



# 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

### MEETING

### MINUTES

**SEPTEMBER 22, 2020**

**Present:** Chair Chris Hagger, Vice-Chair Diana Warren, Diana Cebra, Taryn Trexler, Marjorie Katz, Steve Greene Fred Bautze

**Absent:** Jan Costa

**Others Present:** Beth Perry, Planning and Community Development Administrator, Adam Duchesneau, Director Planning and Community Development

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 6:30 PM

#### **316 Goodman's Hill Road under the Demolition Delay bylaw**

Present: Pamela Skewes-Cox, Applicant/Homeowner of 316 Goodman's Hill Road, and Tom Huth, Architect for Applicant

Mr. Hagger provided background and stated that the partial demolition application was received on August 18, 2020, and a site visit with the Commissioners took place on August 10; which was performed 16 days after the application was submitted. He noted that step 3 of the demolition consideration would take place at tonight's meeting. Mr. Hagger was happy to announce that the Commission was far ahead of schedule as outlined in the Demolition Delay Bylaw and had worked diligently with the applicant to move the process along.

Mr. Hagger confirmed that during tonight's discussion, the Commissioner's will determine if the building is historically significant.

Applicant and homeowner Pamela Skewes-Cox, indicated she was hoping to keep a described portion of the structure in character with the rest of the historical home.

Mr. Hagger provided history of 316 Goodman's Hill Road and noted that the Greek Revival home was built in the 1800s, and is adjacent to the historic district. Mr. Hagger indicated that the property had historical significance in consideration of its age, history, and relevance to the Town center.

Ms. Warren noted that in addition to the historical architectural aspects, the historical narrative is of great importance. Ms. Warren spoke of the home's connection with the Jones family and the Haynes family, who represent some of Sudbury's earliest history. She indicated that the home had historical significance.

Mr. Greene suggested that the demolition process should be fast-tracked in consideration of proposed partial demolition. Mr. Hagger confirmed that the process had been fast-tracked with a proposed public hearing to take place in October.

Ms. Trexler agreed that the building was historically significant and agreed, that because the applicant provided much related historical detail on the property, the application should be expediated. Ms. Trexler stressed that the building had already been determined to have historical significance, and stressed that the demolition bylaw process could be improved, especially in consideration of owners who seek to preserve the structure. Mr. Hagger acknowledged Ms. Trexler's recommendation, and stated that the Commissioners would review the process at the next Historical Commission meeting next month.

Ms. Skewes-Cox reiterated that the part she is seeking to demolish is not part of the 1811 original farmhouse, and was added as a garage in the 1930s. She detailed that the original farmhouse was reconstructed, taken back to the studs and reconstructed in 1934. Mr. Hagger commented that changes to the exterior of the main house were suggested, and the demo delay bylaw applied to any properties built prior to 1940.

Mr. Huth thanked the Commissioners for their willingness to expediate the process.

### **Public Comment**

Anu Shah, 257 Concord Road, stated he was concerned about the present process as it related to the project. He indicated that the home already was included on the MACRIS listing, and the submitted plans served to maintain the historical architecture throughout the home. He noted that expediting this process would help the architect address any recommendations that the Commissioners might have. He stressed that winter is quickly approaching, and additional delay would cost the applicant more money and construction delay.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Commissioners conducted a site visit of 316 Goodman's Hill Road on September 10, 2020 and at the September 22, 2020 meeting, determine that the structure is historically significant. Ms. Warren seconded the motion.

Mr. Greene commented that a Public Hearing was not required because the home is not in an historic district, regardless of the language of the demolition bylaw. Mr. Hagger responded that the demolition bylaw regulations apply to properties outside of the historic districts. He detailed that changes to the bylaw must be voted on at Town Meeting. Ms. Katz acknowledged that such bylaws are not the same for every community/town and the Sudbury Historical Commission needs to follow the Sudbury bylaw.

Ms. Warren referred to Section 4, number 5 and read the wording aloud to further describe the bylaw's requiring a public hearing.

Roll Call Vote, 6-1; Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye, Greene-aye, Bautze-abstain, Hagger-aye.

Mr. Hagger stated that he would so inform the Sudbury Building Inspector of this determination.

VOTED: That 316 Goodman's Hill Road is a historically significant property.

**Eversource – Transmission Line Project, Site Visit Dates**

Mr. Hagger noted there were several considerations within the Eversource topic, to be discussed.

Ms. Warren stated that Eversource agreed to lead a site visit of the MBTA corridor with the Commissioners to include Bridges 127 and 128, the Section Tool House, and railroad right of way (flashers, mileposts, etc.).

Commissioners agreed to accept the Eversource invite for a site walk to take place on October 5<sup>th</sup>, October 9<sup>th</sup>, or October 16.

Mr. Hagger asked the Commission what aspects they would especially want to view during the site walk. The Commission agreed that the areas of interest included:

- Area containing the smaller railroad features
- Bridges 127 and 128

Ms. Cebra asked if the site walk features could be recorded with the Commissions recently purchased i-Pad. Mr. Hagger commented that he would ask Eversource representatives if such recording would be possible.

Mr. Hagger asked if the site walk required posting and advertising. Ms. Warren stated that there would be no deliberation involved with the tour, so posting would not be required, similar to demo delay site visits.

Ms. Warren reviewed the draft letters composed to the Army Corps of Engineers. Ms. Warren noted that she had a telephone discussion with a representative from the Army Corps of Engineers, and asked about the expected timeframe. Ms. Warren also relayed that she asked the representative if Eversource and DCR (Department of Conservation and Recreation) had officially filed their application with the Army Corps. She detailed that the Army Corp. representative indicated that in approximately 60 days a Memorandum of Agreement would be submitted to the Mass Historical Commission, which the Sudbury Historical Commission would have a chance to comment about. Ms. Warren emphasized that the process is moving quickly.

Ms. Warren added that she requested a copy of the official filing from the Army Corps. representative, Mr. Anacheka-Nasemann. He asked that the Commission submit a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act, before a copy of the official filling could be sent to the Commission. Ms. Warren referenced the official letter from the Commission to Mr. Anacheka-Nasemann of the US Army Corps of Engineers, requesting a copy of the filing.

Ms. Katz thanked Ms. Warren for all the work she had put into this project. She suggested several edits to the request letter was drafted by Ms. Warren. Related discussion took place. Mr. Hagger suggested that the request be more specific in the interest of time.

Ms. Warren spoke of the Commission letters sent to Eversource in June, July and August. She acknowledged that some material was forwarded to Mr. Duchesneau in response to Commission inquires included in the Commissions July letter to Eversource.

Ms. Warren informed the Commissioners that she drafted a corresponding letter to Eversource, which detailed the request for additional information regarding certain aspects. Ms. Warren confirmed that she reminded Eversource of the outstanding requests for information in this letter. In the same correspondence, Ms. Warren asked that the Eversource representatives meet with the Sudbury Historical Commission again (after the site walk) in light of the Mass Historical Commission request that Eversource continue to consult with the Sudbury Historical Commission regarding the mitigation and avoidance plan as stated in the MHC December 18, 2029.

Ms. Trexler asked Ms. Warren if the Army Corps of Engineers also had some of the documents referred to. Ms. Warren responded that the Corps of Engineers did not have all the documentation, and confirmed that she would include that documentation with the Commissions correspondence to the Army Corps.

Ms. Warren referred to the drafted letter to Denise Bartone of Eversource, dated October 7, 2020; to be sent as a reminder to Ms. Bartone. The Commissioners agreed that the reminder letter was appropriate.

Ms. Warren noted that the Eversource-DCR projects was required to obtain numerous permits and licenses, and she noted that Eversource had postponed their hearing with ConCom (Conservation Commission).

Ms. Warren emphasized that Eversource must obtain Waterway License through MA DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) Waterways Regulation Program, which relates to Bridges 127 and 128; with full and partial demolition of such bridges. She stressed that interested parties (including the Commission) have until Friday, September 25<sup>th</sup> to provide related comment.

Ms. Warren confirmed that she had drafted the appropriate comments/letters to Christine Hopps, Assistant Director, Waterways Regulation Program – Mass Department of Environmental Protection. Ms. Warren referenced the draft letter which requests that Mass DEP hold a public hearing regarding the license application and address the prospect of removal of an existing “dilapidated bridge structure, for rail trail use,” as included within the Eversource Waterways Application. The draft letter to Ms. Hopps indicated the Commissions opposition to the removal of Bridge 127 and advocated for its rehabilitation, or other options. Ms. Warren asked that all Commissioners sign the letter. She hoped that the Board of Selectmen would request that a public hearing be held on the license applications.

Commissioners presented comments/edits regarding the two drafted letters to Ms. Hopps. Ms. Warren agreed to eliminate the wording that the Commissioners request a public hearing.

Mr. Hagger strongly recommended that the drafted letter only justify the historical aspects regarding the bridges. Commissioners Hagger, Katz and Trexler agreed that the last paragraph of the letter was appropriate and worthy of inclusion, which read: “although Eversource has acknowledged that they have evaluated eight alternatives to full replacement of Bridge 127, and the Commission advocates that the alternatives be evaluated by Mass DEP.”

No second to the motion was made.

Mr. Hagger commented that the Commission agreed to send out the letter concerning Bridge 127 to Mass DEP, and would prefer to wait on sending the corresponding letter concerning Bridge 128.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Commission submit the letter regarding Bridge 127 to Mass DEP, and wait until the Preservation Consultant begins work with the Commission and then discuss the proposed changes to Bridge 128. Ms. Katz seconded the motion.

Resident Renata Aylward, 265 Dutton Road, commented about a previous study. Ms. Warren responded that the Town entered into a contract with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of the Narragansett Tribe to perform an initial survey of the corridor to determine if there were archeological resources of significance, and the report affirmed that such historical significance. She detailed that the second phase included site work to be performed by the Narragansett Historic Preservation officer, which did not happen. Ms. Warren indicated that it would be important to the Town that such site evaluation work be completed, and such services have been redacted from the survey which Eversource submitted to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Aylward asked about a foundation across from the bridge. Mr. Hagger responded that Eversource performed a survey of artifacts (including the mentioned foundation) along the corridor. Ms. Warren added that it appears that the Eversource survey was not complete, and the Commission's request for a Historical Consultant would help with this aspect and could perform a peer review of such surveys.

Resident Rebecca Cutting, 381 Maynard Road, indicated that Ch. 91 was not clear, and stated that as a DEP attorney, she could assist the Commission with the letter involving the bridges. She affirmed that she had spoken to Ms. Hopps regarding Bridge 128, and indicated that Ms. Hopps was interested in Section 106 aspects.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the four draft letters previously reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Bautze-aye, Hagger-aye.

VOTED: To approve the four draft letters previously reviewed by the Commission.

The majority consensus of the Commission was not to meet with the Board of Selectmen to discuss request to fund related engineering support at this time.

Resident and President of Protect Sudbury Raymond Phillips, 40 Whispering Pine Road, indicated that enlisting the expert engineering consultations in this matter was crucial, in light of the fact that Eversource would have experts on their behalf, and the Conservation Commission also had its own experts.

Ms. Warren reiterated that professional historical engineering experts was necessary.

Ms. Katz opined about narrowing the scope of what might be requested of such engineering experts. She recognized that experts may be of value in this case.

Ms. Warren offered to re-connect with the engineering candidates in order to narrow the scope of request.

### **Community Preservation Committee Accepting Proposals**

Ms. Warren detailed the CPC application which she drafted regarding funding for a Historic Preservation Plan, was a priority included in the Master Plan, which is be readied for approval. She noted that the proposal would be in the \$30,000 to \$35,000 range.

Ms. Trexler noted that the Historic Preservation Plan should not be owned only by the Historical Commission, and wanted to determine if other Town boards would approve of the Historical Commission going forward with this application, and if others wanted to participate in the management of such a plan.

Ms. Warren noted that the scope of the Historical Commission jurisdiction over historic preservation is broad and suggested that the Commission submit the proposal to CPC and reach out to the Historic Districts Commission, Historical Society, Wayside Inn, and the Planning Board.

Ms. Cebra thanked Ms. Warren for moving forward with this CPC application.

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Historical Commission support the drafting and submittal of the CPC Application to develop a Town of Sudbury Historic Preservation Plan, seeking support from the Historic Districts Commission, The Planning Board, The Historical Society and others as needed. Ms. Cebra seconded the motion. Roll Call 7-0; Warren-aye, Hagger-aye, Trexler-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Bautze-aye, Katz-aye.

VOTED: That the Historical Commission support the drafting and submittal of the CPC Application to develop a Town of Sudbury Historic Preservation Plan, seeking support from The Historic Districts Commission, The Planning Board, The Historical Society and others as needed.

#### **Community Preservation Committee Requested Annual Reporting Forms**

Mr. Hagger maintained that such information had already been submitted to the CPC. Mr. Duchesneau stated that he would relay that status to the CPC, noting that all requested items were complete. Mr. Hagger suggested that Ms. Katz update the cemetery request and Town Article.

#### **Approval of August 4<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting minutes**

Mr. Hagger noted that the August 4<sup>th</sup> minutes were being finalized.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the August 25, 2020 minutes, as amended. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Roll Call 7-0; Warren-aye, Hagger-aye, Trexler-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Bautze-aye, Katz-aye.

#### **RR Section/Tool House**

Mr. Greene researched and discovered that maintenance of the Tool House could not be done without the permission of the MBTA. He noted that he would be participating in a tour of the Tool House and would then compile a proposed maintenance list.

#### **16 Haynes Road – Bowker Store**

Mr. Greene confirmed that the discussed letter regarding 16 Haynes Road, was mailed last week and no response had been received yet.

#### **Hearse House/Town Pound**

Mr. Greene stated that he and Mr. Hagger toured the town-owned property. He added that Mr. Barletta would be contacted regarding minor repairs to be done at the site.

Mr. Hagger commented about an exterior door being original, with many aspects of restoration during the time the House was moved. He noted that there were two cemetery markers there, and suggested that further research could be done.

Ms. Cebra recommended that when Commissioners tour a site, the i-Pad could be used to take pictures/videos to share with Commissioners and others. Mr. Bautze stated that Mark Thompson of the IT Department was holding the i-pad.

Mr. Hagger mentioned that he and Mr. Greene toured the Town Pound and noted that a maintenance list was made to forward to Bill Barletta also.

### **Hosmer House Repairs/Upgrades**

Mr. Hagger stated that a budget existed for the repair of the Hosmer House roof and a new roof would be installed. He added that Mr. Barletta will be coordinating such installation with the Historic Districts Commission. Mr. Hagger stated that a new furnace and a/c filters were also being considered.

Ms. Cebra noted that a back door and wood around several windows at the Hosmer House have rot, and should also be addressed. Mr. Hagger recommended that Ms. Cebra contact Mr. Barletta and Mr. Bautze with a related documented listing of the items mentioned.

### **Sudbury Historical Society requests – Hosmer Painting Image, Loring Parsonage Doors**

Present: Rachel Robinson, Loring Parsonage

Mr. Hagger stated that the Historical Society had asked the Commission about two doors that they wish to remove in the Loring Parsonage. Ms. Robinson referred the Commissioners to hand-drawn plan rendering which depicted the removal and repurposing of the doors, to allow for additional display area.

Mr. Hagger questioned the location of the doors that were previously used at the Loring Parsonage. Ms. Robinson responded that she had no awareness of where those doors might be. Ms. Warren stated that those doors were at the Carding Mill. Mr. Hagger maintained that much time and planning went into the placement of the new doors at the Loring Parsonage. He expressed reluctance regarding the removal of the two doors.

Ms. Warren made comment regarding various aspects of the proposed plan. She stressed the historic relevance of the Loring Parsonage, and did not want the existing plan disturbed. Ms. Robinson stressed the importance of exhibit wall space. Mr. Hagger affirmed that this area of doors had special historical significance.

Ms. Cebra confirmed that visitors to the Loring Parsonage enjoy viewing the staircase, and asked if all the doors at the Hosmer House were original. Mr. Hagger responded that if such doors were taken down, they were removed in the 1960s. He noted that the current agreement documented that the front stairway including the area of the doors, would not be changed.

Mr. Bautze stated that the completed Loring project reflected much time, historical consideration, and money to create a museum about Sudbury via displays and exhibits.

Mr. Bautze motioned that the doors in question at the Loring Parsonage, be removed. The Commission did not second the motion.

Ms. Trexler commented about the benefit of retaining the doors and the benefit of eliminating them. Both Mr. Hagger and Ms. Warren indicated that the doors did not have to be closed or open.

Mr. Bautze suggested removing just one door.

Mr. Greene commented that he would not like to see the doors closed, nor would want to have the doors repurposed. He suggested that the doors be removed, and carefully preserved upstairs at the Parsonage. Ms. Warren agreed that it was inappropriate to repurpose the doors.

Mr. Hagger asked if the two doors could remain at a 90 degree angle to provide added wall space. Ms. Robinson responded that the drawing was not to scale, and there was not enough space for an opened door.

Mr. Hagger motioned to allow the Sudbury Historical Society to remove the door from the vestibule going into the Sudbury Foundation Gallery, and to label the door safely and securely, for storage in the second floor; and keep the hinges on the door frame and examine a way for the door from the gallery to the vestibule; to be opened without harming the exhibit on the wall. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Bautze-aye, Katz-aye, Warren-aye.

#### **Historic Building Survey grant update**

Ms. Trexler commented that Article 32 was approved at Town Meeting. She noted that Selectman Schineller was instrumental regarding the related administrative process, and stated that the RFP process had begun.

#### **Cemetery Restoration update**

Ms. Katz confirmed that Ms. Jones had sent her the related documents for the quote to go out to bid. She stated that she would review all documentation this week.

#### **Master Plan – Preservation/Cultural Resources**

Ms. Trexler provided Master Plan update, noting that the Planning Board would be requesting public comment. Ms. Warren suggested that Commissioners review the SudburyTV recording of the Planning Board meeting regarding the commentary on the Master Plan.

#### **Date for next meeting(s)**

Mr. Hagger affirmed that the next commission meeting would be held on Tuesday, October 20.

**Adjourn**

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bautze seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Warren-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Greene-aye, Katz-aye, Bautze-aye.

VOTED: To adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:50 PM