

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

YARMOUTH TOWN CLERK
18MAR20PM4:14 REC

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Meeting Date: March 20, 2018 at 3 PM in Town Hall Hearing Room Map: 32 Lots: 89
Applicant: Captain Parkers 658, LLC (Gerry Manning, Manager) Zone(s): B2/HMOD1/VCOD VC 1
Site Location: 658 Route 28, West Yarmouth

Persons Present:

DCR Members Present	Yarmouth Town Staff Present	Guests
Charlie Adams <i>[Signature]</i>	Kathy Williams	Kieran Healy
Jack McCormack <i>[Signature]</i>		Gary Ellis
Sara Jane Porter <i>SJP</i>		Gerry Manning
		George Moudouris

DRC Review for this project started at: 3:04 PM

DRC Review ended at: 3:52 PM

On a motion by Sara Jane Porter, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to adjourn the March 20, 2018 DRC meeting at 3:52 PM.

Project Summary

General Description: Applicant, Captain Parkers 658 LLC (Gerry Manning, Manager), is proposing to renovate and modify the existing commercial building at 658 Route 28 into a commercial space on the first floor, storage and managers office in the basement, and one apartment on the second floor. The proposed improvements to the building include the addition of decks, awnings, custom chimney cap and cupola, as well as relocation of the handicapped ramp.

The site renovations also include upgrades to the landscaping, septic, drainage and parking areas. The existing parking in the front has been reduced to two handicapped spaces to provide for additional buffer landscaping along Route 28. The parking in the rear of the building has been expanded and only 5' rear and side yard buffers are shown.

Summary of Presentation: Kieran Healy of BSC Group gave an overview of the project, located two doors down from Captain Parkers Restaurant, separated by a parcel which Captain Parkers has an agreement for 20 parking spaces. Discussed the new handicapped ramp. Proposing some trees but not fully meeting due to subsurface septic and infiltration. Sixteen perimeter trees proposed in the buffers. Drainage system is shallow so takes up a larger area, stone bed impacts ability to install buffer trees which would impact chambers. Inside building storage/office space on lower floor. Ice cream store and coffee shop on first floor with an apartment on the upper floor.

DRC Questions & Discussions: Charlie Adams had questions regarding landscaping along Route 28. Kieran Healy noted that there will be plantings similar to Captain Parkers.

Kathy Williams commented on how nice the building looked with the addition of the cupola tower, awnings and decking. She did note that the width of the parking in the rear was extra wide. Kieran Healy noted that it was wide to allow for double parking for staff. Kathy Williams read Dick Martin's comments. Kieran noted that the garage is needed for storage. The building is the same footprint, but the decks extend outward. Decks help to connect all the doors to the building to the handicapped ramp.

Sara Porter asked about the siding. Currently white cedar shingles. Existing shingles will remain and be repainted. Some windows are getting changed out and shingles will be filled in and painted white. Want to match the white shingles of Captain Parkers. She noted the appreciation of the building design and details on the plans, including everything being well labeled.

Charlie Adams noted that the building design is fabulous and asset to Route 28. Inquired about the dumpster and signage. Kieran Healy noted that they would reconfigure the existing sign. Charlie inquired about lighting and landscaping around the sign. Kieran said it would be same as Captain Parkers. Kieran noted that the dumpster would be in the back and enclosed by 6' cedar fencing.

Jack McCormack also felt it looked great. He inquired about increasing the buffers. Kieran said this would lose 7 parking spaces. Parking is located behind the building and not visible from Route 28. Gerry Manning noted that every parking space is vital.

Charlie Adams inquired about pedestrian access for parking. Kieran Healy noted that this would be for staff parking and could use the Route 28 sidewalk. Charlie inquired about acquisition of parcel in the middle. Gerry Manning noted that he is working on the acquisition of that parcel. Kieran noted that the required minimum setbacks make it difficult to develop the lot due to narrowness of the lot. Gerry Manning noted that at some point he would like to make it all a single campus.

Kathy Williams inquired about the fencing along the western property line. Gerry Manning noted that he was going to upgrade the 6' fence in its current location. Style to be determined, either cedar or vinyl.

Review Comments In Relation To The Design Standards

SITING STRATEGIES

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

Applicant is proposing to decrease parking in the front to two handicapped spaces, reduce the width of the curb cut to 24' and provide a robust landscaping buffer, including two trees and plantings similar to the existing landscaping at nearby Captain Parkers Restaurant (on both sides of the curb cut).

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

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

See Sect. 1, Streetscape Comments Above.

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

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

Building has a partial second story already.

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

The attractive building architecture, reduction in parking and proposed robust landscaping do not require use of topography to screen the development.

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

The attached proposed parking calculations from BSC Group show 11 parking spaces required, with 18 shown (including 2 handicapped spaces) on the site plan. The rear parking lot is wide (77'+/-) resulting in only 5' side and rear yard buffers behind the main building, limiting the ability to retain any existing buffer trees and impacting planting additional trees. In addition, existing or proposed trees around parking areas need to be every 20'. An upgrade to the fence in proposed along the western property line.

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

Handicapped parking in the front is limited to two spaces and is screened with landscaped buffer. Remainder of the parking is located behind the building.

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

Parking area is small, shown as a total of eighteen spaces.

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

Existing overhead utilities are shown as remaining.

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:

The existing building is small and does not need to be further broken down.

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 small size of the building combined with the addition of decking and existing building modulations provides for façade variations.

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

The building has varying wall heights associated with the second floor in the rear of the building.

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

The building has varying roof lines associated with the second floor in the rear of the building and use of awnings.

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

Decking and awnings help to bring down the building edges, along with the single story portion of the building.

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:

Decking and awnings provide for pedestrian-scaled features.

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

New energy efficient windows are being proposed

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

On a motion by Sara Jane Porter, seconded by Charlie Adams, the Design Review Committee (DRC) voted (3-0) to approve these DRC Comments as meeting minutes for the March 20, 2018 DRC meeting for the proposed commercial development at 658 Route 28.

Received by Applicant(s)

<i>Gerald Manning</i>		
-----------------------	--	--

ATTACHMENTS:

- **March 20, 2018 Agenda**
- **DRC Application form and Materials Specification Sheet**
- **Aerial, photo of 658 Route 28 and photo of Captain Parkers Restaurant Landscaping**
- **March 16, 2018 e-mail from Kathy Williams, Town Planner, and March 17, 2018 e-mail from Dick Martin, DRC Member**
- **Proposed Parking Calculations from BSC Group**
- **Site Plan – prepared by BSC Group:**
 - **Proposed Conditions, dated February 20, 2018**
- **Architectural Plans – All plans prepared for Gary A. Ellis N.S.B.C. Inc. and dated March 2, 2018:**
 - **A-1 – Elevations (South and East)**
 - **A-3 – Elevations (North and West)**
 - **A-3 – Lower Level Floor Plan**
 - **A04 – First and Second Level Floor Plans**
 - **EX-1 – Existing Elevations (South and East)**
 - **EX-2 – Existing Elevations (North and West)**
 - **EX-3 – Existing Floor Plans (Lower and First Level)**
 - **EX-4 – Existing Floor Plans (Second Level)**