



Town of Sudbury

Historical Commission

historical@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756
www.sudbury.ma.us/historicalcommission

MINUTES

MARCH 9, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

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

Others Present: Arnold Robinson, Regional Director of Planning for Fuss & O'Neill, Rick Conard, Wayland Historical Commission, railroad historian; Beth Perry, Coordinator Planning and Community Development

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting at 7:00 PM

Due to technical difficulties the meeting was not recorded by SudburyTV until 7:14 p.m.

Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT) Historical and Cultural Artifacts, including Joint Meeting with the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Task Force

Mr. Robinson presented the PowerPoint slides - The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail – Sudbury Segment Historic Resources Inventory (3/1/21 Draft). He suggested that the BFRT Advisory Task Force continue the work involved in maintaining the accuracy of the inventory.

Ms. Warren asked why MA DOT had not completed such an inventory to date as a survey must be completed under the Programmatic Agreement. Mr. Robinson confirmed that the Commission should discuss that aspect with the Task Force.

Mr. Robinson stressed the importance of interpretive panels being located in the vicinity of each historical feature, and exemplified the rail rest feature.

Mr. Hager asked Mr. Conard if he had seen this type of rail rest on other rail lines. Mr. Conard responded he had not seen such rail rest design before. Mr. Greene described the rail rest structure.

Mr. Greene noted it was easy to miss some of the historical features on the trail, especially the mile posts which are extremely low and off the embankment. Mr. Robinson stated he was looking forward to walking the trail again to continue looking for additional items to add to the inventory listing.

Mr. Hagger asked if the Town was considering providing additional pictures of features, as discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Robinson responded that Staff would likely be taking more pictures within the next two weeks in order to provide appropriate pictures of the added inventory. Mr. Hagger stressed the importance of such photos.

Ms. Warren commented that the South Station (on the Union Ave. side) was used for two rail lines, and asked if a sign panel would be included near it. Mr. Robinson responded affirmatively. Ms. Warren stated that intersection was especially important.

Proposed Design of the Pantry Brook Bridge

Mr. Robinson provided updated description regarding the proposed design of the Pantry Brook. In response to questions from last week's meeting, Mr. Robinson noted the Fuss & O'Neill team was working on the required size of the concrete arch and how the panels might appear in a historical context. He noted that he would come back to the Commission with information regarding possible materials to be used.

Mr. Hagger inquired about using the style of the Wayside Inn bridge. Mr. Robinson confirmed he mentioned that aspect was presented to the team engineer, who was currently studying what materials might be available for the Pantry Brook project.

Sketch Plan Proposed Design – Hop Brook Bridge

Mr. Robinson stated that the Fuss & O'Neill team was currently studying what treatments need to be removed to drop the existing steel and determine what the restructuring would look like underneath in consideration of anchoring, buffering and support. He commented that an upcoming memo would outline the options for Hop Brook in consideration of cost, historical fabric, and environmental implications.

Historic District – Roadway Crossing – Hudson Road

Mr. Robinson confirmed that a meeting had taken place with the Historic Districts Commission and SHC members concurred that use of historical materials, such as Victorian benches, and historical paint colors, would be most appropriate. Mr. Robinson added that a full layout sheet would be presented to the Commission and continued his description of additional elements and amenities along the trail, especially at North Road, Davis Field, Morse Road, Hudson Road, Tri-Sales and Station Ave.

Mr. Robinson reviewed BFRT Task Force input regarding kiosks, panels, and mile markers, benches (which could be cast metal on concrete base, wooden or more natural) to be installed in addition to the existing markers to be restored. Mr. Robinson presented memorial opportunities in the form of benches along the trail.

Mr. Robinson stated that the Task Force was favoring metal bike racks in similar style of the BFRT Concord section, along with several bike stations with colors to compliment the benches. He presented pictures of proposed hydration stations as well. He reviewed the pictures for trash receptacles. Mr. Robinson also presented photos of nature-based play areas, which would not be covered by MA DOT funding.

Ms. Warren confirmed that interpretative signage along the trail would be installed at Station Road, Broadacres, and Hudson Road; and asked about additional signage at Codjer Lane. Mr. Robinson concurred that additional signage at the Codjer Lane location would be beneficial. He confirmed that the BFRT Task Force was looking to the Historical Commission for related input, as a starting point.

Mr. Robinson referred to the Historical Interpretive Signage aspects which detailed potential signage topics, such as:

- History of Lowell-Framingham Line
- Town Center History
- Junction with Mass Central Rail Trail
- Broadacres Farm – History of Haynes Farm
- Cavicchio – History of agriculture in Sudbury
- North Sudbury Railroad Station
- Cattle Crossings

Mr. Robinson stated the timeframe for the 75% set would be April 21 with a couple of weeks to finalize the list. He stressed the importance of submitting the exact quantity of amenities, and stressed that the exact location could be changed.

Ms. Warren commented that the Commission had to determine if they wanted to add anything more to the list. Mr. Robinson displayed the slide depicting the smaller interpretive signage on posts, as well as the larger narrative signage set on stands.

Ms. Warren asked how wide the APE (Area of Potential Effects) was. Mr. Robinson responded that the APE was approximately 60 feet wide (a narrow railroad right of way) and about four miles in length, with several areas that increase the width by six or seven feet. Mr. Robinson referenced the cattle crossing areas; noting that related sketching was done to determine the possibility of working around such cattle crossing/s, and avoid wetlands and slopes at the same time. Mr. Hagger stated that some of the original sloping was marginalized with the rail trail in Weston. Mr. Robinson confirmed he examined the Weston section which reflected a total width of 90 feet. Mr. Hagger acknowledged that the abutment in Weston came close to the right of way. Ms. Warren stressed the importance of establishing a bypass around the cattle crossing/s.

The Commissioners agreed to add smaller signage at the signals, mile posts and rail rests, noting that kiosks would tell a story about a neighborhood, the siding at Freight House. Mr. Robinson included those items on the documented list.

Ms. Trexler asked if signage could be provided for archeological and conservation-related feature signage, as well. Mr. Robinson responded in the affirmative, noting that implementation of panels for crossings and Hop Brook ecosystem would be worthy additions. He noted there are other agencies and organizations to consult with the Task Force regarding these considerations. Mr. Greene mentioned a significant kettle hole along the right of way.

Ms. Warren asked if an Archeological Survey had been performed, and if the Narragansett tribe had been informed of the various aspects of the proposed project; and questioned where the tribal paths might intersect the railroad right of way. She asked if such interpretive sign could be included to highlight the Native American history in Sudbury. Mr. Robinson responded that he would have to defer to the Town permitting staff, and indicated that a Phase I Archeological Survey of this nature had not been performed.

Approval of January 5, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the January 5, 2021 meeting minutes. Mr. Green seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye

Other Business

Mr. Hagger explained that several weeks ago the Commission voted unanimously to allot up to \$300.00 of the Hosmer House budget to obtain tags for paintings, and now discovered that such supplies would cost between \$400.00 and \$500.00.

Mr. Hagger motioned to amend the previous vote to approve up to \$300.00 for painting tags, to approve up to \$500.00 for painting tags.

Ms. Warren asked if the tags are engraved metal plates, and asked if such language was part of the original vote. Mr. Hagger responded in the affirmative. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Costa-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye

Stone Farm Signage Request

Mr. Hagger referred to correspondence regarding the Planning Board Site Plan Review Decision of 554 Boston Post Road and its provisions dealing with signage.

Ms. Warren mentioned that the Historical Commission had established a Historic House Maker program and process for historic properties considered historic. She noted that marker signs for historic structures appropriately designed and proportioned. She recommended that a house marker sign for the Stone Farm should be in keeping with those for other historic structures in Sudbury, which were made by the same person who currently makes such signs for Sudbury. She stressed it would not be appropriate to use a large, commercial-type sign on the Stone Tavern. She suggested that the Commissioners make a recommendation to the Planning Board that the approved version of the house marker historic sign would be the most appropriate signage to use at the Tavern. She added that a larger more descriptive interpretive interior sign could be installed or at the exterior back door where customers would enter.

Ms. Warren suggested that farm stand signage could be included in the rear or in the interior of the stand. She stressed that a commercial sign installed in the front of the property would be inappropriate. Commissioners agreed with the recommendations presented by Ms. Warren.

Ms. Warren mentioned the inclusion of a standing historical interpretive panel, and questioned the composition of the interpretive signage. She stressed that a commercial type of shiny sign would not be appropriate.

Mr. Hagger stated that the Historic District Commission may also provide additional comment regarding the proposed signage and content. Ms. Trexler offered to share the Commissioners comments with the Historic Districts Commissioners at their next meeting. Mr. Hagger suggested that any Commission comments be submitted to the Planning Director Adam Duchesneau.

Date for Next Meeting

Mr. Hagger confirmed that the next Historic Commission meeting would be held on March 16, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. He detailed that the agenda for the next meeting would include:

- The Eversource Transmission project update
- Historic Preservation Plan update
- Historic Homes Inventory status update

- Historic Preservation Plan Article Presentation at Town Meeting
- Continued BFRT discussion/features
- Demolition Delay update
- Hosmer House update

Adjourn

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Greene-aye, Hagger-aye, Trexler-aye, Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Costa-aye, Katz-aye

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Commissioners proceeded to enter into joint meeting with the BFRT Advisory Task Force.