

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

'19SEP4AM9:02 REC

Meeting Date: September 3, 2019 Map: 32 Lots: 66  
Applicant: Chaya Rosenberg Zone(s): B2/HMOD1/VCOD VC1  
Site Location: 606-610 Route 28, West Yarmouth

#### Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Jan Kvietok
Dick Martin		John Lavelle
Jack McCormack		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:02 PM Room B  
DRC Review ended at: 5:23 PM

***On a motion by Jack McCormack, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the September 3, 2019 DRC meeting at 5:23PM.***

#### Project Summary

**General Description:** The Applicant is proposing to replace a commercial building that had been destroyed by fire with a new mixed use building with an approximately 2,150 square foot (sf) first floor having two retail/office units, 1,945 sf second floor having one 3-bedroom residence, 7 parking spaces and associated site upgrades.

**Summary of Presentation:** John Lavelle, Baxter Nye Engineering, gave a brief overview of the project. He noted the footprint is smaller, but with more square footage on the second floor. The rear setback was 3.2' on the non-conforming building which is being maintained in the proposed building. Proposing all underground utilities. New drainage is being proposed along with landscaped island, handicapped accessible parking space and sidewalks. The new title 5 septic is proposed under the front parking area. Overall, the site will be improved environmentally. Parking is the same number as the original, but will be larger spaces in the front to avoid backing out into Route 28. The intent was to not do any work within the state right-of-way due to the long permitting process. There are two trees and shrubs being installed for beautification of the site. They are also proposing a cedar picket fence along the rear of the property.

#### **DRC Questions & Discussions:**

Charlie Adams asked about the number of residential units on the second floor. Mr. Kvietok noted there would be one dwelling unit on the second floor with a main and secondary means of egress.

Charlie asked about the lighting proposed. Mr. Lavelle noted there will be lighting on the building (gable end and sconce lights along building) as well as street lighting on the utility poles.

Charlie asked about the limited parking impacting the type of businesses. Mr. Kvietok noted that the parking is based on retail or office. Anything else would need to be looked at more closely. Mr. Lavelle noted that there would be one less parking space than required, but the same property owner owns the adjacent Great Island Plaza and additional parking would be available down the road. Jack McCormack noted that the parcel may be able to be sold separately so not sure they can rely on the adjacent site for parking.

Charlie Adams asked about the curb cuts. Mr. Lavelle noted that they did not want to go to MassDOT for a permit as it takes a lot of time.

Dick Martin noted that the building is very nice looking and a big improvement. He notes that there is a lot of leeway due to the non-conforming nature of the building and site, but wonders if it is too much on a tiny lot. The setback in the rear was only for a portion of the building and now it will be closer for a longer distance and will impact vegetation. Mr. Kvietok noted that they were trying to improve the site overall. Mr. Martin would like to see the curb-cut shortened as it is only a one-way in. He would also like to see some greenery in the front, even 1'-2' to provide some greenery. Mr. Lavelle discussed the need for curbing and potential conflict with turning vehicles. Possibility of a 4-inch curb was discussed. Mr. Martin noted that maybe the redevelopment of the neighboring lot should include some spaces allocated for this property as he had some concerns about the parking calculations and adequate parking on the site.

Jack McCormack would feel better if the entire properties were combined as the adjacent lot is needed for circulation and potentially for parking.

Mr. Martin knows the Town is interested in making this area more of a village center with parking in the rear and green space in the front. He understands that this site is too small to do that. Mr. Kvietok tried to balance the return on investment if make the building too small. If shrink the units may be too small to be viable. Mr. Martin noted that he would like to see some additional planting on the north and eastern side of the property maybe arborvitaes, rhododendrons and fencing. Mr. Kvietok noted that this could be done.

Charlie Adams noted that signage could be included noting additional parking on the adjacent parcel. Mr. Kvietok noted that the additional parking will be available in the future. Charlie Adams asked about deliveries. Mr. Kvietok noted it would need to be through the front door.

Mr. Martin noted the need for arrows on the pavement, provide 2 parking spaces on adjacent parcel and access easement for exiting, green up the property with small buffer in front and along other buffers and reduce the curb cut.

DRC members were all pleased with the looks of the building. Mr. Kvietok showed some samples and noted the store front would be white, possibly with blue on the gable end, sandstone gray shingles and black trim windows, as shown in the rendering.

### **Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards**

#### **SITING STRATEGIES**

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

***The entire front streetscape is currently paved with a very wide curb cut (over 40'). Due to the size of the lot, the angled parking and one-way traffic through the parcel, the front streetscape remains paved with no buffer. Even a small 1.5' to 2' wide buffer along the front would have significant benefits. It would allow for some plantings of daylilies or ornamental grasses to soften all the hardscape and parking in the front. Reducing the curb cut to 24' and extending the sidewalk is also recommended. To allow this project to move forward in a timely fashion, and understanding the lengthy MassDOT permit process, reduction in the curb cut width could happen as part of the future project on the adjacent property.***

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

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

***See Comments in Sect 1 - Streetscape***

Sect. 4, Shield Large Buildings  N/A  Meets Standards, or  Discrepancies:

Sect. 5, Design a 2<sup>nd</sup> 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:

**See Comments in Sect 1 – Streetscape. Provide additional buffer vegetation (i.e. arborvitaes, rhododendrons, and trees if possible) and fencing on the north side of the property, and along the east side of the property tapering down as get closer to Route 28.**

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

**See Comments in Sect 1 - Streetscape**

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

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

**Utilities for the proposed project are underground. However the overhead utilities to the Post Office travel over this site and should be located underground when conducting this site work or included as part of the development of the adjacent property.**

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:

**Although the new building does not meet the modulations requirements of 5' every 50', the overall small size of the building, the differing roof lines, wall heights, colors, materials, varying window styles and inclusion of a front porch add a great deal of interest.**

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 Charlie Adams, seconded by Jack McCormack, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for September 3, 2019 for the proposed mixed use development at 606-610 Route 28, West Yarmouth.**

Received by Applicant(s)

		
--	---	--

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

- **September 3, 2019 Agenda**
- **August 28, 2019 e-mail from Kathy Williams & Aerial Photo**
- **DRC Application:**
  - **DRC Application, Materials Specification Sheet and Owner Authorization**
  - **Site Plans: All plans prepared by Baxter Nye Engineering & Surveying and dated August 27, 2019:**
    - **C1.0 – Existing Conditions Plan**
    - **C2.0 – Layout and Dimension Plan**
    - **C3.0 – Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan**
  - **Architectural Plans: All plans prepared by Tatra and dated August 22, 2019:**
    - **A#1 - Cover (Building Rendering)**
    - **A#2 - Foundation Proposed**
    - **A#3 – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Plan Proposed**
    - **A#4 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Plan Proposed**
    - **A#5 – Elevations**
    - **A#6 – DR Specs**