



# Town of Sudbury

## Historic Districts Commission

HistoricDistricts@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building  
278 Old Sudbury Road  
Sudbury, MA 01776  
978-639-3387  
Fax: 978-639-3314  
[www.sudbury.ma.us/historicdistricts](http://www.sudbury.ma.us/historicdistricts)

### MINUTES January 8, 2026 AT 7:30 PM Virtual Meeting

**Members Present:** Chair Ahnu Shah, Taryn Trexler, Chris Hagger, Pete Iovanella, Griff Noble and Shervin Hawley

**Members Absent:** none

**Others Present:** Beth Perry, Planning and Zoning Coordinator, Peter Benton, Heritage Strategies,

Mr. Shah called the meeting to order at 7:33 PM.

**Public Hearing – Case 25-35, 230 Old Sudbury Road (Assessor’s Map H10-0023, David Friesorger Applicant, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove and replace two doors**

Jim & Jevon Francis, Owners were present to discuss the application with the commission.

*Project:* Replace two doors (front and side); applicant reported doors already installed prior to HDC approval.

*Issues raised by Commission:*

Installation without approval: Commissioners noted the applicant/installer had knowledge of the pending process; doors were installed after an initial meeting where applicant was absent.

Design concerns: The front door’s horizontal panel design was judged stylistically inappropriate for the house’s Colonial-influenced design; commissioners suggested six-panel, four-panel or other colonial-appropriate styles (including flat panel or V-groove) instead of the current horizontal five-panel look.

Material concerns: Steel/metal door was flagged as inappropriate for the prominent front elevation in the Old Town Center historic district. Commissioners preferred wood or high-quality wood-composite doors (Simpson brand recommended as an option that offers wood/wood-composite doors).

Visibility/proximity: Although the house sits ~64–65 feet from the road, commissioners emphasized the property’s high visibility in the Old Town Center district and the need to avoid setting an undesirable precedent.

Side/secondary door: Commission was generally comfortable compromising and approving the side door (metal) if it is painted to match and with other conditions; primary objection remained the front door.

*Applicant’s explanation:* Scheduling/installer timing issues led to installation before approvals; installer had represented experience with permits but applicant acknowledged miscommunication and inexperience with historic district process.

Commission requested revised proposal for the front door (material and design), recommended Simpson doors as an option and offered informal pre-meeting review by staff (Anu) of proposed designs.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the February 5, 2026 meeting. Mr. Iovanella seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

**Public Hearing – Case 25-40, 135 Peakham Road (Assessor’s Map J04-0021), Robert LeBlanc Applicant and Julie Hojman Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 8 windows**

Justin Goven (Renewal by Andersen) representing owner Julie Hojman was present to discuss the application with the commission.

The request is to replace eight windows. The house was built in 1993, property set back roughly 500 feet from Peakham Road, heavily treed and minimally visible from the public way. Existing windows to be replaced were reported as vinyl with interior wood grills; the new windows proposed were Fibrex composite by Andersen (mortise-and-tenon corners and interior wood grills).

Commission discussion and decision:

The commission noted that replacement windows would not be appropriate on true historic homes, but because this is a 1993 house, is non-historic, and is minimally visible (large setback and heavy tree cover), commissioners were comfortable approving the replacement windows.

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the application as submit for the following reasons:

- It is a 1993 house,
- non-historic
- minimally visible
- +/- 500 ft from Peakham Road

Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

**Public Hearing – Case 25-41, 52 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0008, Adelma Gillespie Applicant and Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows, repair front steps and replace door**

Mr. Noble recused himself from this discussion.

Adelma Gillespie, applicant and Owner was present to discuss the application with the Commission.

Project: Replace windows, repair front steps, and replace a door. The application encompassed multiple distinct areas: original historic house windows (c. 1876 Second Empire / Mansard cottage), an attached later addition (kitchen wing/porch), basement windows, and the front door/porch steps.

Historic significance: Commission emphasized the house’s high historic significance (Second Empire Mansard cottage, dated 1876; MACRIS-recorded and part of King Philip historic area). Original/early windows should be preserved and repaired rather than replaced if at all possible; professional assessment by a window restoration specialist is recommended.

For non-original/addition windows: Commission open to replacement where the component is a later 20th-century addition; such windows may be replaced with appropriate wood windows and with clear installation details (new-construction vs replacement windows and trim profiles) shown on drawings.

Front door: Existing main house front door was identified as an original, ornate, leaded-glass door. Applicant clarified they did not intend to change the principal front door facing the street; proposed changes were for the side/carriage entrance (south side).

Steps and railings: Commissioners asked for dimensioned drawings for proposed step repairs/replacement (granite treads and simple wrought-iron railing suggested) and details to show how they would appear relative to the façade.

Basement windows: Commissioners had no major objection to replacement in-kind with wood windows and sill repair; want specifications (sub-sills, materials) provided.

Commission recommended a more complete submission with accurate existing/elevation drawings, clearer documentation of historic vs altered sections, and possibly a site visit. The applicant was advised to consider hiring a preservation architect or professional to prepare elevation drawings and details.

Application continued to February 5, 2026 for resubmission with improved documentation, window-by-window inventory, clear drawings (existing and proposed), and specifications for materials and trim.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the February 5, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Hawley – Aye (Mr. Noble is an abutter)

**Public Hearing – Case 25-44, 268 Old Sudbury Road (Assessor’s Map H09-0060), Anthony Alberico, Applicant and Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new wood carriage doors**

Anthony Alberico, Applicant/Owner was present to discuss the application with the commission.

Project: Install new solid wood carriage doors in an existing opening (house built 1880).

Proposal details: Applicant plans to craft mortise-and-tenon solid wood carriage doors (likely oak), six-light per leaf, painted to match existing red doors, hung on six 24" iron strap hinges salvaged from an antique dealer.

Recommended conditions/details: Show strap-hinge locations (across rails), confirm door clearances and functional operation, and retain or replace the existing trim above the opening to match the current profile unless evidence indicates an original historic profile that should be reinstated. Commissioners encouraged applicant to document the intended trim profile for the file.

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following conditions:

- 3 iron strap hinges installed across rails of the doors
- trim and water shedding remain as-is

Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble – Aye

**Public Hearing – Case 26-01, 84 French Road (Assessor’s Map J03-0016), Fabiano Maia, Applicant and Gabby Cefalo, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to add dormers**

Contractor Murillo Vieira representing Fabiano Maia, the applicant was present to discuss the project with the Commission.

The applicant would like to add three dormers (two side dormers and a center dormer) to the existing flat roof area to gain light and roof articulation. Applicant stated some dormers would be non-functional while at least one dormer (center) would be functional. Proposed materials included clapboards for siding and vinyl windows though the applicant also indicated willingness to match existing materials.

Commissioners noted existing front elevation and trim were not accurately shown on the plans. The architectural drawings did not represent the current façade details or trim and were therefore insufficient to evaluate the proposal.

Scale, massing, and material considerations: Commissioners requested better proportioned massing and careful design if the owner desires more second-floor space or light.

Proposed vinyl clapboard siding was specifically noted as unlikely to be acceptable in a historic district; commissioners requested manufacturer cut-sheets and paint color swatches, and pointed out that vinyl siding typically will not be approved on a historic property.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the February 5, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

### **Untimed Items:**

#### **Eagle Scout Project Update**

Project: Design and construction of a freestanding historic sign with two posts, cedar framing, shingles, and a laminated or aluminum sign panel.

Presentation highlights:

Theo presented a 3D model of a two-post sign with a roof, cross-bracing, cedar materials, and recommended attachment details. Proposed posts: 4x4 cedar, with 2x4 framing, and plywood backing (cedar- or exterior-grade) and cedar shingle roof. Proposed posts footing depth discussed with reference to frost depth; idea to consult building department for frost-depth requirements.

Theo noted ADA text-size concerns and the need to confirm signage text sizing and layout for ADA compliance. Commissioners pointed to existing resources and to Historic Commission consultant Jan Costa for ADA guidance and recommended Jan as a contact for specific ADA/legibility guidance.

Constructive feedback: Commissioners encouraged an A-frame/gabled roof (rather than single-pitch) to better protect the sign face and to hide roofing fasteners; they recommended examining the training-field kiosk example as a model.

Next steps: Theo to refine the model (consider A-frame roof), finalize wording with Historical Society (Francesco) and Scouts, plan to have wording finalized by March, and file a formal application with HDC when ready (targeted availability for a Feb meeting if materials provided by Feb 2 for Feb 10 meeting, otherwise apply for March). Commissioners advised keeping staff informed and reviewing examples.

#### **Approval of Minutes from November 6, 2025**

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve minutes from November 6, 2025 as amended. Mr. Iovanella seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

### **Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2025**

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve minutes from December 4, 2025 as submitted. Mr. Hawley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

### **Review of 2025 Annual Report**

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the 2025 Annual report as amended. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah- Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble - Aye

### **Historic Guidelines Update**

Peter Benton from Heritage Strategies presented the status update.

Delivered a draft outline (Nov) and a Word/PDF version of existing guidelines with formatting corrections. Draft materials included design principles and Secretary of the Interior Standards-related text.

Next task: produce district-by-district writeups that describe each district's history, development patterns, and distinguishing characteristics to guide future reviews (e.g., Town Center vs King Philip vs Wayside). This would be supplemented with photographs.

Timeline: consultant aims to provide district writeups; commission proposed a follow-up brainstorming meeting in Feb.

### **Stewardship working group**

It was agreed that the SHC and SHDC Stewardship Working Group members would seek to meet with the Conservation Commission in April or May 2026 to discuss the historic Carding Mill since it is within a historic district, is very historic as it was reassembled by Henry Ford on his campus from a historic mill located in New Hampshire and it is located on Town owned Conservation land. Chris Hagger will reach out to the Sudbury Conservation Commission to obtain dates for such a meeting.