



Town of Sudbury

Historic Districts Commission

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

HistoricDistricts@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicdistricts

MINUTES

MAY 2, 2019

SILVA ROOM, FLYNN BUILDING, 278 OLD SUDBURY ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Fred Taylor, Chair, Linda Hawes, Frank Riepe, Lee Swanson. and William Andreas.

Others Present: Anuraj Shah, Jordan Mackey, Biha Reser, Ed Hawkins, Neil Joyce, Steve Shelter, Joel Bargmann, Craig Blake, Elaine Jones, Diana Warren, Kay Bell, Patricia Guthy, William Barletta, Facilities Director.

New Business:

Chair Taylor opened the meeting by reading the agenda into the record as posted at the Town Clerk's office and Town's website, which noted the following Historic District Commission applications and opened the meeting.

1. Public Hearing – Case 19-6, 29 Hudson Road (Town Assessor's Map H09-0002),
Applicant 29 Culinary, LLC seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for new signage and lighting at Twenty-Nine Rustic Mediterranean.

Mr. Mackey explained that he is requesting to place a temporary sign with the logo for his new restaurant over the existing restaurant logo in three places. Next year he will be submitting a request for larger permanent signs. He also requested and showed pictures of low voltage stream lighting that he would like to install on the patio.

After some discussion, Mr. Taylor made a motion, Ms. Hawes seconded the motion, and Commission members voted 5-0 to approve petition 19-6 as presented.

2. Public Hearing – Case 19-7, 19 Maple Avenue (Town Assessor's Map K08-0017),
Applicant Christina Hermos seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a two-car garage and deck. *To be immediately continued to June 6, 2019 meeting.*

3. Public Hearing – Case 19-8, 26 Concord Road (Town Assessor's Map K09-0017),
Applicant Memorial Congregational Church seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to install two air conditioning units.

Mr. Hawkins and the Director of the Child Care facility presented their request to install two air conditioning units.

After discussion the Commission asked for the pipe to run horizontally below the windows with a vertical part reaching the units.

Mr. Taylor made a motion, Ms. Hawes seconded the motion, and Commission members voted 5-0 to approve petition 19-8 as presented.

4. Public Hearing – Case 19-9, 322 Concord Road (Town Assessor’s Map H09-0062),

Applicant Town of Sudbury seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the Town Hall building for accessibility and code compliance. Proposed renovations include an addition for code-required restrooms, the Town Clerk’s office, and accessible entry from the parking lot, as well as an accessible ramp for the main entryway, among other items.

Mr. Bargmann presented the proposed plans for renovations and handicap access to Town Hall building. He explained that the building is a Greek Revival design that was originally built in 1848 and rebuilt in 1949 (**Correct dates are 1847 and 1932*). The proposed plans include an addition to the rear, east side of the building, and building updates according to current building code. Among these are handicap access ramps. The proposal includes a handicap access ramp on the north side and an enclosed ramp on the back of the building. Along the south side the stonewall will be rebuilt, stairs will connect to the Loring Parsonage, and the garage doors will be kept. Regarding the roof, the assessment is that the shingles have reached the end of their useful life. The proposal is to replace the shingles with a synthetic shingle. The cost for the project renovation is approximately \$ 7.2 million.

Mr. Taylor began discussion by asking if any members of the public wished to speak.

Patricia A. Guthy, Commission on Disability, asked for clarification on the front entrance door level and if handicap parking will be available closer to the main entrance.

A member from the Commission on Disability asked the applicant to share with the Commission information on the nature of the variances that are being requested.

Ms. Hawes commented she was pleased with the proposed rear elevation rendering.

Mr. Taylor asked for discussion regarding the handicap access to the front of the building.

Mr. Bargmann stated that the Blue-Ribbon Committee proposal did not included a handicap access ramp and that this would require a variance. He explained three criteria that must be satisfied to receive a variance.

Mr. Blake stated that the ramp discussion was led by the Permanent Building Committee with the thought that there would be a number of variances needed. He said that in the Committee’s opinion getting a variance for no handicap accessibility would be difficult and applying for one could jeopardize chances of get others.

Anuraj Shah, 257 Concord Road, expressed that he had couple of issues with the plans. In his opinion since there is now an entrance in the back, it should be made more accessible and become the main entrance. The front should be preserved as is. He asked where the Blue-Ribbon sketches have ended. In his opinion there needs to be more thought given to the use of the building. The proposed design is not a continuation of the building style or a departure from it. In his opinion it should be one or the other.

Mr. Riepe stated in studying the presented drawings the original stair that is in the northwest side of the building does not lead to the second floor. As he reads the drawings this is an egress from the second story to the exterior. In said that this was not the scheme that was put forth by the Blue Ribbon Committee. The handicap front access only takes you to the first floor building room and it is not possible to get to the second floor meeting room. The only way to do this would be to first go down a level to the other end of the building and then use the elevator to get to the second floor.

Mr. Andreas stated he could contemplate the handicap access in the rear of the building but not the front side leading to the portico. Doing this would be inconsistent with Greek Revival architecture and it would cover the Ralph Adams Town's Seal. In his opinion considering the cost and the fact that the ramp will not be use, a variance should be sought.

The value of having a front entrance was then discussed. Mr. Bargmann expressed that there is much value in having a grand front entrance. Mr. Taylor agreed that something would be lost without one.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed that the aesthetics and purity of the Greek architecture and that it would be compromised if an accessibility ramp were installed. He asked about a temporary-portable ramp that was considered in the planning at one point. Mr. Barletta commented that a temporary and portable ramp is not a small object and might be a challenge to place, remove, and store. Mr. Taylor later clarified that what he had in mind was not the ramp on the north side leading to the landing but only the riser and ramp on the portico.

Mr. Andreas suggested that if a ramp will be built on the front of the building, not to put planters or railings in the front of the building, and if they are trying to maintain the Doric style they have to put a ramp on the other side of the building as well to be symmetrical.

Diane Warren, a member of the Historical Commission, stated the Commission believes there should be more concentration on the back of the building making it the grand entrance.

Chris Hagger, Chair of the Historical Commission, stated the Commission shared a list of items with the PBC and requested a list of the variances anticipated to be requested. He said the Commission would continue the discussion at a future meeting.

Mr. Taylor directed the conversation to other matters. Regarding the roof material he asked if the existing slate roof was repairable and if it was soft or hard slate. Mr. Bargmann replied that it would be too expensive to repair and he thought the slate was pretty soft. Mr. Riepe suggested

using a tile roof and showed a sample of tile. The Commission said more information regarding roof options was needed.

On windows the Commission asked for a detail description of the windows. To say that they will be all wood is not enough. They would like to have more specifications: size, material, style and rail dimensions. For comparison purposes, Mr. Taylor said he would like to see the cost of true divided lite windows with storm windows. Mr. Hagger stated the PBC needs to do some research on the half circle window located on the front faced, called an “eye brow window,” and a proposed plan to replace it.

Mr. Blake asked Mr. Taylor what information the PBC should provide for the next meeting. Mr. Taylor asked for the following:

- Ideas, sketches, or renderings for back entrance(s).
- Rendering of front showing ramp and handrail on left without raised platform or flower boxes on landing (I.e., assuming platform would be removable)
- What if any exterior lights will be removed, changed, or added?
- Comparative prices and longevity for roof options. (DaVinci, tile, slate). Is slate hard or soft?
- Comparative prices for window options (SDL clad, SDL wood, true divided lights with interior storms.)
- List of variances being sought.

Mr. Taylor made a motion, Ms. Hawes seconded the motion, and the Commission voted 5-0 to continue petition 19-9 to the next meeting.

Other Business:

135 Peakham Road – Preliminary discussion.

The Commission decided to drive by the property to determine if the property is not visible from the main road.

Miscellaneous:

- Approval of Minutes from April 4, 2019 and April 23, 2019 Meetings.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Andreas seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0 to approve meeting minutes from April 4, 2019 and April 23, 2019.

- Administrative Report/Update

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 PM on a motion by Chair Taylor, seconded by Mr. Andreas, with all members voting in favor.