

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

'19OCT21AM10:48 REC

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: October 15, 2019 Map: 60 Lots: 173
Applicant: 45 Commercial LLC (dba Whitten Landscaping) Zone(s): B1
Site Location: 20 Commercial Street, South Yarmouth, MA 02664

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Kieran Healy
Dick Martin		Craig Whitten
Jack McCormack		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:06 PM

DRC Review ended at: 4:33 PM

On a motion by Jack McCormack, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the October 15, 2019 DRC meeting at 4:33 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: Applicant is proposing to construct a new building and associated site improvements on a vacant lot for maintenance and repair of vehicles for his landscape company.

Summary of Presentation: Kieran Healy gave a brief overview of the project. A previous DRC application included two residential units which turned out to be too expensive. The new proposal eliminated the housing and is a maintenance/repair facility only. As the site is currently vacant, the 1952 side yard building setback is 6'. The buffer on the side yard around the building is arborvitae with trees around the rest of the property. Have drainage and septic system on site. The building includes garage bays, office space, with building mounted lights and signage. No free standing sign is proposed. The roof is to be black architectural shingles as there will be solar on the southern side of the building.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Dick Martin asked if there is any parking requirements for this use. Kieran Healy noted that there could be 2-3 people on site and that they would park in the crushed stone parking area. Dick Martin inquired as to whether the Building Commissioner had identified a specific number of required parking spaces. Kieran noted that they would find out at SPR but there is space in the stone area. Dick asked about H2O loading for the septic, which Kieran noted would be provided.

Charlie Adams inquired about site lighting. Kieran noted the photos which included the building mounted lighting.

Kathy Williams inquired about the stone veneer. Craig Whitten had a sample of the natural field stone to be used. Kathy Williams inquired about a portico or covering over the two entrances facing the roadway. Craig Whitten indicated he would be willing to do that. Kathy Williams noted that the vegetated buffer should be 10' on the north side rather than 6'.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

Curb cuts should be reduced to 24' wide.

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

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

See Sect. 1 Comments above

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:

Meets the standard if provide a 10' buffer for the trees along the northern property line, rather than extending the stone.

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

Meets the standard if there is no parking in the front of the building. Parking to be provided in the stone parking area per any Site Plan Review requirements.

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 relatively small at about 2,500 square feet.

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:

Building is a 62'x 40' rectangle with no modulations. Meets the standards if provide a small portico or roof over the entrance doors along the Front and Left Side Elevations to vary the façade lines, wall heights, roof lines, bring down building edges and add a pedestrian scale feature.

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

See Sect 3 Comment above.

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

See Sect 3 Comment above.

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

See Sect 3 Comment above.

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:

See Sect 3 Comment above.

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 October 15, 2019 for the proposed facility at 20 Commercial Street.

Received by Applicant(s)		
		

ATTACHMENTS:

- **October 15, 2019 Agenda**
- **October 10, 2019 e-mail from Kathy Williams**
- **DRC Application:**
 - **DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet**
 - **Photos of Building Mounted Lights and Sign**
 - **Site Plans: All plans prepared by BSC Group, last revised October 10, 2019:**
 - **Site Plan**
 - **Design Plan**
 - **Architectural Plans: All plans prepared by Donald I. Meyer, last revised October 11, 2019**
 - **1 – Front and Left Side Elevations**
 - **2 – Rear and Right Side Elevations**
 - **3 – Floor Plan**