



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 16, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING

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

Others Present: Rick Conard, Wayland Historical Commission, Beth Perry, Coordinator Planning and Community Development

Open Meeting and Roll Call:

Mr. Hagger opened the meeting 6:30 p.m. and requested roll call: Costa-present, Hagger-present, Warren-present, Greene-present, Katz-present, Trexler-present,

79 Nobscot Road

Mr. Hagger recommended that the new owners of 79 Nobscot Road be sent a copy of the Macris listing and a copy of the Demo Delay report, which included the history of the property.

Approval of January 19, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Hagger motioned to approve the January 19, 2021 meeting minutes, as edited. Ms. Warren seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Warren-aye, Cebra-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye

At approximately 6:36 p.m. a second roll call was taken; Costa-present, Hagger-present, Greene-present, Warren-present, Cebra-present, Trexler-present, Katz-present

Eversource – Transmission Line Project

Ms. Warren provided update of significant interest. She detailed a new development that on March 11th, Protect Sudbury submitted a petition requesting that the US Surface Transportation Board make a declaratory judgement that the Central Mass Railroad has not been abandoned and that the Option Agreement between Eversource and the MBTA is invalid.

Ms. Warren stated that such judgement would likely not be finalized for three to four months, and if the rail line has not been legally abandoned; agreements which the MBTA entered into could likely be null and void. She explained that voiding of the agreement, may indicate that the US Surface Transportation Board may be the lead federal agency under Section 106, not the US Army Corp of Engineers. This change may put Section 106 on hold.

Mr. Greene asked about including the Bridge abutment considerations in the proposed letter, and further advocated for change in project plans in order preserve the rail tracks in the area around the Section Tool House. Ms. Warren agreed and thanked Mr. Greene for all the information he shared about the Section Tool House.

Ms. Trexler confirmed that this recent development had been brought forth by Protect Sudbury only, and not the Town, and therefore she sought to get guidance from Town Counsel. Ms. Warren stressed that it would be the Advisory Council and the Army Corps of Engineers actions that would be determinant, so SHC communication to both the Army Corps and the Advisory Council would be beneficial.

Ms. Costa added that it would be important for the Commissioners to understand what other Town committees/boards are thinking about this aspect, as well as, receiving guidance from Town Counsel.

Ms. Katz agreed with the comments presented by Ms. Costa and added the Commission should attempt to coordinate with other Town groups. Ms. Warren maintained that the SHC reached out sending a memorandum to the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board expressing our concerns about the railroad culverts and bridges but was informed each board/commission had its own jurisdiction separate from the Historical Commission's.

Ms. Trexler noted that the question to ask Town Council should include how and when the Commission should respond, considering the Town was not a part of the lawsuit initiated by Protect Sudbury. Ms. Warren commented that the recent action taken by Protect Sudbury was not a lawsuit.

Ms. Cebra acknowledged that recent actions did not represent a lawsuit. She indicated that SHC was operating in on a totally different jurisdiction than the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Katz stated that a declaratory judgement is not a lawsuit, but a court-issued judgement, which outlines the rights and obligations of each party in the contract and is legally binding.

Mr. Greene stated there are several issues of interest to the SHC that do involve the other commissions. He indicated that the other Town Commissions must understand the concerns of SHC and the historical significance of a particular site.

Ms. Warren suggested that the Commission wait a month before doing anything and see how the Advisory Council and Army Corps may proceed.

Mr. Hagger recommended that the Board commence with identifying historic railroad artifacts to highlight in the rail trail. He offered special thanks to Ms. Costa, Ms. Trexler and Mr. Greene for all their work regarding the historical artifacts to be highlighted.

Commissioners agreed to resume railroad artifacts discussion at the April meeting.

Ms. Warren commented on a procedural issue involving the Narragansett tribal leader who not been consulted by Eversource or the Army Corps regarding potential archeological artifacts, and for this reason the Section 106 process may be delayed. She affirmed that letters had been sent in 2019 to two other Tribes, but not to the Narragansett tribe.

Resident Kathryn McGrath, 39 Pilgrims Path, archeologist introduced herself. Ms. Warren commented that Sudbury is rich in native American resources and that the Historic Preservation Plan being proposed by the Commission may include consideration of an archeological survey conducted for the Town.

Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT) Historical and Cultural Artifacts

Mr. Greene spoke of additional cultural artifacts discovered, which were submitted with pictures to Beth Suedmeyer of the Planning Department. He stressed that MA DOT (Department of Transportation) did not do a good job with recording/recognizing the artifacts along the Sudbury right of way on the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail.

Mr. Greene itemized some of the recently discovered artifacts; emphasizing the North Sudbury Rail Station and stated that related artifacts will be presented to the BFRT Advisory Task Force.

Mr. Conard detailed the recently discovered safety derailment mechanism and additional mile posts. Mr. Greene suggested that the latest discoveries and narrative with pictures be included in the historical and cultural artifacts report.

Ms. Warren stated that she was not in favor of the metal bike racks proposed by the BFRT Task Force and suggested the SHC discuss preferred Trail amenity style at an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Cebra commented about the great importance of identifying the full artifacts listing.

Demolition Delay Bylaw

Ms. Costa referred to the latest versions of the Demolition Delay Bylaw Frequently Asked Questions & Answers, and the Procedural Steps. She indicated that the latest versions of the two Bylaw process documents reflected their completion.

Related discussion took place.

Ms. Costa offered to prepare a PowerPoint presentation regarding a Demo Delay education piece. She mentioned prospective stakeholder/such as other Town boards/commissions and possible external stakeholders being the Chamber of Commerce, realtor, or other professional organizations in Town as may be determined to be appropriate. Mr. Hagger and Ms. Warren offered to assist with a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Hagger recommended a Demo Delay PowerPoint be presented to the Planning Board, The Historic District Commission, the Town Manager, Building Inspector, and others involved with the Demo Delay process. He suggested presenting the PowerPoint to external groups as well, especially to help inform regional realtors. Mr. Bautze commented that the Demo PowerPoint with graphics could be recorded and made available to all.

Ms. Warren stated that the emphasis should be “why” the benefits and necessity for the Demo Delay Bylaw. She explained the connection between the Master Plan and the Demo Delay Bylaw. Ms. Warren suggested a flow chart also be created as an additional aid to property owners about the Demolition Delay process.

Ms. Trexler agreed that the PowerPoint presentation be recorded and included on the SHC webpage.

Historic Preservation Plan/Community Preservation Act Project Presentation

Mr. Hagger offered to present the SHC Historic Preservation Plan Article at Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Warren announced the MA Historical Commission confirmed that the SHC had been selected for a \$16,000 grant, the full amount the Commission had applied for the Historic Preservation Plan matching grant.

Commissioners congratulated and thanked Ms. Warren for her efforts.

Sudbury Historic Property Survey including Phase II List of Properties to be Surveyed

Mr. Hagger stated that the consultants completed Phase II of the assignment and provided a list to the Commissioners.

Ms. Trexler presented the document titled: SUDBURY SURVEY UPDATE, 2020-2021 - Phase II List of Properties to be Surveyed. She confirmed that she and Mr. Hagger had worked with the two survey consultants. She noted that some 108 structures were surveyed.

The Commission reviewed various structures listed on the survey.

Hosmer House

Mr. Hagger thanked Ms. Cebra for working on the ADA property survey for the Hosmer House.

Mr. Hagger mentioned the restoration of the two Hosmer House paintings. Ms. Cebra offered to work on that aspect. Ms. Katz offered to help with that painting renovation project as well. Mr. Bautze stated that the Commissioners had approved the restoration of the two paintings at a previous meeting.

Ms. Cebra confirmed that she arranged a LSRHS student community service day on June 2 to help with tasks at the Hosmer House.

Conflict of Interest Law/Ethics Training

Mr. Hagger reminded Commissioners that the online Conflict of Interest Law/Ethics Training must be completed.

Date for Next Meeting(s)

Mr. Hagger announced that the next meeting would be held on April 20, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.

Adjourn

Mr. Hagger motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. Ms. Costa seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous 7-0; Costa-aye, Hagger-aye, Greene-aye, Cebra-aye, Warren-aye, Trexler-aye, Katz-aye