

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

'19JUN20AM9:00 REC

Meeting Date: June 18, 2019 Map: 110 Lots: 9
Applicant: Robert B. Our Company Zone(s): B3/APD
Site Location: 363 White's Path, South Yarmouth, MA 02664

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Abby Our
Dick Martin		Alison Alessi
Sara Porter		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:03 PM in Room B
DRC Review ended at: 4:52 PM

On a motion by Sara Porter, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the June 18, 2019 DRC meeting at 4:52 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: The Applicant is proposing to convert an existing industrial factory bay into 2,560 square feet of business office space. Some site improvements have been shown to add greenery to the front of the building.

Summary of Presentation: Alison Alessi, Architect, gave a brief overview of the project. The existing building is relatively non-descript, and are working to turn it into office space. Only finishing a portion of the existing building. Office space would be for Robert B. Our staff. The large overhead door on the northern elevation will be filled with glass to get some light to make for a more pleasant work environment. The front will include signage, updated lighting and a small pergola roof. The west elevation, facing the side, will have some new windows for natural light. Conceptual site plan added some greenery in the front. Want to keep the space behind and around available for industrial sized trucks. Abby Our noted that the property is heavily used and they need to maintain curb cuts for larger trailers.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Dick Martin expressed concerns about the parking in the front without buffers.

Charlie asked about the parking. Can parking on adjacent spaces be used for this property. Abby Our noted that it is all in the same ownership.

Sara Porter asked about the types of trucks accessing the rear of the property. Sarah noted that moving the gate further to the west would provide for parking against the west wall.

Dick Martin noted that he would like to see the parking behind the gate and make more green space in the front.

Charlie noted having built up planting boxes so wouldn't impact the asphalt or utilities.

Dick Martin noted that the building would be much more attractive with the proposed improvements. Site is very non-conforming related to buffers/plantings that would be required now. Kathy Williams noted that increasing parking due

to change in use could trigger site upgrades. Will need to coordinate with the Building Commissioner. The newer buildings along White's Path have done a lot of nice site improvements, so dressing up the front and moving the parking to the side would be much appreciated.

Charlie noted that a second egress would help with insurance. Charlie inquired about lighting. Alison noted the gooseneck lighting on the front of the building and need lighting at the doors for emergency egress.

Sara inquired about the colors. The building will be gray and the windows will have black frames. Suggested cleaning up the electrical meter service to the building. Suggested reconsidering the parking location to the side.

Abby Our noted that they need the pavement in the front for trucks to park and pick-up materials.

Charlie asked about the location of the dumpster, which is located in the back.

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 no remaining greenery. The Applicant has shown some greenery in the front to help define the streetscape but this is located within the road right-of-way (ROW) and trees cannot be planted in the ROW or over utilities.

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

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

See Comments to Sect 1, Streetscape 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:

DRC suggested moving the required parking to the westerly side of the building and green-scape as much as possible the front of the property, including a few trees.

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

Meets the standard if move parking to west side of building and screening it with additional front buffering. Show parking area for the office staff to meet zoning requirements. If leave spaces in the front, it does not meet the standard.

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

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

Overhead utilities are shown as remaining.

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

BUILDING STRATEGIES: *This project is a renovation to an existing building and includes minor modifications to add windows and entrances to the new office space.*

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 there are limited façade changes in the existing industrial building, the variations in the roof lines and heights provide interest to the building lines. The pergola also adds depth and interest to the office area.

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:

DRC supported extending the proposed fiber cement siding to the entire front façade.

Sect. 9, Incorporate Pedestrian-scaled Features N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:


The pergola over front façade adds a pedestrian scaled feature.

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 Sarah Porter, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for June 18, 2019 for the proposed office conversion at 363 White's Path South Yarmouth.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- June 18, 2019 Agenda
- Aerial Photos – current view and 2017 view
- Building Photos
- DRC Application:
 - Design Review Application and Materials Specification Sheet
 - Site Concept Plan – no title block or date provided
 - Architectural Plans: 11x17 Plans: All architectural plans prepared by A3 Architects, Inc, dated June 18, 2019:
 - A-1 – First Floor Plan
 - A-2 – Second Floor Plan
 - A-3 – Elevations Section
- Supplemental information provided at the DRC Meeting:
 - Anderson Window Cut-sheets