
YARMOUTH PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 9, 2022

I. CALL TO ORDER

Wendi Holden called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

	PRESENT	ABSENT
Wendi Holden, Chair	X	
Janet Hansen, Vice Chair	X	
Andrew Bertocci	X	
Hildy Ginsberg	X	
Mary Lynn Engel	X	
Jerry King	X	
Tony Cowles	X	

OTHERS

- Erin Zwirko, Director of Planning & Development
- Julie Dubovsky, Assistant Planner
- Wendy Simmons, Administrative Assistant, Recording Secretary

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon a motion duly made by Mary Lynn Engel, seconded by Hildy Ginsberg and carried by a roll call vote of 6-0 (Jerry King absent at vote) the minutes of the February 23, 2022 meeting were approved.

IV. COMMUNICATION

- E. Zwirko reviewed her memo to the Board regarding the upcoming Railroad Square Master Plan hearing scheduled for the 3/23/22 meeting.
- On 2/23/22 The Town Council adopted the ADU Amendment lifting the requirement of public water and public sewer to have an ADU. They also adopted the Aggrieved Party amendment.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Ratification of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law: Building Demolition/Substantial Alteration, Chapter 701 Article IX; Review of proposed Substantial Modification; Vicinity of 115 Portland St., Map 32 Lot 92, Ronald Tustin, Applicant.

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of law was revised to reflect additional information regarding meetings between the Planning staff and Mr. Tustin and others prior to the first Planning Board Meeting on March 10, 2021.

The Motion was made by Andrew Bertocci, seconded by Tony Cowles to ratify the findings of fact as written.

The Board is in agreement that this Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law accurately reflects the votes taken at the February 23, 2022, Planning Board Meeting. Voted 5 in favor, 0 opposed (Hansen abstain, King absent).

B. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Workshop Item: Concept Ch. 703 Development Plan and Ch. 601 Major Subdivision, Railroad Square Master Plan; CD-4, Village Center District; Vicinity of 48 Railroad Square; Map 37 Lot 28 & 29A; Railroad Square Associates, LLC, Applicant.

The applicant seeks approval of a Development Plan consistent with the requirements of Chapter 703, Character Based Development Code, Article 6, and Chapter 601, Major Subdivision Plan. A Development Plan lays out the location of thoroughfares (roads) and blocks as well as pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, open spaces and civic spaces, mix of uses and densities, landscaping, architectural design context, and stormwater management. A mix of uses are proposed, including civic space of 2,750 square feet, commercial space of 7,600 square feet, and 61 residential units. This is the second in a series of public hearings on this project. This hearing will focus on the initial traffic trip generation, parking, and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. A vote will not be taken. Public comment will be received.

E. Zwirko summarized what the Planning Board should consider at this phase. The development plan is required to address the requirements of Character Based Development Code for the thoroughfares and public amenities as well as the requirements of Subdivision such as public infrastructure. Subdivision encompasses more technical standards. The applicant will be required to return to the Planning Board for approval of each building before construction and subdivision amendments will require further review. Tonight, they will demonstrate how they plan to connect the site with traffic, parking and the pedestrian shed.

Matt Teare, Diane Morabito, Rick Licht and Keith Smith presented.

Diane Morabito discussed the traffic study. A traffic count will be formally conducted in April 2022. Feedback from the public was the study should be conducted during the school year as it is when Main St. is busiest. Based on previous traffic study information available including the 298 Main St. traffic study the number of trip counts does not exceed 80 new trips. A DOT Traffic Movement permit is not required unless it reaches a level of 100 trips; but they will submit their findings to DOT for confirmation they do not need to obtain a Permit.

Their Pedestrian Shed plan includes existing sidewalks, pathways, trails and the proposed rail to trail. They identified schools, open space, parks, public buildings, playgrounds and shared parking opportunities in the neighborhood.

The mixed-use concept of building encourages shared parking opportunities. According to their parking calculations of 1.3 spaces/unit yields 116 parking spaces available and according to Code requirements they need to provide 113 spaces. The 3 residential buildings in the back of the property will all have underground parking for tenants. The 6 Carriage House style units in the existing Strong Bodies building will each have a 1 car garage. An additional parking lot and parallel parking spaces for commercial and residential use will be located along the entryway from Main St. They are also allowed to take advantage of 2 on street spaces on Main St.

The Board requested the definition of Pedestrian Shed. E. Zwirko - There are 3 types of Pedestrian Sheds defined in the Character Based Development Code. The applicant has chosen to use the Standard approach which considers a ¼ mile radius around the property which is about how long someone can walk around in 15 minutes. This analysis shows non-motorized traffic movement and how things connect.

Chair Holden opened to public comment

Jeanne Rapone – 250 Hillside St.

Requested Mill St. be added to the traffic study area. The Mason's parking lot will be used as public parking and have increased activity in the future.

Bob Zimmerman – 65 Center St.

Concerned about who is the impartial party reporting traffic data. Supportive of a phased building process which will be re-evaluated with each building.

Kevin Sztam – 126 West Elm St.

Likes mixed-use buildings. Supportive of the underground parking and green space. Requested more information about the parking multiplier for the required number of spaces. Concerned this is a busy area of town and increasing traffic outflow. Asked if there was consideration given to turning the lower level of the residential units into commercial? Questioned if the applicant could make a smaller footprint along the entry by Down East and plant more trees?

Public comment closed

M. Teare – Has worked on many 55+ housing projects and has a good sense of a parking multiplier. Many people in 55+ housing are single and only have 1 car. The unbiased party is Tom Errico of TY Lin who is hired by the Town to do an independent traffic review. The Town wants mixed-use to revitalize the downtown area and offices and residential units produce the least amount of traffic.

The Board questioned why the Intermed entrance and Mill St. entrance were not included as intersections for the traffic study? They questioned why parallel parking and not pull in spaces along the entryway? Questioned if there was a better way to separate the residential from commercial? As traffic flows in to visit commercial space they may not understand they need to park in the front lot and not continue into the residential area. Requested a parking plan be developed per TY Lin's comments.

D. Morabito – typically only major intersections are included in a traffic study and in this case South St. and Yarmouth Crossing Drive were chosen. From those two intersections they should be able to get a good idea of how Mill St. and Intermed would contribute to traffic.

R. Licht – Thoroughfare standards do not allow pull in spaces so parallel parking was chosen. The developer is also restricted on the right side due to the shared easement with Down East. Oil trucks need access and this limits what they can do in the area. They will consider the materials used on the thoroughfare to help demarcate the residential from commercial areas.

The Board requested Mill St. and Intermed intersections be added to the traffic study area.

The Chair encouraged residents to attend the community meetings being held by the developer to have further in person conversations about the project and can have conversations in a group setting. This will be a phased process and traffic will be reevaluated at every phase.

ADJOURNMENT

With no objection, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Wendy Simmons, Administrative Assistant, Recording Secretary