
YARMOUTH PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 27, 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 Janet Hansen and carried by a roll call vote of 5-0 the minutes of the April 11, 2022 meeting were approved.

IV. COMMUNICATION

E. Zwirko gave the following updates:

- The Historic Preservation Committee had its first meeting on 4/25. They started working on developing a process to review materials involving Ch. 701 Article IX and providing comments to Planning Board.
- The newly formed Tree Advisory Committee has requested a joint meeting with the Planning Board. E. Zwirko will work with the Committee to find a Planning Board meeting date.
- The Site Walk for Railroad Square is scheduled for 5/25 at 5:00PM before the regular Planning Board meeting.
- The Town of Yarmouth sponsors BuildME. If any Planning Board members are interested in attending, they can be registered through the Town.

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. OLD BUSINESS:

None

B. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Action Item: Substantial Modification of a Contributing Structure in the Lower Village Historic District, 17 Lafayette Street, Map 33 Lot 143, Kate McPherson,**

Applicant.

The applicant is requesting review of the façade alterations to the structure that are readily visible from the public street which are considered a substantial modification. The alterations include changes to windows, doors, siding, and a landing. As a Contributing Structure, it is assumed that the structure is a Building of Value under Chapter 701, Article IX, defined as a building that has architectural, cultural, historical, or archaeological significance, contribution to an overall setting or streetscape, or otherwise of a character defining a particular area, neighborhood or streetscape. The Planning Board will determine whether the proposed design retains and respects the significant character defining features of the building. As part of its determination, the Board may apply a delay of 180 days to undertake efforts to modify the design to retain and respect the significant character defining features of the building and/or other efforts outlined in Chapter 701, Article IX. The Board may also waive any delay if it determines that the proposed design retains and respects the significant character defining features of the building. The Board may vote on this item after public comment is received.

Kate McPherson, applicant gave an overview of the project. She is proposing to change the floor plan of her home switching the bedroom and living room. With this proposed change she would like to change out the French doors to windows in the new bedroom and put in a sliding glass door in place of windows in the living room. The windows and doors chosen are in keeping with the historic look and feel of the existing home.

E. Zwirko reported that the Historic Preservation Committee met to discuss the proposal and issue recommendations to the Board. The Committee supported approval and recommended that the applicant consult with the Committee on window and door selections.

Chair Holden opened to public comment.

No public comment.

Public comment closed.

The Board discussed the historic nature of the home, reviewed the comments received, and the Historic Preservation Committee recommendation, and had no concerns. The Board determined that waiving the delay period was appropriate and determined no additional conditions of approval were necessary.

The following motion was made:

On the basis of the plans presented by the applicant, the testimony and public hearing, and the findings of Planning Memo April 21, 2022, regarding the application of Chapter 701 Article IX, Historic Building Alterations and Demolitions, for the façade alterations at 17 Lafayette Street, Map 33 Lot 143, Kathleen McPherson, Applicant, the Planning Board finds that the proposed design retains and respects the significant character defining features of the building, and therefore waives the delay period, and allows that the substantial modifications proceed subject to Town Planning Authority approval and permit issuance of the redevelopment plan.

Such motion moved by Janet Hansen, seconded by Tony Cowles, and voted 5 in favor, 0 opposed, Jerry King and Hildy Ginsberg absent.

2. Workshop Item: Amendment of a Building & Lot Plan, Major Site Plan, and Major Subdivision Approval and Request to Extend the Major Site Plan Approval; 298 Main Street; Map 37 Lot 30; 298 Main Partners, LLC, Applicant.

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the August 2021 approval of the Building & Lot Plan, Major Site Plan, and Major Subdivision for a new 3-story mixed-use building on the site of 298 Main Street. The applicant proposes a change to the exterior materials and other alterations to the façade. The applicant also requests an extension of the Major Site Plan approval to August 11, 2023, per Chapter 702, Article L.2. Public comment will be received. A vote will not be taken.

Mark Nordby, Barrett Made presented the proposed changes to the exterior of the building. The original building was designed as brick and masonry. Due to increased cost of labor and materials they are proposing clapboard siding with a cornice around the top of the building. The new design look is in keeping with other buildings throughout the downtown area. The ground floor would be cast stone.

The Board questioned the elimination of some of the windows. M. Nordby, the windows were omitted to stay within Code glazing requirements and are in the stairwell. They do not impact any residential units. The board was mixed on the addition of the horizontal and vertical bands with the new design.

Chair Holden opened to public comment.

Ed Ashley, 20 Spartina Point

Suggested they eliminate the horizontal band but is supportive of the vertical bands. Suggested the retail space on the first floor have 2 over 2 windows and not 1 large window. Questioned where retail signage would be located? Questioned the color of the windows, recommended white and not black. Questioned the clapboard materials and the design fit?

Tom Reinsborough, 44 E. Elm St.

Understands the need to reduce construction costs; but believes if the materials are going to change then the whole design of the building should be reconsidered, and a sloped roof should be revisited. The building was originally designed in keeping with the brick block.

Robert Zimmerman, 65 Center St.

Agrees if the building materials are changing then the whole building should be reconsidered. The brick materials match other building throughout town but the clapboard does not. It does not fit into the neighborhood. It would be helpful to see a model with colors and materials to envision the building more fully. If changing to clapboard the building should be more residential looking.

Susan Prescott, 58 Hillside St.

Requested more detail regarding materials and colors at the next meeting. Supportive of the vertical bands.

Public comment closed.

Some board members do not like the look of the clapboard and think a clapboard building should have a pitched roof. A pitched roof may exceed the height limit if everything remains the same. The Board was mixed on their thoughts regarding the material changes but generally felt if they were going to approve the material changes the applicant would need to present a more refined design concept than what was submitted. At the next meeting they requested more detail on color, materials and design. Actual material samples were also requested. The Chair requested the applicant not advertise with a building rendering that has not been approved.

3. 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 third in a series of public hearings on this project. This is the fourth in a series of public hearings on this project. This hearing will focus on architectural design and a detailed Thoroughfare and Lot Plan/ Subdivision Plan. Public comment will be received. A vote will not be taken.

Matt Teare, Rick Licht, and Mark Nordby presented the next phase of the project including architectural design and thoroughfares. A neighborhood meeting is scheduled on 5/11 to discuss traffic and parking. They are meeting with the direct abutters on South St. to discuss screening at the property line. The Town held a site visit to discuss the intersection at Main St. R. Licht presented information regarding thoroughfares. The applicant will work with the Town regarding the Main St. Entrance. The next thoroughfare is shared with Down East Energy. They are trying to be creative on a division between the two properties which acts as a visual barrier but still allows commercial truck traffic. The applicant met with Fire Chief Mike Robitaille to discuss that NFPA standards are in conflict with the Character Based Development Code. Based on the meeting, the Fire Chief agreed to allow 18-foot lanes opposed to 20-foot lanes. The applicant presented each section of thoroughfare for discussion, including Code requirements and how they intend to meet those requirements regarding parking spaces, sidewalks and traffic lanes.

The Board had safety concerns about the throughfare at the Carriage Houses with cars backing out into traffic. They questioned the sidewalk in front of the Carriage Houses because it does not lead anywhere. They questioned the size of parking lot 3 and if it could be reduced by using diagonal? They provided feedback regarding landscaping and how it fits in with the thoroughfares throughout the property. They requested the applicant continue to work with the Fire Chief to fine tune the thoroughfares and meet all the NFPA requirements.

Chair Holden opened to the public.

Tom Reinsborough, 44 East Elm St.

Requested R. Licht give a summary of each building and if it is residential, commercial or mixed-use. Recommended removing the sidewalk in front of the Carriage House. Thinks the corner across from the Carriage House units is too tight and cars will drive over the curbing.

R. Licht – Pavilion (Lot 1)– closed in and becoming a multi-use space. Lot 2 – a 3 Story building, mixed use, with commercial on first floor and 7 non-55+ market rate apartments above. Lot 3 – a 2 story building - mixed use, with commercial on first floor and 3 non-55+ market rate apartments above. Lots 4 & 5 – 3 buildings of 55+ housing each with 15 units and underground parking. Lots 6 & 7 – are 6 units of 55+ housing with a carriage house style. Totaling 51, 55+ units and 10 market rate non 55+ apartments.

Ed Ashley, 20 Spartina Point

Recommended removing the sidewalk in front of the Carriage House units. Questioned if a ladder truck could make the corner at Thoroughfare 4 across from the Carriage House units.

Susan Prescott, 58 Hillside St.

Recommended removing the sidewalk in front of the Carriage House units. Suggested working with Fire Chief Robitaille to make the thoroughfares smaller and add more open space. Questioned if the corners of the thoroughfares could act as landing pads for the ladder truck? Questioned if the road were smaller if the open space F become larger?

Public comment closed.

M. Nordby presented a conceptual property layout with the general style of building they are considering for each lot. Each lot will be required to come before Planning Board for a full review and approval before being built. More architectural details will be provided at that time. Generally, the taller buildings will be in the back of the property and size and scale stepping down as it moves towards Main St. The developer projects the timeline for building to be 3-5 years in several phases.

Chair Holden opened to public comment.

Ed Ashley, 20 Spartina Point

Questioned the size of the building on lot 3? Does not like the architectural style of the Carriage House buildings. Suggested the three multi-use buildings all be different so they are less cookie cutter.

Public comment closed.

The Board thanked the applicant for the presentation. The Board requested that the applicant pay close attention to a cohesive application of the priorities that come from the CBDC, the Fire Department, and others.

ADJOURNMENT

With no objection, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Wendy Simmons, Administrative Assistant, Recording Secretary