

TOWN OF SCITUATE  
*Design Review Committee*

TOWN OF SCITUATE  
TOWN CLERK

Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, November 1, 2017

2017 DEC 19 PM 1:16

Agenda Topics:

RECEIVED

- I. Next Meeting Date, and Sept. 12th Meeting Minutes Approval
- II. Follow-Up of Seaside at Scituate Building Elevations and Design Concepts

*The meeting was held in the Planning Board Office and called to order at 7:04PM.*

**In Attendance:**

Hal Stokes (DRC Chairman)  
John Roman (DRC Secretary)  
Laura DeLong (DRC Member)  
Dave Buckley (Toll Brothers)  
William Ohrenberger (Atty.: Toll Brothers)  
Richard Taylor (Planning Board)  
Pat Lambert (Planning Board)  
Karen Joseph (Planning Office)

**I. First Order of Business:**

- A) Establish a date for the next Design Review Committee meeting.
- B) Approval of DRC Meeting Minutes from the September 12, 2017 meeting.
- C/D) Other Business

- A) The DRC decided on Tuesday, December 12, 2017 at 7PM for the next Design Review Committee meeting.
- B) The minutes for the September 12, 2017 meeting were approved.
- C) Hal Stokes, Chair of the DRC, expressed his desire to no longer be the Chair of the committee. It was decided a further discussion on this would take place at the next DRC meeting in December.
- D) It was decided that the Design Review Committee's planned "Scale Elevation" proposal to the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals was already covered in Zoning By-Law 770.5. If the DRC ever wishes to implement this request for scale comparisons, the members can invoke this bylaw for approval to do so.

(The "Scale Elevation" concept is attached to these minutes.)

## **II. Second Order of Business:**

### **Follow-Up of Seaside at Scituate and Design Concepts**

Dave Buckley (Toll Bros.) reviewed his follow-up designs for:

1. Outdoor lighting: entry lights and street lights
2. Stone base for each of the structures in the complex
3. Fencing at garages
4. Building shakes
5. Building colors
6. Sidewalks
7. Roof shingles

### **Design Review Committee comments:**

The Design Review Committee responded to the submitted material specifications and samples with the following comments:

1. **All three members** accepted the lighting fixtures submitted (front door and garage lights, and Domus Series Lumineer (4000k) street lights).
2. One member of the committee pointed out that the stone bases on the "pack" structures was not consistent with the way actual stone bases would be utilized on buildings. Having the *garages* with stone bases seemed an over-kill of the use of stone. It was suggested that the applicant re-think that material use and **re-submit new plans** showing the buildings with less stone (elimination from extensions from the main structure such as the garages). Some of the end-units presently show shakes from top-to-bottom. Picking up this theme on the garages would lighten the visibility of the stones. **All three committee members** agreed with this suggestion.
3. Pickett fences at the homes will be Walpole "Sudbury" line. It was recommended that the fence style at the main entrance visually tie-in with the fences use at the garages and around the structures. This is especially important with the type of caps the fence posts have at both locations. **All three members** agreed with this.
4. The applicant presented polypropylene shakes for the structures. **Two members** of the committee accepted the shake design. One preferred Hardie Board cement shakes. The applicant explained the reasoning why cement board was not practical. Toll Brothers submitted residential address where vinyl shake siding was installed. Upon further review, it was determined that cement board siding was used at the new Library and Safety Complex. Cement board was also used at the Toll Brothers Cohasset residential site. One member strongly felt vinyl shake siding was not appropriate for the area.
5. The applicant stated that the shake colors were not yet chosen and would be addressed *after* the buildings are up and in place. The applicant stated they would be using three colors throughout the complex. **All three members** of the committee suggested four colors in areas where four structures were

clustered...three colors where three buildings were positioned. The members also wished to see the color choices *before* the buildings are erected.

6. All roofing shingles are to be the same color and style. **All three members** found this acceptable.
7. The sidewalks will be brushed concrete. **All three members** found this acceptable.

DRC continued the discussion from last meeting regarding the repetition of the garage doors throughout the complex. DRC asked Toll Brothers again for an alternative creative design to minimize the view of garage doors. Toll Brothers indicated that this was not possible at this point in the project. DRC advised that they should have been consulted early in design and not brought toward the end of the design process. It was noted that by looking at elevations alone, one can not really get a sense of how the garage doors will look in reality when landscaping, terrain and the effects of three dimensions comes into play. The applicant noted that they would provide 3-D renderings to give a better impression of the garage door visibility and placement.

**Public Correspondence Note:**

A Scituate resident (Karen Pritchard) who could not be present, submitted a set of comments she'd requested from an architect/friend on some of the general design of the condo building clusters. The document was submitted only minutes before the DRC meeting began, and therefore DRC members had no chance to study it. Therefore it was not acted on or discussed, but was considered a part of the public record, and a copy was provided to Toll Brothers attorney Bill Ohrenberger, and may also be of use for members of the Planning Board to consider.

*The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.*



APPROVED 12.12.17 -

**John Roman**  
*Design Review Committee Secretary*

**Hal Stokes: Chair**  
**Laura DeLong: Member**  
11.7.17

Sept. 12, 2017

The exact distance between a proposed building and existing buildings can be determined by the Planning Board and the ZBA (in other words, this may not pertain to existing dwellings at a specified distance from a construction site).

Below is an example of a Scale Elevation drawing. The intention of such a design drawing would be to show the Planning Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals, and the Design Review Committee at a glance exactly what the scale of a proposed project will be, and how proposed new construction will fit into the surrounding neighborhood.

[illegible]