

Sara Porter inquired as to the location of the proposed tree on Commercial Street as well as the new entrance. Brian Yergatian showed the locations on the plan. She indicated she was fine with the proposal.

Jack McCormack also had a question about the drainage which was answered.

Kathy Williams inquired about the location for a gate to access the rear parking area. Jay Frazier noted he could put in a vinyl gate/fencing near the crushed stone/pavement area between the buildings. Also discussed adding a tree to the proposed island in front of 27 Commercial Street and also adding an island and tree in front of 29 Commercial Street. Jay Frazier noted that he would like to continue to use the stone within the planting areas. Ms. Williams noted that the proposed project offers significant improvements to the site and provides a much needed service in town.

Chris Vincent needed to leave the meeting at 4:25 after the presentation and the DRC made their comments. As the Design Review Committee is advisory for this type of project, the remaining members chose to continue with the meeting to allow the applicant to move forward with their permitting process.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

The location of parking in the front impacts the streetscape along Commercial Street, but the locations of the existing buildings are close to the street with front facing entrances and windows. The proposed building does not have any setbacks or architectural detailing facing Delivery Road.

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

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

The street edge along Delivery Road has been improved with the installation of street trees. The short end of the new building will be facing the street and will be mostly screened with the trees.

The streets edge along Commercial Street remains impacted by existing parking in the front (including an on-street parking space with curb stop) and existing vehicle display area. The area could be better defined with the addition of an island and tree in front of 29 Commercial and a tree in the proposed island in front of 27 Commercial. Retention of a segment of the existing fencing would also help to hide parking and activities in the rear of the property.

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:

Significant improvements have been made to the buffers/screening along the eastern and southern property lines, including along Delivery Road. There are no buffer plantings along the western property line, but this is where the building is in close proximity to the property line. See Sect. 3 – Define Street Edge, for additional comments on screening along Commercial Street.

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

Parking remains in the front along Commercial Street. See comments to Sect. 3 – Define Street Edge.

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

There are additional islands and trees that have been added to the parking area in the rear.

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

Services to the existing building are overhead from Commercial Street. The applicant anticipates going through the existing building to service the expansion.

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

BUILDING STRATEGIES: The design review committee felt this was an industrial area and the proposed project will ultimately be an enhancement.

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:

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 Jack McCormack, seconded by Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (2-0) out of necessity to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for the September 22, 2020 DRC meeting for Platinum Auto at 27 & 29 Commercial Street.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- September 22, 2020 DRC Agenda
- September 18, 2020 e-mail from Kathy Williams with Concept Idea Sketch
- Aerial of the Properties
- DRC Application:
 - DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet
 - Photos of the Properties
 - Cut Sheets for:
 - MBCI Metal Roof and Wall Systems – siding panel and trim colors
 - CHI Overhead Doors and Exterior Doors
 - RAB wall mounted light fixture
 - RAB site light fixture and pole
 - Architectural Plans by ConServ, dated June 9, 2020
 - A100 – Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations
 - Site Plans: All plans prepared by BSC Group, dated September 14, 2020
 - Existing Conditions Plan
 - Site Plan