Town of Ipswich Architectural Preservation District Commission
Public Hearing
February 13, 2019
Mary Conley Room - Town Hall

Minutes

Members Present: Chris Morse, Nancy Carlisle, and Will Thompson

Alternate Members Present: Ruth Strachan, Susan Dolan

Staff Present: Ethan Parsons

Others Present: John Colantoni, Hadley Coonley, South Side Green, LLC
                John Dugger, J S Dugger & Associates
                Deirdre Davis, 3 Payne Street, Ipswich, MA
                Laura Gresh, 72 Country Road, Ipswich, MA
                Oleksiy Svitelskiy, #4, 68 County Road, Ipswich, MA
                Scott and Mary Hanna, 3 Poplar Street, Ipswich, MA

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM.

CITIZENS QUERIES: None.

MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING: Ms. Carlisle moved to pass the previous meeting
minutes. Ms. Strachan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING: 64-66 County Road Certificate to Alter for alterations.

REQUEST for Approval of Certificate to Alter for alterations including addition to existing
building and new construction located in the Architectural Preservation District, pursuant to
Section 8, Chapter XXII of the Ipswich General Bylaws.

Mr. Colantoni provided an overview of design changes incorporated as a result of additional
meetings with the Design Review and Planning boards. Revised building elements included three
windows on the west facing façade of unit 3, two gables on the east facing rear of the new
building, and a wraparound first floor pent roof. Mr. Morse recommended two distinct
discussions relative to the existing and new buildings.

On the existing building, Mr. Morse suggested that the four similarly sized operable sash
windows beneath the proposed restored pent roof, shown on a previous elevation (DD A-5) be
incorporated on the west façade, and that metal roof support brackets be used in lieu of wooden
columns. There was consensus on both of these attributes. Mr. Morse inquired as to whether the
garage addition could be moved inward more than 12 inches from the existing south façade. Mr.
Colantonì responded that it could not due to the required turning radius for a car entering the garage.

Ms. Strachan inquired as to whether wood clapboards would be used. Mr. Colantonì responded that Hardie Lap Siding was intended. After back and forth regarding the use and appearance of cement siding as compared to wood clapboards, it was agreed that wood clapboards would be used on the front three sides of the existing building. Salvageable, existing wood clapboards would be maintained wherever possible.

Mr. Morse began the new building discussion by asking whether the mass could be reduced by bringing the dormer inward, adding that there is a lot going on with the front elevation. Mr. Colantonì responded that the design reflected direction from the Design Review Board. He explained that the team would support integrating a gable with dormers, but that the current design intended to improve the view of the east facing elevation. Mr. Morse added that the Greek Revival elements in the rear make sense considering the existing building and surrounding ones.

Mr. Morse inquired as to whether the third-floor window on the south elevation could be offset to stand under the roof ridge. Mr. Colantonì stated that this was possible. Mr. Morse recommended a further reduction in unit square footage to reduce the massing. Mr. Colantonì responded that the number of units and square footage is outside the APDC purview, and that the front west facing shed dormer would not be reduced nor moved in further from the end.

After much discussion regarding the west facing façade, there was consensus to remove the bump outs from the third floor. In addition, one window would be removed from each of the two floors above the south facing garage, and two windows would be removed from the west facing second floor elevation. Even spacing would apply to the remaining four, west facing windows, and the proportions of the third-floor dormer windows would be made longer and narrower.

Mr. Morse inquired as to whether the vertical boards could be replaced by clapboards. Ms. Strachan added that the town is clapboarded, and this building should be as well. Mr. Colantonì responded that Hardie Lap Siding would be incorporated on all levels.

Ms. Strachan asked if the side lights could be removed from the doors in exchange for windows within the door top panels. Mr. Colantonì responded that this could be done. Mr. Morse inquired as to whether the pent roof would be metal. Mr. Colantonì replied that it would incorporate metal roofing and wooden supports. Ms. Carlisle inquired as to whether the garages could be painted one color, to include the false hinges. Mr. Colantonì responded affirmatively to both suggestions. Ms. Dolan expressed appreciation for the disappearance of the barn motif.

Mr. Morse opened the discussion to comments from the neighbors.

Ms. Gresh recommended reducing the structure to two and one half stories, applying metal roofing to the rear portion of the pent roof, and reducing the unit sizes to 1,800 square feet each. Mr. Colantonì responded that metal would not be used in the rear, and that the Planning and Design Review boards recommended the two gables to de-emphasize the rear elevation. Mr. Dugger added that the two-tone color scheme also serves to visually diminish the scale. Mr. Morse recommended consideration of a single tone color scheme.
Mr. Hanna commented that the overall scale of the project remains inappropriate considering the location. Ms. Carlisle responded that it would be difficult to not approve the project based solely on the scale. Mr. Parsons added that the Planning Board determined that the change of use is not more detrimental to the existing building’s present non-conformance, and that the Planning Board did not feel that the project is too big. Mr. Colantoni commented that the team is doing everything it can to satisfy the neighbors and the boards. He added that to keep the project in perspective, the neighboring building is larger than the proposed structure.

Ms. Strachan commented that the neighborhood had filled up over time. Mr. Svitelskiy added that the project does not fit with the local environment, and that this project will lead to other home owners developing similar projects on their properties.

Ms. Carlisle recommended the team consider the points made and return in two weeks. Mr. Colantoni iterated that the team would restore the existing building and that the project had to prove financially viable. The project would result in improved drainage, bylaws would be met without any waivers, and that change was difficult in an area that had remained vacant for such a long period of time. He added that the team did not want to come back and continue talking about the same aspects, and that the process had to move forward. Ms. Strachan replied that specific requests had been made by the APDC that should be taken under consideration.

Ms. Gresh commented that the APDC is charged with maintaining integrity of neighborhoods. Mr. Parsons reminded the board members that what the Planning Board proposes or accepts is irrelevant to the APDC’s decision making process. Mr. Dugger added that there is always confusion when a board is relatively new. Mr. Morse replied that this is the first project to have this level of involvement between the three boards.

Mr. Colantoni stated that in a previous meeting the APDC discussed not making a decision on this project until after the Planning Board had made a decision on its scale, and that now the APDC was failing to vote. Mr. Thompson offered that Mr. Colantoni was dismissing the fact that instead of two iterations of design feedback, his forcing a vote during the two previous meetings could have resulted in the APDC voting against the project.

Discussion ensued around reducing the new building’s scale to two and one half stories. Mr. Morse iterated his recommendation to move the west facing dormer inward from the end elevation. Ms. Carlisle asked whether the east facing rear elevation could also incorporate dormers. Mr. Colantoni responded that the design had been changed several times, and that they would not reduce the size of the units nor lose additional third floor head space. There was disagreement on this subject between the members, Mr. Colantoni and the attending neighbors.

Mr. Morse made a motion to continue the discussion until February 27, 2019. Mr. Thompson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT**: Mr. Morse made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Carlisle seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 21:03.

Minutes prepared by Will Thompson, Secretary