



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

historical@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

AUGUST 17, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

Commissioners Present: Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Commissioners Jan Costa, Steve Greene, Diana Cebra, and alternate member Kathryn McGrath serving as full member for the meeting.

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Taryn Trexler and Marjorie Katz.

Others Present: Prospective alternate member Chris Durall, railroad historian and Wayland Historical Commissioner Rick Conard, Select Board members Charlie Russo and Janie Dretler, Planning and Community Development Coordinator Beth Perry, and applicant Christine Coen.

Chair Hagger opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. Minutes to be taken by McGrath.

I. Demolition Delay Bylaw

Materials: Draft Demolition Delay Bylaw Guideline Regulation

Vice-Chair Warren presented wording she had drafted to create Historical Commission Guideline Regulations, which would give the chair and vice-chair review power to determine if a building is historically significant in certain cases where a structure was built before 1940, but appears to have no local history or identifiable architectural period style, and to determine whether the permit application would continue to the full commission or be returned to the building inspector. Warren stated that such a draft guideline regulation if supported by the Commission would need to be reviewed by Town Counsel. This was introduced to propose how the Demo Delay Bylaw process could be streamlined—it would save time for the applicant, the commission, and the building inspector.

An efficient timely administration and implementation of the Demolition Delay Bylaw is a priority for the Commission, however, and, as this guideline having just been introduced during this meeting, no Commission discussion took place, no decision was made, and no vote was taken.

II. Candidate for Alternate Position on SHC: Chris Durall

Introduction and questioning of Durall as a potential alternate member. Questions pertained to interests, background, familiarity with Sudbury's historic sites, importance of Sudbury's resources, role of historic districts, interest in genealogy, and a preservation "win" that inspires him.

- Motion: Warren motions to approve recommending Durall as an alternate member.
- Second: Hagger seconded.
- Voted: Passed (6-0. Cebra—aye; Greene—aye; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—aye).

III. 16 Basswood Avenue

Materials: Application for Special Permit

Applicant Christine Coen presented proposed alterations to the home at 16 Basswood Avenue [presented as 18 Basswood Avenue in meeting]. The permit application was presented to the SHC on August 3, 2021 by the building inspector, and, per Section 4(2) of Sudbury's Demolition Delay Bylaw, a site inspection was completed on August 11, 2021 [August 18 during the meeting]. Per Section 4(3), the determination of whether the building is historically significant must then be determined. Applicant noted their intent was to raise the roof to match the other portion and add a dormer. Commissioners presented their assessment of its historical significance. The home had been previously altered, did not exhibit a distinct architectural style, and was not found to be associated with someone significant to the town's history. Warren noted that the house was not a particular discernible architectural period style, had been previously altered since it was originally built in 1927, and that there was no known association of the house to Sudbury's history or persons of importance, and therefore it appears to not be historically significant for purposes of the Demolition Delay Bylaw. Cebra, Costa, McGrath and Hagger concurred that the house is not historically significant and not subject to the Demolition Delay Bylaw.

- Motion: Hagger makes a motion: Under the Sudbury Demolition Delay Bylaw the Sudbury Historical Commission conducted a site inspection of 16 Basswood Avenue. The Sudbury Historical Commission at our August 17 public meeting determined that the house at 18 Basswood Avenue is not historically significant and a demolition permit may be issued.
- Second: Warren.
- Voted: Passed (6-0. Cebra—aye; Greene—aye; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—aye).

IV. Approval of July 20, 2021, Meeting Minutes

Delayed to the next meeting.

V. Historic Preservation Plan (HPP)

Materials: MHC Preservation Planning Manual

Vice-Chair Warren reported on the progress of the historic preservation plan grant project. The Request for Quotes (RFQ) for the project was now closed for submittals. Selection will be made with Massachusetts Historical Commission's (MHC) required approval after which the town will draft the contract with the selected consultant, then the project will begin and it is currently on schedule.

VI. Bruce Freeman Rail Trail

Materials: 1) AHS Introductory Letter for Assignment #11; and 2) Technical Proposal for the Intensive (Locational) Archaeological Survey, Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Extension (MassDOT Project #608164) Contract No. 107360, Statewide Open Services MassDOT Assignment #11.

Commissioner McGrath shared some minor concerns for the extent and design of the proposal for the archaeological intensive locational survey work to be conducted by Archaeological and Historical Services of Storrs, Connecticut (AHS) for the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Extension. Hagger asked that concerns be brought to the Commission so the Commission, as a whole, may discuss and comment as a Commission. Warren indicated the review, and approval and permission to conduct archaeological work for Intensive Locational Archaeological Surveys are handled by the Mass Historical Commission. Warren also commented that the August 2, 2021 letter from AHS invited the SHC to comment on the proposed rail trail project and requested any information the Commission would like to share about the project area, rather than for comments on the proposal for the Survey work. She has called MHC and would reach out again to ask if the proposal had received MHC approval yet. This topic was deferred to the next meeting, so others have time to review.

VII. Section 106--Eversource

Materials: 1) NAE-2017-014 MHC letter Aug 6 2021- Hudson Historical Commission Copy; 2) Memorandum of Agreement Between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Massachusetts Historical Commission Regarding the Sudbury-Hudson Transmission Reliability and Mass Central Rail Trail Project, Hudson, Stow, Marlborough, and Sudbury, Massachusetts; and 3) SHC Motion Consult Services August 2021.

Commissioner Warren brought to the attention of the Commission an August 6, 2021 USACE Letter addressed to the Hudson Historical Commission with a revised draft MOA regarding File No. NAE-2017-01406 ACHP Case Number 016522, on which Vice-Chair Warren was cc'd. Warren commented that the SHC had not received a letter addressed to the SHC or a revised MOA, yet most of the 70 railroad resources referred to in the letter are located in Sudbury, not Hudson. Chair Hagger suggested that the SHC send a letter to the Corps inquiring why the SHC has not received a similar letter from the USACE and pointed out an inaccuracy in the letter

which states that Sudbury intends to create a CMRR historic district, which is false. Also discussed was the revised MOA and its various provisions and stipulations including one that claims the ACHP will not be a consulting party, yet the date for such supposed decision was left blank in the MOA. Warren commented on the inclusion of railroad features in the MOA that are outside the Corps Appendix C permit area and that the Corps is not being consistent with the application of Appendix C and 106 Regulations. Warren also stated she understood that the Council has not decided yet on consulting party participation. A comment was made that if the SHC signed the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), the SHC would be sanctioning the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) use of Appendix C – if the MOA is based on Appendix C.

The Commission discussed and decided to send two letters to USACE – the first to respond to the Corps August 6th letter to the Hudson Historical Commission asking if the Corps intends to send a similar letter to the SHC, and a second letter to the Corps to be sent at a later time to provide consulting party comments. The Chair suggested the Commission consider hiring consultant Stacy Spies for further consulting services to assist with drafting a second letter. The Vice-Chair referred to a scope of work she had drafted for further consulting services for this purpose. The Chair stated that the Commission would discuss the SOW and vote on the matter at the next meeting.

Chair Hagger proposed that Vice-Chair Warren with input by Chair Hagger will draft a letter to send back to USACE referencing the cc'd letter to the Hudson Historical Commission highlighting several inaccuracies in the letter. The Commission agreed that the Chair and Vice chair draft a letter to the USACE based on the input from the Commission and for the Vice-Chair to contact historic preservation consultant Spies regarding availability to assist with second USACE response letter.

VIII. DCR -- MCRT Response Letter

Materials: 1) Enclosure - SHC Letter to DCR re MCRR Trail Recommendations_08.16.2021 {Form A, Central Massachusetts Railroad Corridor [Boston & Maine Railroad Corridor]}; 2) Draft HC Letter to DCR re lease agreement; and 3) Draft SHC Letter to DCR re MCRR Trail Recommendations_08.16.2021

Continued discussion on drafting a response letter to DCR regarding their 2010 lease agreement with Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), which would allow the MBTA and DCR to remove all rail infrastructure in the CMRR ROW which has been studied and evaluated by the SHC consultant. Comparison between versions of the letters to go to the DCR. Commissioners proposed edits to the final letter including mention of lease provision about financial incentive to removal of the infrastructure and requesting a meeting with DCR. Invitation is to be extended to DCR to meet at the September meeting (date pending).

Concern also expressed over the removal of features catalogued by the commission as the Eversource portion of the project occurs in Phase I, at which point the removal of these materials

will be affected. DCR involvement comes in during Phase II by which point the resources will have been potentially already significantly affected.

IX. Sudbury Historic Properties Survey

Chair Hagger extended a thank you to all commissioners and to Commissioner Trexler for pushing this through in the allotted timeframe. The survey provides important planning information for the town. Forms were submitted last week to be reviewed by MHC, comments from which would be returned the last week in August.

X. Return of Gravestones to Natick

Commissioner Greene reports on the return of gravestones to be returned to Natick. A letter is to be drafted to go to the Natick Historical Commission. Russo approves this, and a request should go to the town manager and Select Board chair to be put on the Select Board's agenda. The media will be notified of the transfer to generate positive publicity; a representative of the Select Board may also attend the event. Russo encouraged recording a new presentation of the previous one given by Greene and Sudbury Historical Society's Ellen Nieterman about the marker, which could be made available on SudburyTV.

XI. Maynard Wheeler Gravestone

Greene provided background on this item for Russo: the stone was damaged due to an automobile accident in 1976. A new gravestone was emplaced, and the original stone has been lying in the Hearst House. Many interments without stones are known to exist throughout the cemetery and has been described as "thickly settled ground" (Hudson 1889 quote). Russo notes if any funding is sought, the town manager should be notified as much in advance as possible.

XII. Hosmer House

Commissioner Cebra reports on the following items pertinent to the Hosmer House:

Meeting between town manager, Bill Barletta, and Sterling Movers will be rescheduled. Sterling Movers is to move paintings while roof is being replaced. A contact at the Codman House will provide specifics about moving paintings. Concerns raised by Commissioner Costa include climate control during this temporary storage. Paintings will remain onsite. A lot of paintings are to be moved; a false landing may be necessary in one area for safety, funding for which will be brought up at next month's meeting.

Hosmer House will be open eventually to the public, but the volunteer support may be difficult to re-establish. Multiple plans should be made for reopening under different in-person scenarios. Additional outreach might include the planned 9/11 ceremony—would the commission want to have something like refreshments? Another event might be the Town Fair at the end of October. Would the commission want to have a tent outside?

Since the Hosmer House has not been open, revenue from the gift shop has not been coming in, and no online sale is currently possible. Discussion on the ordering and sale of Sudbury throws as a fundraiser and advocacy was made. Research in the fall of 2020 indicated the cost might be \$30/throw, and the purchase of 30 throws was the goal. The throws are usually sold and would supplement the \$14,000 in the Hosmer House fund.

- Motion: Cebra makes a motion for the commission to authorize \$1000 to order 30 throws; resale cost to be determined later.
- Second: Costa
- Voted: Passed (4-0; Cebra—aye; Greene—nay; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—nay).

Filming by the Old Post Road musicians is to be in the ballroom on Sunday, August 22nd. Music will be appropriate to the house and period. Chair Hagger requests that the SHC can get a copy.

Checking messages at the Hosmer House—Cebra will check messages and have finalized procedures at the Hosmer House. If pertinent, messages will be forward to Adam to be distributed to the entire commission.

Keys—discussion on whether to change the locks, possibly by Bill Barletta, rather than trying to get back keys that have been given out in the past.

- Motion: Hagger makes the motion to ask Bill Barletta to change the lock on the back door and give us 10 keys, which, if the town cannot do this, then a request for funds will be made at the September meeting.
- Second: Greene
- Voted: Passed (6-0; Cebra—aye; Greene—aye; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—aye).

XIII. Wadsworth Cemetery and Revolutionary War Cemetery—Fence Repair, Markers

Department of Public Works (DPW) is to repair a broken fence at the Wadsworth Cemetery; Cebra confirms that when the invoice is received from DPW, it can be forwarded to and reviewed by Costa and Hagger, and paid. It is anticipated that the cost will be similar to the fence repair at the Training Field, which was \$68. Money will be from the SHC's General Fund.

- Motion: Hagger proposed to allocate up to \$100 for fence repair.
- Second: Greene
- Voted: Passed (6-0). Cebra—aye; Greene—aye; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—aye.

Funding for repairs at the Revolutionary War Cemetery needs to be obtained. Chair Hagger deferred this discussion to next month.

XIV. 554 Boston Post Road

Materials: photographs of current conditions.

Historic District Chair Fred Taylor and Vice-Chair Warren had been completing research on paint scheme for cupola; the cupola will be painted red with white trim on ventilation louvers. A historic house marker will be ordered by developer Nowland in addition to the placement of the required interpretive signage per the Planning Board's Site Plan Decision for 554 BPR. Taylor provided an update to Warren on the interpretive signage issue and the windows installed in the Tavern, and it appears the windows are vinyl and not of wood construction as required for windows per the SHC Demolition Delay Bylaw decision in February 2020 that specified the installation of wood windows.

Warren made a site visit and took pictures of the granite curbstones that had been placed by the developer, which has changed the aesthetic. The grade is now distinctly different outside and on the inside (building side) of the stones. This was discussed with Sudbury's Building Inspector, Andrew Lewis, and it appeared this may address required building code drainage surrounding the historic building.

No occupancy permit has been given yet; regrading could be done. Also noted were the gas meter, air conditioning units, and electrical box that have been placed within street view, also changing the aesthetic. A new historic district incorporating this property is to be dealt with later.

XV 24 Church Street

Materials: photographs of current conditions, referenced renderings and documentation from May 25, 2021 public hearing and Demolition Delay Bylaw decision by the Commission concerning the front façade and west side of the house.

Commission is responsible for the north elevation and west façade only. At the May 25th public hearing the Commission determined that the house did not have to be preferably preserved because the commission approved the alterations as presented in Demolition Plan (renderings, documentation and other information) reviewed at the May 25, 2021 SHC meeting. However, it has come to the attention of the Commission that the construction of the front façade is not what the Commission approved. The Commission was not informed during the public hearing about additional decorative elements, such as rectangular paneled decorative elements on the Queen Anne tower and under the west side bay windows and added roofing. Building Inspector Andrew Lewis will complete a site visit as well.

Applicant is waiting on the occupancy permit. In order to discuss the changes, the commission decided the applicant will have to appear before the Commission. Cebra notes this is also one potential update to the demolition delay bylaw—how to inspect to ensure compliance, especially when shortening the six-month delay. Comments from Building Inspector Andrew Lewis to go to the SHC.

XVI. Landscaping for Town-owned Historic Properties

Discussion of the responsibilities between town departments. Greene and Cebra have been trimming bittersweet from stone walls. Stones in the Wadsworth Cemetery are covered with weeds, which has been brought up by Elin Nieterman of the Sudbury Historical Society. Training Field and the Haynes Garrison site also need to be cleaned up. Discussions with Van Mason and DPW have been undertaken; DPW uses outside contractors, which might be more difficult for the SHC to educate. Bittersweet is the main invasive.

Sudbury's Conservation Committee suggests Sudbury Valley Trustees (SVT) Weed Warriors can train and lead to certification. It was suggested that maybe the SHC would take this up again, but whose budget would this be on was still in discussion. Care would include the lilac bush at the Hosmer House, which is a plant important to that property's story.

In the past, a private landscaper provided spring and fall cleanup on two sites (Haynes Garrison and Training Field + tool shed=\$1800). The commission decided to meet Town Manager Henry Hayes and Dan at the site then discuss at the September meeting.

XVII. MA Historic Preservation Conference

Materials: email on conference.

The MHC's historic preservation conference will be September 23 and 24. The SHC can reimburse its members for the \$25 registration fee. Procedures for reimbursement to be distributed to all.

XVIII. Colonial Faire Booth

In past years, the commission has had an informational booth, but the SHC will sit this out this year. This has not been very productive as most interactions were with out-of-town/state visitors. Volunteerism and fund-raising, though, has been low as the gift shop and house have been closed this past year. Past events have gathered about \$200. Another avenue for funding might be grant-writing, as past grants to the Hosmer House has come from the Sudbury Foundation.

XIX. SHC Financial Reports/SHC FY 22 Budget

Materials: financial reports with executive summary.

General fund is at \$7,800 with \$2,265 being estimated for recording fees, and \$2,000 staying in the budget for cleaning the Hosmer House. Estimated consultant fees for the next fiscal year, however, will still need to be finalized.

XX. CPC Funds

The grant submittals to the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) for Community Preservation Act (CPA) funding are due around October 8 or 11 [October 13]. The HPP will recommend projects such as possibly recommending a community-wide archaeological survey, but perhaps +the Commission should wait until the HPP is completed. Potential projects were discussed, including invasive species at historic sites. Commissioner Cebra has discussed with Lori Capone of the Conservation Committee, especially on how to keep these from recurring at the Haynes Garrison site. Cebra notes the removal of roots and chemical treatment by trained individuals is recommended. Other possibilities to submit for a CPC grant could include following the HPP recommendations after they are formulated such as additional historic properties surveys, such as a Pine Lakes Area form. Potential Grant project ideas will be discussed in more detail at September's meeting.

XXI. Date for Next Meeting(s)

One commissioner cannot make the scheduled September 21 date. If those commissioners that are absent at the current (August 17) meeting cannot make a September 22 meeting, the meeting will remain as the previously scheduled September 21. Otherwise, the date will be moved to September 22.

XXII. Motion to Adjourn

- Motion: to adjourn the meeting made by Chair Hagger
- Second: Greene seconded.
- Commissioners voted unanimously to adjourn the August 17, 2021, session at 9:36. (Passed 6-0, Cebra—aye; Greene—aye; Costa—aye; Warren—aye; McGrath—aye; Hagger—aye)