was talking there were several meetings with the Mayor and we as abutters have not been involved in the final action. We feel we have been limited in the knowledge received as to the actions taken by the Mayor and the lack of procedural in its method of implication.

I do want to thank you for an attempt to make all positions clear. This does not preclude any legal action from any individuals. This letter is not sent to any other party but I am not precluding you to show to anyone else.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Glicksman', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

David Glicksman