



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

SEPTEMBER 21, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

Present: Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Steve Greene, Taryn Trexler, Marjorie Katz, Alternate SHC Members: Chris Durall and Kathryn McGrath

Others Present: Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Coordinator; Adam Duchesneau, Planning and Community Development Director; Stacy Spies, Historic Preservation Consultant; Rick Conard, Central MA Railroad historian and Wayland Historical Commission member

Absent: Diana Cebra and Jan Costa

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting of the Sudbury Historical Commission at 6:31 P.M. Mr. Hagger requested Commissioners roll call: Hagger-present, Trexler-present, Greene-present, Warren-present, Katz-present, Durall-present, McGrath-present.

Mr. Hagger noted that Alternate SHC Members Kathryn McGrath and Chris Durall would act as voting members at this meeting.

Approval of July 20th, August 17th and August 30th, 2021 meeting minutes

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Sudbury Historical Commission approve the meeting minutes of July 20, 2021, as amended. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Durall-aye, McGrath-aye

VOTED: That the Sudbury Historical Commission approve the meeting minutes of July 20, 2021, as amended.

Mr. Hagger acknowledged that the August 17th and August 30th meeting minutes would be reviewed at the next Commission meeting.

Historic Preservation Plan

Ms. Warren provided a Historic Preservation Plan update, announced that Heritage Strategies, LLC was the chosen RFQ consultant candidate. She added that the MA Historical Commission approved the selection, noting that Heritage Strategies, LLC; created Historic Preservation Plans for the Towns of Lenox, MA; Beverly, MA; Falmouth, MA; and provided the Historic Commission guidelines for the Town of Wellesley.

Ms. Warren stated that Heritage Strategies, LLC has also prepared preservation planning projects across the country. She noted that the start-up meeting had been held with Heritage Strategies, LLC and herself

and the MA Historical Commission staff, and that Phase 1 has begun. Heritage Strategies, LLC would be conducting a Sudbury site visit and would be scheduling a date to meet with the SHC.

Ms. Warren encouraged all SHC Members to register for the upcoming series of MA Historical Commission Historic Preservation workshops.

Mr. Hagger mentioned the Preservation Massachusetts' Conference being held this week, which will include the topic of Historic Preservation Plans. He invited SHC members to attend.

Historic House Marker Requests

Mr. Hagger commented that a house marker request for 79 Nobscot Road had been made by the new owner. Ms. Katz confirmed that she had a discussion with the applicant and mailed out a house marker application form to him. She also mentioned that the Stone Tavern marker is being made by Mr. Leonard, mentioned other requests from several other owners; one from 308 Concord Road, and one for 18 Hudson Road.

Mr. Greene noted that the House Marker for the Hearse House needed to be redone. Mr. Hagger inquired if the HC should submit a HDC application and Ms. Katz will check with the HDC Chair if an application will be necessary for a new marker that will be placed in the same location.

24 Church Street under the Demolition Delay Bylaw

Present: Steve Garofalo, Owner

Mr. Hagger recalled 24 Church Street had previously come before the Commission under the Demolition Delay Bylaw because the north and west sides are not in the historic district, that a demolition plan had been submitted, a formal hearing on the submitted plan had been held and the Commission approved the demolition plans that were presented to the HC with some specific changes including the front porch and doors. Mr. Hagger commented that since the HC approval it had come to the attention of the Commission that additional changes to the north and west sides of the house have been made that were not in the demolition plans presented to the Commission and were not approved by the Commission. The Commission reviewed the documents reviewed at the hearing: the Demolition application, demolition plans, renderings, and MACRIS file. Photos of the house showing the changes made after the Commission's approval were also viewed as well as photos and information presented by the owner.

Mr. Hagger reviewed and described what the Commission had approved.

Three photos depicting the completed structure were submitted by the owner and shown on the screen, with changes including:

- Bay window on the north side
- Alterations on the turret

Mr. Garofalo read the letter he sent to the SHC after receiving communication from Building Inspector Lewis. Mr. Garofalo stated that the shingling was aluminum siding and not clapboard. Mr. Garofalo maintained clapboard was under the aluminum siding. He stressed the MACRIS description detailed that

Historical Commission
Minutes
September 21, 2021

many changes/alterations were made to the building since it was built in 1873. Mr. Garofalo said he wanted to replicate what was under the aluminum siding and wanted to replicate what was the original part of the house, with added expense. He added that panels were added to the turret (above and below the windows with a small roof over the windows), and the bay window on the north side of the building included boxed out/paneled areas below the windows. Mr. Garofalo detailed MACRIS statements regarding numerous alterations made to the home.

Mr. Hagger stated that SHC has jurisdiction over the entire front façade – not just the porch area and would have appreciated other details in the renderings when the demolition plans were submitted to the Commission and reviewed during the public hearing. Mr. Hagger noted that the aluminum siding had been removed prior to submission of the demolition plans which did not detail the additional changes that have been made.

Ms. Warren stressed that the entire front façade and north side was included in the final approval, including the turret. Ms. Warren described architectural changes that were different than those that were approved by the Commission: the addition of panels on each of the five sides of the turret both below and above the windows, addition of roofing above the turret's windows, addition of panels on the bottom of the bay window on the north side, removal of the flat pilasters/caps between the windows on the turret, and lack of architectural details on the top of each porch column.

Ms. Warren noted that the aluminum siding was in the style of clapboards, adding that although the Historic Districts Commission's jurisdiction was limited to the view from the street the Historical Commission's is not, and there were many dramatic changes made to the turret which was not in keeping with the Queen Anne architectural style, without the approval of the SHC.

Mr. Greene mentioned that such changes should have come before the Commission before installing the panels, though he had no objection to the panels.

Ms. Trexler stated that part of the property is in a historic district, and part is not, which creates an undue burden for the property owner. Ms. Trexler expressed her gratitude with the owner's beautiful restoration of the property, and did not want the owner experiencing harassment of any sort. She suggested that more of Church Street be classified as Historic District zoning. Ms. Trexler acknowledged that two Commission members were absent from the original vote and did not see that they could now vote on this matter.

Ms. Katz had no further comments.

Ms. McGrath acknowledged the uniqueness of the situation and questioned the installed paneling features.

Mr. Durall stated that he understood why Mr. Garofalo preferred to maintain the type materials used on the original home, and commented about possible related presentation to the Commission before installation.

Mr. Hagger said that the Demo Delay Bylaw process was very detailed on the steps the Commission needs to follow, and his concern is that if the plans that are submitted to us are not accurate and we made

a decision on the basis of the plans and then the owner makes further additional changes that were not in the plans that opens up the Commission to other property owners who also make additional changes. He expressed that he wished these alteration changes had been presented to the Commission with the demolition plans. He expressed his concern about setting a precedent. He also indicated that harassment did not enter into this matter, and the Commission was acting in the Demolition Delay procedure. He stated that the Commission had already given a lot on the changes to the facade of this property.

Related Commission discussion took place.

Ms. Warren opined that the main issue being considered involved adhering to the Demolition Delay Bylaw process and was concerned that allowing the additional new changes would create a loophole in the bylaw.

Ms. Warren motioned that the SHC request the opinion of Town Counsel about the Commission's Demolition Delay Decision concerning 24 Church Street, and that the information and renderings submitted with the Demolition Delay Plan for the Public Hearing differs from the construction of details regarding the front façade and north sides of the structure; and therefore the Commission requests advice and the opinion of Town Counsel as to how to handle the discrepancy between the Commission's Demolition Delay Bylaw decision and the construction as it currently exists. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. It was on motion 6-0-1; Katz-aye, Trexler-aye, McGrath-aye, Hagger-aye, Durall-aye, Greene-no, Warren-aye

VOTED: That the SHC request the opinion of Town Counsel about the Commission's Demolition Delay Decision concerning 24 Church Street, and that the information and renderings that were submitted as part of the Demolition Delay Plan during the Public Hearing differs from the construction of details regarding the front façade and north side of the structure; and therefore the Historical Commission requests advice and the opinion of Town Counsel on how to handle the discrepancy between the Commission's Demolition Delay Bylaw decision and the actual construction as it currently exists.

Mr. Garofalo expressed his disappointment with SHC.

Section 106 – Eversource

Mr. Hagger commented that previously the Commission had sent a series of letter to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and that the Commission would review another letter to approve to send. The ultimate goal being a consultation with USACE and to provide input on a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). He said the Corps' approach using Appendix C is to only focus on the waterway artifacts and archeological features, but haven't included the majority of railroad artifacts. He said the Commission needs to discuss setting up a consultation meeting with the USACE.

Ms. Warren provided a summary timeline since the Commission received a letter from the USACE dated April 21, 2021 and an initial MOA drafted by Eversource. She noted that the SHC had sent a comment letter to the MHC on May 12, 2021 and sent a comment letter to the USACE on May 20, 2021 in response to the April 21st letter. The SHC had received an April 30, 2021 letter from the ACHP that called out the

Historical Commission
Minutes
September 21, 2021

Corps for not following the Section 106 regulations. The SHC had not received a response to the May 20th SHC letter, but on August 6th the USACE sent a revised Memorandum of Agreement. The SHC responded sending a letter to the USACE on August 24, 2021. Ms. Warren stated that the SHC had received an email from the USACE about a group Section 106 consultation meeting with the MA SHPO, THPOs, Eversource, DCR and the VHB. She stated that the Commission sought to have a one-on-one discussion. She commented that the USACE's Appendix C had never been approved by the Advisory Counsel. Ms. Warren questioned the legitimacy of DCR being party to the Section 106.

Mr. Hagger paraphrased that the Commission requests that USACE review the complete inventory of all artifacts involved, and not just consider the Appendix C approach.

SHC members further reviewed, and edited the letter drafted by Ms. Spies to Mr. Maniccia of the USACE.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the draft letter to Mr. Maniccia of the USACE, as edited. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. It was on motion 7-0; Greene-aye, McGrath-aye, Hagger-aye, Durall-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye

VOTED: To approve the draft letter to Mr. Maniccia of the USACE, as edited. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. It was on motion 7-0; Greene-aye, McGrath-aye, Hagger-aye, Durall-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye

Mr. Hagger asked if Select Board Member Dretler had any comments. Ms. Dretler responded not.

Ms. Warren recommended that she and Mr. Hagger attend the USACE group Section 106 consultation meeting as observers, and be present to hear the presentations and take notes. She requested another SHC meeting take place to prepare for the one-on-one meeting with the USACE. Ms. Warren recommended that Ms. Spies attend the Commission's one-on-one Section 106 consultation meeting with the Army Corps. Mr. Hagger suggested that the Commission ask the USACE to attend a Commission public meeting for the one-on-one consultation meeting so that all Commission members could attend due to the Open Meeting law requirements. Ms. Trexler commented that each Commission Member had assisted in this effort and should be in attendance at the one-on-one meeting.

It was recommended that the SHC propose to the USACE that the one-on-one meeting with USACE take place on October 14, 2021, or on October 18, 2021. The Commission agreed to hold a preparatory Commission meeting on October 5, 2021.

Ms. Spies left at approximately 9:15 p.m.

Ms. Dretler suggested that the new Commission Members be able to attend all related meetings; as observers at the mentioned joint meeting. Mr. Hagger stated that he would ask the USACE if some SHC Members could attend the joint meeting as observers. Mr. Hagger mentioned that Ms. Spies should make preparations for the one-on-one meeting.

Ms. Warren motioned that Stacy Spies; Historical Consultant provide the following services:

- Provide consultation services and advice, including drafting the talking points for avoidance and mitigation of the 66 National Registry eligible features of the MA Central Rail Trail Corridor Historic District, and to prepare the SHC for attending a one-on-one meeting with the USACE regarding the SHCs consulting party comments,
- To attend the SHC October 5, 2021 meeting and the “to be scheduled one-on-one meeting” with the USACE,
- To assist in the drafting and finalization of written comments and provide support to the SHC in the drafting and submittal of the one-on-one consultation meeting comment and input, and
- For a consultation fee of \$675, at \$75.00 per hour, not to exceed a nine-hour maximum.

It was on motion 7-0: McGrath-aye, Durall-aye, Greene-aye, Durall-aye, Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Hagger-aye

VOTED: that Stacy Spies, Historical Consultant provide the following services:

- Provide consultation services and advice, including drafting the talking points for avoidance and mitigation of the 66 National Registry eligible features of the MA Central Rail Trail Corridor Historic District, and to prepare the SHC for attending a one-on-one meeting with the USACE regarding the SHCs consulting party comments,
- To attend the SHC October 5, 2021 meeting and the “to be scheduled one-on-one meeting” with the USACE,
- To assist in the drafting and finalization of written comments and provide support to the SHC in the drafting and submittal of the one-on-one consultation meeting comment and input, and
- For a consultation fee of \$675, at \$75.00 per hour, not to exceed a nine-hour maximum.

Sudbury Historic Property Survey

Ms. Trexler provided an update and confirmed that the Sudbury Historic Property Survey project was completed, and a hardcopy of the surveys was submitted to the Planning office. Ms. Trexler noted that some properties included on the Survey had more than one home on the site. She stated that 86 properties had been surveyed and 2 Area Forms had been completed, so in total 108 structures had been surveyed.

Mr. Greene recommended that a copy or two of the Survey be submitted to The Goodnow Library.

Ms. Warren stated that a copy should be provide to the Building Inspector and Commission members.

CPC Grant Applicant(s)

Commission discussion took place. Ms. Trexler stated that some CPC money was still available from a prior grant for surveys.

CPC Reporting Requirements

Mr. Hagger mentioned that the SHC needs to provide CPC Reports on the following projects: historic properties survey, cemeteries, and the HPP project.

DCR – MCRT Response Letter

Mr. Hagger stated that Mr. Jahnige will attend our next meeting and discuss the SHC comment letters to DCR.

Return of Gravestones to Natick

Mr. Hagger confirmed that Mr. Greene would be presenting this topic at the Select Board meeting on September 28th for approval. Mr. Hagger thanked Mr. Greene for his researched findings. He mentioned that the Natick Historical Commission suggested that a dedication ceremony with the SHC take place. Mr. Hagger opined about release of a press statement.

Maynard Wheeler Gravestone

Mr. Hagger announced that the Maynard Wheeler gravestone was found in the Hearst House, and will remain in Sudbury. He noted the gravestone would need restoration, and asked that the CPC gravestone restoration be considered.

Ms. Katz explained that CPC Chair Sherri Cline confirmed that the SHC could only use the CPC funds for the restoration if there was money remaining in the fund after completion of the cleaning of the Wadsworth and Revolutionary War cemeteries. If additional funding was needed for the Wheeler Gravestone, such funds could be requested

Cemeteries – Markers

Ms. Katz stated the contractor cleaned the Veterans section of the Wadsworth Cemetery. When she reviewed the work, she was not satisfied. Therefore, the contractor had not been paid to date. Upon Elaine Jones suggestion, Ms. Katz contacted the contractor. Mr. Hagger suggested inquiring about contractual options.

Ms. Katz stated this was the only contractor that responded to the bid. Related discussion took place.

Mr. Greene mentioned that a broken stone in the Wadsworth cemetery was discovered during a tour of the cemetery on October 2, 2021.

Mr. Greene said that he and Ms. Cebra did some trimming of overgrowth at the Revolutionary Cemetery, and now some gravestones are visible.

Hosmer House including Roof Project and Keys

Mr. Hagger stated that new keys are being made, in order to change the existing locks. Mr. Barletta asked that all old keys be turned in to him. Mr. Hagger noted that new keys would be made for all the Commissioners.

Mr. Hagger detailed that Ms. Cebra met with Mr. Barletta and the moving company, who presented an estimate to relocate items in the attic to the basement before construction begins. He stated that volunteers were needed to spread plastics over the furnishings for protection.

Mr. Hagger stated that roof singles and gutters will be replaced with new materials of similar type and color. Ms. Trexler noted that upgrade in new gutters and roofing would extend the life of the Hosmer House.

Ms. Trexler motioned to recommend that the Building Department use the architectural asphalt shingles, instead of the three-tab asphalt shingles, to help extend the life of the shingles and to be more in-line with the historic architectural appearance and history of the Hosmer House, assuming the price differential is not significant. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. It was on motion 7-0; McGraw-aye, Hagger-aye, Durall-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: To recommend that the Building Department use the architectural asphalt shingles, instead of the three-tab asphalt shingles, to help extend the life of the shingles and to be more in-line with the historic architectural appearance and history of the Hosmer House, assuming the price differential is not significant.

554 Boston Post Road

Ms. Warren confirmed that the owner at 554 Boston Post Road did submit an application for a historical house marker. She presented update regarding developments at the site.

MA Historic Preservation Conference

Mr. Hagger reiterated that the MA Historic Preservation Conference would be held on Thursday and Friday, and suggested that commissioners register to attend this conference, as well as other scheduled MA Historical Commission workshops.

Date for Next Meeting (s)

Mr. Hagger announced that the next SHC meeting was scheduled for October 5th at 7:00 p.m.; and a morning meeting would take place on October 14th or 18th. He added that the regularly scheduled SHC meeting would take place on October 19, 2021. for regular meeting

Adjourn

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 p.m. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. It was on motion 7-0; McGrath-aye, Durall-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye