



# 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

JANUARY 14, 2020

#### LOWER TOWN HALL, 322 CONCORD ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Fred Bautze, Diana Cebra, Jan Costa, Chris Hagger, Margi Katz, Taryn Trexler, and Diana Warren

Other Attendees: Jerry Effren, Quentin Nowland, Krisanne Bursik, Anne Stone, Chuck Mills, Debbie Dineen, Patrick McCarthy, and Steve Green

Mr. Hagger called the meeting to order. Mr. Hagger appointed Mr. Bautze, alternate member, to vote at tonight's meeting to fill the vacant full member position.

#### 35 Lincoln Lane

Under the Demolition Delay Bylaw, the Historical Commission (SHC) conducted a site visit within 30 days of the SHC's receipt of a Building Permit. The SHC needs to decide if 35 Lincoln Lane is historically significant. 35 Lincoln Lane is not in the MACRIS database. Motion: Move that under the Demolition Delay Bylaw, the SHC conducted a site visit January 13, 2020 of the property at 35 Lincoln Lane and I would move the property is not historically significant and a Demolition Permit could be issued. Motion seconded. In favor: Ms. Cebra, Ms. Costa, Mr. Hagger, Mr. Katz, Ms. Trexler, Ms. Warren. Abstention: Mr. Bautze. None opposed. Motion passes. Mr. Hagger will inform the building inspector of this decision.

#### 554 Boston Post Road

Mr. Hagger led off the discussion stating that when we last met with the property developer, there was a request to shorten the Demolition Delay Bylaw. The SHC asked for an interior deed restriction that would preserve certain farmhouse interior architectural features beyond the immediate, future owner. The SHC was informed by the developer that they were not able to accommodate the deed restriction. Mr. Hagger indicated that he was hoping something could be worked out and disappointed that it did not happen.

Mr. Effren responded that they verified the list of historically identified interior features with their architect, and that the plans filed with the SHC are the plans shown. The developer's lender would not agree with the inclusion of the deed restriction, citing a potential down the road problem such as in a foreclosure.

Mr. Hagger commented that the SHC voted that to preserve both structures they be deemed "preferably preserved", and initiate a Demolition Delay Permit pause of six months (per the

Town's Demolition Delay Bylaw). The SHC previously asked for 1) documentation of additions to the farmhouse, 2) access to the farmhouse, 3) a restriction on the farmhouse interior farmhouse elements, and 5) move the barn to elsewhere on the property. The SHC was hoping to get some movement of some of these items, but Mr. Hagger indicated the SHC did not get any movement.

Discussion ensued around item 24 from the Sudbury Planning Board's September 25, 2019 Site Plan Review Decision 554 Boston Post Road. Item 24 states "**Prior to the issuance of any Demolition or Building Permit for the Stone Tavern building**, the Applicant / Owner shall provide reasonable and timely access to member(s) designated by the Town of Sudbury Historic Districts Commission and Historical Commission, in connection with the plans to renovate the Stone Tavern building, to be used as an office for the self-storage facility, to determine, to the extent possible, what interior elements of historical significance may be preserved during such renovations." Mr. Hagger will follow up with the Sudbury Planning Department to determine who is responsible for managing this provision to ensure the appropriate follow up. To date, despite many requests over the last year the SHC has not been permitted access to the interior of the Stone Tavern Building.

Discussion followed regarding the shortening of the Demolition Delay Bylaw time period, which is completed on March 17, 2020. Initial discussion: It was stated that the SHC can't vote without knowing what's in the interior and to understand the historical nature of the additions is. A site visit of the farmhouse interior per Item 24, referenced above has been denied to-date. Certain elements and additions of the farmhouse have been considered historically relevant, but they have not been directly viewed by any member of the Historic Commission. There is insufficient progress, in particular the provisions of obtaining a deed restriction or the benefits of a deed restriction, that warrants shortening the Demolition Delay Bylaw. Shortening the delay would set a future precedent inconsistent with another recent SHC Demolition Delay Bylaw decision. The precedent of 484 North Road was cited as a comparable example where the SHC maintained the full six-month Demolition Delay Bylaw in the absence of any applicant movement on historical preservation. Allowing the additional time period should enable an opportunity for future discussion. Another option of developing a preservation restriction was mentioned. Mr. Effren stated that nothing requires them to preserve the farmhouse and if we do not suspend the decision, they will go ahead. An alternative perspective was discussed: There has been acknowledgment, based on Stone Tavern drawings of the interior, of certain features discussed at the January 7 SHC meeting, in a draft letter of agreement from the applicant. In order to preserve these elements, it would benefit the SHC to shorten the Demolition Delay Bylaw. The 484 North Road decision was based on a total demolition request versus a partial demolition request.

Motion: "To immediately lift the six-month demolition delay, as enacted under the Sudbury Demolition Delay Bylaw for the main building/Stone Tavern Farmhouse at 554 Boston Post Road, provided the following will take place during the renovation/rehabilitation:

- Roof to be architectural asphalt shingles;
- Siding to be replaced with cedar clapboards and be graduated towards the ground level;
- All siding courses to align with window headers and sills;

All exterior trim to be wood and historically accurate reproductions of the original profiles and dimensions;

- All exterior windows visible from the public right of way on the first and second floors will be wood, six-over-six true divided light, historically appropriate windows;
- Smaller attic windows at both gable ends to remain or be replaced with wood, true divided light windows;
- Repoint brick masonry at the chimney with appropriate materials;
- Exterior paint and trim colors will be represent the period of significance (c. 1804), similar to historic Sherwin Williams paint scheme presented at the January 6th meeting;

No gutter will be added to the front elevation.

The Historical Commission also encourages the final renovation to include an interpretive panel or plaque with the history of the Stone Family and the Stone Farm property.

Per the suggested agreement by the potential developer, Quentin Nowland d/b/a 554 BPR LLC, (the “Developer”) and the Historical Commission, the Developer will also preserve key interior architectural features of the Stone Tavern Farmhouse during the demolition, re-construction, and adaptive reuse of the property.

Further, per the Sudbury Planning Board’s “Site Plan Review Decision” dated September 25, 2019, following completion of construction the Developer will cooperate, assist, and otherwise promote the actions of the Sudbury Historic District Commission to place the Stone Tavern building and Stone Farm cupola within the jurisdiction of the Historic Districts Commission in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40C, as outlined in “Condition No. 26.” Motion seconded. In favor: Mr. Bautze, Ms. Trexler, Opposed: Ms. Cebra, Ms. Costa, Mr. Hagger, Mr. Katz, Ms. Warren. Motion did not pass.

Mr. Hagger asked for a motion to shorten the delay on the Barn application. None was offered.

### 85 Raymond Road

Under the Demolition Delay Bylaw, the SHC conducted a site visit on January 13, within 30 days of the SHC’s receipt of a Building Permit. The SHC needs to decide if 85 Raymond Road is historically significant. This property was historically surveyed in 2010. It is part of a cluster of houses along Raymond Road that are architecturally significant. The owner’s representative / restoration contractor invited the SHC site visit attendees inside the interior of the house and provided an in- depth walk through and discussion on the historical features of the home. SHC attendees commented that it was a collaborative and cooperative site visit. Motion: Move that the SHC conducted a site visit inspection at 85 Raymond Road on January 13, 2020 and we have determined the building to be historically significant. Motion seconded. In favor: Ms. Cebra, Ms. Costa, Mr. Hagger, Mr. Katz, Ms. Trexler, Ms. Warren. Abstention: Mr. Bautze. None opposed. Motion passes. Mr. Hagger will inform the building inspector of this decision.

Re 554 Boston Post Rd, Ms. Warren offered to draft a preservation restriction agreement. Ms. Warren pointed out provision #5 under the Permanent Building Committee’s Site Plan Review Decision 554 Boston Post Road regarding archaeological surveying. SHC did not indicate any consensus on these items. Mr. Hagger will follow up with the Planning Director to determine who manages the Permanent Building Committee’s Site Plan Review Decision 554 Boston Post

Road, including item 24. Ms. Warren suggested a half day retreat for the SHC. Mr. Hagger will seek guidance on that suggestion.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 13, 2020. Motion to adjourn. Seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned.