

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 COMMITTEE (DRC) - COMMENT SHEET
(DRC comments which are provided to the Planning Board)

Meeting Date: June 7, 2022 - Room B/Virtual	Map: 60	Lots: 131 & 132
Applicant: Ekaterina & Family, LLC	Zone(s): ROAD Optional Overlay District	
Site Location: 1276 & 1282 Route 28, South Yarmouth, MA		

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams	Kathy Williams	Halim Choubah, CEG
Steve O'Neil		Attorney Paul Tardif
Sara Porter		
Dick Martin		

DRC Review for this Agenda Item started at: 4:02 PM
DRC Review ended at: 4:48 PM

On a motion by Sara Porter, and seconded by Steve O'Neil, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to adjourn the June 7, 2022 DRC meeting at 4:48 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: The Applicant seeks to develop the project using Zoning Bylaw Section 411 – Revitalization Overlay Architectural District (ROAD) to demolish all 6 existing buildings on the two sites and construct a gasoline filling station with five dispensers, overhead canopy, a 6,560 square foot mixed-use building, and various site improvements. The mixed-use building is proposed to include a convenience store, coffee shop area, and drive-thru on the first floor; and four (4) residential apartments on the second floor. The lots currently contain five cottages, a convenience store and two gas pumps with canopy.

Kathy Williams noted that for ROAD projects, the Planning Board serves as the Design Review Authority and will be holding their Public Hearing on June 15, 2022. The application is also distributed to the Design Review Committee (DRC) for their input and comments which will be provided to the Planning Board. The standard for the optional ROAD overlay district is substantial adherence to the Architectural and Site Design Standards ("Design Standards"), and it is not a case of something being better or more conforming than the existing site conditions.

Summary of Presentation: Attorney Paul Tardif noted the project went before the DRC in January and the applicant has made changes based on the comments and are now redeveloping as a ROAD project.

Hal Choubah briefly reviewed the project and the proposed site plans and noted some changes including a smaller size building, elimination of the outdoor seating area and conversion to a landscaped area, increased buffers, addition of about 18 large trees and more landscaping including a 5' buffer along Route 28. Also introduced a covered vestibule in the front to break up the long front façade. He noted there are fewer parking spaces to the west to add more landscaping, added pedestrian access to from Route 28 to the building, added an escape lane for the drive-thru, and added the 8' fence to the north of the property that abuts the residential property to minimize lighting and noise. He reviewed the small changes to the building elevations and showed the renderings with colors.

DRC Questions & Discussions:

Steve O'Neil noted that the DRC's requested changes were made and liked the added trees and buffering.

Charlie Adams was glad to see the amount of vegetation added since the last plan and likes the reduced size of the building and that the applicant worked with the DRC.

Sara Porter thinks the building looks great. She inquired as to where the tenants will park. Mr. Choubah noted the tenants will park to the west of the building and they will be marked for the tenants.

Mr. Martin concurred with the rest of the committee comments and was happy with the additional landscaping. He liked the façade changes and that the applicant took the DRC comments into consideration. He was still somewhat concerned about the residential neighbors in the rear, but the fence and the plantings will help. Mr. Martin inquired as to the size of the plantings, which Mr. Choubah noted were on the landscape plan. Mr. Martin noted one large tree being retained with the rest of the rear buffer being arborvitaes. Mr. Choubah indicated the trees on the border are being retained as much as possible. Mr. Martin noted that they also need trees in addition to arborvitaes. Mr. Martin was fine with the looks of the building. He noted there is a lot proposed for the site, but felt they were doing the best to make it work and this is a good economic addition to the community and better than what is there now. Mr. Adams and Mr. Martin both felt these areas need to be irrigated. Mr. Choubah indicated he would include irrigation on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Adams asked about the sign block sight distances. Mr. Choubah indicated the sign is 8' from property line, but about 20' to the edge of pavement. Mr. Adams felt the sign looks good, but it would be better if it was up a little higher so people could see through the lower level to make it easier for people driving out.

Kathy Williams reiterated that ROAD projects must have substantial adherence to the Design Standards. Attorney Tardif noted that gas stations need to have visibility for the pumps for easy access and suggested they look at the use which is different. This use as a gas station is not prohibited under the ROAD bylaw. Attorney Tardif felt that substantial compliance means they have done the best they could to meet the standards. The DRC was in general agreement with Attorney Tardif's comments related to meeting the standards to their best ability.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

Although the new building does not front on the street, the design is in substantial compliance as much as possible due to the nature of the use as a gas station where visibility of the pumps is important.

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

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

See Comments to Section 1 above. The street edge is improved with a 5' landscaped buffer in front of the canopy and by reducing the number of curb cuts from three (3) to two (2). The front buffer is intended to be improved on both private and state layout 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:

Although few mature buffer trees are being retained, the design may be considered to substantially adhere to the Design Standards as there are proposed plantings to augment and reestablish the buffers, and most of the side and rear buffer include an 8' solid fence. Need to add trees to the northern boundary in addition to the arborvitaes, and provide some variety in tree species.

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

Although parking is not to the side or rear, it could be consider substantially adhering to the Design Standards as there is improved buffering along Route 28 to reduce visibility of the parking, along with the addition of the in-lot planting islands.

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

The design may be considered to substantially adhere to the Design Standards as there are no proposed large parking lots and there are three vegetated planting islands in the parking area.

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:

The design may be considered to substantially adhere to the Design Standards as the building has incorporated a 24' wide, 5'-6" bump out vestibule on the lower front façade with an upper level overhang. Although the rear façade exceeds the 50', there is an angle to it with an overhanging upper level porch.

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

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

The design may be considered to substantially adhere to the Design Standards as the building has varying roof lines, heights and decorative cupolas, and the canopy design incorporates a hip roof, and stone capped/PVC wrapped columns.

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:

The existing building is relatively small and does not need smaller structures such as porches to act as frontage buildings. Pedestrian access has been shown to Route 28.

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

Next step for applicant: Go to Planning Board Return to Design Review for Formal Review

On a motion by Steve O'Neil, and seconded by Sara Porter, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (4-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for the June 7, 2022 DRC meeting for the proposed development at 1276-1282 Route 28 using the ROAD overlay district.

Received by Applicant(s)

		
---	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- **June 7, 2022 Agenda**
- **June 3, 2022 Memo from Kathy Williams and Aerial**
- **ROAD Application 2022-1:**
 - **ROAD Application Form**
 - **Project Narrative**
 - **January 18, 2022 DRC Comments (when the project was being developed using the underlying zoning)**
 - **April 19, 2022 Site Plan Review Comments**
 - **Existing Conditions Plan: Prepared by Borderland Engineering, Inc, dated December 7, 2021**
 - **Site Plans: All plans prepared by Choubah Engineering Group, dated April 28, 2022:**
 - **Cover Sheet**
 - **Demolition and Erosion & Sediment Control Plan**
 - **Erosion Control Details & Notes**
 - **Site Layout Plan**
 - **Grading & Drainage Plan**
 - **Utility Plan**
 - **Sewage System – Profile & Sections**
 - **Landscape Layout Plan**
 - **Lighting Plan**
 - **Site Details #1**
 - **Site Details #2**
 - **Site Details #3**
 - **Underground Fuel Storage Tanks Details**
 - **Architectural Plans: All plans prepared by Choubah Engineering Group, dated April 28, 2022:**
 - **Proposed 1st & 2nd Floor Layouts**
 - **Proposed Building Elevations**
 - **Canopy Elevations & Details**
 - **Architectural Renderings #1**
 - **Architectural Renderings #2**