



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

historical@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756
www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

MAY 25, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

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

Others Present: Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Coordinator

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 6:32 PM. Mr. Hagger recognized the Sudbury Historic Commission (SHC) roll call: Trexler-present, Hagger-present, Cebra-present, Costa-present, Greene-present, Warren-present, Katz-present

24 Church Street under the Demolition Delay Bylaw Hearing

Present: Steve and Beth Garofalo, Owners/Applicants

Mr. Hagger opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hagger summarized the status of the application, noting that the applicant's appeared before the Commission on May 18, 2021, and agreed to present requested information which has been distributed to the Commissioners. The submitted materials included: a revised front facade design rendition, and possible front door options.

Mr. Garofalo detailed the revised plan, which included the front porch being reduced by 18" at each side; a set of double doors, which look more-like the original doors.

Mr. Hagger stated that the revised schematic displayed more balance related to the front porch. Mr. Garofalo agreed.

Mr. Garofalo presented nine separate front-entry door schematics with specifications. Commissioners inquired about various door styles as presented.

Mr. Garofalo emphasized that the door #1 option was most like the original entry door.

Mr. Greene favored the door #1 option, and indicated it was the closest to the original style.

Ms. Trexler preferred door #1, and felt it was the most appropriate door. She stated she was fine with door #2 as well.

Ms. Cebra asked if there was a historical entry door website, which might include hardware options. She indicated that the first door looked most authentic.

Ms. Warren stated that door #1 was most appropriate. She stated that the hardware would be an important aspect, and recommended a round-knob and plate-door hardware period correct style. She asked if the applicant would be willing to come back and show the selected door hardware.

Ms. Katz agreed that door #1 was the best option, and stated that she could accept Door #2 in consideration of the lesser expensive.

Ms. Costa thanked the applicant for his preparation, and stated that door #1 was the best choice.

Mr. Hagger supported the door #1 option, and suggested specific door hardware be included in the motion.

Mr. Garofalo confirmed that the thickness of the door was thick at almost 2 inches. He explained that one of the doors would have the lock hardware on it.

Commissioners recommend a brass doorknob. Mr. Garofalo agreed. Mr. Garofalo stated the manufacturing brand of the door was a Vintage door.

Ms. Cebra asked about the height of the door. Mr. Garofalo said 30" by 7 feet.

Ms. Warren asked about transfer of doors. Mr. Garofalo said the existing door will be moved in its integrity.

Mr. Hagger motioned to close the public hearing for 24 Church Street under the Demolition Delay Bylaw. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The voted was unanimous 7-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Trexler-aye

Ms. Warren expressed her appreciation regarding various door options as presented to the Commission by the developer. She appreciated the quality and styling of the first Mahogany door as well.

Ms. Warren provided a brief historical narrative regarding the home and its style, stressing the importance of the Queen Anne period front façade with the projecting enclosed porch and tower. She noted that this style was unique in Sudbury (Queen Anne front facade feature of the Italianate house) and no other home on the street could be used as a comparison. Ms. Warren detailed that the Italianate style period ran from the 1840s through the 1880s, and the Queen Anne style went from 1880 through 1910. She added that other home styles on the street reflected the Colonial Revival architecture which was popular from 1910 to 1930.

Ms. Warren stated that the home is rich in its connection to Sudbury's history and the family's connection to some of the original families in the Town; the Haynes, the Howes, Dakins, etc. She further detailed the merit of restoring and preserving such structures such as this house because it has special historical importancet. Ms. Warren read Section 4 (5) of the Demolition Delay Bylaw which states, "the Commission shall determine that a structure should be preferably preserved only if it finds that the building is historically significant which because of the importance made by such structure to the town's historical and/or architectural resources, it is in the public interest to preserve, rehabilitate or restore. The proposed porch design does not preserve, rehabilitate or restore the historical structure and therefore it would be detrimental to the historical and architectural heritage of the town and should be considered preferably preserved. Ms. Warren stated that she would vote that this structure be preferably preserved

because of the house's historical and architectural importance, and if a motion is made to approve the proposed porch as designed, she would have to vote no to comply with Demolition Delay Bylaw.

Mr. Greene read the historic properties survey dated 1996, and the photograph included on the survey did not show an enclosed porch, but did show an open porch. Mr. Hagger explained that such depiction was somewhat of a visual illusion. Ms. Warren provided example of that inclusion.

Ms. Costa affirmed that she had more of a pragmatic position, and indicated that productive discussions in good faith took place with the applicant, with the applicant having made the changes or proposed options as requested from the previous SHC meeting discussions.

Ms. Trexler agreed with the comments made by Ms. Costa.

Mr. Hagger stated that this is a unique situation, and the Historic District Commission has allowed the side porch, and neighbors expressed their support of the proposed porch at last week's hearing. He noted that the applicant had flexibility with the new door and did not want a delay situation to take place.

Ms. Cebra indicated her support with the applicant's proposal for a new double door, and knowing Ms. Eaton, the last family owner, advanced her appreciation for the property did not agree with the proposed porch and because it did not seem appropriate with the historic style of the house.

Mr. Hagger confirmed that the SHC held a hearing on May 18, 2021, and continued the public hearing to May 25, 2021, to review the demolition plan submitted by the applicants/owners for the historic property at 24 Church Street. The SHC determined at the May 25, 2021 hearing that the plan presented to the Commission with additional material at the May 25, 2021 hearing, with the following changes agreed to by the applicant: the front porch extending to 18" away from each corner of the front west side of the house; the installation of Vintage doors by Yesteryears, DB105 Clear Beveled glass double-entry unit – African Mahogany door; and the third change would be the use of knob-type hardware with a Satin Brass plate on one door, which would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural heritages or resources of the Town; therefore the structure need not be considered preferably preserved, and a Building Permit may be issued by the Building Inspector. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was 5-2; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-no, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-no.

Mr. Hagger confirmed he would convey tonight's motion to the Building Inspector and would copy the Garofalo's' on it, as well as Mr. Duchesneau. Mr. Hagger asked Mr. Garofalo to present the hardware at the June 14th meeting, if he wished to.

Eversource Transmission Line Project - Eversource Letter

Ms. Warren confirmed that the SHC letter was sent to the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the MA Historical Commission (MHC) was cc'd on that letter. She stated that the letter was sent UPS overnight as well as by e-mail to the MHC.

Mr. Hagger stated that a SHC response to the Mass DCR (Department of Conservation and Recreation) should be that all the identified railroad features/assets should be preserved.

Ms. Costa mentioned a binary approach was used in the initial draft documents for the DCR rail trail project: retain or document – to retain various assets visibly on the trail (4 mileposts, 4 whistle stops, 3

signal relay boxes, etc.) She noted that the SHC did not address inclusion of signage on all of the features, and such signage on all features is important. Ms. Costa continued with the process description.

Mr. Greene noted there was no signage agreement in place with DCR at this time. Ms. Warren mentioned that the signage size and associated narrative needs to be addressed by the Commissioners. Ms. Warren stated the most important aspect is that all 66 features are retained and kept in place exactly where they are now.

Ms. Trexler noted that DCR is already moving forward on certain areas that the Commission has not addressed. She emphasized that SHC should go forward with the official plan for preservation of all the features.

Hosmer House

Mr. Hagger stated that he spoke with Town Manager Hayes and the Town Manager requested a tour of the Hosmer House. Mr. Hagger relayed to Town Manager Hayes that he and Ms. Cebra would provide the tour in June. Town Manager Hayes indicated that the Town might consider various cleaning options for the Hosmer House after the roofing project is completed.

Ms. Cebra stated that she had previously invited Assistant Town Manager Bilodeau to participate in such a tour of the Hosmer House, as well.

Ms. Cebra stated that he reached out to members of the Parsonage and received an informative link regarding various options for blinds. She estimated that the cost might be \$60.00 per window.

Ms. Warren suggested that when the tour is provided to the Town Manager and Assistant Town Manager, Mr. Hagger and Ms. Cebra explain the historical significance of the Hosmer House in light of the Town's history.

Mr. Hagger suggested that an art restoration specialist associated with Historic New England, might consider viewing the artwork at the Hosmer House by Florence Hosmer.

Ms. Costa added there was a refund check from Sturdy Home Improvement. Mr. Hagger recommended the check be submitted to Mr. Duchesneau, and acknowledged the check was associated with the recent Demolition Delay Public hearing.

Cemetery Restoration

Ms. Katz reported that she had no further information regarding the cleaning of the gravestones.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

March 3, 2021

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the March 3, 2021, meeting minutes. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

March 9, 2021 (two sets of minutes – joint minutes with BFRT Advisory and regular SHC minutes)

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the March 9, 2021, SHC meeting minutes. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the March 9, 2021, joint meeting minutes. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

March 16, 2021

Ms. Costa provided several text additions/deletions.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the March 16, 2021, meeting minutes, as amended by Ms. Costa. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

April 20, 2021

Ms. Costa provided several edits to the Demolition Delay section of the minutes.

Ms. Trexler provided an edit to the historical properties survey.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the April 20, 2021, meeting minutes, as amended by Ms. Costa and Ms. Trexler. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Ms. Warren requested that draft minutes be received one week prior to the next meeting date.

Historical Commission Finance Reports

Mr. Hagger confirmed that he had a discussion with Town Manager Hayes, who stressed that the Commission be mindful of approving budget amounts before confirming such availability. Town Manager Hayes provided the SHC with guidelines regarding allocations and timing of services incurred.

Ms. Costa presented a Financial Statement from the Accounting Department, dated May 19, 2021. Commissioners reviewed the current SHC budget, as presented by Ms. Costa.

Mr. Hagger motioned to rescind the appropriation of \$750.00 voted at the May 18, 2021, meeting for Consultant Stacy Spies until after the total current year budget has been reviewed. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Mr. Hagger motioned to rescind the second \$500.00 appropriation for “other Section 106 consultation,” made and voted at the May 18, 2021, meeting for Consultant Stacy Spies; until after such year-to-date expenditures have been reviewed. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

Date for Next Meeting (s)

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

Adjourn

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