

Review is: Conceptual Formal Binding (404 Motels/R.O.A.D. Project) Non-binding (All other commercial projects)
Review is by: Planning Board Design Review Committee

If this is a conceptual review, a formal review will be required before Site Plan Review.

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: May 5, 2015	Map: 50	Lot: 109
Applicant: Dr. Mohamed Butt	Zone(s): B2/HMOD1	
Site Location: 1117 Route 28, South Yarmouth		

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Dick Martin <i>D.M.</i>	Kathy Williams, Town Planner	Kieran Healy, BSC Group
Sara J. Porter <i>SJP</i>		Attorney Paul Tardif
Jack McCormack <i>J.McC</i>		Dr. Mohamed Butt
Charlie Adams <i>C.A.</i>		

DRC Review Started at: 4:14 PM
DRC Review ended at: 4:55 PM

Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to increase the footprint of the first floor office by approximately 270 sf (from 1,318 sf to 1,587); modify and enlarge the second floor apartment and install two exterior egress stairs with decks in the rear of the building. Three dormers are proposed in the front and an expansion of the shed dormer in the rear. The building materials are to match existing, including asphalt architectural shingles, vinyl siding in light gray, and 6 over 6 double hung windows with shutters. A new handicap ramp is proposed for the front entrance. Site layout for the 5,775 sf triangular lot include 9 parking spaces shown, 3 of which are in tandem behind the building in the buffer area, and 8 shrubs.

The project is being proposed to be developed under the Revitalization Overlay Architectural District (ROAD), which allows for some flexibility in the zoning bylaw requirements, provided the redevelopment meets the criteria of the Yarmouth Architectural and Site Design Standards. The applicant will need to go before the Planning Board for approval of the ROAD District Development Plan and the Board of Appeals for a Special Permit.

Attorney Paul Tardif gave a brief overview of the project. There is an existing apartment on the second floor that the owner uses when working at his orthodontist office on the first floor. There was some water damage a few years ago and the applicant would like to renovate and increase the building footprint. ZBA Special Permit issued in the 70s for the medical office in a residential zoning district. Parking was a concern then. Patients are by appointment only which can help to regulate patient traffic. Dr. Butt would be partially retired so wouldn't see more than 2-3 patients per hour, for 2-3 days per week. The surrounding site is well vegetated. The current sign would remain, which is partially with the Route 28 ROW.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

The building fronts along the street with a street oriented main entrance, and continues the established setback patterns. See additional Comments in Section 3 below.

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

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

The existing trees shown along the streetscape are located in the Route 28 ROW. If Route 28 were to be widened, these trees would be impacted. With the existing larger diameter trees, it would be difficult to plant trees in front of the building on the property, however, one smaller tree may be possible in the front of the northeast corner of the building to have at least one tree established within the front buffer 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:

See comments to Section 3 above regarding street trees. Planting of buffer trees would be difficult for much of this property due to the small size of the lot and the number of existing large trees located just outside the property limits, which limit direct sunlight to the property and overhang onto the subject parcel. However, other forms of vegetation could be planted within the buffer areas. The pavement behind the building, including that within the 10' buffer area should be removed and vegetation planted. No parking spaces should be located behind the building nor should tandem parking spaces be allowed, even if only used for employees. The opening behind the building is only 8' wide from the corner of the building to the front face of the retaining wall. It is evident by existing damage to the siding at this corner of the building, that vehicles have been hitting the building when exiting due to the narrow space. The parking spaces behind the building would also impede pedestrian access to the stairs to the apartment.

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

Only parking for handicapped individuals should be allowed in the front of the building and no parking spaces within the Route 28 layout should be counted as parking for this property.

It does not appear that the site can accommodate 9 parking spaces, especially if Route 28 is widened in the future within the existing ROW. There are also the concerns of how the cars will be able to leave the site without backing out into Route 28. The applicant should show vehicular turning movements as part of the Site Plan Review process.

Replacement of the deteriorated fencing adjacent to the parking area would help to screen the parking from the side.

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

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

Existing overhead utility service to remain for these site conditions.

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 building façade is slightly over 50' long (approximately 55'), the building reads as a residential home, and the single story office space on the west side of the building helps to break down the building mass.

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

The roof lines and wall heights vary around the structure with 3 dormers added to the front and a shed dormer expansion to the rear of the structure.

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

See Comments to Section 4 above.

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

See Comments in Section 3.

Sect. 7, Vary Building Mat'ls For Depth N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

The small size of the residential scale building does not require varying building materials to add depth to the façade.

Sect. 8, Use Traditional & Nat'l. Building Mat'ls N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Although vinyl siding is not a natural building material, it essentially reads as clapboards and has been accepted by the DRC on other projects. Recommend using 1x5 or 1x6 corner boards and 1x4 trim on windows, vinyl should be smooth, and window grills should be applied to outside, or between the glass (no snap ins).

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

The small size of the residential scale building does not require additional pedestrian scaled features.

Sect. 10, Incorporate Energy-efficient Design N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Replacement windows will be double pane and insulation will be upgraded.

Next step for applicant: Go to Site Plan Review Return to Design Review for Formal Review

Read & Received by Applicant(s)



--	--	--