

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

Review is by: Planning Board Design Review Committee

YARMOUTH TOWN CLERK

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

'19MAY21PM5:34 REC

Meeting Date: May 21, 2019 Map: 36 Lots: 104.1
 Applicant: Code Realty, Inc Zone(s): B2/APD
 Site Location: 44 and 48 Route 28, West Yarmouth

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Brian Yergatian
Dick Martin (left at 4:55PM)		Todd MacDonald
Jack McCormack		Curt Sears
Sara Porter		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:07 PM
 DRC Review ended at: 5:19 PM

On a motion by Sara Porter, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the May 21, 2019 DRC meeting at 5:19 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: The Applicant is proposing to raze and replace an unoccupied retail building with a new 4,000 sf retail building and associated site work at 44/48 Route 28 in West Yarmouth. Parking would remain in the front but would be raised up several feet, along with the new building. New septic system and drainage systems are proposed.

The new building will have a flat membrane roof with grey hardie cement board vertical siding with brick skirting and white trim boards and cornice. Awnings to be antique copper with black decorative brackets over the entrance and storefront windows. Black "onion" style light fixtures are proposed along the front of the building.

Summary of Presentation: Brian Yergatian gave a brief overview of the project. He noted the wetland resources and floodplain on the property (BFE 9), as well as the property being located in the zone II. The replacement building will be smaller and further away from the wetland and above the flood zone. Reconfiguring the parking lot which serves both the new building and existing building (coffee house). There will be a significant amount of fill to increase the building height by about 3' to facilitate better site drainage, greater separation from ground water and make egress onto Route 28 safer. Landscaping is proposed to enhance the site. Drainage improvements include stormwater treatment, groundwater recharge and removal of a couple of direct discharges that go into wetlands. All stormwater runoff will be captured, treated and infiltrated into the ground. The project is also reducing the amount of impervious surfaces. Brian briefly reviewed the building architecture noting the various materials. The building will be for retail, with no proposed tenants at this point.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Charlie Adams asked about site lighting. Brian Yergatian noted that no new lighting fixtures are proposed. Charlie Adams noted that additional lighting maybe necessary. Kathy Williams noted that all site lighting needs to be cut-off lighting.

Charlie Adams inquired as to the location of the dumpster. Brian Yergatian noted that it would be located behind the coffee house and would be shared with the retail building. It is currently not proposed to be screened. Charlie felt the dumpster should be enclosed with stockade type fencing.

Sara Porter felt the perspective made the windows look like entrances. Sara would like the canopies to be lowered over the windows to make the entrance more prominent with the higher canopy. Consider simplifying the shape of the canopies (different profile). Sara also inquired as to the type of brick being used. She would prefer the more monochromatic brick. Don't need added texture from the brick in addition to the other architectural elements. Sara would like to see a sample of the vertical siding, including the joints and texture of the boards.

Charlie Adams asked about the signage. Brian Yergatian noted that the new building will have signage and will check into the free-standing signage.

Dick Martin noted he is not a fan of flat roofs, but the building has interesting elements with the pediments and awnings to break it up. The building is not overly Cape Cod style but not unattractive. Dick Martin noted there should be a tree in the island east of the entrance. He would have liked to see buffer trees in front of the coffee house but there is an existing septic system there. Could add one on the western property line close to Route 28. He would like to see trees to the maximum extent practicable.

Kathy Williams commented on the need to show trees remaining as protected and that grading changes on the adjacent property may impact the in-lot trees. Kathy Williams inquired about the removal of the guardrail which with the grade changes may no longer be required. Curt Sears noted that maybe guardrail could be removed as part of MassDOT resurfacing project.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

The parking lot remains in the front of the building even though the project includes razing and replacing the building and regrading the parking lot. Wetlands in the rear and suitable soil conditions for subsurface infiltration may impact building location as well as maintaining connectivity with the adjacent property.

New buffer trees are being provided to help define the streetscape. With the new grading, the existing guardrail along Route 28 may no longer be needed and should be removed if approved by MassDOT.

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

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

See Comments above for Sect. 1.

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:

Parking remains in the front of the building and will be more visible due to the raised elevation. The only proposed screening are the five buffer trees. Adding intermittent planting beds with shrubs between the

front buffer trees will better screen the front yard parking, or adding a picket style fencing. Add two trees along the western buffer line.

Plans should clearly delineate all trees within work area being protected and ensure grade changes don't adversely impact those trees shown as remaining. If a site tree needs to be removed, it should be noted on the plan and replaced with a new 3" caliper tree. Type of tree species should be reviewed for native species.

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

Only one in-lot tree is proposed. Add second in-lot tree in island east of the entrance. Also see Comment above in Sect 7.

Site lighting for the parking lot does not appear to be replaced. Current lighting is at an angle and should be replaced with a cut-off light fixture.

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

See Comments above in Section 7 and 8.

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:

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:

Lower the awnings over the windows to make the entrance more prominent with the higher canopy. Consider simplifying the shape/profile of the canopies.

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:

Type of brick should be more monochromatic and the hardie plank should be smooth. Provide samples and/or catalogue cut-sheets on the brick/mortar and siding (including joints and texture of the boards).

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 Sara Porter, seconded by Jack McCormack, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as DRC meeting minutes for May 21, 2019 for the proposed retail building at 44/48 Route 28.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- **May 21, 2019 Agenda**
- **DRC Application:**
 - **DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet**
 - **Site Plans: All plans prepared by BSC Group, dated April 12, 2019:**
 - **Title Sheet**
 - **Existing Conditions Plan**
 - **Layout & Materials Plan**
 - **Grading & Drainage Plan**
 - **Utility Plan**
 - **Landscape Plan**
 - **Detail Plan**
 - **Detail Sheet II (Sheet 8 of 10)**
 - **Detail Sheet II (Sheet 9 of 10)**
 - **Detail Sheet IV**
 - **Architectural Plans: All plans prepared by T.F. Rogers, dated April 7, 2019**
 - **A1 (Materials, Sign and Perspective)**
 - **A2 (Floor Plan and Front Elevation)**
 - **A3 (Left, Right and Rear Elevations)**
- **May 16,2019 e-mail from Kathy Williams**