

TOWN OF SCITUATE  
*Design Review Committee*

Meeting Minutes for: Monday, July 27, 2020

Agenda Topics:

- I. 14-16 Old Country Way-Site Plan Special Permit-Mixed Use Development in the Village Business Overlay District (VBOD), Applicant/Owner: Robert Proctor, Manager (RP); Architect: Kelley, Jill Neubauer Architects (JNA).
- II. 18 Ford Place – Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for Density and Tandem Parking in the Village Center and Neighborhood District-Greenbush Center Subdistrict (VCN-GVC), Applicant: Don McGill, Owner: JB Scituate, LLC (DM)

*The meeting was held in the Joseph P. Norton Emergency Operations Center, Public Safety Complex, 800 CJC HWY and called to order 5:30PM.*

**In Attendance:**

Hal Stokes (DRC Chairman)  
John Buckley (DRC Member)  
Craig Mutter (DRC Member)

Ann Burbine, Planning Board Chairperson  
Patti Lambert, Planning Board member

Karen Joseph, Scituate Town Planner

- I. Informal Discussion 14-16 Old Country Way
  - a. RP presented the preliminary plans for 14-16 Old Country Way. He is proposing 6 residential units with a total of 12 bedrooms in two 2-story buildings along with a 1200 sf wood shop and 2800 sf of warehouse space in the north barn building. 4 units are in the southwest building by Old Country Way and 2 are in the north barn building on the second floor. It is intended that the lower floor of the north building houses shops of carpenter, cabinet maker, electrician, job printer, painter, paperhanger, plumber, sign painter or upholsterer in conformance with Section 420.3.S of the zoning bylaw. No affordable units are proposed nor is a density bonus requested. The units are served by a single driveway on Old Country Way. The existing concrete driveway running to Jenkins Place will be removed and replaced with grass.
  - b. Overall Scale of Building- The two buildings are expressed as simple gabled forms. **The DRC consensus is that the scale of the buildings is appropriate.**
  - c. Height of Buildings are in compliance with height requirements.
  - d. Front Façade Proportions – The façade proportions are appropriate and great care seems to have been taken to express a crisp clean modern reinterpretation of local context. **The DRC suggests taking advantage of the Old Country Way façade of the southwest building (which is actually the side of the building) by creating a focal point. DRC identified the kitchen window location as a potential site for a bay window or figural composition.**

- e. Rhythm of Solid to Voids in the Front Facades – As noted above, the southwest building is rotated such that the side elevation is fronting the front yard setback. **The window spacing and proportion seems appropriate to the DRC. DRC expressed approval for the dormers and barn doors with transom expressed on the north building.**
- f. Size, Shape, and Proportion of Openings – The windows are proposed to be vertical 2 over 1 double hung windows. Anderson 400 Series windows with simulated divided lights are proposed.
- g. Roof Shapes and Proportions – The simple gable roof line will fit in well with the surrounding context.
- h. Façade Materials and relationship to the surrounding buildings – JNA suggested that the southwest building will be clad in cedar shingles or simulated cedar shingles made from Hardi-board. Corner boards are intentionally not being proposed. **DRC recommends that the project use real cedar shingles, and that this will enable the design team achieve the sharp crisp woven corner details at the corners. The north building is proposed to be a wood board and batten expression made from Hardi-Board. DRC approves, and suggests natural wood color for the cedar shingles and the proposed white color of the proposed board and batten and trim areas.**
- i. Preservation of Historic or Traditional Architecture – although historically significant structures are not impacted by this project, **the DRC agrees that the architectural language of the proposed structures is a commendable reinterpretation of traditional architecture.**
- j. Landscaping, Walks, Walls, Fences, Signs, Lighting, Driveways and Parking Areas –Walkways are to be made from cast in place concrete,. **The DRC recommends that the design team consider trees on the east side of the driveway to balance the trees in front of the south west building and to frame the development from the street and screen the neighboring property.**
- k. **DRC Recommendations**
  - i. **Consider composing the south end of the southwest building to create a focal point on the façade along the front yard setback.**
  - ii. **Detail the cedar shake façade of the southwest building to achieve the desired crisp corners.**
  - iii. **Include site lighting strategy in the next public presentation.**
  - iv. **Provide a row of trees on the east side of the driveway.**
  - v. **DRC recommends approval of the proposed development.**

## II. Informal discussion of 18 Ford Place

- a. DM presented preliminary plans for a Multi-family building with (5) 2-bedroom units for a total of 10 units. The applicant is applying for special permit for density which requires Public Realm Improvements are made for residents and the surrounding VCN District.
- b. Overall Scale of Building-The proposed building is large for the lot. Technically the applicant is satisfying the required setbacks and open space requirements; however, the building appears to fill every square inch of the site.

- c. Height of Buildings – the building appears unnecessarily tall. DRC observed that a large ‘macro gable’ roofline spans from one end of the building to the other. The applicant indicated that this is driven by the decision to use pre-engineered trusses.
- d. Front Façade Proportions – The front façade proportions are difficult to evaluate because the rendering presented does not appear to match the architectural drawing set.
- e. Rhythm of Solid to Voids in the Front Facades – Each of the four sides of the large square footprint is punctuated by two gabled volumes and the corners that are framed on the corners by two sided balconies and a center public entrance that is set back from the façade.
- f. Size, Shape, and Proportion of Openings – The DRC noted that there are multiple inconsistencies between the elevations, plans and renderings in the documents presented. The windows in the rendering are represented as large identical, but awkwardly proportioned windows that march around the building. In the elevations the windows do not seem to correspond to the implied volumes of the gabled masses. The plans show a variety of window sizes that do not correspond to the elevations.
- g. Roof Shapes and Proportions – As mentioned above, the roof form is unusual and unnecessarily large. The DRC observed that there is no reason for the height of the building other than the desire to use the proposed roof trusses, and suggests that the applicant reconsider the ‘macro gable’ on the roof and express each of the smaller gabled volumes in the roof line.
- h. Façade Materials and relationship to the surrounding buildings – Materials selection appears to be driven by economy. Most materials are proposed to be painted Hardi-board. The guard rail balusters at the balconies are proposed to be painted black. **The DRC recommends using white balusters.**
- i. Preservation of Historic or Traditional Architecture – the issue of preservation of historic structures does not seem to be applicable to the project, though the combination of the building’s size, lot coverage and height does not seem to be considerate to neighboring properties, or in keeping with the character of the greater neighborhood.
- j. Landscaping, Walks, Walls, Fences, Signs, Lighting, Driveways and Parking Areas – Apparently street trees are being considered as the public amenities to meet the requirement for the special permit. **The DRC wonders what the significance of this amenity to the public is.**
- k. **DRC Comments**
  - i. **The DRC recommends that the applicant provide a complete and fully coordinated set of architectural plans and renderings for review and indicate the specific design that is being proposed.**
  - ii. **The applicant should reconsider the need for the ‘macro gable’ to lower the height of the building. A much more interesting roof line would result from expressing the smaller pavilion gables.**
  - iii. **The applicant should consider a variety of window types and sizes and be more deliberate about how the position of windows can reinforce the idea of the gabled pavilions.**

- iv. The applicant should consider more traditional railing details at the balconies.**
- v. The DRC does not think that the quality of the materials presented merits approval.**

Approved: September 2, 2020