

12.14.21



TOWN OF SCITUATE

Design Review Committee

600 Chief Justice Cushing Highway
Scituate, Massachusetts 02066
Phone: 781-545-8730
FAX: 781-545-8704

Meeting Minutes

Date: November 16, 2021

ATTENDEES:

Karen Joseph	Town Planner
Patricia Lambert	Planning Board
Ben Bornstein	Planning Board Liaison
Frank Polak	Applicant
Kayla Sepulveda	Sullivan and Comerford
Phillipe Thibault	Phillipe Thibault Architect LLC
Jennifer Kuhn	
John Buckley	DRC
Craig Mutter	DRC
Paulette O'Connell	DRC

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS/ADMIN.

Review and approval of Agenda

Review and approval of Meeting Minutes for September 14, 2021

Review of procedures

The project is located in a Village Center & Neighborhood District. As such, standards must be met as noted in the Zoning By-Laws. The Planning Board referred this to the DRC for architectural opinion.

A checklist was created from Section 750.5 of the Bylaw, included herein.

This project is a Special Permit and the Planning Board must make findings on the DRC's recommendation. Some guidelines could be waived if it will improve the project with the exception of building height.

PRESENTATION AND REVIEW OF 7 NEW DRIFTWAY

A site plan, floor plans, elevations and revised rendering were presented to the DRC.

The building has a 7,200 sf floor plate 100'-0" wide X 72'-0" deep. It includes 21 apartments with a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units.

Changes were made to the rendering. They included the reduction in window size, addition of shutters in strategic locations, modulated bay at the fourth floor, higher cornice at the front, white windows and lighter material selections. Note, there were no changes to the floorplate or massing.

A Design Elements checklist was prepared by Planning to evaluate the proposed design for visual compatibility within the building, with surrounding buildings and with the neighborhood per Zoning Bylaw Section 750. See below for evaluation/recommendations.

(Note: Text in gray italics are excerpts from the Zoning Bylaws)

1. Building Placement and Orientation

- a. Building Lot Dimensions - Does not comply
Street facing width (60 min/100'-0" max)
The DRC noticed that the bay window on the west façade extends the width above 100'-0" max.
- b. Number of Buildings – 1 building complies
- c. Placement (see below d, e and f)
- d. Build-to-zones (BTZ)
The Build to Zone is 10 ft. min and 30 ft. maximum – Does not comply
The area between the min. front setback and the max. front setback is the Build to Zone in which the front façade of the primarily building facing the primary street shall be placed.
As the building is located on an angle to the street only a small portion of the southwest corner is within this zone. The DRC would like to see some options for placement of the building.
- e. Build-to-zone Occupancy (BTZO) Does not comply, see above BTZ
- f. Corner Lot Clearance and Facade Orientation Does not comply
The front façade and entrance of a principal building must be built parallel to a Street ROW line. On a corner lot, the building may be retracted at a 45 degree angle.
The building is not parallel to the street nor is the building designed to the corner lot specification. The DRC noted the prominence of the site and its visibility from the nearby roundabout. As currently designed, the west façade will be highly visible and will feel out of proportion.
Note: It appears it can be shifted to fit within the setback lines and meet the Façade orientation

2. Building Height

- a. Minimum and Maximum Height Appears to comply, see comments
4 stories / 40 ft.
The DRC would like to see a section with actual building components to confirm height meets Zoning.
There was a discussion by the applicant to ease the building height restrictions. Note that is not the purview of the DRC.
- b. Height Measurement and Roof Pitch Appears to comply, see comments
Vertical distance from the average ground level to the top of the roof joists
The DRC would like to understand how the average ground level was determined.
- c. Penthouse
 - *Penthouse dwelling units shall not be visible from any sidewalk on the perimeter of the property line. Unable to determine compliance – requires additional views/documentation*
 - *Setback from the edge 1:1 Does not comply at rear*
 - *Height 10 feet Complies*
 - *Floor Plate Area Maximum – 50% of the principal building Appears to comply, would like to see area calculations*
- d. Height Exceptions - No exceptions.
- e. Ground Floor Elevation - Did not discuss, appears to comply

3. Building Step-back and Street Enclosure - Does not comply

Multifamily buildings taller than 25 feet shall be required to be setback or stepped back from the street in accordance with Figure 6. Figure 6 illustrates that no structure should be over 25ft with 25 ft. of the R.O.W. No structure shall be over 35 ft. within 25-50 ft. of the R.O.W.

The Applicant noted they are looking for a waiver. The DRC feels this should be addressed in some massing options to be presented at the next meeting. As designed, the DRC would not recommend approval of a waiver.

4. Overall Scale of the Building

It was thought that the scale of the building may be too large for the site. The scale of the building is challenging in the current location. The DRC is awaiting further massing models and documentation.

5. Building Proportions and Façade Composition

- a. Proportion for Front Façade - See comments on Step-back and street enclosure
- b. Historic Composition of Existing Building - N/A
- c. Rhythm of Solids to Voids on Front Façade - Complies
- d. Vertical Modulation and Articulation - Complies
- e. Horizontal Modulation and Articulation - Efforts were made to comply, the DRC would like to see this carried a bit further and applied to a new massing scheme
- f. Surface Relief and Architectural Features - Appears to comply
- g. Façade Transparency – Appears to Comply

6. Roof Types and Design

- a. Shape and Pitch - Appears to comply with the zoning ordinance guidelines, yet many of the surrounding building are pitched roof and viewed in this context it had to agree the shape and pitch are compatible.

The shape and proportion of the roof shall be visually compatible with the architectural style of the building and those of neighboring buildings.

- b. Parapet Wall - Complies
- c. Roof Materials - Flat roof will comply

7. Exterior Treatments

Efforts were made to blend the design in further with Scituate's other buildings. The DRC will want to discuss in the context of any additional changes.

Materials were briefly discussed but further discussion is requested in future hearing(s) when the general massing is more compliant with the ordinance and design guidelines.

Additional items on the checklist that were not discussed

8. Building Types: Commercial, Multifamily, Mixed Use

9. Building Frontage Zones

10. Building Activation Encroachments

11. Development Site Standards

12. Development Block Standards

13. Site Landscaping

14. Sustainable Site Design Standards - Section 751

The DRC felt that there was insufficient information to give a recommendation to the Planning Board. A second meeting is scheduled for December 14th at 6:30. Additional materials were requested by the DRC, included by not limited to the following:

1. Revised massing and perhaps revised building location to better meet the Zoning Bylaws in Section 750.5 A. 1.
2. Additional renderings to show views from furthest points on the property (on New Driftway and the Rotary) to meet Zoning Bylaws in Section 750.5 A. 2. C.
3. Building sections showing actual depths of structure to ensure height is attainable
4. Spot elevations at the building corners or calculations to determine the ground plane elevation.

END OF MINUTES