



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756

historical@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

MAY 18, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

Present: Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Jan Costa, Diana Cebra, Steve Greene, Marjorie Katz

Absent: Taryn Trexler

Others Present: Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Coordinator

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 6:30 PM. Mr. Hagger recognized the Sudbury Historic Commission (SHC) roll call: Cebra-present, Hagger-present, Costa-present, Greene-present, Warren-present, Katz-present

26 Franklin Place under the Demolition Delay Bylaw

Present: Jeff Rochucci, Representative for the Owner

Mr. Hagger noted that a Demolition Delay application had been submitted to the Sudbury Historical Commission (SHC) on May 10, 2021. A site visit to the property was conducted earlier today (May 18) by the Commission, which complied with Section 4 – Item 2 under the Demolition Delay Bylaw. He added that under Section 4 – Item 3, the Commissioners would determine if the structure is historically significant.

Ms. Warren stated that the structure was not historically or architecturally significant, with no known historical Sudbury associations, and therefore not historically significant to be subject to the Demolition Delay Bylaw.

Mr. Greene agreed with the evaluation presented by Ms. Warren.

Mr. Hagger detailed that the structure required determination by SHC under the Demolition Bylaw, Section 3 – Item 2, and he read aloud: “a building located 200 feet from the boundary of any Federal, State, or local historic district,” shall be considered.

Mr. Hagger stated that the structure was not historically significant, noting that the structure was built after 1940.

Ms. Costa agreed that the house was not historically significant, and was not applicable to the Demolition Delay Bylaw.

Ms. Cebra concurred with comments made by the Commissioners, and indicated the structure was not historically significant.

Ms. Katz agreed that the structure had no historical significance.

Mr. Hagger motioned that under the Sudbury Demolition Delay Bylaw, the Sudbury Historical Commission conducted a site inspection of the home located at 26 Franklin Place on May 18, 2021. The Sudbury Historical Commission determined by a vote of 6-0, that the home is not historically significant, and a demolition permit was issued; as Mr. Hagger was so informed by the Sudbury Building Inspector. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Cebra-aye, Hagger-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Mr. Hagger confirmed he would send notice of such determination to the property owner, James Westen; Representative Jeff Rochucci, and to the Sudbury Building Inspector.

Historic Preservation Plan

Ms. Warren stated that the MA Historical Commission (MHC) approved the grant for the Historic Preservation project, and noted that a CPC Article for matching funds would be voted on at the Sudbury Annual Town Meeting on Saturday. She noted that she and Mr. Hagger would be attending orientation session/briefing for the grant on Tuesday, May 24.

Historical Commission Reappointments

Mr. Hagger stated that results of a SHC vote today, would be forwarded to the Select Board and the Town Manager.

Mr. Hagger motioned to reappoint Diana Warren to a three-year term to the Sudbury Historical Commission. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Cebra-aye, Hagger-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Ms. Warren motioned to reappoint Chris Hagger for a three-year term to the Sudbury Historical Commission. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Hagger-aye

Mr. Hagger noted that alternate members would be voted on at the SHC meeting in June. Ms. Warren added that a historical commission can have a number of associate/alternative members (not to exceed the number of seven Commissioners who are members of the SHC), in accordance with MA General Law. Ms. Warren encouraged participation of such associate members, and recognized there is much work to be done on the Commission.

Sudbury Historic Property Survey

Mr. Hagger noted that the communication from Ms. Trexler received today, indicated that the Preservation consultants are developing the surveys on the 100+ Sudbury properties. He noted that those surveys would be submitted to the Commission by the end of July. At that time Commissioners would have to review the surveys and compile comments by August 13. He asked that members volunteer to review the surveys and organize all SHC comments.

Ms. Katz volunteered to help, and suggested a review guideline be provided. Mr. Hagger mentioned typical guideline elements, and stated he would circulate such a list. Ms. Cebra, Ms. Costa and Mr. Greene also agreed to help with the project, along with Mr. Hagger, Ms. Trexler, and Ms. Warren.

24 Church Street under the Demolition Delay Bylaw Hearing

Present: Steve and Beth Garofalo, Owners/Applicants

Mr. Hagger opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Hagger acknowledged that a partial demolition delay application had been submitted to the SHC from the Building Inspector on April 8, 2021. The Commissioners conducted a site visit on April 15, 2021; and on April 20th the Commissioners met and determined that the property has historical significance, and notified the Building Inspector of such determination. Mr. Hagger confirmed that the owners were presenting a demolition plan at tonight's public hearing.

Mr. Garofalo referred to the Demolition plan, which he submitted to the Building inspector on April 7, 2021; detailing the removal of an existing front porch, to be replaced with a new front porch, measuring 33.6 feet x 7 feet. He noted that the existing room and turret above the porch, would be preserved.

Mr. Garofalo detailed that the siding and sheathing at the existing front entry had been removed due to extreme rot, and related work stopped per directive of the Building Inspector on April 7, 2021. On April 8, the Building Inspector submitted an e-mail to Mr. Hagger regarding a building permit for changes to the existing porch.

Mr. Garofalo stated that he and his wife were not aware of the historical status of the home when they purchased the property in October 2020; and knew that the Historic District line went through the house on the south and east sides. The Historic Districts Commission provided several action recommendations, which the applicant completed. Mr. Garofalo acknowledged that because part of the home was within 200 feet of the Historic District, SHC involvement was necessary.

Mr. Garofalo referred to the property plot plan and described all related aspects, including a private right of way. Mr. Garofalo presented proposed renditions of the site, including the addition of a three-car garage.

Mr. Hagger noted that the property had been listed on the State MACRIS (Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System) listing since the 1990s, and was considered a historical home according to the State.

Ms. Warren commented that 24 Church Street was surveyed in 1995 and is listed on the Mass Historical Commission MACRIS database and is one of the most important historic properties in Sudbury because of its historical and architectural significance and deep roots to Sudbury's history. It was built in 1873 by Rufus Hurlbut, elected to the Mass State Legislature, and has been continually owned by the same family for 150 until Natalie Easton's estate sold it to the recent owner. The family is descended from patriots of the American Revolution including Ezekial How, owner of the Wayside Inn, Aaron Haynes and John Nixon. Ms. Warren compared the architectural style and period of 24 Church with the other historic houses on Church Street with porches which are of a later period and a different style – colonial revival. Ms. Warren commented that the front Queen Anne two story enclosed porch with double front door and second story tower were a unique feature in the neighborhood and in Sudbury. She asked if the front door had been saved. Mr. Garofalo confirmed that the front door and balustrade were not saved. Mr. Garofalo presented photos of neighboring homes, with inclusion of similar front porches, wooden rails and entry steps.

Ms. Cebra asked the owners about the original doors which were removed, and queried about the contemporary glass lights on the side, which was not necessarily in keeping with the original character/fabric of the house. Mr. Garofalo responded that the panels with front entry door fit the opening frame.

Neighbor Ed Harlan, 19 Church Street, stated he had no concerns regarding the Garofalo's design plans, and supported the plans for the home.

Neighbor Lori Harlan, 19 Church Street, indicated her approval of the project, and mentioned that the front door was not historically accurate, but the rotting situation required immediate attention.

Neighbor John Muccino, 11 Church Street, stated that the home was in dire need of repair, and supported the Garofalo's plans to preserve and improve the structure.

Mr. Hagger acknowledged a letter from resident Ember Herting, 125 Pelham Island Road, who requested that the SHC advocate for the historic preservation and restoration of the home, especially the "corbeled front porch and the second level tower."

Mr. Garofalo asked if Ms. Herting was a neighbor. Mr. Hagger responded not. Ms. Warren noted that Ms. Herting assisted the former owner, Ms. Eaton.

Mr. Cebra stated that the Sudbury Historic Society of which she and Mr. Greene are trustees of, had studied the life of Natalie Eaton and her contribution to Sudbury. Mr. Cebra detailed that member of the Historic Society helped Ms. Eaton, and Ms. Herting was helpful with providing inventory of items in the house, while Ms. Eaton was alive. Ms. Eaton was very active in the Sudbury Historic Society.

Ms. Hagger described the property as an Italianate Queen Anne as exemplified in the MACRIS photograph, characterized by the front façade; the vestibule with the turret above it. He added that to further change that special feature, would alter the Italianate character of the house. Mr. Hagger asked the owners if they had any flexibility in regard to maintaining the character of the existing building. Mr. Garofalo responded that the house had been changed significantly over the years, and the turret and roofing frame were added.

Mr. Hagger stated that the replacement front door was not in keeping with the character of the house, or its style.

Mr. Garofalo questioned the differences with the SHC mission and the Sudbury Historic Districts Commission mission. Mr. Hagger provided explanation, adding the Demolition Delay Bylaw applied to all buildings built before 1940. He reiterated that this house is half in the Historic District, and falls under both jurisdiction, which is rare.

Mr. Garofalo recommended that with situations such as this, perhaps the SHC and the SHDC could make considerations at the same time, which would help owners. Mr. Hagger agreed with Mr. Garofalo's recommendation.

Ms. Warren reiterated the historical significance of the house. She elaborated on the unique style of the property, indicating that changes to the front porch would not be in keeping with the style of the home. She mentioned that the front façade was the most important element of the historic home. She indicated

that the new door was not historically appropriate for the house particularly the horizontal glass at the top of the door and the side lights as well.

Ms. Warren commented that the maintenance of the property was not relevant to evaluating the historical significance under the bylaw and that appropriate treatment is guided by the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines.

Mr. Hagger mentioned that the owners made some accommodation to the SHDC, and wondered if the owners might consider such accommodation for the SHC. Mr. Garofalo acknowledged there was some flexibility, but he wanted to resolve the situation at tonight's meeting.

Neighbor Trip Lilliston, 28 Church Street, stated that he admires historical homes, but given the disrepair of this property, the owners were vastly improving the site. He asked if the demo delay really controlled what work would be done to a property; and if it does not, it just makes the project for the owner more difficult in terms of lost time and expense. He indicated that he supported the porch plan, and suggested pulling in the porch somewhat. Mr. Hagger responded that enforcement of the demo delay allows the owners time to resolve any differences with the SHC, and meet with the applicant on a monthly basis in order to arrive at a better historical plan.

Ms. Costa stated that she participated in the recent site visit, and thanked the owners for keeping the property from total demise and demolition. She acknowledged the support of several neighbors. Ms. Costa mentioned it would be ideal if the owners would consider working with the Commission on some level.

Mr. Greene asked when the turret might have been added to the house. Ms. Warren stated it was added about a hundred years ago. Mr. Greene said he would reserve his comments, and noted that Ms. Herting was not a neighbor.

Ms. Katz acknowledged the difficulty of this application.

Ms. Warren suggested that the front porch be reconstructed, and a more appropriate front door be installed, such as a double door. Mr. Hagger asked if the glass panels around the front door could be changed. Ms. Costa agreed with a double-door design.

Mr. Garofalo said he would be willing to decrease the length of the porch, a foot at each end, and confirmed that the glass transom over the door could be switched. He stated that the door cost \$4,000.00. Ms. Warren responded that plan renditions should be submitted to the Commission at a next meeting/hearing.

Ms. Cebra felt strongly that the installed front door was inappropriate.

Ms. Costa asked to see another design rendering with the decreased porch, as well as and different door.

Ms. Katz agreed that the door should be changed, in addition to the one-foot alteration on the porch.

Mr. Garofalo agreed with the SHC recommended changes and confirmed that he would replace the existing door with a double door, and decrease the size of the porch, per recommendation of the Commission.

Ms. Warren asked that the final rendering be presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Greene stated that he wanted to see the porch brought in a foot on either side, which necessitates a finalized rendering.

Mr. Hagger motioned to continue the public demolition delay hearing for 24 Church Street to May 25, 2021, at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Warren-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Costa-aye

The applicants agreed to continue the public hearing to May 25, 2021, at 7:30 p.m.

Hosmer House Roof Replacement

Present: Facilities Director Bill Barletta

Mr. Barletta summarized the Hosmer House roofing plans, noting that the new roofing would be replaced in entirety and kind. He noted that over the years, the roof had been replaced in a piecemeal fashion. He confirmed that any other damage associated with the roof structure would be repaired at this time.

Mr. Barletta addressed the project bidding process, and wanted that all assurances be in place before the project begun, including clearing of the attic as much as possible, and covering treasured items

Mr. Hagger recommended that plywood sheathing be installed. Mr. Barletta agreed that such sheathing would be included.

The Commissioners and Mr. Barletta discussed various measures to protect treasured items during construction.

Mr. Hagger read aloud several related questions from Ms. Trexler. Ms. Trexler asked if the new roofing shingles could be upgraded to the Architectural asphalt shingles, which are used at the Town Center buildings. She recommended the 3-tab shingles. Ms. Trexler also asked if there were plans to redo the gutters at the same time, and asked about gutter hangers. Mr. Barletta responded affirmatively.

Ms. Warren expressed concern about the dust that would be generated from the roof construction and recommended that all paintings be covered and removed off the walls.

Mr. Barletta that all runoff from the new roof be directed to proper drainage methods. Mr. Barletta suggested that he and the Commissioners perform a site visit. Ms. Katz and Ms. Cebra volunteered to be the point persons to work with Mr. Barletta.

Hosmer House

Ms. Cebra noted it was difficult securing professional cleaners for the Hosmer House in consideration of insurance coverage. Ms. Cebra presented a “to do” listing:

- Doorknob repairs, insulation around doors, and screen repair
- Floor-board repairs
- Fairy Garden and appropriate plantings
- Purchase of cloth coverings for furnishings
- Garden tools
- Replacement of broken blinds

Ms. Cebra and Ms. Katz stated that they brought several paintings to the restore shop, and an estimate would be provided by end of this week.

Training Field/Haynes Garrison Site/Cemetery Maintenance

Ms. Cebra confirmed that DPW was working on the fencing at the Training Field.

Ms. Cebra spoke of SWEET, and volunteer group that removes invasive bittersweet growth. She mentioned Haynes Garrison site maintenance issues.

Date for Next Meeting (s)

The Board agreed to meet on June 14, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.

Eversource Letter

Ms. Warren noted that Ms. Trexler provided edits to the Eversource letter to the Army Corps of Engineers, which was discussed at last night's meeting. Ms. Warren reviewed all edits and comments suggested by Ms. Trexler.

Mr. Hagger addressed edits and points made by Ms. Spies.

After the Commissioners read points addressed by Ms. Spies, Mr. Hagger provided his edits.

In the edit process, Commissioners agreed that SHC signing of the MOA required more than the saving of Bridge 127; it also stressed the 66 total artifacts identified by Ms. Spies.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the letter to USACE, which will be finalized by Ms. Warren and Ms. Spies, the Historic Preservation Consultant, including Commissioner comments from last night's meeting and tonight's meeting. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Hagger-aye, Costa-aye,

Ms. Warren asserted it would be a mistake to not include additional language regarding the content and intention of the Advisory Council's letter, which suggests pathway for SHC to advance preservation of the identified artifacts. Ms. Katz expressed confusion about this aspect, and sought a clearer understanding since she was absent from last night's meeting.

Mr. Hagger withdrew his motion.

Ms. Warren explained to Ms. Katz that the Commission debate involved inclusion of the question about MA DCR having "standing" as party of Section 106, or not. She stressed that the Advisory Council letter indicated this aspect. Ms. Warren further stressed that such consideration prompted the inclusion of the amended section: "The Sudbury Historic Commission will sign an MOA based on Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800). The Commissioners agreed to change the language of this heading by substituting "will sign," with "intends to sign."

Ms. Warren stated that she proposed inclusion of DCR standing in the letter to the Advisory Council by adding such language, but other Commissioners chose not to add such language. She maintained that this DCR related issue was an important element to be added to the letter.

Ms. Warren explained to Ms. Katz that the other debate last night involved the letter from the USACE, requesting that the SHC review the MOA and provide comments on the MOA. She emphasized that her proposed language additions sought to satisfy and strengthen that request, and included the erroneous statements made by USACE.

Ms. Katz asked Ms. Warren if her proposed language was denied by the Commissioners. Ms. Warren responded in the affirmative. Mr. Hagger indicated that rehashing last night's comments would be a waste of time, and the Commissioners voted on this aspect last night. Ms. Cebra indicated that she wanted to continue last night's discussion to better understand why that proposed language was omitted from the draft letter.

Mr. Hagger maintained that much of the language proposed by Ms. Warren was not under the purview of the SHC, and detracted from the overall message. The Commissioners agreed that a brief statement would be preferred. Ms. Warren suggested language indicating that the SHC fully agreed with comments and opinion made by the Advisory Council, which was included in their letter to SHC dated April 3, 2021.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the letter to the USACE as discussed, including the changes incorporated by Taryn Trexler, and changes made in today's meeting, which includes the comment regarding Advisory Council comments/opinion. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Hagger-aye, Costa-aye, Cebra-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye

Ms. Warren stated that she voted in the affirmative, with reservation.

Historical Commission Finance Reports

Ms. Warren stated that the Town funded the first two contracts for Ms. Spies.

Related discussion took place.

Ms. Warren motioned that SHC approve \$500.00 for 6.6 hours of consulting services provided by Stacy Spies to continue the services associated with Section 106 Review. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Costa-aye, Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye

Ms. Warren motioned that SHC approve up to \$750.00 for 10 hours of consulting services provided by Stacy Spies, regarding Section 106 and related letters. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. The vote was 4-2; Hagger-no, Greene-no, Costa-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Mr. Hagger stated he would prefer to receive account balance confirmation before voting on this matter.

The Commissioners discussed municipal and Hosmer Fund aspects. The Commission consensus advocated for the SHC to take official votes on all municipal account allocations, and to also vote on Hosmer House allocations officially in amounts over \$100.00.

Adjourn

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 6-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:05 p.m.