



# 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

**NOVEMBER 16, 2021**

**VIRTUAL MEETING**

**Present:** Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Jan Costa, Diana Cebra, Taryn Trexler, Steve Greene, Marjorie Katz, Kathryn McGrath (became a voting member when Diana Cebra left the meeting)

**Absent:** Chris Durall

**Others Present:** Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development; Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Coordinator; Rick Conard, Railroad Historian and Wayland Historical Commission Member, Nick Pernice, Jim Gish, Daniel DePompei, Renata Alward, and Rebecca Cutting

At 6:30 P.M. Mr. Hagger called the meeting to order, and requested Sudbury Historical Commission rollcall; Hagger-present, Trexler-present, Costa-present, Cebra-present, McGrath-present, Warren-present, Greene-present, Katz-present

#### **Sudbury Planning Director Comments:**

Present: Adam Duchesneau

Mr. Duchesneau stated that many Town committees gather member comments, and assign a board/committee member to draft those comments into a document or letter and forward such documentation to a staff member, in the interest of time. Mr. Hagger agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Duchesneau mentioned aspects of meeting conduct, including equal comment time for all members.

Mr. Hagger suggested that all members raise their hands when wanting to speak, and will assign time estimates to agenda items. He hoped to achieve the goal where each member will have opportunity to speak and respect all opinions.

Ms. Costa thanked Mr. Duchesneau and Mr. Hagger for addressing the topic and offering efficient options.

Ms. Trexler seconded comments made by Ms. Costa. She stressed the benefit of addressing all applicants and others who come before the Commission, in an equal fashion. Mr. Hagger agreed with impartial treatment for those presenting.

#### **Community Preservation Committee Reporting Requirements – Project Reporting Form for 2015 TM Article 48**

Present: Lynn MacLean, former SHC Chair

Mr. Hagger referred to the “Town of Sudbury Community Preservation Committee – CPC Project Submission Form,” for 2015 Town Meeting Article 48 and spoke of the “Project Description” section on this project submission form submitted several years ago to the CPC. Mr. Hagger detailed the three parts of the project description funded by Article 48 – the first aspect to build an information kiosk and produce historical signage next to the Hearse House, Town Pound and Revolutionary War Cemetery. Mr. Hagger recollected that a kiosk had been prepared as an Eagle Scout project and a plaque had been placed on the Hearse House, but that no signage had been installed at the Hearse House/Town Pound. He noted that a second part of the project for historic properties surveys costing \$5,000, was not used either; and suggested that the Commission might still be able to use these unused funds for surveys. Mr. Hagger asked Mr. Duchesneau about the possible usage of those funds and hoped that those funds could still be used for historic surveys. Mr. Hagger also commented that the third part of the project was signage at the Town Cemeteries and asked Ms. MacLean what her recollection was about this aspect of the project. Ms. MacLean stated she believed that all the signage for the Cemeteries had been installed except for perhaps the West Cemetery (part of North Cemetery).

Mr. Duchesneau confirmed that \$5,000 dollars of CPC funding remained for the second aspect of the project and applying those funds to historical surveys would be appropriate to be used in the survey of homes and other historical buildings in the Town. Mr. Hagger noted that the Commission would request to reappropriate some of the remaining balance from \$15,000 originally designated to the first section of the request, for a signage at the Hearse House and the Town Pound.

Ms. Warren commented that Town Meeting had voted for the three parts of the project and that aspects of the project had not been completed yet so she recommended retention of funds for completion of these remaining unfinished projects. She also suggested that the Commission should strive for signage continuity, especially introductory signs and wayfinding signs in Town Center and consult with the HDC on this issue.

Ms. McGrath asked if a complete Ground Penetrating Radar survey was performed for the whole Revolutionary War Cemetery area, and if not, should one take place before installation of a proposed signage at the Hearse House/Town Pound. Ms. MacLean confirmed that such GPR was completed, and all documentation was on record.

Ms. Cebra confirmed that she was on the Commission during that time. She recommended that the Commissioners study the Revolutionary War Cemetery plaque, for leakage. Ms. MacLean confirmed she had recently inspected the plaque, which was dry from rains the day before, but a stain had rubbed off.

Ms. Warren noted that at the wooden base as well as at the base the Revolutionary War Kiosk maintenance was needed. She recommended that the \$15,000 in full be retained and not be reverted back to the CPC and that the Commission researches this aspect a bit more and finished the projects approved under Article 48.

Ms. Trexler commented that the funding should be returned to CPC if the Commission does not use the funds within the year and reapply for funding if necessary.

Mr. Hagger motioned the HC ask CPC to hold under item #1 \$14,000 for the HC continued study and use, \$5,000 for item #2, and \$500 to be held for item #3 for the one sign in the North Cemetery. Ms.

Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Costa-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: To ask CPC to hold \$14,000 under item #1 for the continued historic study, and use \$5,000 from item #2, and hold \$500 from item #3 for the one sign in the North Cemetery.

### **American Rescue Plan Act Funds**

Mr. Hagger suggested the HC apply for ARPA funds in light of closure of the Hosmer House impacted receipt of revenue from door donations.

Ms. Costa stated that total donations from multiple entities in 2018 was approximately \$5,200.00 which includes the store room, purchase of throws by the Wayside Inn, Cup plates, Wayland Depot rental and door donations.

Mr. Hagger asked Mr. Duchesneau about the ARPA funding process. Mr. Duchesneau responded that such request should be in written form and submitted to the Town Manager/Sudbury Select Board. He detailed that the Select Board is charged with how the Town will spend the ARPA funds.

Ms. Costa noted there was another source of donations as gifts in the amount of approximately \$10,000.00 and is not a regular donation source.

Mr. Hagger motioned that SHC requests \$10,400.00 from ARPA funding via approval of the Sudbury Select Board, to cover lost Hosmer House revenue due to closure in the 2020 and 2021 years, due to COVID covering donations, rental income and store income, which would be customarily received by the SHC. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Costa-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: That SHC requests \$10,400.00 from ARPA funding via approval of the Sudbury Select Board, to cover lost Hosmer House revenue due to closure in the 2020 and 2021 years, due to COVID covering donations, rental income and store income, which would be customarily received by the SHC.

### **HDC CPC Application**

Mr. Hagger noted the Commission received a copy of the Historic Districts Commission's CPC application for funding for a design guidelines project to hire a consultant. Ms. Trexler had forwarded the October 13th HDC CPC application to the Historical Commission on November 15<sup>th</sup> because it had been a topic of discussion at the last meeting. Mr. Hagger asked Ms. Trexler how the Historic Commission might benefit from this consultant. Ms. Trexler responded that consultant findings might be a resource for homeowners and the demolition delay aspect.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Historical Commission support the Sudbury Historic District CPC funding request for design guidelines. Mr. Hagger asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Ms. Warren noted that the CPC would be discussing this application and had questions about the HDC application and the project as it has not been defined, and in view of this she would abstain from the vote. She commented that the HC could have but did not utilize the current HDC guidelines for 24 Church

Street and had the HC done so the outcome could have been different. She reiterated that the Sudbury HDC has guidelines

Ms. Costa seconded the motion; Trexler-abstain, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Costa-aye, Cebra-abstain, Katz-abstain.

Ms. Katz and Ms. Cebra both stated they did not have enough information to vote so abstained. Ms. Warren did not vote on the motion.

Prior to the completion of the vote on Mr. Hagger's motion, Ms. Warren motioned to withdraw the motion. Ms. Katz seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Costa-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: To withdraw the previous motion.

Mr. Hagger stated he did not understand why Commissioners would not support this motion, as it is a preservation tool. Ms. Costa asked if would be beneficial to request that the Historic Districts Commission share with us their guidelines with the SHC before they are finalized.

Mr. Hagger stated that the Commission could discuss this item further later in the meeting.

### **Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Presentation**

Present: Paul Jahnige, DCR; Tracey Leinhardt, VHB; Beth Suedmeyer, Environmental Planner.

The meeting was interrupted as the Zoom function failed during this agenda item at approximately one hour and 20 minutes into the meeting and resumed approximately 35 minutes later.

Mr. Hagger asked Mr. Jahnige if he had any ground rules on issues he wanted the HC to ask him about limited to just what he would be presenting.

Mr. Jahnige stated he proposed four topics; the Diamond, Track and Spurs, Interpretive Signage, and the Section Tool House and hoped for a collaborative dialogue session; and would not be able to address Eversource specific aspects or issues that are wrapped up in the Section 106 consultation.

Mr. Jahnige presented slides titled "DCR – MCRT – Wayside – Gateway Alternatives," which included the diamond track. He presented conceptual diagrams of the diamond track, where the MA Central Rail Trail and the BFRT intersect.

### **Diamond**

Mr. Hagger mentioned that the diamond design on the Concord part of the trail was unimpressive. Mr. Hagger asked how much track would be retained with the Diamond. Ms. Leinhardt said she did not have that information and would get back to the HC on that information.

Mr. Greene stated that he was impressed by the diamond diagram as presented by DCR.

Ms. Suedmeyer detailed design aspects of the diamond area and right of way area.

Mr. Jahnige suggested placement of features such as benches.

Commissioners discussed various proposed aspects of the design.

#### Track Spurs

Mr. Jahnige presented a design including the track spurs. The HC discussed this topic.

#### Section Tool House

Mr. Jahnige stated that the Commissioners might like to do what they might wish with rails and ties around the Section Tool House. He suggested that around the pavement an inlay could display rails and ties conceptually.

Mr. Hagger asked if bikers and walkers would be able to walk up to the Section Tool House. Mr. Jahnige responded they would, as the Section Tool House would not be fenced off and could be a good area for interpretative signage. Mr. Hagger suggested there might be a way to locate real tracks around the Section Tool House, if the Tool House could be moved some. Mr. Jahnige said he thought that was an interesting idea.

Ms. Warren requested that the sheet plans for the Section Tool House include the loading platform attached to the Section Tool House. She stated she would appreciate if DCR could provide a table of all 66+ railroad features along the rail trail, as requested by the Commission in its letter to DCR and which of those features would actually be removed by either DCR, Eversource and the MBTA. Mr. Jahnige responded that such information would be provided through the Section 106 consultation process. Mr. Jahnige indicated that the DCR project will not move or remove any of the identified features but to not hold him to this if he is mistaken. He further stated the HC knows what Eversource project proposes to do with the bridges and two culverts which are proposed to be modified and removed. He also talked about features that may be removed and reset.

#### Interpretive Signage

Mr. Jahnige indicated that DCR was considering two or three interpretive signs. He mentioned options for identifying features, as well as bridges. He stated if the Commission might feature a simple historical marker at each historical feature.

Mr. Hagger questioned why only three interpretative signs. Mr. Jahnige responded that within the DCR budget enough that three interpretive signs could be provided. Mr. Jahnige suggested that DCR and the Commission work on the signage together.

Ms. Costa stated she agreed with focusing on what would be happening with the 66+ identified artifacts and going forward it would be beneficial for the HC to have more information on the other artifacts like the signal relay towers, whistle stops, mileage markers, culverts as so forth.

Ms. Warren asked if public comments on this agenda item would be accepted due to the number of people attending. The chair decided to not open up for public comment. This decision was based on the fact that the SHC still had a large number of agenda items left to discuss and take action on, the meeting was interrupted by a failure in the Zoom connection for 35 minutes and 4 Commissioners had informed the Chair that they would need to leave the SHC meeting by 10pm.

Mr. Jahnige stated he would look forward to further discussion with the Commission.

### **Historic Preservation Plan**

Present: Consultant Peter Benton

Mr. Benton introduced himself as a preservation consultant with Heritage Strategies; and he and his partner, Elizabeth Watson, would be working on a Historic Preservation Plan for the Town. He stated that the completed project would be presented in June, 2022.

Ms. Warren read a brief biography of Mr. Benton's professional background.

### **Sudbury Historic Property Survey Copying**

Ms. Trexler confirmed that the Commission would need to make approximately 11 copies of the Sudbury Historic Property Survey book; nine for the Commission, one for the Planning Department, and one for the Goodnow Library. She stated that the cost of such copying ranges from \$400 to \$500 depending on preference regarding front and back printing.

Ms. Costa thought a \$400.00 expense would be affordable.

Ms. Warren stated that a copy should be provided to the Town Building Inspector. She also commented that the Commission might not be able to afford the \$400.00, in consideration of the ongoing Section 106 review and the potential need for additional consultation services and funding. She stated it was essential that the Building Inspector receive a copy.

Mr. Hagger recommended copying the manuscript in the spring when budget details would be more apparent.

Ms. Trexler suggested conferring with the IT Department in this regard.

Mr. Greene suggested that the Historic Society should also get a copy, as well as others in the Town.

### **Town of Sudbury Sweater Throw-Down Contest Gift**

Ms. Hagger spoke of the holiday sweater he wore for the taping of his video speech at Hosmer House and noted that the Commission provided a gift of a throw for the contest. .

### **Approval of September 21, 2021; October 5, 2021; October 14, 2021; and October 25, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

#### **September 21, 2021 Minutes**

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the minutes for September 21, 2021, as edited; Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 8-0; Costa-aye, McGrath-aye, Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Trexler-aye

VOTED: To approve the minutes for September 21, 2021, as edited

#### **October 5, 2021 Minutes**

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the minutes for October 5, 2021. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 8-0; Costa-aye, McGrath-aye, Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye, Trexler-aye

VOTED: To approve the minutes for October 5, 2021

Mr. Hagger mentioned that the October 14, 2021, and October 25, 2021 Minutes had been received and would be reviewed at the next meeting.

### **Historical Commission Finance Reports, including SHC Budget**

Commissioners discussed finance reports and budget.

Ms. Costa reviewed aspects of the budget.

The Commission reviewed the budget forms.

Ms. Costa suggested that a credit card be opened for Hosmer House purchases.

### **Date for Next Meeting(s), including 2022**

Mr. Hagger confirmed that the Commission had been meeting on the third Tuesday of the month. The next Commission meeting was scheduled for December 14, 2021

### **Hosmer House**

Mr. Hagger thanked Ms. McGrath, Mr. Durall, Ms. Cebra, Ms. Katz, and Mr. Greene; for their work at the Hosmer House.

Mr. Hagger noted that the roof replacement project has been postponed to April 2022, and movers are scheduled to move the heavy items. Mr. Hagger mentioned the suggestion made by Ms. Cebra about opening the Hosmer House for Valentine's Day. He mentioned that water was leaking into the house, and informed the Facilities Director of this aspect.

Ms. Warren stated that the CMRR corridor historic district is one of the most important historic resources in Sudbury and the level of interest and concern in Sudbury about the Eversource/DCR project is well known over the last five years. She commented that the impact of this project on historical resources is critically important issue the HC has been dealing with for over two years and often at HC meetings the public has not been allowed to speak. She stated that the opportunity for the public to ask questions to DCR was missed. She encouraged the Chair to allow the public to ask questions at further meetings.

Ms. Katz agreed and expressed that she was disappointed that the audience was not allowed to participate. Mr. Hagger stated that if the Commissioners were willing to stay, those comments could have been received.

### **Adjourn**

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 8-0; McGrath-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: To adjourn the meeting

The meeting adjourned at 10:06 P.M.