

Town of Ipswich Architectural Preservation District Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 3, 2019 at 7:00 PM
Meeting Room C - Town Hall

Members Present: Nancy Carlisle, Peter Bubriski, John Fiske and Will Thompson

Alternate Members Present: Ruth Strachan and Susan Hill Dolan

Others Present: Michael Becker, Principal, Clink LLC
Thomas Mayo, Architect, Thomas Mayo Associates
Larry Graham, Engineer, H.L. Graham Associates
Anne Wright, 100 High Street, Ipswich, MA
Richard Kallman, 9 Ocean Drive, Ipswich, MA
Daniel Cullen, 79 High Street, Ipswich, MA
John Page, 90 High Street, Ipswich, MA

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

CITIZEN QUERIES: None.

ELECTION OF CHAIR: Carlisle expressed her willingness to serve as Chair and opened the floor for discussion. There was general support for Carlisle's appointment. Strachan moved to elect Carlisle as Chair. Bubriski seconded. The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTING MEMBERS: Carlisle appointed alternates Strachan and Hill-Dolan as voting members for the 83 High matter.

PUBLIC HEARING: 83 High Street request for Certificate to Alter for the renovation of an existing structure and construction of three new structures.

REQUEST for Approval of Certificate to Alter for alterations including renovation of an existing structure, demolition of a structure and construction of three new structures located in the Architectural Preservation District, pursuant to Section 8, Chapter XXII of the Ipswich General Bylaws.

Mike Becker provided an overview of his development experience in Salem and provided members with a copy of a letter from the City of Salem Historical Commission. Tom Mayo, Becker's architect, provided an overview of the lot layout and calculations allowing for a 13-unit development. He then walked through the proposed 8-unit development drawings, which include the restoration of the Kimball house, the addition of a new house to the east with frontage on High Street, and an adjoined third house and barn toward the rear of the development footprint. Becker added that no variances would be required for the project and that the design had passed the Design Review Board.

John Page, 90 High Street, inquired whether any engineering related studies or models had been considered for the Kimball house regarding vibrations from trucking. Mayo responded that the foundation is in good shape. Page recommended the team make allowances for such considerations as trucking sometimes sets off alarms at their home immediately across the street.

Carlisle recommended that the development team continue providing the project overview. Mayo introduced civil engineer, Larry Graham. There were general comments from the Commission that site civil considerations were beyond the APDC purview and no questions were forthcoming.

Mayo continued describing the project, showing the density and scale of buildings as compared to the surrounding neighborhood structures. He showed photos of the existing site conditions and explained that the 1930's era barn would be demolished. He stated that the new structure on High Street would be set back five feet from the existing homes on either side.

Mayo explained the proposed elevations from the front to the rear of the property. Strachan inquired as to the elevation change from the street to the barn. After some discussion, it was estimated that the elevation difference from the street to the back of the barn at grade would be approximately 16 feet.

Mayo explained that cedar fence would be incorporated on the sides of the property and then summarized the intended paint scheme based on existing colors found in the neighborhood. Fiske responded that the project was copying the wrong paint colors, and encouraged the team to consider colors appropriate for a unique historical district rather than copying bad examples. He recommended the team review the first and second period colors posted on the Ipswich Historical Commission and APDC web pages. Carlisle commented that the APDC has no authority over colors, and opened the discussion for comments from neighbors.

John Page, 90 High Street, inquired as to how delivery trucks would negotiate the curving driveway and parking areas. Mayo responded that the Ipswich Fire Department requested 20-foot wide access whereas the Planning Board preferred a 16-foot roadway. Page commented that he appreciated the layout of the buildings, adding that preservation on the opposite side of the street requires saving the structures from truck vibrations and collisions. Bubriski commented that there are plans underway to increase curbing in the area to slow and redirect traffic flow.

Becker commented that *Secretary of the Interior Guidelines* would be incorporated in the Kimball House restoration. Fiske responded that the guidelines do not reflect historical New England building practices and attributes. Mayo added that Gordon Harris had been helping the team. Carlisle inquired as to whether the Greek Revival details including the front doorway would be retained. Mayo responded affirmatively.

Daniel Cullen, 79 High Street, commented that he is enthusiastic about saving Ipswich's unique structures, but that this proposal represents an assault on the historic district and history of the area. He added that this review is about historic and architectural preservation, and that forcing eight units into the property is not preservation. Carlisle responded that Cullen offered a fair

reflection, and inquired as to what level of development would be favorable. Cullen responded that eight units would be too many, and that preserving the look of the neighborhood should be of primary importance.

Anne Wright, 100 High Street, inquired as to whether this project opens the door for other similarly sized lots to be developed in a similar fashion. Mayo responded that the lot has twice as much frontage as the neighboring lots, and that the rear area is zoned rural and is thereby limited to only one unit.

Fiske commented that he is deeply concerned with the historical integrity of Ipswich. He continued by providing a brief history of the initial town lot arrangements dating back to 1635, explaining that Ipswich's intact original lot lines and 17th century streetscapes are absolutely unique in the United States. He added that the agricultural barn structure *in town* is incongruous as that activity likely never occurred on the property. Fiske concluded by stating that even with the goodwill gestures associated with the design and development, he would not know how to support this project.

Bubriski expressed his appreciation for the sensitive presentation and level of detail, adding that he is also conflicted considering the Kimball house restoration. John Page commented that he appreciates the design, but believes it would negatively impact the traffic flow. Carlisle stated that enough ground had been covered regarding traffic, and recommended that the team come back with a smaller project. Becker iterated that the lot has twice as much frontage of the other neighboring lots and that ample consideration should be made for that.

Strachan expressed appreciation for the placement of the two new house structures, but took exception with the incorporation of seven garage doors where historically none would have existed. Thompson commented that perhaps the parking could be consolidated in one area, out of view from the street. He suggested that space in the two new house units could be made available due to the parking not being incorporated within the units. Becker responded that the garages were largely out of view from the street.

Fiske inquired as to why a barn was proposed rather than another residential structure. Carlisle responded that there could at some point have been some sort of outbuilding.

Rich Kallman, 9 Ocean Drive, expressed his appreciation for the discussion and process being conducted between the developers and APDC members.

Carlisle proposed a site walk. Strachan commented that the development incorporated too many units. Thompson expressed agreement with reducing the number of units, and that in consideration of the members' comments, removal of the barn offered the best option. Becker responded that the landscaping will naturally screen the barn. Kallman inquired as to how much of the property would not be developed. Becker stated 60%.

Carlisle expressed her appreciation to the team, adding that the development still represented too much density in a very visible space. She suggested that the project team take the members' comments under consideration. Mayo inquired as to how much the development would need to

be reduced. Carlisle stated that would be up to the team to consider. Becker commented that the team had spent a lot of money already. Thompson responded that town board reviews and drawing iterations were part of the development process, and that the members are reminded of said costs regularly.

A site visit was established for April 6th, at 9:00 AM.

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE HEARING: Carlisle moved to continue the hearing. Strachan seconded. The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

Documents: Prepared by Thomas Mayo Associates, 2/4/19: Sheet A-1 Site Plan/First Floor Plan; Sheets A-2 & A-3 Elevations.

MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING: Bubriski moved to accept the March 20, 2019 meeting minutes. Strachan seconded. The vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

Documents: Draft minutes of March 20, 2019 meeting

ADJOURNMENT: Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Bubriski seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 PM.

Minutes prepared by Will Thompson, Secretary

Minutes adopted: June 20, 2019