

Meeting Minutes
September 11th 2018 – Design Review Board

Attendance: Linda Riley, Laura Gresh, Rue Sherwood, Ken Savoie, Mitch Lowe, Jeff Anderson

6:45 – Bank Gloucester (Architect- Vincent Sorrentino)

Changes all match requests at previous DRB Meeting. Site plan has increased green space due to driveway width change.

Savoie asked if two curb cuts were needed. He suggested low screening on the High Street side parking or a fence along property edge.

Lowe suggested increasing plantings in the wedge next to building inside of the driveway loop.

Lowe moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board based on increased planting and the installation of a fence on High Street frontage and planting the wedge of land adjacent to the northeast side of the building, as well as requesting additional consideration for the second curb cut. Rue seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Proposed Site Development Plans, prepared by MHF Design Consultants, Inc., revised through 8/27/18*
- *Floor Plans & Elevations, prepared by Studio Architecture, revised through 8/14/18*

7:10pm – 15 Market Street (Applicant- Frank Pasciuto)

Revised site plan positively reviewed by Board.

Lowe moved to generally approve of plan reserving pre-building review of planting beds and potential future hardscape changes at 21 and 23 Market Street, as well as future review of final elevation drawings. Sherwood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations, prepared by James S. House, 8/28/18*

7:25 – Essex Pastures (No applicant)

Savoie gave background about what the Board is tasked with reviewing in projects that come before it. He made clear that in this case the Board is advising the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is not a normal practice for the Board.

There was an extensive discussion by the Board members and community about the overwhelming lack of contextual design to this project. In general, the project is too big, too dense, and poorly planned for Ipswich. The Board members decided to submit comments directly to the Planning Office, which will draft a recommendation to present to the Board at the next meeting.

Lowe moved to continue the review in order to allow Planning staff to compile Board member comments and draft a recommendation to the Zoning Board. Sherwood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Site Development Plan, prepared by Bayside Engineering, 5/4/18*
- *Application for Comprehensive Permit, 5/11/18*
- *Floor Plan and Elevations, prepared by MZO Group, 1/11/18*
- *Landscape Plan, prepared by James K Emmanuel Associates, 4/16/18*

8:05 – Pleasant Street (No Applicant)

There was an extensive discussion by the Board and community about the overwhelming lack of contextual design to this project. In general, it is too big, too dense, and poorly planned for Ipswich. The Board members decided to submit comments directly to the Planning Office, which will draft a recommendation to present to the Board at the next meeting.

Lowe moved to continue the review in order to allow Planning staff to compile Board member comments and draft a recommendation to the Zoning Board. Sherwood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Development Plans for Comprehensive Permit Filing, July 2018*
- *Architectural Building Plans and Elevations by Jennifer Sutherby Architect LLC, 7/1/18*
- *Site Plan by Hancock Associates, 7/9/18*
- *Landscape Plan by Jennifer Sutherby Architect, LLC, 7/1/18*

8:45 – Preliminary Review of 83 High Street (Architect- Tom Mayo)

The DRB had multiple comments on all aspects of the project. In general, the Board felt the architect and client were trying to cram too much density into too small of a space on the lot. Clearly the zoning rules dictated the design, not an assessment of what fit with the character and density of the neighborhood. Given this project falls within the Architectural Preservation District, the Board felt the scale of the buildings, the historic re-creation and lack of green space were out of line with the neighborhood and a complete redesign is needed.

Tom Mayo noted that without zoning rule allowance, only eight units could be built in this zone instead of the proposed thirteen.

Community Comments:

Mat Cummings – Cummings Architects

- Buildings out of scale in terms of height with neighborhood
- Not a true little house, back house and barn
- The project needs variation in style (period, massing and configuration)

- Barn looks more like a factory building than barn due to the way it is configured and windows
- Design should focus more on historic character of the original home and a story should be created for the rest of the development

Kathy Hegarty – 82 High Street

- Street view is all building because of barn
- This project will alter the character of the neighborhood
- Sets precedent for major change in how properties abutting the hill can be utilized (radically increased density)
- Does not adequately address parking/traffic
- How will a project like this affect neighboring home values?
- The balconies appear to give views directly onto neighboring properties/homes

Al Boynton – 41 High Street

- Serenity garden is not a community benefit (reiterated by others in attendance)
- APDC compliance is in question (architect noted they had discussed with APDC, but not in a hearing)
- Barn not in character with High Street
- Parking/Traffic density
- This project does not fit with intent of zoning with this much density
- Traffic flow issues, delivery trucks and fire apparatus cannot turn around in area provided
- Historic context is important and not really taken into account with proposed design
- Snow storage?

Linda Banbhan – 61 High Street

- What is the value of a development like this with no consideration for affordable or accessible units, both of which Ipswich lacks?

Ryan McShera – 84 High Street

- Missed opportunity to improve streetscape
- Needs information on materials
- Is the rear of the site even accessible for residents/pedestrians around barn

Bob Hegarty – 82 High Street

- Design looks more like Malden than Ipswich

Documents:

- *Zoning Summary Sheet*
- *Building 3, Section G*
- *Plans prepared by Thomas Mayo Associates, 8/30/18*
 - o *Site Plan; First, Second, Third, Fourth Floors; Elevations*

Minutes approved: October 29, 2018

Minutes prepared by Jeff Anderson and Ethan Parsons