

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**

'20APR29PM2:52 REC

Meeting Date: April 28, 2020 at 4 PM – Virtual Meeting      Map: 32      Lots: 64 & 65  
 Applicant: Great Island Plaza LLC      Zone(s): B2, HMOD1, VCOD VC1, ROAD  
 Site Location: 590, 600 & 602 Route 28 and 12 Winslow Gray Road

**Persons Present:**

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Chris Vincent	Kathy Williams	Brian Yergatian, BSC Group
Dick Martin	Mark Grylls	Jan Kvietok, Tatra Building
Jack McCormack		Dan Santacroce, Dennis Colwell Architects
Sara Porter		Chaya Rosenberg, Applicant
		Jean Kampas, Nutter McClennen & Fish

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:00 PM  
 DRC Review ended at: 5:59 PM

***On a motion by Jack McCormack, seconded by Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to adjourn the April 28, 2020 DRC meeting at 5:59 PM.***

**Project Summary**

**General Description:** Applicant is proposing to redevelop the project site under the B2 zoning district including renovations and reconstruction of the existing commercial building at 590, 600 and 602 Route 28, demolition of the existing building at 12 Winslow Gray Road, reconfiguration of site access drives and parking areas, installation of a new pressure-dosed septic system, and improvements to drainage facilities, utilities and landscaping. No modifications are proposed for the existing Post Office building.

**Summary of Presentation:**

Jan Kvietok, Tatra Building, introduced the project team and gave a brief overview of the project. The lots are planned to be combined. The building at 12 Winslow Gray and the east end of the strip mall will be removed. There are some proposed additions to the building. One area will be rebuilt with a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor residential unit. Unit 7 will be a completely new building with retail on the first floor and office space on the second floor. Units 5 & 6 will have extensions in the rear to add square footage and functionality for these smaller units.

Brian Yergatian, BSC Group, gave an overview of the site improvements. The property contains 2.04 acres of land. The proposed uses are shown in the parking table and need 82 parking spaces with 55 proposed including 7 handicapped spaces. Stormwater treatment and subsurface drainage is proposed for the site. Another major improvement is upgrading the septic system by replacing the existing four individual systems with one system. The landscaping plan includes a variety of trees and shrubs and flowering plants.

Jan Kvietok reviewed the building renderings which were meant to resemble the building facades in the 1960s, making it a desirable place to go. The entire building will get new windows and doors and most of the siding will be replaced. Proposing to use Azek trim to rebuild the storefronts, along with some brick veneer. Planning on maintaining most of the historic uses in the plaza, including convenience store, restaurants and hair salon. Unit 7 will be an entirely new building to replace the existing structure. Looking at a bakery or coffee shop. The second floor will be offices for now with the potential for residential in the future. There may be some rear entrances to some of the units depending on the interior layout of the units. There are some shared bathrooms shown for two of the units. Planning on installing a sprinkler system.

## **DRC Questions & Discussions:**

Chris Vincent asked about what is going into 12 Winslow Gray Road. Jan Kvietok indicated it is open space for now, but reserved for future development. Brian Yergatian noted there will be a septic tank installed for a future connection. Dick Martin noted the septic tank should have H-20 loading as parking may be required in this area.

Jack McCormack asked if all three lots are in the B2 zoning district, which they are.

Dick Martin asked about 18 Winslow Gray Road which is also owned by the Applicant. He has concerns about not meeting the buffer requirements as currently shown and not selling the parcel separately. Jeannie Kampas noted that the lot to the north is owned by Ms. Rosenberg but is the subject of litigation right now so they eliminated this parcel to be able to move forward with the project now. There is a buffer issue, and will address the buffer in the future and hope it will ultimately be redeveloped as part of this development. Dick Martin noted that there was no plan to leave existing buffers to the east and north naturally treed. He noted that the buffer trees along Winslow Gray Road should be added, along with additional foundation shrubs and plantings in front of the Post Office. The site plan shows the 4 parking spaces set aside for the 606-610 Route 28. Dick Martin asked about the type of trees in the center island and recommended that in-lot trees, not shrubs, be included in the parking lot. Additional shrubbery would also be good. He felt the landscaping plan as shown was not adequate. Jan Kvietok noted trees could be added to the 12 Winslow Gray Road buffer. Dick Martin noted that some existing buffer trees could be saved to minimize the need for new plantings. Jan Kvietok indicated they could retain good trees.

Dick Martin felt the circulation was good and elimination of the curb cut was good. He was comfortable with the rest of the site plan. Brian Yergatian noted the thin strip in front of the Post Office could impede site distance if planted with a tree. He noted that the southeast corner of the rear parking is a hydrangea, but that corner is right on the edge of the leaching field and he would like to stay away from that. Dick Martin felt the site should meet the bylaw as close to possible. Kathy Williams asked if the leaching field could be rotated to give additional space for planting a tree. Brian Yergatian thought that could be done. Dick Martin felt the parking layout was good and doesn't feel you would need the 82 spaces, especially as space is available at 12 Winslow Gray for additional parking. Dick Martin asked if anything was being done to the Post Office building. Jan indicated nothing was proposed for the building at this time, but that they are angling the parking spaces and adding some landscaping. Jan noted some previous siding work done to the Post Office a few years ago, along with some painting and patching of the pavement. Dick Martin noted that with the improvements on either side, it would be good to improve the Post Office building.

Dick Martin inquired as to whether there were any west side elevations? Jan Kvietok noted the Left Elevation on Sheet A2.0. Dick Martin mentioned the large expanse of wall. Jan Kvietok indicated this is the convenience store that has interior fixtures. Dick Martin felt something is needed to break up the wall. Chris Vincent suggested an arbor. Sara Porter suggested a smaller gable with a window in it that could project out. Chaya Rosenberg noted she had added the two windows you see in the existing gable end and the rest of the wall could possibly be a mural. Chaya felt an arbor is more for where someone can sit and there may not be enough room in that location. The center island of the parking lot may be better. Jan Kvietok noted they were planning on installing foundation plantings along this wall and can dress it up with plantings and trellises. Sara asked about a rendering. Chris Vincent noted he meant a trellis flat against the wall and not a pergola. Jan Kvietok noted he will try to get some visuals along the left elevation of the building.

Sara Porter noted she isn't usually a fan of brick, but feels it is done sparingly here. The cornice moulding at the hair salon could be extended around the east and north elevation. The pizza place cornice moulding in the front should be included in the rear. She also asked about the gable end of units 2 & 3 and whether it extends out. Dan Santacroce stated that it does extend out. Sara Porter noted it is not included in the Revised Elevations and Roof Plan. Dan Santacroce stated that the plans can be updated to denote the gable. Sara Porter felt that the back of the building is not as dynamic as the front and patrons will be parking in the back. She suggested adding more visual appeal to the rear façade. Dick Martin concurred with Sara and noted that the rear can be seen from Winslow Gray.

Jack McCormack asked about the floor plan in the restaurant, which shows stairs going down and whether there a basement. Dan Santacroce noted that there is a basement which will be used for storage.

Chris Vincent asked about electric service connections and condensers, and it would be good to show them on the plans. Dan Santacroce said they are working on them.

Sara Porter inquired about the runoff from the Delicatessen roof. Dan Santacroce noted he would need to cricket the roof. Kathy Williams asked about funneling water to the center of the building and snow loads. Dan Santacroce noted there will also be an internal roof drain in the center area. From a snow load perspective, they are checking the

roof framing for code compliance. Jan Kvietok noted they were hoping to have roof mounted equipment which can be hidden in this center roof area. Sara asked about other ways to hide the mechanicals with increasing the height of the walls at the Hair Salon and Basil Thai. Jan noted he would need to look at water loads but that something could be done. Chaya Rosenberg noted that some landscaping in the rear of the building would help to make it more welcoming. She also liked the idea of false windows. Dick Martin noted there are some green spaces in the rear which could accommodate landscaping.

Dick Martin noted it was a good proposal on a site that has been neglected. He's thrilled to see the repairs to the existing building. Adding of the architectural and landscaping comments noted here will just add to the property. Jack McCormack echoed Dick's comments and felt it would be a good addition to Route 28.

Kathy Williams asked about the dumpster locations and access for garbage trucks. Jan Kvietok noted that they tried to find the best place for the dumpsters where the employees can have easy access, especially in the winter time. Jan Kvietok felt this would be the best location and they are hiding them with arborvitae and fencing and they will be accessible for smaller trucks. Brian Yergatian felt a smaller garbage truck would be able to access these areas as the travelway is wide in this area. Brian Yergatian will run an Autoturn analysis and have it available for Site Plan Review.

Sara Porter had some sketches for the rear elevation that she would like to give to Dan Santacroce. Dan Santacroce was open to suggestions.

Dick Martin asked about outside dining. Jan Kvietok said outside seating was included in the calculations for the restaurants as the sidewalk is wider. Sara Porter asked about the variable sidewalk, and whether it needs to be that wide and whether you could add to the width of the buffer. Jan Kvietok wanted to keep the sidewalk wide for a larger crowd and outside seating, benches and planters.

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

#### **SITING STRATEGIES**

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

***Significant improvements have been made to the streetscape through the elimination of much of the parking in front of the building, elimination of the curb cut on Winslow Gray Road closest to Route 28, and the addition of the landscaped buffer along the roads. The majority of the parking is to the side/rear of the buildings with a pedestrian corridor between the buildings from the main parking area to access the street-oriented entrances. The front of the buildings face the street with a wide sidewalk and 7 parallel parking spaces in front of the main building (similar to on-street parking). Pedestrian walkways are shown from the building entrances to the public sidewalks.***

***Although the building modulations are less than 5' every 50', the addition of awnings, a variety of different architectural features, wall heights and roof lines add interest to the buildings, reducing the visual impact of the building size.***

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

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

***Although some parking remains in the front, the buildings are still relatively close to the roadway. The addition of street trees helps to further define the street edge. While a wider buffer along Route 28 would be preferred, a more comprehensive landscape plan is recommended along Route 28 and along the corner of Winslow Gray Road to add planting beds with flowers and shrubs. The planting bed at the corner around the proposed sign only includes one type of plant (switch grass) and the trees are located too far apart. Continue the daylily buffer proposed for the adjacent property at 606-610 Route 28 to in front of the Post Office.***

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:

***The proposed uses along with the proposed improvements do not need to be screened with any significant enhanced topography.***

Sect. 7, Landscape Buffers/Screening  N/A  Meets Standards, or  Discrepancies:

***No existing 4" diameter buffer trees are shown to remain, with the buffers along the abutting properties being impacted by grading/drainage and no new buffer plantings are shown. Retain more existing buffer trees and supplement with proposed buffer plantings. Provide screening for the proposed transformer, condensers and building electric meters. Provide foundation plantings around the building. The addition of trellises and plantings would be beneficial along the blank wall along the Left Elevation (west side).***

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

***The new parking lots are located to the rear and side of the buildings and the existing parking in the front has been significantly reduced. Also see Comments under Sect. 3, Define Street Edge.***

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

***Unfortunately the location of the subsurface septic system impacts the ability to plant trees in some of the parking lot islands, but the large center island allows for canopy trees. Some island plantings are shown as shrubs and need to be 3" caliper trees. Retain existing larger healthy trees in the center island where possible.***

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

Sect. 11, Shield Loading Areas  N/A  Meets Standards, or  Discrepancies:

***The location of the central dumpsters are very visible for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and the angled orientation may make it difficult for trash truck pick-up. Provide improved screening, and utilize solid white vinyl fencing. Provide Autoturn movements for a trash truck at Site Plan Review. Site lighting will be on a precast base or flush mounted.***

## **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:

***Petitioner agrees to improve the look of the rear of the building to potentially include landscaping, false windows, trellises, or extension of cornices. Sara Porter will provide some ideas to the Applicant's Architect.***

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

***The building modulations are less than 5' every 50'. However, the addition of awnings and a variety of different architectural features and roof lines add interest to the buildings, reducing the visual impact of the building size.***

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:

***The majority of the building is single story and there is no need for smaller attached masses to break up the building size.***

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:

***Awnings, wide sidewalks and a pedestrian walkway between the buildings add pedestrian scale features to the buildings.***

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 Jack McCormack, seconded by Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for the April 28, 2020 DRC Meeting for the proposed redevelopment at 590, 600 & 602 Route 28 and 12 Winslow Gray Road.***

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- April 28, 2020 Agenda and Virtual Meeting Information
- April 23, 2020 e-mail from Kathy Williams and Aerial
- DRC Application:
  - DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet
  - Cut Sheets on Azek Trim, Column Wrap & Moulding, Boral Exterior Siding, Coronado Weathered Brick, SBC Weathering Stain, Rejuvenation Lighting (sconces, wall fixture, and shepherds hood post light)
  - Cut Sheets on Marvin Commercial Doors, Picture Windows, and Double Hund Windows
  - Photo of similar free standing sign
  - **Site Plans:** All plans prepared by BSC Group, dated March 26, 2020, unless otherwise noted:
    - Title Sheet
    - C2.0 – Existing Conditions Plan, prepared by Baxter Nye, dated April 13, 2020
    - Layout & Materials Plan
    - Grading & Drainage Plan
    - Utility Plan
    - Septic Design Plan
    - Erosion Control Plan
    - Landscape & Lighting Plan
    - Detail Plan
    - Detail Sheet I (Sheet 10 of 13)
    - Detail Sheet II (Sheet 11 of 13)
    - Septic System Detail Sheet I (Sheet 12 of 13)
    - Septic System Detail Sheet II (Sheet 13 of 13)
  - **Architectural Plans:** All Architectural plans prepared by Dennis Colwell Architects of Foxborough, MA and dated April 22, 2020, unless otherwise noted:
    - A.1.0 – First Floor Plan (west end)
    - A.1.1 - First Floor Plan (east end)
    - A.1.2 – Second Floor Plan (west end)
    - A.1.3 – Second Floor Plan (east end)
    - A.1.4 – Roof Plan, dated April 27, 2020
    - A2.0 – Elevations, dated April 27, 2020
    - A2.1 – Unit “7” Elevations
- **Building Renderings:** Fourteen (14) pages of 11x17 renderings of the exterior of the proposed building renovations and reconstruction.