



Town of Sudbury

Historic Districts Commission

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

HistoricDistricts@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicdistricts

MINUTES

April 9, 2026 AT 7:30 PM

Virtual Meeting

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

Others Present: Beth Perry, Planning and Zoning Coordinator and Andrew Lewis, Building Inspector

Mr. Shah called the meeting to order at 7:32 PM.

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

Gabby Cefalo returned with a revised concept for adding dormers to 84 French Road after incorporating feedback from prior meetings. She presented a simpler, more cohesive design: same-size dormers across the roofline to better create a cape-like appearance, plus updated first-floor windows intended to better match the upper windows and unify the house’s overall character.

The Commission responded positively to the new direction, describing it as a major improvement and more consistent with the house and the historic district. Several members noted that the new scheme better balanced the front entry, reduced the visual dominance of the roof, and improved the overall massing and cohesion of the façade.

At the same time, commissioners flagged several design issues to refine before the next submission:

- The roof proportions in the rendering may not be accurate, and the actual house may have a steeper or larger main roof than shown.
- The end dormers on the wings may need to be smaller or repositioned, depending on the final roof and room layout.
- The dormers should likely be centered more carefully over the first-floor windows.
- The final drawings need to be produced to scale by the architect.

Window design also received detailed feedback. The applicants asked about a half-grid / half-clear configuration and whether a full grid would be preferred. The Commission said half-grids were acceptable and consistent with Cape/cottage-style houses, but emphasized proportional consistency across all window units. Members stressed that the grid rectangles should be visually

similar from window to window and that the final pattern should be determined once the scaled drawings are produced.

The Commission also discussed window materials and construction. Members said clad windows could be acceptable here, but emphasized that simulated divided light with an interior spacer bar and exterior/interior applied grids would be preferred over grids-between-glass, because it would read more authentically and perform better visually. They also noted that the eventual choice should preserve a cohesive look across all windows.

The front door concept was generally supported, with the caveat that the final door design would need to be checked for proportional fit once the architect scales the plan. Members liked the stronger presence of the new entry portico and thought the overall entry composition was a positive improvement.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the May 7, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble – Aye

84 French Road informal pool discussion

Immediately after the dormer hearing, there was an informal discussion about a proposed pool fence at the same property. They explained that a pool permit required HDC review because part of the fence would be visible from the historic district. The proposed solution was a black metal fence along the more visible side sections, with black chain-link fencing in the rear wooded area where it would not be seen from the road.

The Commission clarified that only the visible portion near the house and woods would fall within jurisdiction, and asked for the exact location and extent of the fence. The applicants showed a site plan indicating that roughly 22 to 25 feet of fencing on the side near the woods would be visible. The fence would run on both sides of the house and around the backyard, but only a limited portion would be visible from the street.

The Commission had no major concerns with the concept and noted that similar fencing had been approved elsewhere. However, members requested a clearer site graphic for the formal application: a satellite view with the fenced areas highlighted so the relationship to the house and woods is easier to understand.

Public Hearing – Case 26-04, 377 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map G09-0014), Marvin Replacement, Richard Fallon, Applicant and Bahroz Hussain, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 5 windows

Withdrawn without prejudice

Mr. Shah made a motion to accept the withdrawal without prejudice. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble – Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-07, 75 Hudson Road (Assessor’s Map G08-0008), Sandra Duran, Applicant and Town of Sudbury, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a solar canopy

Sandra Duran, Combined Facility Director for the Town of Sudbury, and Byron Woodman of Select Energy presented the concept. They described the project as a solar canopy over part of the police station parking area that would provide shade and weather protection for police vehicles while supporting a town solar strategy. They emphasized that the project was still very conceptual and would need further engineering, geotechnical work, and formal design before any final approvals.

Byron shared conceptual renderings and explained the basic physical layout:

- Two canopy rows in the rear parking area
- The structure would not interfere with the existing vehicle storage/garage area
- Steel columns would support the canopy deck
- The project would likely use a standard clearance of 13'6" at the lowest point, though height could be adjusted
- No tree removal was planned
- Black solar panels would minimize glare

He also described the economic rationale, saying the project was designed to be viable over a 25-year power purchase agreement and estimated net savings of about \$120,000 over the term.

The Commission was supportive of the idea of solar canopies in principle, especially since the structure would be behind the building and would not be mounted on the historic-looking roof. However, members were very concerned about the visual character of the design. Several commissioners said the presented structure felt overly industrial, with exposed steel and an appearance that clashed with the carefully designed police/fire buildings and the surrounding historic district.

Key design concerns and suggestions included:

- The canopy should be more architecturally considered rather than a bare industrial product.
- The structure should coordinate better with the district context, possibly through slimmer members, arched or angled steel, or other refined detailing.
- The color should be carefully chosen; members suggested options that could coordinate with existing site elements such as light poles or traffic infrastructure.
- Lighting under the canopy would need to be carefully controlled to avoid creating a bright, parking-lot effect at night.
- If equipment or bollards would be visible from the street, those should be shown in the formal submission.

The Commission emphasized that it supported the solar initiative itself, but wanted the eventual design to reflect the same level of thought and care that went into the architecture of the police and fire complex. The applicant agreed that the comments were useful and said the team would incorporate them as the project advanced.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the June 4, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, Mr. Iovanella-Aye and Mr. Noble – Aye

Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2026

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve minutes from March 5, 2026 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

Wayside Inn informal discussion window repair, restoration, and replacement project

Victor Stokowski, speaking for the Wayside Inn Board of Trustees, presented an update on a large project involving repair, restoration, or replacement of approximately 140 windows at the Wayside Inn. He explained the project's background, including:

- A donor-initiated concern about drafts in the dining room
- Prior work already completed on the front room windows
- A budget of just over \$300,000, combining a \$250,000 donor gift and \$60,000 from the Sudbury Foundation
- A formal bid process involving multiple contractors and window vendors

He explained that the project had divided the windows into phases:

- Phase 1: the already completed front room windows
- Phase 2: the oldest windows on the front façade
- Phase 3A: the 1970s windows in the dining room and rear guest-room additions
- The remaining windows in a rear area not under HDC jurisdiction

Victor asked the Commission for informal guidance on whether it preferred restoration or replacement, and whether the answer should vary by window group. He noted that the inn's windows were likely not pre-1950s originals, given the building's fire history and subsequent alterations, but that some windows had acquired their own historic character over time.

The Commission expressed a strong preference for repair and restoration on the older, more historic portions of the inn.

General guidance from the Commission included:

- Repair should be preferred over replacement wherever possible

- For the older front portions, restoration or like-for-like replacement of irreparable elements should be the approach
- If a window must be recreated, single-pane construction with a storm window would be preferred over double-pane, because it better preserves historic character and allows future reversibility
- The 1971 rear/dining-room windows could be treated more flexibly, including possible replacement with appropriately detailed wood windows if restoration is not feasible
- Interior storm windows were discussed as a good energy-efficiency strategy that would not fall under HDC jurisdiction

Members also noted that a restoration-first approach may actually be more cost-effective, and that future applications should likely include physical samples, especially for a project as important as the Wayside Inn.

Possible Future Agenda Items

Carding Mill:

Stewardship Working Group debrief

Rail buildings update

Phase 2 preliminary draft guidelines