# TOWN OF SCITUATE Design Review Committee

Meeting Minutes for: Wednesday, Sept. 2, 2020

# TOWN OF SCITUATE CLEPK 2020 OCT 19 IPM 9: 47

# **Agenda Topics:**

- I. 48-52 New Driftway Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit-Gas Backwards - Village Center and Neighborhood District, Greenbush - Driftway Gateway District - New Driftway Transit Village Subdistrict - (VCN-GDG-NDTV), Applicant: Petro Realty Corp.; Owner: New Driftway 4852 LLC
- 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)
Karen Joseph, Scituate Town Planner

Patti Lambert, Planning Board member

- I. Informal Discussion of 48-52 New Driftway
  - **a.** Applicants presented a set of plans showing a gas station and a 5,500 square foot commercial building designed in a "gas backwards" configuration on the property at New Driftway. The gas-backwards configuration puts gasoline pumps to the rear of the building, and puts the building façade along New Driftway.
  - **b.** The plans showed the one-story building will contain 1,500 square-foot restaurant on the east side of the structure and a 4,000 square-foot convenience store on the west side of the building. For reference, the main public-facing side of the building fronts to the north, running alongside New Driftway. The gas pumps are behind the building, to the south.
  - c. An initial set of civil plans, dated (revised) July 24 showed a pair of gabled porticos facing the sidewalk/bike path running along the north side (along New Driftway) one to serve the restaurant and one to serve the convenience store. An adequate-looking setback with green strip and bicycle rack showed an inviting pedestrian/cylist entrance from the north.
  - **d.** The south side of the building showed a similar pair of gabled porticos facing the gas pumps, paved area and parking spaces.
  - **e.** The west elevation showed a single, similar gabled portico providing entrance to west side of the convenience store. The west side of the

- building faces the paved vehicular access drive for cars turning in and out of the gas pumps and parking lot. In addition, the plans showed a reasonably broad (perhaps 8 or 9 feet) expanse of landscaped open space with walks and attractive landscaping, along with a sign.
- f. However, at the meeting a revised set of plans was shown. The dual gabled entrances on the north side were reduce to one, and the gabled portico on the western side was removed, along with the broad landscaped open space referred to in Item e. above. The applicant stated that this was mainly done to maximize wall-space on the interior of the convenience store since the three access doors in the earlier plans had used up a good deal of the commercially-valuable wallspace. Other site considerations including (potentially) fire department regulations were responsible for shrinking the open space and widening the access driveway, according to the applicant.
- g. The DRC nevertheless expressed the opinion that the removal of the western-facing portico and associated open space was a detriment to the structure and could be an obstacle to DRC approval. It should be noted that the western side of the building faces oncoming traffic driving into Scituate from the rotary to the south, and is an important visual aspect for the site. In addition, Town bylaws call for an adequate amount of open space in that zone, and DRC noted that the original plan had that along the western side in the July 24 plan, but not in the revised plan shown.
  - h. The DRC expressed the opinion that the July 24 set of plans promised a much more pleasing and appropriate structure, and urged the applicant to do additional revisions that would maintain the shape and dimensions of the west-facing portico, even if it will not contain a true entrance door, but perhaps simply be an interior area for customers inside the convenience store.
  - i. Other items for consideration the DRC urged were:
    - 1. Consider "flipping" the usage of the building, and putting the restaurant on the west end and the convenience store on the east end.
    - **2.** Reconsider re-adding the second gabled portico to the New Driftway side of the building elevation.
    - **3.** Gaining more public amenity outdoor space on the east side of the building by moving the ground-level utilities to on the roof, and screening them behind a faux-widow's walk.
    - **4.** Mimicking the pitch of the building's roofline and structure to the covering roof that sits over the gas pumps.
- j. DRC felt that the clapboard siding with corner boards, and asphalt roofing shingle on the hip-roof structure (with gazebo) appear appropriate and pleasing in the July 24 plans.

## II. Informal discussion of 18 Ford Place

The applicants presented a revised set of plans on Sept. 2, that made significant improvements to the plans shown to the DRC on July 27. Notably, they:

- Lined up the first and second story windows to achieve a more balanced look for the structure.
- "Bumped out" the triple windows on first and second story to create more relief in the expanse of the exterior walls.
- Added square windows in the peaks of the gables above the second story.
- Showed an expanse of lattice along the sides of the rear garage that offers visual relief from the expanse of wall and provides a practical venting of the garage
- Showed white-colored, traditional balusters on the exterior balconies
- Eliminated one parking space on the long parking drive to the right of the Ford Place elevation, replacing it instead with a patio an attempt to make a public amenity as required by the by-laws for the special permit.
- Lowered the roof line by four feet.

In general, the DRC appreciated the revisions and feels that they result in an improved appearance of the structure.

However, the DRC voted unanimously to recommend that the Planning Board <u>not approve</u> the plans until the large roof truss arrangement shown in the plans is replaced by a more traditional roofline. By traditional roofline, the DRC intends that the developer should abandon the truss arrangement and instead build a traditional framed roofline with gables butting into the rooflines in a stick-built manner more appropriate to the neighborhood.

The DRC also recommends that the Planning Board inquire specifically about the exterior siding materials, which appear to be cedar shingle but have not been specified as such.

Approved: September 30, 2020