

racks near the tot lot. This all goes towards building coverage which will be at 26% and relief will be required (25% allowed).

Dave Walsh from Hammer & Walsh landscape architects reviewed the landscape plan. Discussed need for native plantings. Two types of fences are proposed, solid fencing to prevent headlights from penetrating into abutting neighbors. Briefly discussed the sign. Photometric plan was discussed and need to meet the bylaw foot candles. Reviewed the tot lot and proposed equipment.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Jack McCormack had no comments.

Sara Porter noted that the dormers look very small and feels there is enough interest in the building so they can be eliminated. The building has horizontal elements so elimination of some of the horizontal trim boards would be better along the roof eave. Confirmed that the lattice on the fencing is horizontal not diagonal. Roof over the side entrance on Building 1 looks boxy, would be helpful to pitch to the side. Good looking building. Likes the siting with the building locations.

Dick Martin noted that honey locusts may not be good as they are shallow rooted and may not do well in storms. Dick likes the western building at a slight angle. Agree with other comments about tot lot being outside of the buffer if impacts buffer trees. He's comfortable with the architecture with Sara's comments. If dormers were bigger would work better but can live without them. Larger diameter buffer trees need to be retained in the buffers. He is comfortable with trees in front of building and the parking along Route 28, wouldn't want to see any less. Along westerly boundary, need more trees than every 40' or so. Likes the amount of parking shown. Likes the architecture and the design of the community room adds interest. He's fine with the lighting proposed in black. He noted that the perspective does not coordinate with the landscape plan. Confirmed that sidewalks are to concrete with concrete curbing, except granite at the entrance and cape cod berm in the rear parking. In-lot trees need to be confirmed with the Building Commissioner. Emphasized that the property needs to be properly maintained and managed.

All plans and supplemental information submitted at the October 25, 2017 DRC Meeting are part of this decision and are attached to this determination.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

One building fronts along the street to help define the streetscape and includes a street-oriented entrance and pedestrian access to Route 28. The short end of the building faces Route 28 with varying rooflines, facade modulations and covered entrance to add interest. There is parking to the side of this building with a 25' setback allowing for the planting of landscaping and street trees along the public way to enhance the street edge and shield parking located to the side of buildings. The proposed bus shelter further defines the streetscape.

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

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

See Comments above for Section 1, Site Strategies.

Sect. 4, Shield Large Buildings N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Sect. 5, Design a 2nd Story N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Both buildings are two story.

Sect. 6, Use Topo to Screen New Development N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

Landscaping, including bushes, trees and fencing are used to screen the parking areas. Include a small berm (approximately 2') in front of the parking along Route 28 to further hide the parking lot.

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

Quality larger buffer trees of 4" in diameter and greater should be identified on the plans and wherever feasible they should remain and be protected during construction. New buffer trees (minimum 3" caliper), shrubs and fencing have been incorporated into the design for buffering and screening. Utilize existing trees wherever possible and plant supplemental trees of 2.5" caliper or greater at a distance of no greater than 30' around the buildings. Trees in buffers around parking areas need to be 3" caliper trees every 20'. Landscaped areas will be irrigated.

Provide additional screening for electrical transformers, HVAC condensers and building mounted electrical meters.

Do not locate utilities or the playground area within the required buffers if they impact the ability to plant out the buffers or retain existing large trees within the buffers.

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

Side parking along Route 28 is well screened with landscaping and the small bus shelter. Include a small berm in front of the parking along Route 28 to further hide the parking lot. The parking in the rear is screened with solid fencing and plantings.

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

There are two separate parking lots placed on the property, with the larger lot being broken up with a landscaped center island.

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

All utilities are underground. Any ground mounted transformers, electrical cabinet or building mounted meters shall be located to minimize visibility and shall be screened. Building mounted meters shall not face Route 28. No utility or plumbing vents shall be in the roof lines facing Route 28. Condensers need to be located on the plans and screened.

Signage is shown at the entrance along Route 28 and a detail was included on the revised plans.

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:

There are multiple buildings on the site. Each building is broken down visually into smaller structural masses through varying the façade line, wall heights, building materials and colors, and roof lines.

Sect. 2, Break Down Building Mass – Sub-Masses N/A Meets Standards, or Discrepancies:

See Comments above for Section 1 Building Strategies.

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:

The dormers shown can be eliminated as there is adequate variations in the roofline without the dormers. Eliminate some of the horizontal trim band at gable ends to soften the horizontal line at the eave. Roof line over the emergency egress door is boxy and consider modifying the roofline while providing adequate headroom.

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:

Provide final color selection at SPR.

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 Sara Porter, seconded by Jack McCormack, the DRC voted (3-0) that the proposed 40 unit residential development at 497 Route 28 as presented at the DRC meeting of October 25, 2017 is in compliance with the Siting and Building Strategies outlined in the Architectural and Site Design Standards, with the modifications noted above.

On a motion by Sara Porter, seconded by Jack McCormack, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for October 25, 2017 DRC meeting for the proposed 40 unit residential development at 497 Route 28.

Read & Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- **October 25, 2017 Agenda**
- **DRC Application form with Materials Specification Sheet**
- **Architectural Materials dated October 25, 2017**
- **REVISED PLANS:**
 - **Site Plans – All plans titled Residences at Yarmouth Gardens, prepared by Coastal Engineering and dated October 25, 2017**
 - **C2.1.0 – Plan Showing Existing and Proposed Building Layouts**
 - **C1.2.1 – Plan Showing Existing Site Conditions**
 - **C2.1.1 – Plan Showing Proposed Layout & Materials**
 - **C2.3.1 – Plan Showing Proposed Utility Layout**
 - **Landscape Plans – All plans titled Residences at Yarmouth Gardens, prepared Hammer & Walsh Design and dated October 25, 2017**
 - **L100 – Planting Plan**
 - **L101 – Untitled (included Details for fencing, lights, bike rack, play equipment surface/footings and entry sign)**
 - **L102 – Tot Lot**

- L103 – Plant Palette
- L105 – Illustrated Site Plan
- Photometric Plan – All plans titled Residences at Yarmouth Gardens, prepared by Omni-Lite and dated October 25, 2017
 - L104 – Site Lighting Photometric Plan
- Architect Plans – All plans prepared by Winslow Architects and dated October 25, 2017
 - G-001 – Title Sheet
 - A101 – Building 1 Floor Plans
 - A102 – Building 2 Floor Plans
 - A103 – Roof Plans
 - A201 – Exterior Elevations – Building 1
 - A202 – Exterior Elevations – Building 2
 - A203 - Perspectives