

TOWN OF SCITUATE
Design Review Committee

Meeting Minutes for: Tuesday, June 7, 2016

Topics:

- **Update on Revisions to the Completed Harbor Medical Sign**
- **Second Design and Site-Plan Review of 93-97 First Parish Road**

*The meeting was held in the **Planning Board Office** and called to order at **7:01PM**.*

In Attendance:

Hal Stokes (DRC Chairman)
John Roman (DRC Secretary)
Laura DeLong (DRC Member)
Robert Vogel (Planning Board & Bldg. Dept.)
Laura Harbottle (Town Planner)
John Barry (representing JMGH Family Trust)
Jennifer Kuhn (neighbor on Carrie Litchfield Ln.)

First Order of Business:

- A) Establish a date for the next Design Review Committee meeting.*
- B) Approval of DRC September 8, 2015 Meeting Minutes.*

A) The DRC members decided on Tuesday, July 14th at 7PM for the next Design Review Committee meeting.

B) The minutes for the May 10, 2016 meeting were approved.

Second Order of Business:

Discussion of Completed Harbor Medical Sign

The new sign at Harbor Medical Building on The Driftway has been completed and is currently standing. This sign went through the approval process of the Design Review Committee in 2015, however, two members of the Planning Board in separate e-mails over the past few weeks mentioned that the completed sign does not look like it conforms to the design the DRC approved. Specifically, the lettering

at the top of the tenant sign appears to be touching the top of the panel and is throwing off the aesthetic balance.

Committee member John Roman met with Steve Wyman at the Harbor Medical Building (sign) on May 18th to explain the issue and to discuss possible solutions. Mr. Wyman was in agreement with the sign's design flaws and planned to bring them before his sign-maker. He stated that the DRC would be kept abreast of his proceedings with the sign-maker.

Third Order of Business:

Second Design and Site-Plan Review 93-97 First Parish Road

John Barry, the representative for the JMGH Family Trust who is building the new structure at 93-97 First Parish Road, submitted new plans drawn as per suggestions given by the committee at the first design review for this project on May 10th. Mr. Barry addressed all concerns made at that meeting and adopted all design suggestions made by the committee and the abutters.

Abutters to 93-97 First Parish Road who were not able to attend the meeting sent e-mailed concerns and issues to be considered by the committee. The e-mails were read aloud by the Design Review Committee members and addressed after they were read.

Those e-mails are included below:

Pamela & Lionel Peter Giovannin 9 Stockbridge Road

This project is of great concern to us and the effects on our neighborhood. Although not an abutter, we will be affected by among other things, drainage issues, appearance of the property, and increases in traffic (with a strong worry about condo residents backing up a slope onto busy First Parish Road). I'm sure there will be many more concerns which we share that will be brought up at this meeting. My hope is that the committee members will consider all the ramifications of this project and its size.

Rich Bowen Stockbridge Road

1) The plans show a dumpster. The current dumpster has been the source of windblown litter for a number of years. Of course, most of this predates Mr. Barry's ownership. However, since the property is proposed as a condominium development rather than its current rental use, the dumpster is unnecessary. The owner-occupants

can make their own disposal arrangements just as the rest of us do: transfer station sticker and a weekend trip to the transfer station. Therefore, I request that the dumpster be eliminated, which will also eliminate the litter problem.

I have communicated my request to Mr. Barry.

2) The plans show that the building will be moved significantly closer to my property line as compared to its current location. Since this will have an impact on my privacy, and since the intensity of the proposed use is greater than that prevailing in the neighborhood, I request that the applicant put up a fence and vegetative border along the property line.

I have communicated this request to Mr. Barry, and he told me that he would have no objection.

3) The plans do not show the placement of any outdoor lighting which may accompany the new building. The current building does not have any lighting that projects on to my property (or on to the neighbors' properties so far as I have observed.) I would appreciate it if the Committee could preserve the relatively calm lighting that prevails in the side and rear parts of the properties in this part of the neighborhood. This is of particular concern to me, since the proposed building would move closer to my property.

4) The plans do not show provision for drainage extending fully along the applicant's property's border with 99 First Parish Road. While this would not necessarily appear on a plan for design review, the Committee should be aware that Mr. Barry has migrating down hill should not be blocked by any construction and filling on his property.

***Zarla Ludin and Ben Bornstein
99 First Parish Rd.***

1. Scale and size of the building. The proposed increase in size of each unit is essentially creating a structure that is disproportionate to the size of the lot and the other nearby homes in the neighborhood. The proposed size is very large for the lot, leaving an imposing look and feel from the street and especially from our home. We are concerned with having to look at the back of a large condo building instead of the current yard, greenery, and side of the home. We absolutely feel that the large increase in square footage and aspects of the site plan (parking, etc.) is intensifying the non-conforming use (multi-family in an residential R-3 zone with 10,000 sq. ft. lot size) of the property.

2. Privacy issues. Although Mr. Barry mentioned the incorporation of landscape features that could create natural screens between the properties, the overall intent is to sell each unit. It is possible that each owner will be able to modify their property as

desired, which can include cutting down shrubbery, adding decks or patios that would decrease the distance between their living space and our property line, and other decisions that an owner will have the right to have. The building is large and there will be 5-family's worth of windows looking onto our property.

3. Lighting, noise, and other incidental impact of the reoriented structure. Facing the back of the property, we are concerned with outdoor lighting, automated lights, and lights from various windows of the five-family structure. We are also concerned with where AC units, trash barrels, and other non-structure property will be placed in such tight quarters. AC units are loud, and trash barrels attract pests.

4. Water drainage and landscaping issues. We have raised this issue before and it does not seem to be addressed in the elevation or plans, but there is a lot of water running between our properties. We are concerned that during construction and thereafter that our property will be negatively impacted. We would also like to see the proposed landscape plans for the area between our two properties and the overall site.

5. No rear elevation provided. We do not see any image in the files provided of the back of the proposed building. There was significant conversation at the last design review meeting about the back specifically. We would like to see an updated back elevation with the design comments considered.

We could honestly go on and on. Overall, we feel that this building in our neighborhood in this lot much like trying to fit a square peg in a round hole... it doesn't fit. This is a large building on a small lot, period. While important, we feel that design tweaks to the look and feel of the structure and site plan are overshadowed by our concerns regarding building size and zoning/land use which still need to be addressed.

Thanks so much, and we look forward to being present at the upcoming ZBA meeting. Again, both Ben and I have made it a point to be present at these meetings as we feel we are the property MOST impacted by this structure.

A neighbor (Jennifer Kuhn) who **owns** a home on Carrie Litchfield Lane complained that the scale of the new building still was not in keeping with the neighborhood and once again suggested (as she suggested during the May 10th meeting) that a building should be constructed to replicate the size and style of the existing structure.

John Barry expressed a sensitivity to all the issues raised by the abutters and he assured that he would address all issues as best as possible in his succeeding design solutions.

Design Review Committee Comments:

The Design Review Committee members were pleased with the new design plans submitted by John Barry, yet, in light of the comments by neighbors to the property, felt that perhaps a totally new approach was necessary for the structure and the site's arrangement. Various solutions were discussed by all in attendance, with one approach potentially holding the key to the inherent problems.

It was suggested that possibly a replica of a historic "farmhouse" building could contain the five units Mr. Barry is seeking for the project and retain the historic character of the area. This might include a main house (2 units), with an attached connector (1 unit), and a barn (2 units). Garages for the five units would not be attached, rather they would be housed in a separate carriage-house-style building. This idea was well-received by Mr. Barry who stated that he would provide rough sketches for such a design (and possibly alternatives) at the next DRC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:06PM.

John Roman
Design Review Committee Secretary
6.14.16