

**Town of Ipswich Architectural Preservation District Commission**

**Public Hearing**

**January 25, 2022**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/>

**Meeting ID: 835 4107 0726**

**Passcode: 306689**

**Minutes**

Members Present: Nancy Carlisle, Joe Bourneuf, Peter Bubriski, and Will Thompson

Alternate Members Present: Susan Hill Dolan

Staff Present: Kristen Grubbs, Ipswich Town Planner

Others Present: Helen and Bill von Oehsen, 48 Turkey Shore Road  
Michele Hunton, 67 Turkey Shore Road  
Alison O’Neill, 52 Turkey Shore Road  
Ross York and Sarka Plihalova, 2 Labor in Vain Road  
John Morin, The Morin-Cameron Group  
Ben Nutter and Michele Karam, Nutter Architects

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM. Mr. Bubriski motioned to appoint Ms. Hill Dolan as a voting member. Mr. Bourneuf seconded. All approved.

**CITIZENS QUERIES:** None.

**MINUTES:** Mr. Thompson stated that he would complete the current and previous meeting minutes ahead of the next meeting.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:** Request by Helen and William von Oehsen for a Certificate to Alter for substantial exterior alterations and an addition to a single-family home, and for demolition of a barn and construction of a new barn containing an accessory residential unit at 48 Turkey Shore Road (Assessor’s ID 42A 005), located in the Architectural Preservation District, pursuant to Chapter 113 of the Ipswich General Bylaw.

Ms. Carlisle began by inquiring as to what changes had been made since the previous meeting.

Mr. Oehsen stated that the team was doing their best to accommodate the feedback received to date. Mr. Nutter began by providing an overview of where the current and proposed addition and accessory dwelling unit would stand in relation to the 100-foot buffer. Shifting to the elevations, Nutter explained that the ell roofline had been lowered below the existing gable roof as requested, and now incorporated a porch roof. The first-floor windows facing the street had been separated and the gable windows removed. On the barn end of the addition, the shed garage had been reduced in length and width, and the shed dormer was reduced in each dimension.

Mr. Oehsen stated that the Conservation Commission had issued a continuance based on the requirement to determine the final footprint of the project first. Mrs. Oehsen added that an alternatives analysis was also requested in terms of the rationale for locating the accessory dwelling unit. The Owners were unaware of any outstanding comments from the Planning Board ahead of the next meeting, scheduled for January 27.

Carlisle continued by reading the pertinent guidelines from the APD Bylaw, focusing on the elements of preservation and protection, as well as architectural compatibility and neighborhood character. She added her appreciation for the design changes and reduced massing to date and stated her continuing concern for the size of the addition footprint.

Bourneuf expressed appreciation for the new ell window arrangement, as well as the new roofline and garage shed. Bubriski agreed, adding appreciation for the removal of the dormer windows. He inquired as to whether material from the existing two-story ell would be reused. Nutter explained that they would have a better idea of what would be salvageable once the project begins. Mrs. Oehsen added that their intent was to reuse as much as possible from the roof and supporting structure in the new space.

Thompson inquired as to the importance of having a door on either side of the shed garage and if the team had considered a salt box roof line. Nutter responded that the doors would provide more ready access from each direction, and that a salt box roofline would not provide enough head room or resolve the scale element.

Mrs. Oehsen commented that the project should be considered from all angles of the streetscape, as perception of mass changes as you pass the property. Nutter showed pictures of other historic properties incorporating connecting ells and large barns. He continued by sharing building coverage ratios from the surrounding properties, which showed that the 48 Turkey Shore projects would leave that ratio below average in comparison.

Ms. O'Neill expressed concern for scale of the project and view to the front of their property and summarized the points of her letter dated January 10.

Mr. York stated his position that the scale is too large for the location.

Ms. Hunton summarized the points of her letter dated January 25. She inquired as to whether some functions of the barn could be provided in the ell section, and whether the garage could be consolidated with the accessory dwelling. Mrs. Oehsen responded that aging in place and accessing vehicles in inclement weather is of great importance, and that the design incorporated garage doors perpendicular to the road so as not to have them facing the streetscape. She added other factors including only a two-foot reduction in the current view of the river between the house and the accessory dwelling, the public park and remaining open space, and that the entire view from the streetscape must be considered – not just the view from Labor in Vain. Mr. Oehsen argued that mass is the criteria, not the view, adding that the team focused on decreasing the mass, not the length along the street or preserving views. Returning to Hunton's first question, Mrs. Oehsen stated that there wouldn't be enough height in the ell to shift a bedroom from the barn section. Nutter reminded the group that the original gambrel stands only 18 feet

tall. Ms. Karam added that the barn incorporates a 7-foot first floor ceiling height and 4-foot-high knee wall on the second.

Carlisle asked for clarification as to the reasoning behind the length of the center ell portion. Nutter replied that it stood above and incorporated the existing stone foundation. He added that decreasing the ell ridge below the gambrel, as had been requested, made it impossible for a second floor to meet code requirements. Carlisle inquired as to the possibility of starting the second floor of the barn closer to the original gambrel.

Hill Dolan returned to the possibility of adding the garage to the accessory dwelling. Mrs. Oehsen replied that the preference was to have the vehicles out of site, and that locating the garage separately would be at odds with how people live today. Bourneuf agreed with the importance of having a connected garage.

Carlisle suggested a shift to the accessory dwelling unit. Mrs. Oehsen provided an overview of the elevations and materials, as well as deck and landscaping. She stated that in addition to the barns in the current footprint, a large barn had formerly stood adjacent to the west side of the gambrel. The new building would incorporate wood garage doors and Anderson 100 series windows. The foundation would incorporate a large door facing the river to accommodate a small boat, storage, etc.

Carlisle inquired as to what the Owners intended for the outcome of the meeting. Mr. Oehsen responded that massing seemed to still be an issue. Carlisle asked members to state their position. Bourneuf commented that he would support the project as presented if the accessory dwelling was omitted from the project. Thompson expressed support for the neighbors in terms of the unity of message pertaining to the scale of the project. Hill Dolan expressed concern for the scale of the addition together with incorporating the accessory dwelling unit. Bubriski applauded the significant design changes made to date, and expressed the dichotomy associated with purchasing a small old home and then seeking to build a new master suite. He added that the existing buildings already block the view, and that overall he supports the project as presented.

Carlisle expressed concern for the creation of new space rather than using the existing space in the gambrel, and inquired as to what functions could be met by the original house. Mrs. Oehsen responded that part of the original building would house the kitchen and office, and that they would live in the old house every day.

Nutter commented that the team would need two weeks to consider any further design changes. Thompson expressed concern for the level of detail expressed for the accessory dwelling unit, considering that if it were a stand-alone project not overshadowed by the main house addition, it would bear greater scrutiny. Mrs. Oehsen provided photos of the finishes on the pre-fabricated building that would house the accessory dwelling unit. Bubriski expressed appreciation for the design. Ms. Grubbs agreed with Thompson and suggested also adding a rendering of the two projects together.

**MOTION TO CONTINUE THE HEARING:** Carlisle moved to continue the 48 Turkey Shore Road hearing until February 8. Bubriski seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**UPDATES AND GENERAL MATTERS NOT FORESEEN WITHIN 48 HOURS:** None.

**NEXT MEETING:** A follow-on meeting was scheduled for February 8, 2022 at 7pm.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Bourneuf moved to adjourn the meeting. Bubriski seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 PM.

Minutes prepared by Will Thompson, Secretary

*Minutes adopted: February 8, 2022*