

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

'19MAR7AM8:49 REC

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: February 26, ~~2010~~ 2019

Map: 109 Lots: 94

Applicant: Capewide Construction Inc

Zone(s): B3/APD

Site Location: 321 Whites Path, South Yarmouth

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Jack McCormack <i>JM</i>	Kathy Williams	Roger Brooks, Capewide Construction
Sara Porter <i>SP</i>		Craig Ferrari, Down Cape
Chris Vincent <i>CV</i>		Joao Junqueira, Capewide Const.

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:00 PM

DRC Review ended at: 4:47 PM

On a motion by Sara Porter, seconded by Chris Vincent, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the February 26, 2019 DRC meeting at 4:47 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: Project includes an approximately 7,440 square foot Warehouse Building with 6 bays, a free standing freezer and associated site improvements. Siding is ivory metal siding with beige wainscot. The roof is a 4:12 sloped beige metal roof. A small overhang with metal roof is provide along a portion of the front façade and over the side door at the corner.

Summary of Presentation: Roger Brooks of Capewide Construction gave an overview of the project, noting the building elements, site layout and storage area for the ice cream trucks. Have shown landscaping buffers around the property. Parking is shown in the rear. The interior of the building was reviewed including individual bathrooms for each unit. Applicant showed some pictures of other similar buildings. Applicant noted that they will be including 2 cupolas.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Sara Porter inquired about the use of the building. Applicant noted the use is for storage of materials and possibly other tenants. Tight tanks will be provided with floor drain.

Sara asked about how far the eyebrow sticks out. The Applicant noted it sticks out 3'.

Sara asked about the type of window being proposed. Applicant said a sliding window. Sara noted that she does not prefer the shutters. Kathy Williams noted that the windows are very small and the shutters make the windows more proportional. Chris Vincent had no preference on the shutters.

Sara inquired about type of fencing and suggested black chain link. She also inquired about the dumpsters. Dumpster will be enclosed with cedar fencing.

Jack McCormack asked about ZBA relief. Applicant said he met with Mark Grylls, Building Commissioner. He had concerns about the cell phone tower fall area and applicant is providing a legal opinion that it's not applicable. Need additional information regarding an APD waiver. Tight tank is being included in the project.

Sara inquired about Johnstone Supply next door. Applicant noted that the layout on this site would be similar to this one.

Sara noted she like the metal roof. Applicant showed metal samples.

Chris Vincent spoke about the need for 3" caliper trees. Kathy Williams read the February 21st e-mail from Dick Martin. Craig noted there is an egress in the back and it is difficult to plant additional trees with existing trees so close on the adjacent property.

Sara asked about the landscaping. Kathy Williams noted the planting list and her desire to plant along the foundation. The Applicant noted it would be better closer to the building to avoid the septic system which is located in the front.

Kathy Williams discussed keeping the larger buffer trees along the southern property line and the southeast end where larger trees exist. Applicant may want to include a solid fencing along the southern end to screen the view from the CCRT and keep people away from their site.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

The building is located close to the road with loading to the side and parking in the rear. Street trees help define the street edge. Building area plantings are noted, but location needs to be shown on the plan.

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

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

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 project meets the standard with the inclusion of the following comments: Existing buffer trees along the southeast and southern end of the property need to be identified and protected during construction, especially those that about the Cape Cod Rail Trial (CCRT). Fencing along the southern property line should be a solid fencing to screen from the CCRT. Remainder of the fencing is to be black chain link.

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

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:

Building is one large rectangular mass of 60' x 124' with only a small metal overhang over a portion of the front façade and the side door.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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

See notes from Sect. 1 above.

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:

A small metal overhang over a portion of the front façade and the side door provide a pedestrian scaled element.

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 Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for February 26, 2019 meeting for the proposed Warehouse Building at 321 Whites Path.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	---	---

ATTACHMENTS:

- February 26, 2019 Agenda
- February 21, 2019 e-mail from Kathy Williams
- February 21, 2019 e-mail from Dick Martin
- Aerial Photo
- DRC Application:
 - Design Review Application Form and Materials Specification Sheets
 - Building Rendering

- **Cut Sheets on Morton Doors, Siding & Roof Color Selections and Earthwise Windows**
- **Architectural Plans: All plans prepared by Capewide Construction Inc, dated 2/13/19:**
 - **A-1 – Ground Floor Plan**
 - **A-2 – Elevations**
- **Site Plans: All plans prepared by Down Cape Engineering, dated February 8, 2019:**
 - **Layout & Landscape Site Plan**
 - **Utilities & Grading Site Plan**
 - **Detail Sheet**

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED AT THE DRC MEETING:

- **Photos of other similar buildings**