

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

YARMOUTH TOWN CLERK

Review is by: Planning Board Design Review Committee

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

'22AUG3PM4:19 REC

Meeting Date: August 2, 2022

Map: 84

Lots: 12

Applicant: JDB 212 Mid-Tech Drive, LLC

Zone(s): B3/APD

Site Location: 186-212 Mid-Tech Drive, West Yarmouth MA

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Kurt Raber
Chris Vincent		John Lavelle
Steve O'Neil		Rick Fenuccio
		Jeff Bilezikian

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:10 PM

DRC Review ended at: 4:50 PM

On a motion by Chris Vincent, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the August 2, 2022 DRC meeting at 4:50 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: The project proposes to demolish the existing structure and replace with a proposed 11,360 square foot contractor bay building with 11 units, new paved parking area with 33 parking spaces, and various site improvements including new stormwater management systems, septic system, landscaping and lighting.

Summary of Presentation: Kurt Raber, Catalyst, gave an overview of the street view of the property, which is located near the end of Mid-Tech Drive. The proposal includes a dense landscape plan along the front buffer. The new building is single story with 11 bays with overhead doors, bath, and rear egress to a fenced in yard in the rear with gates. There will be no property management on the property. Each bay will be condominiumized, but see it as rental units at this time. The building is designed for trades people with access for vehicles. Mr. Raber reviewed the landscaping plan and noted that large substantial trees are remaining, but some will be removed for drainage swales, but they are being replanted to create a greenway to filter the view of the building. Mr. Raber reviewed the site and building mounted lighting being proposed to keep the light on the property.

Mr. Raber discussed the pre-fabricated building with standing seam metal roof (dark Gray), insulated metal siding (light gray), with a 3' concrete wainscoting. Entrances have bollards to protect the building. Doors and window will be white in color.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Charlie Adams asked about whether retail sales would be possible especially with condominiumizing. Kurt Raber noted each unit will have occupancy and business permits for each unit. Mr. Adams inquired about the number of trees being added. Mr. Raber indicated 30 trees will be in the buffer area between existing and proposed. Mr. Adams asked about the type of adjacent businesses. Mr. Bilezikian noted neighbors are boat storage and a printer. Mr. Adams asked about the dumpsters, with Mr. Lavelle noting they are shown in the rear of the site on a pad with a fence. Mr. Adams asked about signage, which the application indicated would be designed at a later date.

Mr. Vincent asked about the roof runoff going to the infiltration areas and using black coated chain link fencing.

Steve O'Neil noted his appreciation for their investing in Yarmouth and felt the new building compliments the surrounding buildings and they did a good job with the landscaping. Mr. Adams noted that landscapers are going out of town for their storage as there is nothing available in Yarmouth so he felt it will serve a need and be an asset to the Town. Mr. Adams noted the need for good landscaping with native species. Mr. Vincent inquired about whether the project will be going to the Planning Board. John Lavelle indicated a Special Permit would be required from the ZBA.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

The building is located back from the street with the majority of the parking in front of the building, and no front windows, and no modulations in the long rectangular building façade.

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

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

See Streetscape Comments above.

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:

The DRC felt the Landscape Plan as presented showed sufficient screening for the project. Any buffer plantings required by the Bylaw should all be located on the subject property. The Landscape Plan shows some plantings within the road right-of-way.

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

The DRC felt the Landscape Plan as presented showed sufficient screening for the project. The trees shown along the perimeter of the parking area are not considered in-lot trees according to the bylaw.

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

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

Rear fencing should be black coated chain link rather than galvanized.

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

BUILDING STRATEGIES: *Although the building design does not appear to meet the Building Strategies, the proposal compliments the area along Mid-Tech and is consistent with what is in the area already.*

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:

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

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

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:

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

On a motion by Chris Vincent seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for the August 2, 2022 DRC meeting for the proposed contractor bays at 186-212 Mid-Tech Drive.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- **August 2, 2022 DRC Agenda**
- **July 29, 2022 e-mail from Kathy Williams and Aerial/Streetscape Views**
- **DRC Application:**
 - **DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet**
 - **Site Plans: All plans prepared by Baxter Nye Engineering & Surveying, dated December 10, 2021:**
 - **C0.0 – Cover Sheet**
 - **C1.0 – Legend and General Notes Plan**
 - **C2.0 – Existing Conditions Plan**
 - **C3.0 – Site Layout Plan**
 - **C3.1 – Tower Truck Turning Template Plan**
 - **C4.0 – Grading and Drainage Plan**
 - **C5.0 – Utilities Plan**
 - **C5.1 – Septic Profile and Details Plan**
 - **C6.0 – Details Plan**
 - **C6.1 – Details Plan**
 - **Architectural and Landscape Plans: Prepared by Catalyst Architecture Interiors, dated December 10, 2021:**
 - **Title Sheet**
 - **A1.1 – Proposed Floor Plan**
 - **A2.1 – Proposed Elevations**
 - **LA.1 – Landscape Plan**
 - **SL.1 – Proposed Site Lighting Plan**