

Town of Ipswich Architectural Preservation District Commission  
Public Hearing  
March 15, 2021  
Zoom Meeting ID: 862 3515 8366 - Remote

Minutes

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

Alternate Members Present: Susan Hill Dolan and Joe Bourneuf

Staff Present: Ethan Parsons, Director of Planning & Development  
Carolyn Britt, Planning Board

Others Present: Sarah Winderlin, 87 High Street, Ipswich  
Roger Leblanc, 14 Mill Road, Ipswich  
Ken Savoie, Savoie Nolan Architects  
Stephen Miles, 58 North Main Street  
Lee Hathaway, 6 Meetinghouse Green, Ipswich  
Daniel Cullen, 73 High Street, Ipswich  
Gordon Harris, 17 Mill Road, Ipswich  
Linda Grimes, 27 Green Street, Ipswich

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

**CITIZENS QUERIES:** None.

**MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING:** Ms. Carlisle designated Ms. Hill Dolan as a voting member for purposes of approving the previous minutes, and requested a motion to adopt them. Hill Dolan moved to accept the February 8, 2021 meeting minutes and Mr. Bubriski seconded. The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

*Documents: Draft minutes of February 8, 2021 meeting*

**PUBLIC HEARING: 87 High St Certificate to Alter.** Review of application by Sarah L. Winderlin for a Certificate to Alter for a multifamily residential development which includes a new four-unit structure and an accessory dwelling rebuild at 87 High Street (Assessor's ID 30D 012), located in the Architectural Preservation District, pursuant to Chapter 113 of the Ipswich General Bylaw.

Ms. Winderlin provided history of 1830 cape and converted 1940's era barn, including intent to tear down barn and replace with 15% larger structure. Also on site is a 2009 storage shed which was converted to a studio workshop in 2013. No changes will be made to the 1830 cape. The 1950 accessory dwelling will become a single-family unit, and the studio workshop will become a four-unit barn, with each unit comprising approximately 1,100 SF – one of which will be

handicap accessible. Winderlin then provided overview of the RRA and IR zoned sections of the lot along with photos of existing conditions.

Mr. Savoie continued by providing an overview of the elevations, unit locations and materials. The barn would incorporate stone, cedar clapboards and cedar shingles, simulated two over two divided lights, inoperable sliding carriage doors, and asphalt roof shingles.

Winderlin added that most on-site parking would be exterior, which had been arranged in locations and with landscaping to obscure vehicles from view. Savoie added that the proposed barn scale was in keeping with those on surrounding properties.

Ms. Carlisle requested that Winderlin review the intent of her previously approved APDC application. Winderlin showed drawings dated 1/14/2019 as compared to the newly proposed accessory dwelling.

Winderlin then explained site grading to accommodate a garage under the accessory unit, which would allow for improved stormwater management and a 30% decrease in runoff from current conditions.

Hill Dolan asked if this constituted a new project. After some discussion, Mr. Parsons explained that the certificate to alter under consideration would apply to both buildings.

Ms. Britt proposed that the APDC should consider renewable energy system placement as part of its project reviews. Winderlin responded by detailing the energy efficiency factors under consideration.

Mr. Miles discussed the importance of the High Street streetscape and inquired as to the reasoning behind doubling the number of units on the property. Winderlin responded that she is a proponent of in-town density due to the walking proximity of downtown businesses and the commuter rail. Savoie added that density may have been even greater 100 years ago given the past footprint of buildings on the lot. Carlisle contended that increasing from three to seven units while doubling the cars represented a significant change to this location. Savoie argued that the lot would not be overwhelmed by the building additions due to the large (RRA) portion of the lot remaining unutilized. The total lot size was explained as 18,000 SF IR and 33,000 SF RRA. Carlisle responded that the density increase remains in front of the property and will be visible from the streetscape.

Mr. Harris inquired as to the square footage of the cape, to which Ms. Winderlin responded 2,000 SF. Harris commented that with 30 First Period houses on High Street, care should be taken as to what is added to the streetscape. He argued that cars would still be visible, that the original long narrow lots allowed for gardening and accessory buildings, and that the proposed barn doesn't look like an Ipswich barn.

Savoie responded as understanding they were being asked to mimic older buildings, but that the area isn't frozen in time. He continued by resharing the rendering looking up the driveway and expressed frustration with the design review process. Bubriski commented that he supports

increasing in-town density and is impressed with the re-design. Mr. Leblanc added that the other board reviews remain open. Ms. Grimes expressed appreciation for the design if it were set in a different location, and agreed that the barn does not appear to belong on High Street.

Leblanc provided an overview of lead paint removal from the 1830 cape.

Miles inquired as to how many units could be built without a special permit. Parsons replied that converting accessory buildings into single or multi-family dwellings require a special permit, the max allowable here would be seven.

Carlisle continued stating that there would not be a vote on the project until after the next Planning Board review.

Mr. Bourneuf commented on the small square windows and use of vertical boards. Carlisle requested that design considerations be tabled for a subsequent meeting. Hill Dolan requested that an elevation rendering from a different perspective be provided with the next design. Savoie suggested that the PB would address site issues rather than design. Carlisle responded that scale could still change given other board reviews. Winderlin repeated her intent to provide affordable housing and that four units made that more feasible.

**MOTION TO CONTINUE THE HEARING:** Bubriski made a motion to continue the hearing until April 5<sup>th</sup>, and Hill Dolan seconded. The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Bylaw Updates.** There was general discussion around issues of density, specifically with pursuing some manner of a square footage building limit or applying a floor area ratio. Other ideas included increasing public relations, and advocating that other neighborhoods pursue addition to the existing APD. Parsons commented that significant tension exists between leveraging increased in-town density to relieve the current housing crisis, and preserving current conditions. He added that the relevant chairs should continue discussing these issues and work toward bringing an agenda item to the Fall Town Meeting.

Carlisle inquired as to how best to tackle projects not requiring review, such as windows, considering their significant permitting volume and great visual impact. Parsons suggested developing educational materials and hosting workshops.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting was scheduled for April 5, 2021.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Bubriski seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.