

Review is: Conceptual Formal Binding (404 Motels/R.O.A.D. Project) Non-binding (All other commercial projects)
 Review is by: Planning Board Design Review Committee

If this is a conceptual review, a formal review will be required before Site Plan Review.

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: April 14, 2014 at 4PM Town Hall Hearing Room	Map: 33	Lot: 77 (C1 thru C10)
Applicant: Seaview Motel Condominium Trust	Zone(s): B2/HMOD1	
Site Location: 785 Route 28	Lot Size: 37,124 +/- sf	

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Sara Jane Porter	Kathy Williams, Town Planner	Attorney Paul Tardif
Jack McCormack		Kieran Healy, BSC Group
Charlie Adams		

Project Summary

The site includes 10 existing units (cottages) which are currently being used as year-round multi-family in violation of the Zoning Bylaw. The Condominium Trust has applied for a Special Permit with the ZBA using Bylaw Section 104.3.2(4) which allows for this conversion if certain criteria are met, or for a Variance. At the 2014 ATM, we also included the requirement that the applicants go through Design Review and Site Plan Review, and develop improvement plans to accommodate this new use.

The proposed site improvements eliminates 3 of the existing curb cuts, reduces impervious areas along Route 28; reduces the width of the western curb cut on Route 28; reduces the number of parking spaces that back into traffic; better defines and organizes the parking and on-site traffic pattern; and provides for additional street trees and fencing.

No improvements were proposed to the buildings at this time. Modifications are necessary to the Condominium documents to allow for the Condominium Trust to undertake exterior improvements to individual units. Draft copies of these documents were distributed to the Town Planner at the Design Review meeting.

A presentation of the project was given by Attorney Paul Tardif and Kieran Healy of BSC Group. A revised Proposed Conditions Site Plan, dated April 11, 2014, prepared by BSC Group was presented at the Design Review Meeting.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

Sect. 1, Streetscape N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

The existing Condo Rules & Regulations do not allow for the placement of furniture or any other articles in the common areas, so the hay bales, gnome and "stuff" in front of unit 3 and elsewhere on the property within view of public ways should be removed and noted on the plan.

The dumpster area along Howes Road needs to be better screened. Ideally it would be located further away from the right-of-way, located behind a buffer area and/or have a fence around it.

Need to provide details on signage upgrades. Additional review of street trees may be required during Formal Design Review.

Sect. 2, Tenant Spaces N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 3, Define Street Edge N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

See comments in Section 1 - Streetscape

Sect. 4, Shield Large Buildings N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 5, Design a 2nd Story N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 6, Use Topo to Screen New Development N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 7, Landscape Buffers/Screening N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

See comments in Section 1 - Streetscape

Sect. 8, Parking Lot Visibility N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Applicant is proposing the use of fencing along section of Route 28 and Seaview Avenue to reduce visibility of parking areas. Street trees are also proposed.

Traffic should be limited to one-way along eastern access from south to north with No Parking signs attached to existing fence to retain a fire lane.

Reduce the double loaded parking in front of Unit 9 to 60' total (bylaw allows for 20' aisles) and provide a larger buffer along Seaview Avenue by reducing the two exterior parking space width to 9'.

Sect. 9, Break up Large Parking Lots N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 10, Locate Utilities Underground N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 11, Shield Loading Areas N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

BUILDING STRATEGIES

Sect. 1, Break Down Building Mass – Multiple Bldgs. N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 2, Break Down Building Mass – Sub-Masses N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 3, Vary Façade Lines N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

The units are small traditional Cape Cod cottage with small breezeways between the buildings and varying orientation which helps to vary the façade lines, the wall heights and roof lines.

Sect. 4, Vary Wall Heights N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

See comments in Section 3 – Vary Façade Lines.

Sect. 5, Vary Roof Lines N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

See comments in Section 3 – Vary Façade Lines.

Sect. 6, Bring Down Building Edges N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 7, Vary Building Mat'ls For Depth N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

In addition to general repairs and maintenance on the exterior facades, the use of shutters and variations of neutral paint colors especially along Route 28 would help to add depth to the structures.

Sect. 8, Use Traditional & Nat'l. Building Mat'ls N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Although traditional materials have been utilized, there has been deferred maintenance and repair on some of the structures which negatively impacts the overall development. Maintenance and repair to these existing traditional materials is necessary.

Sect. 9, Incorporate Pedestrian-scaled Features N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 10, Incorporate Energy-efficient Design N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Next step for applicant: Go to Site Plan Review Return to Design Review for Formal Review

Read & Received by Applicant(s)

--	--	--