

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: October 7, 2014 at 4PM in Room B of Town Hall      Map: 33      Lot: 77 (C1 thru C10)  
 Applicant: Seaview Motel Condominium Trust      Zone(s): B2  
 Site Location: 785 Route 28      Lot Size: 37,124 +/- sf

**Persons Present:**

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Sara Jane Porter <i>SJP</i>	Kathy Williams, Town Planner	Attorney Paul Tardif
Jack McCormack <i>JM</i>		Kieran Healy, BSC Group
Charlie Adams <i>CA</i>		Paul Baron
Anthony Panebianco <i>AP</i>		
Dick Martin <i>DM</i>		

DCR Review Started at: 4:50 PM  
 DCR Review ended at: 5:40 PM

**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.

A presentation of the project history was given by Attorney Paul Tardif. Improvements to the exterior of the buildings can now be done by the Condominium Trust as their condominium documents were modified to allow for this work. Kieran Healy gave a brief summary of the proposed site improvements, including improvements to some septic system components. The site improvements were estimated at \$24,000 and site improvements would happen in first year.

Paul Baron, property manager, and Attorney Tardif gave a summary of improvements to the buildings. There is an estimated 3 year phasing of all improvements. In the first year, the site improvements and improvements to units 1, 2 and 3 would be done. They are proposing to use two neutral color vinyl siding (platinum gray & stone hearth with "mozart" blue doors) on the fronts of each building, with 1"x5" or 1"x6" corner boards and 1"x4" trim around windows, with white cedar shingles on the other sides. The next year, units 8, 9 & 10 would be done. The third year, the remaining 4 units (4, 5, 6 & 7) would receive the vinyl siding and shutters. The Design Review Committee recommended using white cedar shingles on all four sides with white trim and different color doors (colonial colors).

## Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

### SITING STRATEGIES

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

*The streetscape needs to be better defined by adding/modifying street trees/plantings as follows:*

- *The existing tree to the east side of the Route 28 curb cut is a very small caliper and should be replaced with a 3" caliper tree. Although there are two pine trees nearby, they offer little screening for the parking as the canopy is very high.*
- *The tree at the corner of Seaview and Route 28 should be located behind the sidewalk to accommodate the existing tourism sign.*
- *One of the trees shown as being existing on Seaview Avenue has been cut down. Add some ornamental grass in this area.*
- *Two proposed shrubs along Route 28 need to be labeled.*

*Fence styles/heights should be noted on the plan. Fencing to screen parking should be a minimum 3' tall white vinyl picket fence. Fencing to prevent cars from parking on the septic tanks should be white split rail. Fencing around the dumpster should be white vinyl for ease of maintenance. Existing wooden fence along the property boundary should be repaired as necessary.*

*A note should be added to the plans indicating the removal of all personal items within the common areas, in accordance with the condominium documents.*

*When the siding is done, the overgrown foundation plantings shall be removed, and replanted with dwarf species of foundation plantings.*

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

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

*See Siting Comments in Section 1 above.*

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

Sect. 5, Design a 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Siting Comments in Section 1 above.*

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 is limited to one-way along eastern access from south to north with No Parking signs attached to existing fence to retain a fire lane and to better define parking areas.*

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:

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

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

**See Building Comment 1 above.**

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

**See Building Comment 1 above.**

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

**See Building Comment 1 above.**

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:

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

*The Design Review Committee recommended using white cedar shingles on all four sides with white trim and different color doors (colonial colors).*

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

	<b>Read &amp; Received by Applicant(s)</b> 	
---	---	--