



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

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

historical@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 17, 2019 AT 6:30 PM

LOWER TOWN HALL, 322 CONCORD ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Chris Hagger, Chair; Diana Warren, Vice Chair; Fred Bautze; Diana Cebra; Jan Costa; Marjorie Katz; and Taryn Trexler

Members Absent: Fred Taylor

Others Present: Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development, George Pucci from KP Law, Paul Jahnige, Michael Hager, Marc Bergeron, Brooke Kenline-Nyman, Denise Bartone, Kristen Bisson, Beverly Carlon, Sarah Guilford, Anne Stone, Patrick McCarthy, Elaine Jones, Michael Melnick, Michael Orzech, Andrea Orzech, Ray Phillips, William Miniscaleo, Anu Shah, Neil Bingham
Mr. Hagger called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM.

Loring Parsonage

Michael Melnick and Elaine Jones from the Permanent Building Committee were present to discuss the matter with the Historical Commission. Mr. Melnick stated new flooring had been recommended for the floor and that flooring had now been installed. He also indicated the flooring would be painted. The pine flooring was attempted to be matched but Mr. Melnick's preference would be to have the floors (first and second) painted.

Mr. Hagger felt the painted floors would be more historically appropriate.

Ms. Trexler asked if the knots would be pretreated on the floor, and Mr. Melnick stated the knots would be sanded and primed prior to painting.

Ms. Cebra asked if the painters and floor layers were experts in these respective areas. Mr. Melnick stated they were painters but they had experience in painting floors specifically.

Mr. Hagger asked if there was a sense from the Historical Commission if they were comfortable with the painting of the floors if the knots were properly treated. The sense was the Historical Commission agreed with this approach.

Mr. Melnick stated shoe molding would also need to be installed around the floor boards to fill in some of the space near the walls.

Approval of August 29, 2019 Site Inspection, August 29, 2019 Meeting, and September 5, 2019 Site Inspection Meeting Minutes

Ms. Warren made a motion to approve the August 29, 2019 minutes as amended. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. All members voted in favor, 6-0, with Mr. Bautze absent from the vote.

Ms. Warren made a motion to approve the August 29, 2019 site inspection minutes. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. All members voted in favor, 6-0, with Mr. Bautze absent from the vote.

Ms. Warren made a motion to approve the September 5, 2019 site inspection minutes. Ms. Hagger seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 5 members in favor, none opposed, Ms. Katz abstaining from the vote, and Mr. Bautze absent from the vote.

554 Boston Post Road – Determination under the Sudbury Demolition Delay Bylaw for the Stone Tavern Farmhouse

Mr. Hagger noted the public hearing had been closed at the last meeting of the Historical Commission and therefore no further input from the public would be taken in. He read into the record the intent and purpose section of the Demolition Delay Bylaw. Mr. Hagger then recapped the Demolition Delay application process for the Stone Tavern Farmhouse to this point, noting filing deadlines, site visits, and other relevant events. Mr. Hagger stated Ms. Costa and Mr. Bautze should not be voting on either of the applications for 554 Boston Post Road since they were not present during the public hearing, but they could participate in the deliberation discussions.

Mr. Hagger welcomed and appreciated the Applicant looking at the adaptive reuse of the tavern building. He stated the fabric of a historic building is not just the exterior, but the interior as well. Mr. Hagger referenced the process which had unfolded regarding another Demolition Permit application and he wished this same process could have happened with the 554 Boston Post Road applications. He stated he was inclined to suggest the implementation of a demolition delay on the tavern building.

Ms. Cebra indicated there seemed to be a lot of uncertainty as to what would happen with the tavern building and we don't know what is there about the various elements of the building, and it was unclear if it would be feasible to rehabilitate this building as it is a true unknown. She stated that to make the building look similar on the outside instead of really restoring it defeats the purpose of preserving the building. She noted the developers don't own the building and therefore there were no guarantees as to what would happen with the building. Ms. Cebra stated that this building is so significant to the history of the town that the commission should be very careful about making a decision and she would also be recommending a delay be implemented.

Ms. Trexler thanked the public for their participation in the process. She did not believe this was going to be a "feel good" vote no matter the outcome of the vote. Ms. Trexler asked if there was additional information which could be submitted after the delay had already been implemented

and wondered if the delay could be lifted at a later time. Mr. Hagger stated that was a possibility. Ms. Trexler asked if the property changed ownership, would a new Demolition Permit application process need to be undertaken. Mr. Duchesneau indicated he had spoken with the Building Inspector regarding this matter and a new Demolition Permit would not need to be applied for if made within the time period of a 6 month Demo Delay.

Ms. Warren stated she focused on the provisions of the Demolition Delay Bylaw and for the commission to follow the legal requirements and the intent and purpose of the bylaw; essentially the bylaw focuses on buildings, not just parts of the building; the Commission voted that the building was historically significant; the Commission did not vote that only parts of the building were historically significant. She stated that she did not know of any property or buildings in Sudbury that are more historically significant than the Stone Tavern Farm, the tavern farmhouse and the red barn, or which more significantly constitutes the historic resources, cultural heritage and character of our town. She stated that these buildings were a rare extant house and barn and the family connected and linked to this house from 1620 to the present; the layers of significance are wide and deep - representing architecture – it's a Georgian period exterior and interior, it represents agriculture, transportation, communication, commerce, farm residence, patterns of migration and early settlement. She said it is 200 years of one family embodying the story of Sudbury's history linked to important historical events: the foundations of Sudbury Plantation, the American Revolution, the agricultural evolution in Sudbury, connected to four original grantee proprietors settlers of Sudbury Plantation - the Noyes, Haynes, Rice and Stone families, and connected to Mayflower passenger Myles Standish and other passengers, direct descent from Josiah Haynes who died at the Battle of Lexington April 19, 1775, and descended from other patriots of the American Revolution, and also linked to the Wayside Inn because Ezekial Howe who fought during the American Revolution owned the tavern operating it as a tannery and bakery. Ms. Warren noted the tavern building met the criteria used to determine national register historical significance. She indicated she was also cognizant of the Demolition Permit for the tavern which sought a total demolition of the building, not a partial demolition. Ms. Warren stated she was concerned the Historical Commission did not know enough about the entirety of the structure. She viewed the Demolition Plan as the developer's plan, not the property owner's plan. She referred to the various stages in the process under the bylaw specifically referring to providing an opportunity to develop preservation solutions. Ms. Warren indicated that due to the information before the commission that the commission proceeds with caution and she believed that the structure should be preferably preserved and that the commission should invoke the six month delay.

Ms. Warren made a motion the Historical Commission determine and find the Stone Farm tavern building at 554 Boston Post Road be preferably preserved and to implement a six-month demolition delay on the building. Mr. Hagger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0, in favor of the motion with Ms. Costa abstaining from the vote and Mr. Bautze absent from the vote.

554 Boston Post Road – Determination under the Sudbury Demolition Delay Bylaw for the Barn with Cupola

Mr. Hagger noted the Applicant had proposed a repurposing of the barn for parts of the barn use in structures in other parts of town. He stated that while interesting, the repurposing proposal for the barn did not really follow the Secretary of the Interior's standards, the preservation guidance the Historical Commission follows. Mr. Hagger did not feel there was enough information presented and submitted to document the integrity of the barn. If a delay were implemented, he would like the Applicant to work with the Historical Commission to see if a preservation solution could be reached.

Ms. Cebra stated she felt the barn expressed the history of agriculture in Sudbury and did not view the proposal to take and reuse parts of the barn on another site is not repurposing the barn. She said the barn is so visible and that it is unique to have a historic house and barn still together. Demolition of the barn would be losing a part of Sudbury which could never be brought back. She recommended a demolition delay be implemented on the barn.

Ms. Trexler felt there were a number of people in Sudbury who would be very surprised to see the barn come down when it was demolished. She felt more time should be given to look at the surrounding area and what was occurring on those properties.

Ms. Warren noted the focus of the Demolition Delay Bylaw is on a building. She said that the application by the owner for a building permit for the barn with cupola states the reason is to "dismantle and repurpose", and actually the building is not being repurposed. She stated that construction materials are being proposed to be reused, but reusing of parts of the building is not repurposing the barn, She commented on the examples of historic buildings in Sudbury that have been surveyed by the commission that have been repurposed by changing the use of the building while preserving the building. She wanted to reiterate the historical commission voted that the barn is historically significance – not just parts of the building such as the cupola. Ms. Warren stated that to dismantle is to totally demolish. Ms. Warren reviewed the reasons why the barn is historically significant and stated the barn also derives its historical significance because it is paired with another building, the tavern, on the property, and together they are historically significant as a unit. She commented on why the principles of historic preservation embodied in the US Secretary of the Interiors standards provides for four treatments – is not just one solution for preservation of a historic structure; historic structures are old and it is to be expected that they are going to need repair, restoration or rehabilitation, especially this barn which is over 150 years old and which has been rehabilitated by a former generation. She noted the timing issue of salvaging materials from the barn is not pertinent to the Demolition Bylaw. Further she stated the due to the incredible historical significance and the plans that were presented that are not legally binding at this time, she recommended the barn be found preferably preserved and a six-month demolition delay be implemented to have a consultation to seek a better solution that will preserve the structure.

Mr. Hagger made a motion the Historical Commission determine and find the Stone Farm barn at 554 Boston Post Road be preferably preserved and to implement a six-month demolition delay on the barn. Mr. Cebra seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0, in favor of the motion with Ms. Costa abstaining from the vote and Mr. Bautze absent from the vote.

Eversource Meeting

Denise Bartone from Eversource, Brooke Kenline-Nyman from Eversource, Mark Bergeron from Epsilon Associates, Michael Hager from EN Engineering, and Paul Jahnige from the Department of Conservation and Recreation were present to discuss the matter with the Historical Commission.

Ms. Bartone indicated Eversource had started their Section 106 review process with the United States Army Corps of Engineers. She stated they would like to go over the areas the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) had identified, and go over the avoidance and mitigation plan.

Ms. Costa asked if the plan was documented somewhere in the materials provided. Ms. Bartone stated some notations had been provided in the materials to the Historical Commission.

There was then discussion regarding the Nondisclosure Agreement which had been passed along to the Historical Commission for execution. Mr. Pucci indicated he had some questions about the Nondisclosure Agreement and wanted to understand what the limitations would be for the Historical Commission once they signed the Nondisclosure Agreement. Mr. Pucci stated that aside from the cultural report, the two issues identified by the MHC were the bridges and the Historic Districts listed in the State Register. He wanted to make sure the Historical Commission had ample time to review the materials in order to make informed questions about the proposed project.

Ms. Warren felt there might be other resources in the project area which the MHC was not aware of and therefore she felt the information was a bit too narrow. Mr. Bergeron provided a summary of the cultural resource analysis they had conducted to this point in the process.

Ms. Warren requested the cultural resources site in Sudbury be separated out and provided to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Kenline-Nyman indicated archaeological resources and standing structures were looked at in terms of the resources. Mr. Hagger confirmed the types of testing which occurred and where they took place. Mr. Jahnige noted there were various different types of disturbed sections where the railroad was implemented (cut areas, fill areas, etc.).

Discussion took place regarding the various bridges which would be involved in the project and what would happen to them (removed, rehabilitated, etc.).

At this time Mr. Bautze arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Trexler asked if there were any bridges which had been rehabilitated per the MHC's guidelines and Mr. Jahnige indicated they had done this.

Historical Commission members stated they would like to know where individual assets within the corridor were located and what they were.

Ms. Bartone indicated the plans displayed an underground transmission line through the corridor and Mr. Jahnige noted this had significantly reduced the limits of work for the project. Mr. Hager noted this was no longer an overhead powerline project.

Ms. Trexler asked if any blasting would be done as part of this project. Mr. Hager stated blasting was not typically used in a right of way unless it was absolutely necessary and they would try to avoid it.

Mr. Hager summarized the additional pieces of information the Historical Commission was seeking to obtain as follows:

- Resolve the issues and questions pertaining to the Nondisclosure Agreement.
- More information on the above ground railroad artifacts with descriptions on where they were, what they are, and where they would go.
- Provide photographs of bridges 127 and 128, and identifying what would be removed in terms of materials.
- More mitigation details on the section house.
- Written summary of the presentation.
- Information as to whether or not the revised plans were the final impact in the field.
- What plans had been revised since the final impact.
- Locations of test pits.

The Historical Commission asked Ms. Bartone and Ms. Kenline-Nyman what their timeline was for this project. Ms. Bartone indicated the process timeline was entirely up to the United States Army Corps of Engineers and when they would be completing their review.

At 9:10 PM, the Historical Commission took a short recess and reconvened at 9:17 PM.

Old Home Surveys

Mr. Hager noted Mr. Taylor had done a good job of identifying those properties which had been constructed before 1940, but which were located outside of the Historic Districts in town. Ms. Costa asked and Ms. Trexler confirmed there was a \$500 per parcel cost for each historical survey. Ms. Warren suggested the Historical Commission analyze the list developed by Mr. Taylor and remove the properties they did not want to survey. Ms. Trexler noted the Historical Commission was also capable of conducting surveys of properties. Mr. Hager felt the priority should be to conduct surveys on properties which had no information collected on them. Ms.

Warren suggested each member provide a list of properties which they felt should be surveyed to compile a reduced list. Ms. Trexler offered to compile this list of properties from each member and to send the list to Mr. Duchesneau for distribution to the entire Historical Commission.

484 North Road – Demolition Delay under the Demolition Delay Bylaw

Mr. Hagger indicated someone had expressed interest in potentially purchasing this property, however, he was not sure if they were still interested in purchasing the lot. Ms. Warren stated the current owners had purchased the property for \$260,000 and have relisted it for around \$460,000. Therefore, she did not believe the current owners were truly interested in selling the property.

Demolition Delay Bylaw Public Information

Mr. Hagger stated he and Ms. Warren had met with (now former) Town Manager Melissa Rodrigues and Assistant Town Manager Maryanne Bilodeau regarding some of the Historical Commission's ongoing initiatives. Ms. Costa indicated she would compile some outreach materials on the Demolition Delay Bylaw for the November Historical Commission meeting. Ms. Katz suggested a question and answer document be developed to further inform people about various aspects of the Demolition Delay Bylaw.

Financial Report

Ms. Costa noted she had distributed a financial report for the Historical Commission to all members. She spoke to some of the costs and savings which pertained to the Hosmer House. Ms. Katz noted she had recently met with Ms. Bilodeau who indicated she would speak with the Facilities Director regarding the possibility of the Town handling the cleaning of the Hosmer House.

Town Owned Broad Acres Property

Mr. Hagger stated he had indicated to Ms. Bilodeau the Historical Commission would like to conduct a site visit of the Broad Acres property at some point in the near future. Mr. Hagger noted he would like to propose some possible dates and times to the Facilities Director for the Historical Commission to conduct a site visit. The Historical Commission selected some dates for Mr. Hagger to suggest to the Facilities Director for a site visit.

Town Hall Renovation

Mr. Hagger noted the Permanent Building Committee had asked to be placed on the Historical Commission's agenda in December to discuss the Town Hall Renovation project. Ms. Trexler indicated the Permanent Building Committee was seeking a variance from the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board. She noted other Towns have asked for and received variances for their Town Halls from the Architectural Access Board.

Hosmer House Open House Update

Mr. Bautze stated there was a meeting back in June of 2019 and the meeting was very positive. He indicated they discussed decorating the Hosmer House with a theme and this time it would be the Hosmer House presenting Storyland. Mr. Bautze noted the dates of the event would be December 7th and 8th, and December 14th and 15th of 2019.

Hosmer House October 17, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Hagger stated one item which came out of a recent meeting was they wanted to meet again in the fall of 2019. They are working on drafting a profile of what the Executive Director position for the Hosmer House would look like. Ms. Costa was curious to know what board the Executive Director would report to and asked for this item be included on a future meeting agenda for discussion.

Sudbury Colonial Faire at Wayside Inn

Mr. Hagger noted the fair was being held on September 28, 2019. Mr. Bautze indicated he was looking for assistance setting up and taking down the tents that day.

Massachusetts Historic Preservation Conference

Mr. Hagger and Ms. Cebra indicated they would be attending the conference.

Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated by Chair within 48 hours of Posting Meeting

Mr. Hagger stated when he and Ms. Warren had met with Ms. Rodrigues and Ms. Bilodeau, they had also discussed the status of Frost Farm house and possibly retaining some of the architectural details from the building.

Ms. Costa provided an update on the progress of the Master Plan update process and noted the topical meetings which would be occurring throughout October. She also noted the consultant working on the Master Plan update was seeking comments on the Historical and Cultural Resources Baseline Report from the Historical Commission.

Mr. Hagger indicated Ms. Rodrigues and Ms. Bilodeau had encouraged the Historical Commission to get working on the Carding Mill project.

Mr. Hagger stated the next Historical Commission meeting was on October 15, 2019 in the Police Station, 75 Hudson Road.

Mr. Hagger adjourned the meeting at 10:55 PM.