

TOWN OF SCITUATE
Design Review Committee

Meeting Minutes for: Tuesday, August 8, 2017

Agenda Topics:

- I. Next Meeting Date, and June 13th Meeting Minutes Approval**
- II. Seaside at Scituate Entrance on Hatherly Road**
- III. Nautical Mile Restaurant, 7-9 Marshfield Ave.**

*The meeting was held in the **Scituate Maritime Center** and called to order at **7:10PM.***

In Attendance:

Hal Stokes (DRC Chairman)
John Roman (DRC Secretary)
Laura DeLong (DRC Member)
Laura Harbottle (Acting Town Planner)
Dave Buckley (Toll Brothers)
Jeff DeLisi (Atty. representing Toll Brothers / Atty. representing the abutters to 7-9 Marshfield Ave.)
Stephen Leaman (Nautical Mile II Restaurant Applicant)
Steven Medeiros (7-9 Marshfield Ave. abutter)
Robert Okalowitz (7-9 Marshfield Ave. abutter)

I. First Order of Business:

- A) Establish a date for the next Design Review Committee meeting.*
- B) Approval of DRC Meeting Minutes from June 13, 2017 meeting.*

A) The DRC decided on Tuesday, September 12, 2017 at 7PM for the next Design Review Committee meeting.

B) The minutes for the June 13, 2017 were **not** approved as comments submitted by Laura DeLong had not been added to the DOC.

II. Second Order of Business:

Seaside at Scituate Entrance on Hatherly Road

DRC was tasked with reviewing only a specific topic of treatment of the entrances and the appearance of the streetscape on Hatherly Road per Memo to DRC from Stephen Pritchard, Planning Board dated 8/2/17.

Toll Brothers submitted Landscape Plan, Sheet 3 of 10 dated 4/20/17; Landscape Details, Sheet 6 of 10 dated 4/20/17; and 7 Renderings of the Hatherly Road entrance (untitled and not dated) to the DRC for review and comment. As described by David Buckley (Toll Bros.) with reference to submitted documents, Toll Brothers is proposing the following: Hatherly entrance flanked by a stone retaining wall capped with a white, one-rail plastic fence, stone piers with stone cap, one 8-square-foot *Seaside at Scituate* sign mounted to the left side of the entrance (attached to a curved fence) and constructed of raised black letters on a white background. An unmanned guardhouse at the center of the entrance is proposed to be sided with vinyl shingles with stone veneer at base; Architectural shingles matching condominiums will be used for roofing, topped with a cupola. The guardhouse is planned to give the appearance of a gated community, with non-operating gates placed in a permanent “open” position. The guardhouse will be framed on both the left and right by miniature “lighthouse-replica” columns that will have functioning beacon lights in their caps.

The renderings showed vegetation and plantings at the Hatherly Rd. entrance. Landscaping shown and verbally described indicated ornamental grasses, shrubs, evergreens and deciduous trees located behind wall with annuals in front of wall. Existing utility poles along Hatherly Road and proposed to remain were not shown.

No materials were specified on renderings or architectural details. Toll Brothers was unsure what specific materials would be used for the project.

Design Review Committee Comments and Recommendations:

The Seaside at Scituate project is a significant project for the town and if designed and implemented successfully could be an asset to the town. The Hatherly Road entrance can be seen as a “gateway” between the quaintness of the town and the new development. Throughout town, historic and new stone walls can be found along most streets, many homes and businesses are sided with clapboard and shingled sidings, many businesses display carved wood signs, window boxes, preserved antique homes, and many new homes with colonial style architecture with a nod to past can be found throughout town. The entrance should tie in the architecture of the new development but also reflect the charm and history of the seaside town.

After much discussion during the meeting, the member of the committee felt making design recommendations in a fragmentary manner was not the most beneficial way to examine the design intentions of this applicant. One example, when asked by the committee what building style was planned for the 142 homes in the complex, the applicant answered that a building style had not yet been decided.

Therefore, the committee could not make recommendations or motions toward specific actions the applicant should take since the submitted documents were incomplete. Rather, the committee chose to submit a list of DRC comments (below) for the Planning Board's review and consideration.

- The DRC requests the plans for the *Seaside at Scituate* Hatherly Road entrance be revisited at a later time when the applicant has more information regarding:
 - 1) The building style for the 142 townhomes within the complex (Colonial, Federalist, Shingle-Style, Arts and Crafts, etc.), as well as the 10 single-family homes that will be across the street on Hatherly. Knowing the style of the architecture at *Seaside at Scituate* will significantly influence the entire treatment of the Hatherly Road entrance in terms of the architectural style of the guardhouse, the style of the entrance fence, and the style of lamp post designs.
 - 2) The actual materials to be utilized for the 142 homes (clapboard, shingles, trim, roofing, colors, etc.). Knowing what materials and colors are to be used *inside* the complex will effect decisions for the materials used at the entrance and the guardhouse.
 - 3) Specific landscape and architectural building materials and details must be specified.
- The members were in agreement that the low stone wall, stone piers and stone cap should be as natural as possible and not have the artificial look of veneer stone. While it is not necessary to build an actual stone wall, the final product should have an authentic feel. See attached photos for general idea.
- One member felt the low stone wall might be *too* low and could potentially become obscured by plantings in later years.
- One member felt the scale of the entrance needs to be reviewed to ensure it tastefully represents the project but also blends with neighboring homes.
- All members were in agreement that the use of vinyl siding at the entrance, or on the actual homes, would not be acceptable. The applicant should investigate trim and siding materials that are authentic in appearance.
- Two of the members felt that the little lighthouse replicas at the entrance were "hokey" and diminished the (potential) sophistication of the complex as a whole. It was suggested that a viable alternative would be stone posts with lamp fixtures on top that reflect the architectural style of the site.
- Proposed light fixture cut sheet and lighting design needs to be submitted.
- One member did not agree with the main street-side sign only being fully visible to drivers arriving from the north, and being partially visible to drivers approaching from the south. Having the *Seaside at Scituate* sign mounted on a

curved fence on the left side of the entrance, in effect, turns the sign *away* from drivers arriving from the south. (No suggestions were made as to how to alleviate this.)

- While the members were not opposed to the proposed plastic fence, they were in agreement that more natural-looking alternatives should be explored by the applicant.

III. Third Order of Business: Nautical Mile Restaurant, 7-9 Marshfield Ave.

Stephen Leaman, applicant for the 7-9 Marshfield Ave. *Nautical Mile* restaurant, was unprepared to present his planned alterations to the property. He provided no elevations or site plans and only had a floorplan for the proposed restaurant's interior. He was instructed by the committee to have working drawings prepared to "visually" explain his concepts and intentions for the site. The DRC voted that they could not act on the application, due to insufficient materials for making a decision.

Two abutting residents to 7-9 Marshfield Ave. were present (Stephen Medieros and Robert Okalowicz) and their attorney (Jeff DeLisi). DeLisi noted that the application was incomplete since no proposed plans or elevations were submitted. He cited the following areas to be reviewed and addressed: 1) noise and aesthetics of mechanical equipment 2) improvements to facade of building i.e new siding and clapboard materials, 3) handicap egress 4) gap at base of building and deck and entrance 5) possible addition of stone wall in lieu of wood deck surround, 6) landscaping and 7) lighting. They also voiced concerns regarding Mr. Leaman creating a smoking and drinking deck to the left side of the structure. Possible alternative locations for the proposed smoking and drinking deck were discussed, but no workable solution could be found.

From a "design" standpoint, the committee felt Mr. Leaman's desire to have the restaurant's main entrance on the *front* of the building was not the best location as the front doorway sits underneath a large wooden stairway. It was suggested that perhaps the doorway at the new deck might work better as a main entrance, especially if that entrance was dressed up with a canopy/awning and plantings, etc. The committee also questioned the idea of creating a "smoking" and "drinking" deck and suggested that the new deck **not** being used for those purposes might be a solution to alleviating potential noise issues for abutters. If the deck were only used as an entryway, and not for drinking (drinking allowed only indoors) and not for smoking (create a designated smoking area somewhere on the premises), the site would be more acceptable to abutters.

The committee also discussed that the addition of the restaurant offers an opportunity to provide some landscaping and some improvements to the siding. At

present, the siding does not extend down to the grade level, which leaves a large gap between the ground and the exterior walls.

The committee also recommended a new sign placed above entrance and possibly lit with new light fixtures i.e. gooseneck-style light fixtures.

*The meeting adjourned at **8:20 PM**.*

John Roman
Design Review Committee Secretary
8.9.17

Approved 9-12-17