

PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF October 20, 2009

Place: Town Hall Banquet Room

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

A. Quorum/Attendance

Members Not Present – Gary Staffon arrived at 6:35 p.m.

Planning Director William Roth was also in attendance.

B. Acceptance of Minutes –

Albert Borges motioned to accept the minutes for the September 22, 2009 meeting. Timothy Cox seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

C. Planning Board Bills –

1. Fairhaven Neighborhood News – Normandin – 7 Sunset Beach Rd. - \$45.00

Timothy Cox motioned to pay this bill. Joseph Morra seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

II. CURRENT PLANNING

A.. Receipt of Plans – None

B. Approval of Plans - None

III. LONG RANGE PLANNING –

- 1.) Planning Survey – Key Conclusions - Discussion

William Roth – I met with Mr. Morra and Mr. Silva and we went through the survey and looked at things that we felt were key. We came up with what you see before you. (Mr. Roth went through each one.) I think we captured most everything. We tried to include in a broad sense, everything that the survey showed. There are 10 key conclusions we identified, if the Board feels that is too many, than you could reduce that number.

Timothy Cox – I can't see limiting this.

Wayne Hayward – I wouldn't limit it. If you water them down too much, they end up on the shelf. My key conclusions are probably different than these. But we're all not going to agree.

Albert Silva – There was a Boston Herald article recently that called Fairhaven a hidden gem.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING – Mr. Staffon was present for the hearing.

- 1.) Special Permit – 7 Sunset Beach Road – Gerald and Jennifer Normandin

William Roth – I had not received any public comment as of the date of my report. However, I did receive an e-mail, today, from an abutter, which I have given you. I reviewed the request and conducted a site visit. I have not seen any issues. I am recommending approval subject to the two conditions.

Wayne Hayward – When this permit was given by ZBA, they were called in-law apartments. Over time, we now have the special permit from the Planning Board. There is language there. In my mind, this is in a single family zone.

William Roth – This is a single family unit. It is an accessory to the principal dwelling.

Wayne Hayward – Do we want to have a condition that limits it to an in-law.

Timothy Cox – I can't see any issues. The Board of Appeals approved it unanimously. Does the stipulation devalue the home?

Wayne Hayward – I don't know how the assessors would view the issue. We need to look at the bylaw. What would prevent them from getting a building permit and building a secondary entrance?

William Roth – There is nothing.

Albert Borges – If they did sell it, they would have to go through this again. I have no objection though.

Joseph Morra – I don't have a problem as long as it stays single family.

Gary Staffon – I don't have a problem with this. New people coming in, however, should do the same.

Marinus Vander Pol – I think the condition should run with the owner and not the property.

William Roth – If you want to limit the occupant to a relative than I would recommend that you add a condition with the same language as the original Special Permit.

Gary Staffon motioned to add a condition that only family members of the property owner may inhabit the existing in-law apartment. Timothy Cox seconded. The vote was 6-0 in favor (Raymond Fleurent abstained). The motion passed.

Timothy Cox motioned to approve the application with the three conditions. Albert Silva seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor. The motion passed.

Albert Borges motioned to adjourn. Gary Staffon seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor. The motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James Pelland, Secretary
To the Planning Board