



Plympton Historical
Commission

Meeting Summary - 07/27/15

- Meeting called to order at 7:03pm. Members present Jane Schulze, Jill Palenstijn and Jon Wilhelmsen. Associate Member Rick Burnet was also in attendance for both hearings noted below.
- JW noted that the first order of business of the PHC was to hold a Public Hearing with respect to the property located at 6 Cross Street. The 6 Cross Street Public Hearing was called to order at 7:03pm. In attendance were JS, JP, JW, RB for the Commission. For 6 Cross Street were: Melinda DeSanctis (Owner), Aaron Sigman, Dana Nilson (Contractor), Ashley Dunn (Friend/abutter). Additional attendees: Linda Leddy. Additional attendees who joined the meeting in progress and did not offer official comment: Deb Anderson, Plympton Halifax Express Reporter, Plympton Planning Board Member), Art Morin, (current chair and member of the Plympton Board of Health) Mark Russo (Plympton Board of Selectmen Chair), Ken Thompson, Plympton Board of Health member)
- JW noted that the advertisement for the hearing ran in the Plympton-Halifax Express on Friday, July 17th pursuant to Plympton Municipal Bylaws, Article XX, Section 3.5. JW read the hearing notice as follows:

The Town of Plympton Historical Commission

The Plympton Historical Commission will hold a public hearing on Monday, July 27 at 7:00 PM at the Plympton Town House, 5 Palmer Road, for an application for a building demolition permit pursuant to Plympton Municipal Bylaws, Article XX for the single family home located at 3 Forest Street. Jon Wilhelmsen, Chair

- JW explained the Plympton Demolition Delay Bylaw, noting that there were two parts to the process. First, the bylaw required that a determination of architectural or historical significance be determined. This was done at the Commission meeting on 7/8/15 due to the fact that the structure in question is recorded on the Cultural Resources Inventory and pursuant to Plympton Municipal Bylaws, Article XX, Section 2.6(b) is Architecturally significant. Second, the Commission is required to determine if the property is preferably preserved - and that is the purpose of this evening's hearing. JW also noted the existence of the 6 Cross Street Cultural Resource Inventory - a copy of which was presented to Ms. DeSanctis at the PHC meeting on 7/20.
- JW, noting the papers in her and her contractor's hand, asked Ms. DeSanctis if she had information that she wished to provide the Commission for review. They provided the Commission with the 4 following documents (attached):
 - Letter from Ms. DeSanctis to the Commission dated 7/26/15
 - Timeline of actions taken by Melinda DeSanctis on 6 Cross Street (prepared by Melinda DeSanctis on 7/26/15)
 - Letter from Southeastern Development Company, LLC - authored by Dana Nilson dated 7/24/15
 - Letter from ASAP Engineering & Design Co., Inc. entitled "inspection and Evaluation of Existing Antique Home Located at 6 Cross Street, Plympton, MA dated July 24, 2014
- The Commission took some time reviewing the documents submitted. A number of copies were also presented to those in attendance.

Plympton Historical
Commission

- JW thanked Ms. DeSanctis and Mr. Nilson for providing this information. It is important for the Commission to consider all aspects of the application to make sure that an appropriate decision has been made, though it may take more than one reading to absorb the information presented. He suggested that they should move ahead with presenting additional information and come back to this.
- JW thanked Ms. DeSanctis and Mr. Sigman for their time and indulgence during the site visit at 6 Cross Street on Saturday, July 18, 2015 @ 9 am. In attendance on behalf of the Commission at the visit were JS, JP, RB and JW. JW explained that such visits help to provide the Commission with additional information and facts that help it to arrive at a decision. JW also explained that the Commission is currently made up of 3 individuals - JS, JP & JW. RB is an associate member and does not have a voting seat. The Commission looks to RB's expertise as a licensed builder and contractor who has extensive experience renovating and restoring historic buildings in Town to provide his thoughts for the Commission to consider. JW stressed that this process is designed to solicit facts, information and opinions to help the Commission come to a decision as to whether the property in question is preferably preserved as required under the Plympton demolition delay bylaw. JW also noted that the Commission provided initial comments on its visit at the meeting on 7/20 at which Ms. DeSanctis and Ms. Dunn were present. While the Commission provided initial feedback to Ms. DeSanctis, it has not discussed their observations prior to this meeting. To start this discussion, JW asked RB to offer his thoughts regarding the property based on the site visit so that all the attendees could be aware of his observations with respect to the property.
- RB advised that we are clearly in a room full of opinions, That said, after a thorough walk through of the structure, his opinion is that this does not scare him. He asserted that the work that needed to be done was common in many old houses in the area. Adding additional structural supports, pouring a slab, repointing and parging the foundations to help relieve water infiltration would all be items he would recommend. He noted that there were some structural items that also needed to be addressed, including the beam needing to be replaced under the kitchen/bath and the sill under the front door. Otherwise the structure appeared to be in very good shape for a house of this age. He noted that there was some powder post beetle damage, but he has seen much more insect damage on homes he has restored. He has not had unlimited budgets when doing this work either. He is of the opinion that the insect damage could be treated and remediated without undue expense given what he was able to visualize in the basement and the numerous areas that had been revealed due to the work done by the homeowner. RB noted the work he has done on a similar property at 94 Center Street (copy of inventory form attached). The home was struck by lightning and the insurance company gutted the structure. They performed very similar work to that would be required for 6 Cross Street. They even reconfigured the layout of the house to better address modern needs. The house is virtually identical, but for the fact the downstairs is reversed with respect to the staircase. RB encouraged Ms. DeSanctis to stop by the property and ask the Harlfinger's for a tour, which he believed they would be happy to do. She could then get a good idea of what might be possible. BR noted that he had stopped by the property and looked at it again to remind himself of the work performed.
- JW noted that 6 Cross Street and 94 Center Street - along with 82 Center Street (which burned in late 2013 and was raised in 2014) were all built by the Sherman Brothers - builders in Plympton. RB suggested that there were more properties built by them. JW noted that the off-center second floor windows are evident on the other 2 properties noted above. Apparently it was part of the design and is unique.
- Mr. Nilson noted the ASAP Report and attempted to minimize the qualifications of RB. He seemed to imply that the report trumped all and could not understand why we were "ignoring it". JW noted that it was highly probably that if we had the same engineer enter any of the Commission member's properties or other antiques in town that he would issue a similar report - hopefully absent the broken beam. Antique houses were built with different techniques and they had largely stood the test of time - JW questioned whether it is reasonable to hold them to the same standard as modern

Plympton Historical
Commission

built structures built with inferior wood. It is highly probably that a 2x3 construction from 200 years ago could provide similarly or significantly more structural support than a modern 2x6 construction. One of the reason codes switched from 2x4 to 2x6 construction was to account for the current structural loads realized given the decrease in the density of the wood. We are not providing apple to apple comparisons here. JW emphasized that he Commission is not discounting the report, merely questioning how we weigh that against our own observations and the comments provided by RB - an individual with extensive experience in this area.

- A discussion regarding the letters submitted by Mr. Nilson and ASAP ensued. RB noted that he has used ASAP on building projects and he always gets things passed. That said, Mr. Burnet noted that he can be “over the top” with his requirements. JW noted that there is discretion provided for historic structures in the building code. It is not reasonable to expect all historic structures to come up to each and every standard in the most recent code applicable to new construction. JW asserted, in response to comments regarding stairways, that he was pretty sure that if they were not rebuilt that they did not need to come up to code. He would follow up with the Building Department.
- JW also raised the question as to whether the Commission should take any report like the ASAP as sole justification for the issuance of a demolition permit. If “yes” then it is highly likely that virtually every historic home that came before the Commission would be allowed to be demolished. Reports like this do not account for the fact that these houses have raised families and stood the test of time for 100, 150, 200, 250 years. Shouldn't that matter? Would an out of hand acceptance of such reports that seem to largely contradict the visual inspection conducted by the Commission gut the bylaw and the intent of Town Meeting?
- RB asked what the budget was for the rebuild. DN advised that it was around \$330,000. This would be a 2.5 bath, home all on one level with a 3 car garage that would be 1.5x the size of the existing structure.
- JS noted that a lot of information had been received and that she needs additional time to consider all information. JP and JW concurred. JP noted that she believed it was also important to look at all the information. She was concerned that the Commission would be allowing an important structure, based on the history outlined in the inventory, to be placed in a dumpster. She noted the Commission's duty cited under the Demo Delay bylaw to protect the town and what it looks like. She expressed her concern around the loss of this building and how it would change the area.
- JW advised all that he needed to review the information submitted in more detail. It would not be fair to the applicants if we did not provide additional review and thought to the information submitted. Addition comments/information could be submitted to the Commission prior to the next meeting/hearing if the applicants wished. JW suggested that the hearing be continued for a week.
- On the motion of JP, second JS, second JS:

That the PHC adjourn the current hearing with respect to 6 Cross Street to 8/3/15 to consider the information presented and give the applicants additional time to submit information for the Commission to consider.

Vote: 3-0-0

- The public hearing for 6 Cross Street was closed at 7:56pm until 8/3 at 7pm on the motion of JP, second JS. Vote: 3-0-0
- The public hearing for 3 Forest Street demolition permit was reconvened from 7/20/15 and called to order at 7:57pm. Attending to represent the owner, Ms Murgida, was Bob Burgess, the architect for K&G Development Corp. Mr. Burgess presented a revised plan which began to represent the original cottage structure.

Plympton Historical
Commission

- JW advised that this represented an improvement over the prior drawings. However, before submitting his own comments, he wanted to hear from the other members.
- JP noted that she had reviewed all the information. That said she kept returning to the Hx of the house. What does this house “tell” us about the neighborhood? And would removing this detrimentally impact the neighborhood - and Plympton as a well. She did not feel that she had enough information at this point to make that call.
- JS noted that the current house could meet Ms. Murgida’s needs. What are we addressing?
- The Commission then turned its attention to the new design. JW noted that this has some potential given the foundation issues with the existing structure and the significantly limited retention of the old home. The inside retains little to no evidence of its original structure and the outside is limited to the outline of the building given later additions of a door and other newer ornamentation. JW asked Mr. Burgess to confirm that the scale was replicated from the original. He concurred noting that it was within inches.
- JW noted a number of minor changes that he would like to see to the design which would, hopefully, make it difficult for the passerby even know that the original structure had been removed and replaced. The following alterations were suggested by the Commission:
 - Add windows to the south (front) and east sides of the house to balance the appearance.
 - Remove the plastic “shutters” and replace with more substantial trim.
 - break up the long facades on the south and north sides. Add indents or bump outs to break up long surfaces.
 - Change pitch of the el to better mimic a cape or other similar addition. Resolve the feeling that a ranch house is attached to an old cottage.
- Mr. Burgess suggested a peak for the garage. The Commission encouraged him to take the comments and improvise from there to come up with a building that addressed the comments and concerns addressed this evening.
- The Public Hearing for 3 Forest Street was adjourned until 8/3/15 at 7:30 pm on the motion of JP, second JS. Vote: 3-0-0
- Next meeting - August 3, 630pm.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:27 pm on the motion of JS, second JP. Vote: 3-0-0.

July 26, 2015

Jon Wilhelmsen, Chair
Plympton Historical Commission
5 Palmer Road
Plympton, MA 02367

Melinda DeSanctis
531 Ashmont Street
Dorchester, MA 02122

Dear Chairman Wilhelmsen:

This letter notes the actions I have taken since buying the property at 6 Cross Street on April 25, 2014. It explains my initial feelings about the property, my due diligence to work with the existing home (see attached timeline for specifics), and the information that I've discovered in the process. The letter also details my current situation and the circumstances that have led me to seek demolition of the structure on the property. I hope that you and your fellow commissioners will consider it when making your determination.

My decision to buy the property resulted after a close friend (and now neighbor), Ashley Dann, purchased 10 Cross Street in late December of 2013. After visiting her place and spending time in the area, I fell in love with the town of Plympton and vowed to purchase the house next door if it ever went on the market. When it did that spring, I jumped at the chance to buy my own horse property, live next to a dear friend, and take advantage of the peace and tranquility surrounding the property. Although the house was condemned by the Plympton Fire Department just 3 days before closing, I was committed to going through with the sale (against the advice of my lawyer). I wasn't sure what I would do with the place in the long run, but I could at least envision its potential as a home for my horse, Montana. Shortly after closing, I purchased a run-in shed, put up electric fencing, and planted grass. Montana moved in at the end of May.

After driving down from Dorchester (where I currently live) nearly every day during the summer of 2014, I knew that I wanted to put down more permanent roots at 6 Cross Street. Thus began the lengthy process of trying to save the existing house. As detailed in the attached timeline, I worked to find a contractor who thought renovating the existing home was feasible. I failed. None of the three contractors that I had out (two of whom specialized in renovating antique homes) thought it realistic to draw up a proposal for renovation. They all said the same thing – the home had serious structural issues, as well as extensive bug damage (which multiple exterminators confirmed), making the possibility of renovation prohibitively expensive.

Upon learning that my plan to renovate the existing house was not possible, I began investigating new construction. I spoke with multiple custom builders, but was scared away by their 6+ month timelines and high price per square foot, as well as issues of security and quality control. Since I live in Dorchester and work full-time (with the exception of summer vacation), I knew there was no way that I could take on such a project. It was at that point that I discovered modular construction. I contacted a number of modular builders for more information before entering into a contract with Dana Nilson at the Southeastern Development Company in early April of 2015.

Modular construction offers many benefits that would be near impossible and incredibly costly if I were to renovate the existing house. Most notable are extremely short completion times, enhanced construction quality management, minimal site disruption, and improved overall safety and security during the entire process. Modular homes are also known for their structural soundness and efficiencies, which are potentially the two most challenging features of renovating the existing house. Additionally, the house that I would like to put up is a one-level home. As an individual living with Multiple Sclerosis, this is a necessity and will make caring for my unborn child easier and safer.

I hope that this letter provides you with a complete picture of the time, effort, and money that I have already spent working to find a way to save the existing house. For the reasons explained above, doing so is no longer a possibility for me. Please consider that when you make your decision.

Sincerely,

Melinda DeSanctis



**Timeline of actions taken by Melinda DeSanctis on 6 Cross Street
(prepared by Melinda DeSanctis on 7/26/15)**

4/22/14: Fire department places “red x” on property; call to Fire Department confirms that they will not enter property in the event of fire due to its structural unsoundness; Contact at PFD indicates that Building Inspector is planning to inspect property and will likely condemn it

4/25/14: Close on property

5/13/14: Board of Health condemns property – letter sent via certified mail

5/13/14: Board of Health places “unfit for human habitation” sign on property

6/2/14: First dumpster rental (Doctor Disposal) to clean out previous owner’s remaining property and yard debris

10/20/14: Meet with contractor from The Hayward Company about renovation of existing house – contractor agrees to come up with proposal

10/24/14: Second dumpster rental (Doctor Disposal) to demo kitchen, paneling, and some flooring and clean out basement

10/24/14: Board of Health places additional “unfit for human habitation” sign on property

11/14/14: Exterminators (Security Pest and Safety Fumigant) inspect the property – powder post beetle damage found throughout basement and on first and second floors; recommendation is to open up all surfaces (walls, floors, ceilings, etc.) and spray all exposed wood

11/15/14: Contractor from The Hayward Company, LLC communicates that he is no longer interested in the project (states financial infeasibility for me due to structural and powder post beetle damage) and recommends building new

1/17/15: Contractors from SZ Restoration Carpentry and Colonial Restorations (both specializing in antique home renovations) visit the property; their response is similar to that of The Hayward Company – renovating the home will be prohibitively expensive

4/15/15: After extensive research and vetting, contract signed with Southeastern Development Company for construction of a new modular home

July 24, 2015

Project No. 2015-242

Mr. Dana Nilson
Southeastern Development Co.
P.O. Box 1252
Marion, MA 02738

**Re: Inspection and Evaluation of Existing Antique Home
Located at 6 Cross Street, Plympton, MA**

Mr. Nilson:

You asked me to inspect and evaluate the structure of the referenced residence with respect to improvements required to bring the building into compliance with the Building Code for resale purposes. On Tuesday, July 21, 2015, I visited the site to conduct a preliminary walk-through inspection of the home. On Friday, July 24, 2015, I completed a structural inspection. The structural components of the home were observable at the basement level, the attic level, and in select locations throughout the home.

The home is an antique farmhouse-style structure which consists primarily of a 22' x 27' main house with a 14' by 36' ell to the side, and two small shed ells to the rear. The main house and the ell appear to be of roughly the same vintage. Although the style of construction differs slightly, both sections consist of some hand-hewn heavy lumber, un-milled round log joists, and some rife sawn floor, roof, and wall planking. This mix of materials and methods indicates a construction date in the early to mid-1800's. My initial reaction to the mix of materials and styles of construction was that the older portion of the building (the ell) was relocated to the present foundation and enlarged by the addition of the newer front building all at once. The framing of both major components of the house are fairly typical of their eras and the house overall is unremarkable from a structural point of view.

The following are my comments regarding the condition of the primary building components of the house and the general requirements for upgrading to a safe condition and Code compliance. Due to the conditions of the interior of the home, the scope of work required to make it habitable includes removal of wall finishes, leveling of floors, reconstructing of foundation elements, closing of existing openings, repair of insect and water damage, and repair and reinforcement of primary framing, and the improvement of the building envelope. In my view, this required scope will trigger a significant Code upgrade to most of the primary and secondary building systems, requiring the maximum feasible compliance with current Code requirements.

The home has been posted as unfit for human habitation and unsafe to enter in terms of public safety response. I agree with these evaluations of the structure. The structure should be entered with extreme care. The first floor framing consists primarily of 4" to 6" diameter round log sections spaced at 24" that act as joists supporting plank floors. The joists are mortised into 7x7" floor beams at intervals at the interior of the home and 7x7" timber sills along the foundation perimeter. There are very few interior column supports for the beams. These consist of one isolated brick pier and the brick structure of the fireplace/chimney bases. The wood framing bears directly into the brick fireplace/chimney assembly, and the framing generally is in full contact with the masonry of both chimneys. The main house chimney assembly/hearth is actually supported by timber beams spanning from brick pier to pier. The timber sills at the perimeter of the home are seated upon a field stone and granite slab foundation that encloses a substantial basement area.

The field stone foundation consists of a mix of loose laid rough field stone, some of which has been mortared together with a lime mortar mix, surmounted by a split-faced vertical granite slab that dresses off the visible portion of the foundation. The foundation displays some significant signs of distress. There is visible movement in the granite slabs and some of the underlying rubble stone, particularly at the rear of the home. This is most likely due to the long term effects of freeze/thaw cycles on the foundation. There is evidence of substantial water infiltration between the stones throughout the basement and penetration of the mortar joints by plant roots is predominant. The lime mortar joints have deteriorated due the passage of time and the excessive moisture in the basement. There is an uneven dirt floor throughout the basement of the structure.

Long-term high moisture levels and insect damage consisting of termite and powder post beetles, as well as what appears to have been some significant active leak areas, has contributed to the deterioration of several areas of the first floor structure. Portions of the kitchen ell floor are in a state of collapse, with the joists, timber beams, and adjacent sill complete disintegrated. It is not safe to walk in this area. Portions of the adjacent interior and exterior wall assemblies are affected. Some of the main beams and joists in the main house have also deteriorated and failed due to insect and water damage. This is a particular problem below the entry hall at the front door.

The walls of the home consist of a hybrid timber frame/stud wall assembly with 3x stock at intervals and at each side of wall openings. The horizontal board sheathing is attached to these studs and the timber corner posts to form the exterior wall. The kitchen ell is framed in the manner of a small barn-type structure with a loft floor and simple timber rafter roof that bears on a perimeter 7x7" timber frame. The rafters are of various sizes and many have been replaced or "sistered" with new dimensional lumber stock. There is evidence of a significant termite infestation in the top timber plate at the rear wall, which is probably indicative of extensive structural damage in that area. The interior walls of the home are framed with a mix of vertical plank studs and some solid studs with plaster and lathe attached. The second floor joists were largely obscured by existing finishes, but appear to be fairly light, solid-sawn members that are let into the exterior stud walls, which are effectively balloon-framed.

Aside from specific members and structural systems failing, in general the framing is very light for modern purposes. In order to rehabilitate the structure to a safe and marginally Code-compliant condition, the minimal upgrades that would be required would include; "sistering" of a majority of floor joists, installing new lally columns and concrete footings, adding joist hangers and timber connectors, adding solid blocking and fire blocking at all balloon frame stud wall bays, adding positive connections between floor framing and balloon stud assemblies, installing structural ridge beams with end posts, adding new rafters to reduce sheathing span, posting all loads properly down to the foundation, removing and reconstructing/lining the chimney assembly for modern appliances and clearance to existing framing, re-attachment of exterior board sheathing to stud assemblies and the creation of some shear walls, re-framing of door and window openings to provide proper load paths and header assemblies. The foundation would have to be repointed and a significant portion of the granite would have to be removed and reset. It might, at that point actually require lifting the home to accommodate the installation of a modern concrete foundation wall.

This constitutes a partial list of general upgrades for this structure. These are triggered largely because of the already required scope of work required to reach a habitable condition. Other, significant individual items could easily arise as interior demolition exposes more basic structure. Once interior demolition is complete, an in-depth inspection would more clearly identify the exact scope of work required, but the scope presently observable and required is of sufficient magnitude as to render the project economically unfeasible for such an ordinary old home. Additionally, the need to adapt the building for modern living will increase the scope of work for the project. This will result in the final product being substantially constituted by modern materials and methods, with little left of the original structure. In my view, this building is not a viable candidate for renovation or restoration.

If you have any questions regarding this report, or if you require additional information, please do not hesitate to call.

Very Truly Yours,

Robert M. Desrosiers, P.E.



Southeastern Development Company, LLC

July 24, 2015

Jon Wilhelmsen, Chair
Plympton Historical Commission
5 Palmer Road
Plympton, MA 02367

Re: 6 Cross Street Plympton

Dear Chairman Wilhelmsen:

At the request of my client, Melinda Desanctis, please find attached a report from my structural engineer, Rob Desrosiers from ASAP Engineering & Design Co., Inc., as a result of his preliminary inspection of #6 Cross Street in Plympton. You will find that Rob highlights many structural deficiencies with the house and he concludes that, "this building is not a viable candidate for renovation or restoration".

In addition to Rob's report, I have included below a detailed scope of work that would be required to bring the house at 6 Cross Street, Plympton to current building and energy code standards. I have also included the percentage of work needed to complete each item.

Removal and reframing of much of the floor framing to comply with current allowable floor loading(25%)
Replace rotten timbers & sills (25%)
New subflooring (100%)
Removal of the existing stairs and reframing of the stair openings to accommodate new code compliant stairs (New longer stair runs would be required to comply with legal rise & run which create conflicts with code head room and egress platform requirements) Complying with the building code on stairs is a big deal (100%)
Remove and replace all windows and exterior doors (new energy codes), including reframing all rough openings to comply with current structural building code header requirements (100%)
Remove all exterior siding, trim and roofing materials (100%)
Replace rotted wall & roof sheathing as required (25%)
Provide new exterior trim, siding and roofing including a vapor barrier (100%)
Remove and replace all non-complaint plumbing systems (100%)
Remove and replace all non-compliant electrical wiring, devices and lighting (100%)

P.O. Box 1252, Marion, MA 02738 (508) 728-5707 (508) 355-0064 fax

Southeastern Development Company, LLC

Provide new smoke & CO2 detection system (100%)

Provide a new code compliant heating & cooling system (The new sheet metal and energy codes require that the house pass a "blower door" test which measures the amount of allowable air leakage in the house. This is hard to comply with for a new home never mind an old house like yours.) (100%)

Provide new code compliant insulation (spray foam would be suggested to help with air infiltration issues) (100%)

Provide new interior drywall or blue board & plaster (100%)

Provide new ADA compliant interior door openings 36"(100%)

New Kitchen (100%)

New Bathroom fixtures (100%)

New interior painting (100%)

New finished flooring (100%)

New code complaint entry platforms and stairs at all exterior doors (100%)

New appliances (100%)

Couple all of the structural deficiencies noted by Rob in his report with the scope of work above, it is my professional opinion, as a licensed builder, that renovation or restoration of the house would not be remotely affordable when comparing the cost for new state of the art and energy efficient construction and is not recommended.

In reviewing how to soften the demolition of the house, I feel that it would make sense to salvage the following items:

- Granite foundation stones – salvaged by SDC for donation to the town
- Interior Doors – salvaged by N.E. Demolition of New Bedford
- Well pump – reinstalled for the proposed new home

In conclusion I ask that you and your board agree with our findings and opinions on the condition of the house and vote affirmatively that the owner has performed adequate due diligence in the matter of renovating or rehabilitating the house with the conclusion that it would be cost prohibitive for her or any other party to do so; and to notify the building inspector in writing to waive any further demolition permit delay.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Yours,



Dana H. Nilson

Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System

Scanned Record Cover Page

Inventory No:	PLM.106
Historic Name:	Sherman, Joseph Jr. House
Common Name:	Ellis, James Fred House
Address:	6 Cross St
City/Town:	Plympton
Village/Neighborhood:	West Plympton
Local No:	11-1-2
Year Constructed:	r 1850
Architect(s):	Sherman Brothers
Architectural Style(s):	Greek Revival
Use(s):	Agricultural; Poultry Farm; Single Family Dwelling House
Significance:	Agriculture; Architecture
Area(s):	
Designation(s):	
Building Materials(s):	Roof: Asphalt Shingle Wall: Wood Shingle; Wood Foundation: Stone, Cut; Granite



The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has converted this paper record to digital format as part of ongoing projects to scan records of the Inventory of Historic Assets of the Commonwealth and National Register of Historic Places nominations for Massachusetts. Efforts are ongoing and not all inventory or National Register records related to this resource may be available in digital format at this time.

The MACRIS database and scanned files are highly dynamic; new information is added daily and both database records and related scanned files may be updated as new information is incorporated into MHC files. Users should note that there may be a considerable lag time between the receipt of new or updated records by MHC and the appearance of related information in MACRIS. Users should also note that not all source materials for the MACRIS database are made available as scanned images. Users may consult the records, files and maps available in MHC's public research area at its offices at the State Archives Building, 220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, open M-F, 9-5.

Users of this digital material acknowledge that they have read and understood the MACRIS Information and Disclaimer (<http://mhc-macris.net/macrisdisclaimer.htm>)

Data available via the MACRIS web interface, and associated scanned files are for information purposes only. THE ACT OF CHECKING THIS DATABASE AND ASSOCIATED SCANNED FILES DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LOCAL, STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS. IF YOU ARE REPRESENTING A DEVELOPER AND/OR A PROPOSED PROJECT THAT WILL REQUIRE A PERMIT, LICENSE OR FUNDING FROM ANY STATE OR FEDERAL AGENCY YOU MUST SUBMIT A PROJECT NOTIFICATION FORM TO MHC FOR MHC'S REVIEW AND COMMENT. You can obtain a copy of a PNF through the MHC web site (www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc) under the subject heading "MHC Forms."

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Massachusetts Historical Commission
220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, Massachusetts 02125
www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc

This file was accessed on:

Wednesday, July 29, 2015 at 1:13: AM

FORM B – BUILDING

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MASSACHUSETTS ARCHIVES BUILDING
220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

Assessor's Number USGS Quad Area(s) Form Number

11-1-2	Plympton		PLM.106
--------	----------	--	---------

Town/City: Plympton
Place: (*neighborhood or village*): West Plympton

Photograph



Address: 6 Cross St
Historic Name: Joseph Sherman, Jr. House
Uses: Present: residential
Original: residential
Date of Construction: mid-19th century
Source: Bricknell; arch. form
Style/Form: Greek Revival
Architect/Builder:
Exterior Material:
Foundation: granite
Wall/Trim: wood shingle
Roof: asphalt shingle

Locus Map



Outbuildings/Secondary Structures:

Major Alterations (*with dates*):

Condition: fair
Moved: no yes **Date:**
Acreage: 3.41 acres
Setting: rural suburban setting; houses faces east

Recorded by: K. K. Broomer, preservation consultant
Organization: Plympton Historical Commission
Date (*month / year*): June 2013

RECEIVED
JUL 01 2013
MASS. HIST. COMM.

INVENTORY FORM B CONTINUATION SHEET

PLYMPTON

6 CROSS ST

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Area(s) Form No.

220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

PLM.106

 Recommended for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.*If checked, you must attach a completed National Register Criteria Statement form.*

Use as much space as necessary to complete the following entries, allowing text to flow onto additional continuation sheets.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

Describe architectural features. Evaluate the characteristics of this building in terms of other buildings within the community.

Illustrating a 1½-story Greek Revival cottage form that is typical of Plympton houses built in the mid-19th century, this gable-front-and-wing dwelling consists of a three-bay by two-bay main block with brick chimney at the roof ridge, and a four-bay by one-bay lateral wing on the south side with a brick chimney at the roof ridge. The house retains ornament typically associated with the Greek Revival, including gable returns, a wide plain frieze, cornerboards, and remnants of an entablature surround with three-quarter length sidelights at the end-bay entry. The secondary entry in the second bay of the wing is unornamented. Windows contain 6/6 wood sash. The two windows in the gable end on the façade are asymmetrically placed relative to the roof ridge, a feature seen in other gable-front cottages of the same period in Plympton.

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

Discuss the history of the building. Explain its associations with local (or state) history. Include uses of the building, and the role(s) the owners/occupants played within the community.

Bricknell identifies Joseph Sherman as the original owner of this house, but it is not clear which Joseph was here: Joseph Sherman, Sr., or his son, Plympton house carpenter Joseph Sherman, Jr. (1809-1892). The form of the house suggests Joseph Jr. built the dwelling, which is similar to other mid-19th century houses in Plympton known to have been built by the Sherman brothers. Eugene Wright identifies the Sherman carpenters as Edward, Joseph, and George Sherman, sons of Asa Sherman. Instead, census and vital records suggest the carpenters in the family were Joseph Sherman, Jr. and his brother, George Williams Sherman (b. ca. 1815-1877), who were sons of Joseph Sherman and Nancy Bradford. Houses believed to have been built by the Shermans in Plympton include 82 Center Street and 94 Center Street (see forms), which like this house display off-center attic windows in the gable end, along with 4 Maple Street (see form).

Joseph Sherman, Jr. married Lydia Eddy in Plympton in 1834. Their house was located across the road from the Neck School, closed in 1893 and subsequently moved to 110 Center Street (see form). This Cross Street farm apparently remained in the Sherman family following the death of Joseph Sherman, Jr. in 1892. In 1888, Sherman's daughter, also named Lydia, had married James Fred Ellis (d. 19 Nov. 1917) in Plympton, and Ellis is shown as the owner of the farm on the 1903 atlas. Though he was a lawyer at the time of his marriage, Ellis became a farmer and also raised poultry here by the early 20th century. In 1888, he was chosen to be a deacon in the Plympton church

BIBLIOGRAPHY and/or REFERENCES

Town of Plympton. Assessor's online database. FY2013. Property record card.
Plymouth County maps/atlas: 1857 (Walling), 1879 (Walker), 1903 (Richards).
Directories: 1867 (Plymouth County); 1902, 1906, 1910, 1914 (all Carver).
U. S. census for Plympton: 1790-1940.
Massachusetts census for Plympton: 1855, 1865.
Massachusetts Vital Records, 1620-1988. (Online database: *Ancestry.com*). With links to digital images of Plympton town records.
Bricknell, Charles H. "Old Houses in Plympton." 1974.
Wright, Eugene A. "The Shermans: Edward, Joseph, George." In *Tales of Old Plympton*, ii:99-100.
----- "Deacons in the Plympton Church." Loose-leaf binder of typewritten stories on Plympton. Plympton Historical Society.

Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System

Scanned Record Cover Page

Inventory No:	PLM.92
Historic Name:	Packard, Peres - Randall, Foster L. House
Common Name:	Harflinger House - Sunrise Gardens Nursery
Address:	94 Center St
City/Town:	Plympton
Village/Neighborhood:	West Plympton
Local No:	11-2-8
Year Constructed:	c 1843
Architect(s):	Sherman Brothers
Architectural Style(s):	Greek Revival
Use(s):	Agricultural; Nursery; Single Family Dwelling House
Significance:	Agriculture; Architecture
Area(s):	
Designation(s):	
Building Materials(s):	Roof: Asphalt Shingle Wall: Wood Shingle; Wood Foundation: Granite; Stone, Cut; Brick



The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has converted this paper record to digital format as part of ongoing projects to scan records of the Inventory of Historic Assets of the Commonwealth and National Register of Historic Places nominations for Massachusetts. Efforts are ongoing and not all inventory or National Register records related to this resource may be available in digital format at this time.

The MACRIS database and scanned files are highly dynamic; new information is added daily and both database records and related scanned files may be updated as new information is incorporated into MHC files. Users should note that there may be a considerable lag time between the receipt of new or updated records by MHC and the appearance of related information in MACRIS. Users should also note that not all source materials for the MACRIS database are made available as scanned images. Users may consult the records, files and maps available in MHC's public research area at its offices at the State Archives Building, 220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, open M-F, 9-5.

Users of this digital material acknowledge that they have read and understood the MACRIS Information and Disclaimer (<http://mhc-macris.net/macrisdisclaimer.htm>)

Data available via the MACRIS web interface, and associated scanned files are for information purposes only. THE ACT OF CHECKING THIS DATABASE AND ASSOCIATED SCANNED FILES DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LOCAL, STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS. IF YOU ARE REPRESENTING A DEVELOPER AND/OR A PROPOSED PROJECT THAT WILL REQUIRE A PERMIT, LICENSE OR FUNDING FROM ANY STATE OR FEDERAL AGENCY YOU MUST SUBMIT A PROJECT NOTIFICATION FORM TO MHC FOR MHC'S REVIEW AND COMMENT. You can obtain a copy of a PNF through the MHC web site (www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc) under the subject heading "MHC Forms."

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Massachusetts Historical Commission
220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, Massachusetts 02125
www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc

This file was accessed on:

Tuesday, August 11, 2015 at 3:44: PM

FORM B – BUILDING

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MASSACHUSETTS ARCHIVES BUILDING
220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

Assessor's Number USGS Quad Area(s) Form Number

11-2-8	Plympton		PLM.92
--------	----------	--	--------

Town/City: Plympton
Place: (*neighborhood or village*): West Plympton

Photograph



Address: 94 Center St
Historic Name: Packard-Randall House
Uses: Present: residential
Original: residential
Date of Construction: ca. 1843
Source: Bricknell, style
Style/Form: Greek Revival
Architect/Builder: Sherman Brothers
Exterior Material:
Foundation: granite, brick
Wall/Trim: wood shingle
Roof: asphalt shingle

Locus Map



Outbuildings/Secondary Structures: barn, greenhouses and utility building

Major Alterations (*with dates*):

Condition: good

Moved: no yes **Date:**

Acreage: 7.25 acres

Setting: rural suburban setting; house faces south on parcel that extends to Route 58 (Palmer Road); late 20th and early 21st-century utility buildings fronting Palmer Road for seasonal farm stand and nursery business

Recorded by: K. K. Broomer, preservation consultant
Organization: Plympton Historical Commission
Date (*month / year*): June 2013

RECEIVED
JUL 01 2013
MASS. HIST. COMM.

INVENTORY FORM B CONTINUATION SHEET

PLYMPTON

94 CENTER ST

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Area(s) Form No.

220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

PLM.92

Recommended for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

If checked, you must attach a completed National Register Criteria Statement form.

Use as much space as necessary to complete the following entries, allowing text to flow onto additional continuation sheets.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:

Describe architectural features. Evaluate the characteristics of this building in terms of other buildings within the community.

This 1½-story, gable-front and wing dwelling is a good example of Greek Revival-style architecture in Plympton. The main block is three bays across and three bays deep on a granite foundation, with a brick chimney at the roof ridge. The lateral wing, three bays across and one bay deep on a granite foundation with some brick infill, has a late 20th-century brick chimney on the north (rear) slope of the roof. The house displays ornament associated with the Greek Revival style, including gable returns, a wide plain frieze, and corner pilasters. The end-bay entry on the façade is set in a broad entablature surround and flanked by three-quarter-length sidelights with updated glazing. A secondary entry on the lateral wing features a four-pane transom cut into the frieze. The two windows in the gable end on the façade are asymmetrically placed relative to the roof ridge, a feature seen in other gable-front cottages of the same period in Plympton. Windows contain replacement 1/1 sash. Later windows include a 20th-century, two-bay shed dormer on the east elevation, paired sash in a projecting bay on the lateral wing, and a skylight on the lateral wing.

The eastern end of the property includes (with assessors' dates) a wood-shingled, side-gabled barn (1989); greenhouses (2004); and a utility building/store (2004) with vertical board siding fronting Route 58 (Palmer Road). The barn appears to be older than 1989 and merits closer inspection in a future survey.

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

Discuss the history of the building. Explain its associations with local (or state) history. Include uses of the building, and the role(s) the owners/occupants played within the community.

Bricknell dates this house to about 1843, when the owner, shoemaker Peres Packard (b. 1821), married Mercy Bradford Sherman. Packard remained the owner into the last quarter of the 19th century. By 1880, he was a farmer, and the agricultural census for Plympton that year listed his farm production: butter (50 lbs.), Indian corn (15 bushels), Irish potatoes (10 bushels), wood (80 cords), and apples. Foster L. Randall, who was raised nearby at 82 Center Street (see form), was the owner of this farm in 1903. Plympton directories record him as a dealer in boots, shoes, and hosiery in 1902, and a painter in 1914.

Eugene Wright identifies the house as a type built by the Sherman brothers (Edward, Joseph, and George) of Plympton, describing them as sons of Asa Sherman. Instead, census and vital records suggest the carpenters were Joseph Sherman, Jr. (1809-1892), and George Williams Sherman (b. ca. 1815-1877), who were sons of Joseph Sherman and Nancy Bradford. Also employed as a carpenter was Jacob T. Cooper, who married Elizabeth Sherman, a daughter of Joseph Jr., and resided in his father-in-law's house. The Coopers were married in 1852, but left Plympton by 1860. Census records for Edward Sherman describe him as a farmer. Joseph Sherman, Jr. and George Sherman seem to be associated with building 1½-story gable-front cottages in Plympton, both the cottages with off-center attic windows (see also forms for 82 Center Street and 6 Cross Street), as well as examples with centered windows such as 4 Maple Street (see form).

The property encompasses Sunrise Gardens, a seasonal greenhouse, garden center, and farm stand business, established by the Harlfinger family in 1971.

BIBLIOGRAPHY and/or REFERENCES

Town of Plympton. Assessor's online database. FY2013. Property record card.
Plymouth County maps/atlasses: 1857 (Walling), 1879 (Walker), 1903 (Richards).
Directories: 1867 (Plymouth County); 1902, 1906, 1910, 1914 (all Carver).
U. S. census for Plympton: 1790-1940.

INVENTORY FORM B CONTINUATION SHEET

PLYMPTON

94 CENTER ST

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION

220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02125

Area(s) Form No.

	PLM.92
--	--------

U. S. census agricultural schedules for Plympton: 1850-1880.

Massachusetts census for Plympton: 1855, 1865.

Massachusetts Vital Records, 1620-1988. (Online database: *Ancestry.com*). With links to digital images of Plympton town records.

Wright, Eugene A. "The Randalls." In *Tales of Old Plympton*, i:339-340.

----- "The Shermans: Edward, Joseph, George." In *Tales of Old Plympton*, ii:99-100.

Sunrise Gardens, Plympton, Mass. Via www.farmfresh.org.