



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

MINUTES June 4, 2026 AT 7:30 PM Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Ahnu Shah, Taryn Trexler, Chris Hagger, and Pete Iovanella,

Others Present: Adam Burney, Director of Planning and Community Development

Mr. Shah called the meeting to order at 7:34 PM.

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) and Byron Woodman (Select Energy) provided an update on solar canopy project; requested feedback, not seeking approval tonight.

Project status: Utility application approved; SMART incentive confirmed; panels safe-harbored to receive 30% tax credit; power purchase agreement signed; lease pending; geotechnical and ground-penetrating surveys scheduled for July to locate underground utilities, assess soil structure, and inform foundation and canopy design.

Three canopy vendor/structure options reviewed: Solar Mounts (T-frame, Y-frame, truss options); MRC/MRC-like option with large helical piles and concrete abutments (used previously at Stone Zoo and Framingham project); Parasol option with “check-mark” last module or snow guards to prevent snow sloughing, various foundation approaches depending on ledge depth and soil.

Commissioners emphasized architectural sensitivity to historic district explore examples within historic districts (e.g., Lincoln-Sudbury HS, Wayland temple, Lexington police station renderings) and catalog precedents before choosing manufacturer. Consider single-tilt angle and whether tilt can relate to building roof slopes for aesthetics as well as production; seek more architecturally interesting options that fit scale and character.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application until the August 6, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-09, 132 Peakham Road (Assessor’s Map J04-0020), Edmund Stanton, Applicant and Owner, seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows, front door and siding

Ned Stanton, Applicant presented scope: replace failing windows, replace/repair front door and sidelights, replace siding with cedar, and refurbish or replace shutters (some rot/peeling). Many windows have cracked glazing or rot; front door base is rotten at bottom and may need sill/trim work; shutters partially in poor paint condition; aluminum siding previously removed had punctures; house dates circa 1950s (post-1940s).

Willing to use wood shutters and wood door; requests approval for clad (clad/wood-core) Anderson/Woodwright replacement windows to limit cost; provided Anderson and Marvin proposals (clad windows ~\$700–\$800 less per window).

Ahnu Shah: House is a mid-20th-century house in historic district; acceptable to consider clad windows for such a house, provided details (narrow putty-glazed muntin profile) match existing proportions; concerns about applied decorative shutters that are nonfunctional — suggested removing applied shutters entirely rather than replacing them with fixed decorative shutters. Emphasized historic preservation preference to preserve existing material when possible and that storm windows and re-puttying can often preserve existing sashes.

Taryn Trexler: Noted glazing putty is a wear item and can be re-puttied; okay with clad windows here given house era; requested that muntin profiles match existing (5/8" putty-glaze profile); prefers keeping shutters as they appear proportionate on front.

Chris Hagger: Encouraged applicant to explore repairing thresholds/door sills rather than full door/frame replacement; suggested repairing in-kind is allowed without approval; supports retaining shutters as part of 1950s house character.

Commissioners emphasized Secretary of Interior Standards preference for retention over replacement and advised applicant seek specialized restoration contractor to assess whether door/frame and windows can be repaired to avoid unnecessary replacement cost.

Ms. Trexler made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- Windows to be Andersen Wood Right windows as submitted
- Muntin to match the profile of the existing windows 5/8" putty glaze profiles
- Shutters to match in proportion and style to existing windows
- Siding to be wood clapboard with standard plus or minus 4" exposures to match existing exposures; adjust exposures to make sure the siding runs align with the headers and sills of windows and doors

The Commission does not approve the replacement of the front door and sidelights based solely on the condition of the sill. The Commission recommends the applicant seek a second opinion on repairing the sill and restoring the current door. The commission also notes that these are not windows that the historic district usually approves. Our preference is always for wood, true divided light windows, as stated in the guidelines. However, as this house is post-1940 and is

within an area of the district that has a mix of late 20th century construction and historic homes. For these reasons, the HDC finds these windows an appropriate solution for this application.

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

Public Hearing – Case 26-11, 18 Hudson Road (Assessor’s Map H09-0067), Matthew Jennings & Kathleen Duffy, Applicants and Owners, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to repaint house

Matthew Jennings, Applicant proposed repainting historic 1828 house using Benjamin Moore historic palette: Monterey White for body (warm off-white), historic blue for sashes, and red front door.

Commissioners Strongly supported colors, appropriate for Federal-period house; Monterey White suitable (not pure white), blue sashes and red door fall within historic precedent. Recommended re-puttying windows during painting.

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-12, 353 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0051), Cliff Conti-Metro Sign Applicant and Laura Palumbo, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a sign

Cliff Conti of Metro Sign presented a proposed cedar sign with raised letters for 353 Boston Post Road. He explained that the sign would use a black-painted tubular metal support frame concealed to resemble wood, with painted acrylic raised letters and a white border.

The Commission said the proposed sign was too large for the site and not proportionate to the building, especially since it visually crowded the facade and obscured architectural elements. Members pointed to prior sign approvals nearby and established that the acceptable size was 6 feet 4 inches wide by 2 feet tall, mounted symmetrically and at the same height as neighboring signs.

The applicant said that reducing the sign might make it difficult to fit the logo properly, and the Commission suggested redesigning it and returning with a revised proposal. A public comment from Rachel Stocker noted that a prior jewelry store sign nearby had similar dimensions, which Taryn later confirmed as case 21-13, measuring 6 feet 4 inches wide and 2 feet tall.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the July 2, 2026 meeting. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-13, 258 Dutton Road (Assessor’s Map J04-0008), Pete Iovanella, Applicant and Owner, seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace door, lighting and stone wall

Elsa Iovanella proposed replacing an existing fiberglass front door with a smooth fiberglass nine-light cottage-style door painted black, adding a wood screen door, replacing failing sconces at the front door and garage, and rebuilding a failing retaining wall as a two-tiered fieldstone wall.

The Commission had no objections. Members felt the proposed door style was compatible with the house, the black metal lighting replacements were appropriate, and the new stone wall would be an improvement so long as it matched the character of the existing front stonework.

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, and Mr. Hagger-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-14, 16 Rice Road (Assessor’s Map H10-0013), Frederic Bowne, Applicant and Owner, seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof shingles on

Fred Bowne requested approval to replace end-of-life gray 3-tab asphalt shingles on the barn with gray Owens Corning Estate Gray architectural shingles. He explained that the barn is more than 100 feet from the garage and is not read together with the earlier-approved garage roof.

The Commission had no concerns about the switch to architectural shingles for the barn, especially given the distance from the house and garage and the fact that the new color would remain in the gray family.

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella - Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-15, 18 Wolbach Road (Assessor’s Map H11-0100), John Mancini, Applicant and Sudbury Valley of Trustees Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace deck

John Maccini, property manager for the Sudbury Valley Trustees, presented a proposal to replace deteriorated decking at the back of the barn with AZAC composite decking in a mahogany-like color. He explained that the current pressure-treated deck was installed in 2012 after removal of a livestock ramp, but the decking is now rotting and the project is intended to make the area safer and more appropriate.

The Commission said it could not review the request properly because the application lacked essential information, including photos, drawings, visibility context, and details about where the deck sits on the structure. Members also noted that AZAC/composite decking is generally not what they would approve in a historic district without strong justification.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue the application to the July 2, 2026 meeting. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella - Aye

Informal discussion regarding new patio for 308 Concord Road

Andrea Jewett presented an informal concept for a new stone patio in the backyard, near Heritage Park and near a septic pump chamber. The existing wooden platform is deteriorated, and the proposed replacement would be a flush stone patio approximately 15 by 15 feet.

The Commission agreed that the project was generally an improvement but raised a major concern about access to the septic pump chamber. Members advised that the patio should not cover access and suggested relocating it, or creating an accessible hatch or movable section if the patio must remain in that area.

Approval of Minutes from April 6, 2026

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve minutes from April 6, 2026 as amended. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye and Mr. Iovanella-Aye

Approval of Minutes from May 7, 2026

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve minutes from May 7, 2026. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Iovanella-Aye

Historic Preservation update

Under historic preservation updates, Chair Shah noted that Peter had sent additional guideline-related information and said the group should schedule another guideline-specific meeting to review it. The Commission also discussed drafting its own response to the Conservation Commission on a joint preservation issue, with Taryn Trexler volunteering to draft the Historic Districts Commission's separate response.

Possible Future Agenda Items

Taryn also raised the possibility of seeking CPC funding for future work, and the Commission agreed to add a CPC discussion to the July agenda.

Administrative Report

Nothing at this time