

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

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: April 28, 2021 - Virtual

Map: 109 Lots: 2

Applicant: NextGrid, Inc

Zone(s): B3/APD

Site Location: 261 White's Path, South Yarmouth

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams, Town Planner	Brian Yergatian, BSC Group
Dick Martin	Mark Grylls, Building Commissioner	Daniel Serber, NextGrid Inc.
Jack McCormack		
Sara Porter		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:01 PM

DRC Review ended at: 4:38 PM

On a motion by Jack McCormack, seconded by Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to end this portion of the April 28, 2021 DRC Meeting Agenda at 4:38 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: Construction of three (3) carports for canopy-mounted solar panels at the existing commercial facility, one canopy over a portion of the front parking lot and two over a portion of the rear parking lot.

Summary of Presentation: Brian Yergatian from BSC Group gave a brief overview of the project and displayed the site plan showing the single canopy in the front parking and two in the rear over existing parking. About 249 kw will be generated by the proposed project. No grading, stormwater or earthwork is needed. No site lighting is proposed. Applicant is proposing to plant 8 Leland Cypress in front of the posts for the solar canopy in the front. The canopies will have 14' clearance and be tilted slightly to maximize southern exposure. All existing parking and vegetated buffers will remain to screen the canopies including the buffer along White's Path. The western front buffer has a small berm with vegetation to further screen the canopy in the front. The rear canopies were reviewed. I-beam columns are proposed to be in the middle of the double loaded parking to avoid impacts to parking. There are two trees in an island that would need to be removed and will be replaced. Brian Yergatian showed the attached revised plan with four proposed in-lot trees, two being located in new islands. He also showed the rendering of the canopies in the front.

Daniel Serber, NextGrid, indicated White's Path is an industrial area and adding 8 trees will improve the area.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Jack McCormack inquired about the location of the cypress trees.

Charlie Addams indicated the proposal is similar to a system at Spaulding in Sandwich and has no problems with it. Trees in the front of the posts will add to the facility.

Sara Porters indicated she thinks it is a great project. With the new plantings and the canopy, it cuts down on the blandness of the building.

Dick Martin inquired as to whether the canopies meet setbacks. Mark Grylls noted he needs to review the plan and look at building and lot coverage. Dick recommends keeping relief to a minimum. He also hopes that the back

canopy can be reduced to maintain the two trees and be shortened to line up with the other canopy north of it, which may look better. Okay with the tree replacements elsewhere. He likes to see the solar.

Kathy Williams noted that previous planted trees in the front and rear are missing or have been removed as well as an island with plantings in the rear. In-lot trees are meant to be dispersed throughout the parking area. Mark Grylls noted the specific Zoning Bylaw section.

Dick Martin noted that if the solar canopies are impacting the wooded drainage area, he wants to be sure the trees are not removed. Need to replant lost trees, including reducing the canopy in the rear to retain the two existing trees in the island.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

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

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

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:

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

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

Where trees were removed and can be replaced, they should be replaced. If canopies do not allow, add some additional buffering and in-lot trees elsewhere. Two trees in the island in the rear parking should be protected with the canopy shortened.

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

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:

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:

The DRC acknowledged the need to utilize steel i-beams to provide adequate support to the canopies.

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 Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to approve these DRC Comments as part of the minutes for the April 28, 2021 DRC meeting related to the proposed Solar Canopies at 261 White's Path.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- April 28, 2021 Agenda
- April 15, 2021 e-mail from Kathy Williams and Aerial
- Coler & Colantonio Site Plan, dated April 14, 1999, included as part of the Cape Cod Commission Development of Regional Impact Exemption Decision.
- DRC Application:
 - DRC Application and Materials Specification Sheet
 - Rendering of proposed solar canopies in front of 261 White's Path
 - Photos of similar solar canopy installations
 - Original Plans:
 - Site Plan – Photovoltaic Array, prepared by BSC Group, dated April 8, 2021
 - Cross Sections of solar canopies (2 sheets) prepared by CBC Steel Buildings, last revised November 12, 2020.
 - Revised Plans reviewed at the 4/28/21 Design Review Committee Meeting:
 - Site Plan – Photovoltaic Array, prepared by BSC Group, revised April 28, 2021 – add trees.

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

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: April 28, 2021 - Virtual	Map: 32	Lots: 91
Applicant: Gerald Manning (Captain Parkers Restaurant)	Zone(s): B2, VCOD VC1	
Site Location: 668 Route 28, West Yarmouth		

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams, Town Planner	Brian Yergatian, BSC Group
Dick Martin		Gerry Manning, Applicant
Jack McCormack		Gary Ellis, Northside Bldg Consult
Sara Porter		

DRC Review for this project started at: 4:39 PM

DRC Review ended at: 5:09 PM

On a motion by Sara Porter, seconded by Jack McCormack, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to adjourn the April 28, 2021 DRC meeting at 5:09 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: Applicant is proposing to enclose a portion of the outdoor seating area on the east side of the building, add a bathroom in the rear of the existing restaurant, and expand the takeout area on the west side of the building.

Summary of Presentation: Brian Yergatian, BSC Group gave an overview of the proposed expansion of Captain Parkers Restaurant, which include two building additions, one on east side and second smaller addition on west side. The majority of the eastern patio will be enclosed to eliminate the awnings and include a 10x10 bathroom space. The smaller western addition is to enhance the take-out area, so patrons don't need to enter the restaurant. None of the additions will require extensive site work and won't need to modify the building utilities. The restaurant acquired a small square of abutting land which will help with setbacks and lot coverage. Brian Yergatian presented the elevations showing the eastern elevation with the enclosed patio and restroom and the west elevation showing the take-out area.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Charlie confirmed that the location of the take-out area is to the left of the main side entrance.

Sara Porter asked about a southern elevation, which Brian Yergatian indicated was not available.

Dick Martin asked about windows and door locations. Gerry Manning indicated the west elevation is an older version and the doorway to the take out area will be where the two smaller windows are shown. There would be a ramp to this door as well. Sara Porter confirmed that the ramp would be handicapped accessible.

Sara Porter commented that the proposal adds fairly elegant architecture, but the main entrance is very understated.

Charlie Adams thought the enclosures would be a good thing. Needed with take-out now and will be separate from the restaurant. Enclosing the patio and adding a bathroom at that end of the building will be much needed. Charlie Adams inquired about the tent in the front for this summer season. Gerry Manning indicated he has the tent approved for 2021.

Dick Martin confirmed with Gerry Manning that the patio on the western elevation will not happen. Usually with additions, Dick Martin asks for additional landscaping but Gerry does such a good job, he had no comments.

Gary Ellis noted most of the proposed changes do not show much from the Route 28 (south elevation). Gary Ellis confirmed the front entrance is small. Sara Porter suggested enhancing the main entrance to make it more prominent.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

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

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

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:

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

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

No in-lot or buffer trees are proposed as part of the improvements, but the existing septic system would make it difficult to install trees.

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

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:

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 (4-0) to approve these DRC Comments as part of the minutes for the April 28, 2021 DRC meeting related to the proposed building expansion at 668 Route 28.

Received by Applicant(s)		
		

ATTACHMENTS:

- April 28, 2021 Agenda
- April 26, 2021 e-mail from Kathy Williams and Aerial
- Captain Parkers Septic Repair Plan prepared by BSC Group and dated May 20, 2019.
- DRC Application:
 - DRC Application form and Materials Specification Sheet
 - Harvey Window cut sheets
 - Plans:
 - Site Plan – Layout & Materials Plan, prepared by BSC Group, dated April 23, 2021
 - Architectural plans prepared by Northside Building Consults
 - East Elevation, dated February 27, 2021.
 - Seating Plan, dated February 27, 2021
 - A1-1 – West Elevation, dated May 30, 2020.