



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

OCTOBER 20, 2020

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

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

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 7:00 PM

Public Hearing - 316 Goodman's Hill Road under the Demolition Delay bylaw

Present: Pamela Skewes-Cox, Applicant/Homeowner of 316 Goodman's Hill Road; Tom Huth, Architect for the Applicant; Tom Bannon, Bannon Custom Construction Co. - Contractor for the Applicant

Mr. Hagger summarized the proposed Demolition Plan to demolish a portion of the existing home and make other changes to the exterior at 316 Goodman's Hill Road.

Ms. Skewes-Cox confirmed that she had submitted all necessary documentation, and had nothing more to add.

Mr. Hagger explained that the Demolition Plan is to demolish the attached garage on the far right hand side of the house and add a new addition, fill in the overhang porch on the current right wing of the house and make other exterior changes to the existing home. Mr. Hagger asked if an existing framing of the porch area on the side of the wing could be retained. Ms. Skewes-Cox indicated that she would not accept such change to the architectural plan.

Mr. Hagger inquired about a column on the overhang of the side porch entrance included in the proposed plan. Mr. Huth responded the proposed column was simple; was proportioned correctly, and would hold up the portion of the roof.

Mr. Hagger asked about the proposed side door. Mr. Huth responded the door was paneled with glass. Mr. Hagger commented that the plans detailed the replacement of the existing windows in

the wing of the house, with 6 over 1 pane, rather than the current 6 over 6 paned windows, in the kitchen wing and the in the new addition. Mr. Huth agreed.

Mr. Hagger asked about a corner window on the side of the home. Mr. Huth responded that the proposed square window would allow the owner to look out at the swimming pool, and would also provide for additional light into the kitchen. Ms. Shewes-Cox confirmed that the window in question was not visible from the street.

Ms. Warren thanked the owner and architect for their submission - for the completeness of their Demolition Plan – a gold standard for a demolition plan submission. She mentioned that historic structures evolve over time and additions as paired with an original structure can qualify due to age according to the Sec. of the Interiors Standards as being historically significant. And the right wing having been constructed in the 1930s, could qualify as being historically significant because of its connection with the main structure.

Ms. Warren indicated her preference for retaining the historical 6-over-6 light windows in the wing as being historically appropriate in comparison to changing to 6 over 1 lights in the wing, but that 6 over 1 lighted windows are acceptable in the new addition that will clearly not be interpreted as part of the older main house and wing, but a new addition.

Ms. Shewes-Cox stressed that in 2020 insulated windows are essential. Ms. Warren indicated that she had no problem with the insulated windows in the proposed addition.

Ms. Trexler noted that the changes proposed would enhance the livability of the home, which would extend the life of the historic home. She indicated that the plan was appropriate, and the proposed changes were minimal. Ms. Trexler recommended the Commission approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Cebra thanked the applicant for the extensive/informative home tour, and agreed with Ms. Trexler. She maintained the plans should be accepted, as submitted.

Ms. Costa stated that she would endorse the plan, which is most thoughtful. She inquired about proposed landscaping. Ms. Shewes-Cox responded that the existing landscaping would not be changing, with the exception of one tree that she had planted in the front of the house by the kitchen entrance.

Ms. Katz confirmed her endorsement of the plan and recommended the Commission approve the plan, as submitted.

Mr. Bautze had nothing to add.

Mr. Greene indicated his concern regarding the 6-over-1 windows, and asked the applicant why she preferred that design. Ms. Shewes-Cox responded that the view from her kitchen was

special, and eliminating the window panes would enhance the view. Mr. Huth detailed that this window view was important to the applicant.

Resident Anuraj Shah, 257 Concord Road, thought the plan was expertly done, and stressed that the proportion of all window lights have retained consistency. He asserted that the approval process had taken too long, and the Historic Districts process would not have taken as much time to approve.

Mr. Huth mentioned the neighborhood endorsement letters submitted to the Commission.

Ms. Warren confirmed that the 6-over-1 window style in the proposed addition was appropriate, and disagreed with the 6-over-1 window in the kitchen. She requested that those windows be changed to a 6-over-6 configuration, and felt that the proposed addition windows were not in keeping with the 1930s window or the original facade of the house. Ms. Warren stated that she would vote in support of the presented plans, but asked if the owner would consider the change in window style. Ms. Shewes-Cox acknowledged that she would not consider the request made by Ms. Warren, and stated that she and the architect found the window plan to be appropriate.

Mr. Shah stated that wood simulated divided light windows have been approved by the Historic Districts Commission many times.

Mr. Hagger moved to close the Public Hearing for 316 Goodman's Hill Road. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Hagger-aye, Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye

Mr. Hagger motioned that the Sudbury Historical Commission held a Public Hearing on October 20, 2020 to review the Demolition Plan for the historic house at 316 Goodman's Hill Road. The Sudbury Historical Commission determined at its October 20, 2020 Public Hearing that the proposed demolition plan, as submitted to the Commission, would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural heritage or resources of the Town; and therefore, shall not be considered to be a preferably preserved building. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Costa-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye, Hagger-aye.

Ms. Warren noted that she voted in favor with great hesitation, and upon review of Secretary of Interior standards for restoration/rehabilitation; the 6-over-1 windows were not appropriate in the L and had concern that the Commission was setting a precedent. Mr. Hagger recognized that several Commissioners shared the view expressed by Ms. Warren.

VOTED: To approve the demolition plan for 316 Goodman's Hill Road as presented.

11 Candyhill Lane (well barn on the property) under the Demolition Delay Bylaw

Present: John Cecere, Applicant/Home Owner

Mr. Hagger stated that a site visit took place on October 6, and thanked the applicant for allowing the Commission to view the property. Mr. Hagger noted that the Commission would now determine if the Well House was historically significant under the bylaw Section 4 (2) which he read. Mr. Hagger stated that this was not a Public Hearing.

Mr. Cecere confirmed that he was looking forward to taking over the stewardship of 11 Candyhill Lane, and noted that the barn was an unexpected finding. He felt that in its present state, the barn presented some concern regarding entrance to the well.

Ms. Warren stated that the barn structure in the back of Mr. and Mrs. Cecere's property was not historically significant for its architecture, period, style, and was not associated with any cultural or social history in Sudbury; unlike the primary main house residence at 11 Candyhill Lane. She endorsed Mr. Cecere's plan to reconstruct the barn and make it useable.

Ms. Trexler noted that she was not present at the site visit, and referred to the commissioners who were in attendance.

Ms. Cebra stated that she enjoyed the site visit, and found the surroundings interesting; though the secondary structure had no historical significance.

Mr. Greene agreed the well needed to be secured with a safe building.

Ms. Costa stated that she was not present at the site visit and was familiar with the property.

Ms. Katz noted that the site visit was enjoyable, and agreed with the comments made by other commissioners.

Mr. Bautze had no further comments.

Mr. Hagger then made a motion that the Sudbury Historical Commission has determined that the Well House is not historically significant and a demolition permit may be issued by the Building Inspector. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye. Ms. Costa at first stated she would abstain citing the reason that she did not attend the site visit, but then voted aye.

VOTED: That The Sudbury Historical Commission has determined the Well House is not historically significant and a demolition permit may be issued by the Building Inspector.

Eversource – Transmission Line Project

Mr. Hagger thanked the Commissioners who participated in the Eversource site walk; himself, Mr. Greene, Ms. Warren, and Ms. Cebra. He noted that the site walk provided Commissioners an opportunity to examine the railway right of way with an Eversource Representative, some of

Eversource's consultants including Mr. Dubeck from Commonwealth Heritage Group and Mr. Jahnige from the Department of Conservation and Recreation – DCR.

Ms. Warren reviewed and summarized a general overview of the process and steps involved in the Commission's NHPA Section 106 review for the Commission to reach the stage where it can provide comment to the MHC on the project's impact on resources: step one to determine and understand what all the historical and archaeological resources are in the project area, step two to determine if the project as currently designed will have an adverse effect on resources in the project area and what those adverse effects are to what resources, step three to determine if and how the adverse effects can be avoided or mitigated, and step four – can the project be re-designed to, for example, not harm and destroy the bridges or the historical integrity of the Section Tool House and other adversely impacted resources. She stated that obviously the preference is for adverse effects to be avoided.

Ms. Warren mentioned that the MHC December 2019 letter to the US Army Corps of Engineers recommended that the Army Corps make a finding of adverse effects of the project and notify the Advisory Council on History Preservation of the adverse effects finding. So the MHC has already determined that the project has an adverse impact on historical resources.

Ms. Warren stated that the historic preservation consultant will be analyzing the historical resources and effects of the project on the resources. Ms. Warren presented the chronology of the Commission's review to date of the proposed Eversource transmission project.

Ms. Warren itemized various consideration that resulted from the site visit:

- Post Contact Site – colonial (which had not been identified previously)
- Previously informed that abutments for both bridges would remain intact – but Bridge 127 (8 abutment stones will be removed) and 128 abutments will be removed.

Ms. Warren presented a draft letter addressed to Mr. Anacheka-Naseman at the US Army Corps of Engineers, regarding the Eversource Sudbury-Hudson Transmission Reliability Project, The . Commissioners discussed the letter, asked several questions about it and approved the general content of the proposed letter.

Mr. Hagger suggested that the Commission should start related discussion with information that they currently do have, regarding the bridges, the section house and other features noted on the site visit. Ms. Katz recommended that the Board have a serious discussion at the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Hagger indicated that Eversource was not intending to completely demolish Bridge 128, and were proposing to remove the first course of the granite blocks and retain the structural frame, the underpinnings, the wood piers; and would remove the rotting railroad ties and the Boy Scout

bridge. Mr. Hagger asserted that the important consideration was the metal girders – the overriding characteristic of the bridges. He acknowledged that Eversource was proposing to completely demolish Bridge 127.

Ms. Warren asserted that the partial demolition of Bridge 128 would destroy historic integrity of the structure especially with removal of abutments, and it would not be enough to retain the metal girders only. She noted that the historical preservation consultant would address this issue of the integrity of the historical significance of the bridge. .

Ms. Warren spoke of other related letters sent by the Commission to Eversource, asking that the Historical Preservationist have access to the right of way, and agree to meet with the Commission at the November 9th meeting.

Ms. Hagger noted that Stacy Spies was the contracted historical preservation consultant. Ms. Warren acknowledged that the contract was signed by Town Manager and Stacy Spies, two weeks ago.

Ms. Warren spoke about the upcoming public hearing on the MA DEP Waterways Regulation Program on November 30th about bridges 127 and 128. Eversource and DCR seek Waterways Licenses for each bridge however she noted that DCR will not be involved with the construction work on the bridges or any of the historical railroad features in the right of way. She asked that the Commissioners to attend the hearing.

Ms. Warren noted that she would be continuing with the review of related material recently submitted by Eversource consultant VHB. She asked the Commission if she and Mr. Hagger could submit follow-up communication to Eversource/VHB as issues and questions arose when reviewing the material and receiving information. The commissioners agreed.

Commissioners reviewed the VHB letter of September 30, 2020. Mr. Hagger recommended that the Commissioners closely examine the alternatives to the demolition of Bridge 127, as presented in the letter from VHB. Mr. Hagger queried about the validity of option #5 in connection with the Secretary of Interior standards, and recommended that the Commission discuss these alternatives.

Community Preservation Committee Accepting Proposals – Historic Preservation Plan

Ms. Warren confirmed that she completed the CPC application following the Historical Commission's discussion at the previous meeting agreeing to move forward with the application which was submitted. She stated that she would be meeting with CPC tomorrow evening.

Approval of August 4, 2020 and September 22, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Hagger noted that the September 22, 2020 Meeting Minutes would be reviewed at the next Historical Commission meeting.

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the August 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Roll call 7-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Cebra-aye, Katz-aye

VOTED: To approve the August 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Demolition Delay Bylaw

Mr. Hagger acknowledged that the Commission did have to follow the guidelines of the Demolition Delay Bylaw, but was open to hearing any related comments. He noted that there was suggestion that the bylaw process should be more expedient. He commented that Section 4 of the Bylaw provided timeline parameters, which he detailed.

Ms. Warren explained that when an application is voted as not being historically detrimental, and not being preferably preserved; the applicant could be asked if they want a posted meeting at the time of the site visit. Mr. Hagger suggested asking Town Manager Hayes his opinion regarding this aspect.

Ms. Trexler commented that the bylaw process could work better. She suggested that the Commission examine how other communities were handling the process. Ms. Trexler opined that if a property was listed on MACRIS and all elevation plans were submitted to the Commission, a site visit should not be a requirement in every case. Ms. Warren mentioned that many local communities similar to Sudbury, operate under the same bylaw process. Ms. Trexler maintained that the bylaw system in Sudbury should be re-evaluated to help make the process easier for the homeowner.

Mr. Hagger indicated that the site tour was an important step in the bylaw process, and in the case of 316 Goodman's Hill Road, the property could not be clearly seen from the road. He added that older MACRIS photos are often not helpful.

Mr. Greene agreed that the site visit is especially important, and is part of the bylaw. He acknowledged that the Commission could review the bylaw process holistically, but not necessarily isolate the site visit aspect. Ms. Warren agreed, adding that MACRIS only captures a frontal picture of a property. Ms. Trexler maintained that the homeowner/applicant should have the option of the MACRIS depiction with necessary elevation plans submittal, or the site visit process option with submission of plans.

Ms. Katz stated that something should be done to make the bylaw process "friendlier," which would likely require amending the bylaw process in some measure, and to expediate the

timeframe in certain circumstances. Mr. Hagger maintained that seeing a property makes all the difference.

Mr. Bautze echoed the message made by Ms. Trexler, stressing that sensitivity and consideration of the related financial impact/stress to the homeowner; was an important consideration. He mentioned that the Commission might have overstepped bounds when considering 79 Nobscot Road. Mr. Hagger responded that associated comments regarding 79 Nobscot Road, were not accurately represented. Ms. Katz agreed that such information presented to the Commission, was clearly not accurate.

Ms. Costa acknowledged that the current Demolition Bylaw was enacted in 2004, and suggested the Commission might consider reviewing and improving the bylaw.

Ms. Cebra felt that improvements could be made with educating the public (particularly the homeowner) with the process. She stressed that public accessibility to Commission regulations/information was essential. Mr. Greene indicated that such education process could begin earlier if the homeowner were to start the process earlier. Mr. Hagger stressed that the first step involves the homeowner contacting the Building Department. Mr. Hagger agreed that the Commission should update the related website and provide detail regarding the Demolition Delay Bylaw.

Ms. Warren suggested that a related brochure be given to the Building Department for distribution to the homeowner and their representatives.

Ms. Katz agreed with Ms. Cebra's proposal for increased public awareness/education. Mr. Hagger agreed with continued website updating, creation of a brochure, and other modes of education. Mr. Hagger asked if Ms. Cebra and Ms. Katz could work on the proposed brochure. Ms. Costa agreed to help with such brochure, as well. Ms. Cebra recommended a joint meeting with the Sudbury Historical Society and other groups, to ensure continuity. Ms. Warren noted she would contact Gretchen Schuler, preservation planning consultant, to schedule a joint presentation with the Commission and the Historical Society to review Commission and Preservation aspects, to include the demolition delay topic.

Mr. Hagger mentioned that he would ask Town Manager Hayes if site visits could be posted on the website. Ms. Costa stated that she would contact Chris Scully regarding the demolition delay bylaw, and associated materials/resources.

Historical Commission Budget

Ms. Costa reviewed the budget and provided detail on the Hosmer Fund. She also reviewed the General Fund.

Broadacres Farm

The Commission reviewed the Broadacres Farm MACRIS. Mr. Hagger informed the Commissioners that the topic of Broadacres Farm was addressed at a recent Board of Selectmen meeting. At that meeting, Mr. Hagger confirmed that the Historical Commission favored an adaptive reuse/reproposing of the farmhouse, as well as the existing barn with stone foundation.

Hearse House – Cemetery head Stones

Mr. Hagger informed the Commissioners that Ms. Lynn McLean stated that the recently discovered headstones came from a private cemetery on Nobscot Road, where a former Selectwoman lived years ago. That Selectwoman had the stones removed from her property, which ended up at the Hearse House. He noted that the Commission would further research this aspect. Mr. Greene confirmed he would help research the originating location of the headstones.

Haynes Garrison Site

Mr. Hagger noted the existence of a large tree in front of the Haynes Garrison site, which was being effected by a growing vine. Ms. McLean requested that the Commission contact DPW to address the landscape maintenance at the property.

Hosmer House

Ms. Cebra inquired about inclusion of Holiday Hosmer House photographs, for inclusion on the website during this COVID period. Mr. Bautze suggested the transference of digital photos to the website, which he and Ms. Costa would work on.

Ms. Cebra requested that existing Hosmer House brochures be placed outside of the Hosmer House in a plastic holder, for the public. Commissioners agreed with the idea.

Ms. Cebra informed the Commission that Rachael Robinson of the Historical Society, suggested selling the rights to the images in the Hosmer House pictures. Ms. Cebra explained that such pictures could be put on the website, and be used to generate some revenue. Mr. Hagger noted that such a plan would have to be approved by Town Manager Hayes. Ms. Cebra said she would be providing the Commission with additional detail.

Ms. Cebra noted that she sold three Sudbury afghans/throws to a private vendor at the Wayside Inn Barn for \$45.00 each. She stress that because the Hosmer House is not open to the public, and such items would be sold at the Wayside Inn. Commissioners did not see a problem with the sale. Ms. Costa advised that Ms. Cebra send a check reflecting sales of the items to her, and Ms. Costa confirmed that she would submit the check to the Flynn Building. Ms. Warren asked about the cost of the blankets. Ms. Cebra responded \$35.00.

Ms. Cebra mentioned the inclusion of purple lighting at the Hosmer House, the Church, and the Parsonage; in remembrance of the Domestic Violence Round Table, as October is Domestic Violence Protection month.

Historic Building Survey Grant Update

Mr. Hagger noted that Mr. Duchesneau and Ms. Trexler had been working on the procurement aspect, and the Commissioners thanked them both.

Ms. Trexler stated that by the next Commission meeting, they would be close to procuring the grant.

Cemetery Restoration Update/Tree Issue

Ms. Katz commented that requests for proposals should be going out soon. Ms. Katz noted that related construction work would likely not take place during the winter.

Mr. Hagger stated that a tree is effecting one of the cemetery plots at the Revolutionary Cemetery. Mr. Bautze confirmed that the tree issue had been addressed by DPW.

Master Plan – Preservation/Cultural Resources

Ms. Trexler detailed that the Planning Board completed their initial review, and had provided edits to the consulting team. She noted that next steps would include a series of public meetings, with dates to be announced.

Date for Next Meeting (s)

Mr. Hagger noted that the next Commission meeting would take place on November 9, 2020 with Eversource at 7:00 PM

Mr. Hagger stated that the subsequent Commission meeting would take place on Tuesday, November 17, 2020 at 6:30 PM.

Adjourn

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

VOTED