



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 August 6, 2026 at 7:30 PM Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Ahnu Shah, Taryn Trexler, Chris Hagger, and Griff Noble

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

Mr. Shah called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

CONTINUED-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

Mr. Shah made a motion, per the applicant’s request, to continue until October 1, 2026.
Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call: Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye

CONTINUED-Public Hearing – Case 26-19, 4 Maynard Road (Assessor’s Map G08-0012), Mona Reese, Applicant and Sebouh Arakelian, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to install roof mounted photovoltaic (PV) system solar panels

This hearing focused on a revised rooftop solar proposal. The applicant presented revised plans live and said some panels had been removed in response to prior Commission comments. The applicant emphasized support for solar energy and argued that the revised layout reduced visibility from Hudson Road.

Chair Shah stated that the Commission is not opposed to solar but is opposed to panels on the primary front-facing roof of a historic structure. He emphasized that vegetation is not considered sufficient visual screening because it is seasonal and removable. He also referenced a prior ground-mounted solar approval in another case as an example of solar being acceptable when it does not negatively affect the historic building.

Chris Hagger said his concern remained the main front roof, and that he could accept solar on a secondary structure or lower roof areas. Taryn Trexler noted that the revised materials had not been submitted in advance as required and said the primary facade panels were a non-starter. Griff Noble echoed that the main roof remained the issue. The applicant requested a continuance, and the Commission continued the hearing to September 3, 2026.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue until September 3, 2026. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye

CONTINUED-Public Hearing – Case 26-22, 26 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0017), Jane Hightower Roddy, Applicant and Gail Wright, Clerk on behalf of Memorial Congregational Church, Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Jane Roddy, on behalf of Memorial Congregational Church, presented a revised window replacement proposal. The applicant explained that the project had evolved from vinyl windows to higher-quality alternatives and that the windows are likely original to the 1950s portion of the building. The applicant stated that the building is used for preschool and Sunday school and that energy efficiency is an important consideration.

Commissioners noted that the original appearance of the building is unclear because the structure has been altered and sided over time. Commissioners suggested researching historic photographs and examining whether original architectural details remain beneath the siding in a non-public area. Commissioners also requested renderings showing the proposed windows in the context of the building before final product selection.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue until October 1, 2026. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, and Mr. Hagger-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-25, 119 Bent Road (Assessor’s Map J05-0310), Robert and Catherine Cohen, Applicant and Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Robert and Catherine Cohen presented a proposal to replace the original wood 12-over-12 windows with new windows. The applicants initially proposed Anderson 400 Series windows.

Commissioners clarified that the Anderson 400 Series is a clad wood product rather than an all-wood exterior window. Commissioners stated that a more appropriate full wood-exterior product should be considered for a historic district property with existing wood windows. Commissioners suggested alternatives such as Anderson E-Series, Marvin, Pella, or Jeld-Wen. Commissioners also noted that a new-construction style installation would be preferable to preserve glass area and trim proportions.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue until October 1, 2026. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-26, 26 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0017), David Spatara, Applicant and Rev. Tom O’Brien Owner, seek a Certificate of Appropriateness to new post and panel sign

David Spatara of Signarama presented a proposal for a new post-and-panel church sign with an interchangeable copy board. The applicant stated that the goal was to reduce the number of signs on the property while maintaining flexibility for event and service messaging.

Commissioners expressed concern that the proposed vinyl sign was too modern, too large, and not in keeping with the monumental character of the church or the historic district.

Commissioners suggested a simpler and more traditional approach, including a white background with black lettering or a carved/hand-painted appearance. Commissioners also discussed alternatives for handling temporary messages in a more architectural and less cluttered manner.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue until September 3, 2026. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye

Public Hearing – Case 26-27, 419 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map G09-0013), Peter Jurgensen, Applicant and Owner, seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate barn

Peter Jurgensen and architect Jeffrey Shantz presented a proposal to renovate a detached outbuilding/barn into a four-season shop. The applicant described proposed work including roof replacement, a new insulated door, skylight installation, and the replacement of painted faux windows with real windows.

Commissioners stated that the existing building has significant architectural character and should be treated carefully. Commissioners expressed concern that a standing seam metal roof would simplify the building too much and would be less appropriate than an architectural asphalt shingle. Commissioners also indicated that the chimney and eyebrow features should remain and that the building’s decorative elements contribute to its character.

The Commission requested a materials board and revised renderings showing the proposed roof, door, window, and lighting details.

Mr. Shah made a motion to continue until September 3, 2026. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call, Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye

Informal discussion regarding 52 Concord Road

Adelma Gillespie asked whether a Certificate of Appropriateness is required to install a chimney termination cap (a flue/liner cap for a gas insert); owner provided images of the proposed stainless/metal high-wind termination cap.

Commission confirmed Certificate of Appropriateness will be required for visible chimney termination modifications.

Commissioners requested documentation that the specific cap is required by code/manufacture for the gas insert (e.g., installer or manufacturer documentation stating that a high-wind termination cap is required for their appliance), and asked whether any less-visible options (flush mesh cap or brick raised cap / historic brick crown) could meet code while being less visually prominent.

Commissioners noted that a necessity for a specialized high-wind cap for a gas direct-vent appliance is plausible (Adam confirmed such caps can be required for certain gas/direct-vent systems) and recommended submitting an application to the HDC with supporting documentation; if needed, the HDC would consider the cap when shown to be required by code/system design.

FY27 CPC Application for Evaluation of Historic Districts

Proposal lead: Commissioners Anu Shah and Griff Noble with staff support (Adam).

Draft project summary:

Purpose: engage a consultant to conduct a focused evaluation of Sudbury's local historic districts — compile histories, map district boundaries on parcel-based GIS (moving away from "300-foot-from-centerline" boundaries), identify contributing vs. non-contributing properties, analyze district character, identify pockets of residential development inconsistent with district character (for design-guideline solutions), and produce recommendations (including potential boundary adjustments or a framework to pursue new district designations or revisions).

Project deliverables in draft: district history summaries, parcel-based GIS maps, classification of properties (contributing / non-contributing / transitional), recommendations for updated design guidelines and/or regulatory steps, and a clear set of next-phase actions the Commission could take (e.g., boundary adjustments, expansion/creation of districts, or development of tiered review frameworks).

Budget: preliminary request of \$100,000 (would cover consultant research, mapping, public outreach, and reporting). Commissioners acknowledged that a portion might not be spent or could be scaled; the amount is based on prior consultant work and mapping costs.

Major discussion points:

Commissioners sought clarity about the scope: some members wanted the consultant to include identification of historic properties outside existing districts (possible new districts or "spot" designations), while others favored initially sharpening boundaries of existing local historic districts and mapping contributing properties (framing this project as "analysis and inventory" to support subsequent actions).

Chair and supporters framed the project as a foundation (phase 1) to produce research/mapping enabling later actions (phase 2) such as boundary revisions, creation of new districts, or drafting

enabling bylaw/regulatory language. They emphasized this research would assist prudent policy decisions and consistent review.

Multiple commissioners suggested using the Master Plan language as justification (Master Plan recommends considering expansion and boundary revisions), and requested inclusion of the Master Plan references in the CPC application.

Commissioners agreed mapping should be parcel-based (GIS) so the HDC and staff can quickly reference district status in future certificate reviews (i.e., to determine which properties are within district / which review tier applies).

Concerns were raised about how far the project should go: whether it should proactively propose major preservation expansions (which could trigger contentious town-meeting debate) or remain an analytical study that leaves policy changes and legislative actions for later, more deliberative stages.

Next steps:

Commissioners asked for one more meeting to give final edits and a chance for commissioners to add brief comments prior to CPC submission (deadline Sept 14). Adam agreed to accept edits (track changes/comments) and to present the application at CPC with HDC members present; commissioners expressed preference that Adam present professionally with a HDC member as backup.

Commissioners discussed whether the Historical Commission (Town's appointed historical body) must formally endorse the application; Adam will verify process and coordinate any necessary endorsement prior to CPC submission.

Decision: postpone a formal vote to finalize application until the next HDC meeting to give each commissioner a chance to review and submit comments.

Approval of Minutes from July 2, 2026

Mr. Shah a motion to approve minutes from July 2, 2026 as amended. Ms. Trexler seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah – Abstain, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye,

Historic Preservation update

The Commission discussed the draft Historic Preservation Plan chapters that had been circulated. Commissioners agreed that additional time would be needed to review the material in detail and to schedule a separate discussion.

The Commission approved the Carding Mill letter to the Conservation Commission as presented, with minor edits.

Possible Future Agenda Items

The Chair reminded the Commission that the next regular meeting would be held on September 3, 2026.

Administrative Report

Mr. Shah made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:04pm. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote Mr. Shah-Aye, Ms. Trexler -Aye, Mr. Hagger-Aye, and Mr. Noble-Aye