

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER**

September 17, 2015

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Kevin Provencher, Chair
Andrew Shveda, Vice-Chair
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Robyn Conroy
Randolph Bloom
Karl Bjork, Alternate
Cheryll Holley, Alternate

Commission Members Absent: Devon Kurtz

Staff Members Present: Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

Approval of the Minutes: 8/6/2015-Held

8/20/2015 - Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the minutes of August 20, 2015 with edits.

9/3/2015 - Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the minutes of September 3, 2015.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 35 Hamilton Street (HC-2015-066)

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	Diocese of Worcester
Present Use:	Church Rectory
Year Built:	Circa 1914
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed and fka St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church Complex
Petition Purpose:	Cover the copper on the ten dormers with copper colored roof membrane

Father Richard Reidy along with Jordan O'Connor from Jordan O'Connor & Associates appeared on behalf of the item.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission had received the letter from Cole Contracting with the quote options.

Father Reidy stated that he would like to apologize and stated that the numbers given to him and Mr. O'Connor were incorrect and they asked the contractor to go back and look at the options and the contractor told them that they did miscalculate and there is not much financial difference between putting on the copper compared to the sarnafil and it is just a few thousand dollars so they are happy to just put flat seam copper on the dormers and will abandon the sarnafil.

Chair Provencher asked if their intent was to address the copper with the flat seam option under the existing contract or is this something that is going to be deferred to the future.

Father Reidy stated that the plan is to address it right now.

Secretary McCann stated that this is a case where the Building Demolition Delay waiver is successful as it gave the applicant time to go back and look at the project and find out that the cost was going to be negligible to maintain the copper or replace it in kind and is ultimately a similar cost and great for the building in the long term.

Chair Provencher asked what was the difference between the flat seaming and the standing seaming.

Mr. O'Connor stated that concern expressed by the contractor is that the dormers are fairly tight to the pitch slate roof and what they would like to allow is an upward acting flange to act as a little bit of catch to snow and ice and basically they want it to shed a little.

Chair Provencher asked if all the seams were soldered.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they were.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it is important to note that the scope uses 20 ounce copper.

Upon a motion by Vice Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the replacement of the existing copper roof with a flat seamed copper version would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received August 11, 2015 and dated August 11, 2015

Exhibit B: Letter from Cole Contracting Inc., received electronically September 15, 2015 and dated September 15, 2015.

2. 660 Main Street (HC-2015-065)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Community Renewal, Inc.
Present Use: Multi-Unit apartment building
Year Built: Circa 1897
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRIND (National Register Individual Property,
NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area) fka Hotel Aurora

Petition Purpose:

- Repoint brick masonry on the side elevation with mortar to match existing
- Replace existing wood windows with aluminum to match existing
- Replace curved double hung windows with non-curved fixed window

Zan Bross from The Community Builders, Inc. appeared on behalf of the application.

Vice-Chair Shveda, Secretary McCann, Commissioner Conroy and Commissioner Bloom visited the site prior to the meeting.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that in the curved windows all the curved glazing had been replaced with plexi-glass and a lot of the sealants on the plexi-glass has peeled away from the glass which has allowed moisture to enter into the inside of the window. There is some deterioration in the windows and the windows look like they have been painted in the past five years. He stated that the curved windows are not operable.

Chair Provencher asked how many windows had been replaced with plexi-glass.

Mr. Bross stated that all original curved glass has been replaced with plexi-glass.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the interior jams of the unit you could see metal being wrapped around the wood and it was nailed to the wood and there was no sealant. Also, the wood on the exterior seems to be extremely worn.

Chair Provencher asked if the left and right side and rear side windows are being replaced with aluminum clad replacement units.

Mr. Bross stated that was correct.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if there was 214 openings on the building.

Mr. Bross stated that was correct.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that 20 are curved. 10 on either bay.

Mr. Bross stated that they had several options and the original option was to replace the curved window with a straight opening and the Commission made it clear that the curved window was

important so that narrowed it two other options. One would be a complete restoration and the other was replacement in kind and the latter being the less expensive at \$900,000. The complete restoration would be \$1.2 million and the curved windows are a big part of that and cost per replication for each window would be about \$6,400 per window. Mr. Bross stated that they would like to replace the other windows in the property with historically accurate aluminum windows. He believes that they can replace in kind the curved double hung windows with a single pane like window and stated that what they are requesting is to replace the curved windows with historically accurate windows and to replace the remaining windows with historically accurate aluminum windows replicating the profiles to help meet energy standards.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the curved windows remain curved once replaced.

Mr. Bross stated that they would.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the only difference today than what was presented at previous meeting was the curved windows.

Mr. Bross stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher asked if every window on the building besides the curved would be replaced with aluminum.

Mr. Bross stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that if that includes the double hung that are between the curved units then you would have wood units mixed with aluminum unit and the Commission should discuss if that would work. The key to this proposal are the two bays and the continuity of those bays and the sides and rear were far less critical and asked Mr. Bross what the two windows would look like together and if they would have different profiles.

Mr. Bross stated that was a good point and stated that he believed that they would be similar in character and stated that the challenge with doing the large windows out of wood is that it is difficult to get wood windows of that size and not sure quite sure that products exists.

Commissioner Bjork stated that at the last meeting it was presented that cost to reproduce the wood windows would be \$15,000 and now it is \$6,500 and Mr. Bross to explain the difference.

Mr. Bross stated that the \$15,000 would be for a full restoration on site and they cannot entertain that as it too high and the \$6,400 option they would pull the windows off the building taking them to a shop and templating them, reproducing them with historically accurate mahogany, and then shipping them to a glazing company to do the curve glass and then bringing them back to the site to install so it would be a true replica.

Chair Provencher asked if the double hung windows would be operable.

Mr. Bross stated that they would be fixed windows with a true double sash so it be essentially a fixed double hung window but would not be operable.

Chair Provencher asked if the existing double hung windows were double hung.

Secretary McCann stated that they are fixed double hung windows.

Chair Provencher stated that then for the fixed option the lower sash would sit behind the upper sash just as if it was operable so all of the shadows would be the same as if it was an operable window.

Mr. Bross stated that would be the intention.

Chair Provencher stated that option also listed a double hung wood window for the center and asked if that was still feasible.

Mr. Bross stated that they would look into that but don't think that they can get that large of a window but they are just hoping to do it in aluminum as to be more structurally sound.

Chair Provencher stated that it was commendable that the proposal now includes replacement of the curved units and thanked applicant for that but to put in context there is a pair of them and then there is a double hung window in between and the copper cladding ties it all together so at this point he is not convinced that combing the wood replacement with the aluminum replacement would provide a satisfactory result. He suggested that maybe the other item can be voted on and then the applicant could provide some additional data in graphic form that would show the detail of the two types of windows so that Commission could compare side by side. His concern would be the profiles as the profile on the sash of the aluminum unit are thicker than the ones of the wood units then that is a discontinuity that would compromise the whole effect.

Secretary McCann asked if there was any comments from the other Commission members on the 214 remaining windows on the other facades. He feels they are important and are willing to allow for an upgraded window on the facades that are least important if applicant asked the Board to split up the item and vote on everything but the front façade.

Commissioner Conroy stated that Chair Provencher brought up a good point about that center window being aluminum and the continuity so he would like more information about how much a wood window would cost.

Mr. Bross stated that he would like the Commission to vote on the three facades and he can do a little more homework on the front façade on what is available for wood double hungs.

Chair Provencher stated that his opinion about the sides and rear facades is that they are all visible but are far less significant than the front facade and the windows on the side are all double hung and one over one sash so they aren't particularly distinctive and would be comfortable with their replacement. There are several units that are 2 on 2 and they look original but he would ask that the applicant honor that configuration on the rear.

Mr. Bross stated that is the intent to keep the mouton details.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that window type looks to be an arched top and asked if they are true arched top double hung and would they be replaced.

Mr. Bross stated their proposal is to replace with historically accurate windows and that would include that round top and not a panel.

Commissioner Conroy stated that there has to be some type of compromise and applicant is willing to work on front façade which is most important.

Chair Provencher stated that the City of Worcester has adopted energy stretch code so the applicant will be required to meet the energy performance requirements based on that code and it cannot be met with a single glazed wood unit and asked Mr. Bross if property listed on the National Register and does that provide them with an exemption.

Mr. Bross stated that they are listed on the Register but was not sure about an exemption.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission may be able to approve them for single pane glass but applicant may not be able to obtain a building permit so it is important the applicant look into that.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the portion of the application for the east facade until the October 1, 2015 Historical Commission meeting and to extend the constructive grant deadline October 16, 2015.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition or replacement of wood windows on the southwest and northwest to include replacement in kind of mouton patterns would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved with condition that there be no removal of any wood from the trim work.

Chair Provencher, Karl Bjork and Cheryll Holley were not eligible to vote on item as were not present at first hearing when item was opened.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received August 3, 2015 and dated August 3, 2015

Exhibit B: Continuation form, received electronically September 11, 2015 and dated September 11, 2015.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Provencher stated that alternate Commissioner Bjork would vote on item.

3. 44 Hitchcock Road (HC-2015-067)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: David Deagle
Present Use: Three family residence
Year Built: 1911
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed-formerly fka Henry O. Granger-
Chauncey Arnold Three Decker

Petition Purpose:

- Remove rotted wood along trim on both peaks and back of house, entry, porches, windows
- Remove ornamental, decorative blocks in front of house only
- Reconstruct framework as needed to original
- Repair loose slate around all areas of home using new/used slate to match original color and size
- Remove rotted gutters and re-nail existing fascia and repair missing with new pre-primed rough cut pine.
- Repair side porch

David Deagle and Jeff Benoit appeared on behalf of the item.

Mr. Deagle stated that the City of Worcester Inspectional Services had done a neighborhood sweep and they had noticed that the roof on his home needed work and gave him thirty days to get the work done.

Secretary McCann asked if they were slate shingles and if they would be replaced in kind.

Mr. Deagle stated that it was slate and he would replace with slate.

Chair Provencher stated that the trim that needs to be replaced looks rotten.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he had viewed the property and it looks like quite a bit of work needs to be done to it.

Mr. Benoit stated that the upper part of the roof has been in disrepair for quite a while and the porches were reconstructed in 2004 and they plan to remove the decorative block underneath the soffit and replace it with composite material and imitate the molding.

Chair Provencher stated that the work really begins on the gable above the third floor and there is a lot of rot on the fascia and soffit and asked if brackets would be replaced with composite.

Mr. Benoit stated that he would use composite material and the blocks he can take down and put back up.

Chair Provencher asked if any of the brackets were salvageable or would the applicant just template and put on new ones.

Mr. Benoit stated that they will all be replaced as some are too questionable and he will match the existing profile.

Chair Provencher asked if they would be painted.

Mr. Benoit stated that it would not have to be painted as he is using composite material and the decorative blocking would need to be removed, repainted and then reinstalled but framework will all be new.

Chair Provencher stated that the fascia board and soffit would be composite and the blocks will be salvageable.

Mr. Benoit stated that it would look like it was just built.

Chair Provencher asked if the aluminum siding would need to be replaced.

Mr. Benoit stated the siding is in good condition.

Commissioner Bjork asked if applicant was replacing the back porch.

Mr. Benoit stated that he was but was going to add some windows to obtain some natural light.

Chair Provencher stated that would not be visible from the street.

Secretary McCann asked about the side porch.

Mr. Benoit stated that it needs to be straightened a little.

Chair Provencher stated that what he sees is a lot of repair and replacement in kind.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if there were wood gutters on the building and would they be replaced.

Mr. Benoit stated that they are being taken down and nothing being put back.

Secretary McCann stated the he was not in favor of the composite sub-straight.

Mr. Deagle stated that he could do it in white.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed demolition or replacement would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received August 19, 2015 and dated August 19, 2015

Chair Provencher stated that Commissioner Holley would vote on the next item.

4. 9 Ashland Street (HC-2015-068)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness

Petitioner: Savage Realty Trust/James & Clara Savage

Present Use: Multi Family Residence

Year Built: 1887
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and located in the Crown Hill Historic District fka Charles Ranlet & Richard Cleveland House

Petition Purpose:

- Remove/Replace existing slate roof with matching architectural shingles
- Install ice water shield at drip edge and ridge vents to the roof's peaks
- Replace all pipe flanges and any necessary roof flashings

James and Clara Savage appeared on behalf of the item.

Mr. Savage stated that the roof is leaking and needs to be replaced.

Ms. Savage stated that they cannot get through another winter as the porch of the building is leaking constantly during the winter time and water is leaking inside and they have repaired it many times but the roofers are telling them now they have to replace the entire roof. But the option of slate is prohibitive for them and they would like to replace with shingles that look like slate and the roofers have assured them that the shingles are very close to the color of the slate currently on the roof and the roofers will add ventilation as they need to insulate the roof also.

Chair Provencher stated that there are a couple things to discuss as this home is in the Crown Hill Local Historic District so the Commission will need to discuss the removal of the slate but also what is being replaced and the color.

Chair Provencher stated that application was very thorough and he had viewed the property and based on his observation the roof is past the life expectancy of the roof and he has no doubt there are leaking problems and what is being proposed is the right thing. He asked how the soffit vent would work on the house and asked how that would be done.

Ms. Savage stated that according to Home Depot they explained that in the rafters they will have to put in a special type of ventilation to allow the separation between the slate and the insulation.

Chair Provencher asked how the air was going to get into the roof from the eaves.

Ms. Savage stated that they said they will install vents in the top and bottom.

Chair Provencher stated that they see a lot of requests to remove slate roof and this roof is probably in the worst condition than they usually see and they use to request that the applicant get quotes for cost to replace with slate but stopped doing that as generally the quotes were coming in triple the cost and that was for a simple roof and this is not a simple roof.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the way the shingles are laid they are horizontal which is rather unique.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the Commission would look at whether the removal of the slate was detrimental to the building and in his opinion it would be but in perfect world people would

have money to fix the building back to the way it was but that's not the reality and he knows that there not many people who could afford to put a slate roof on this house and far as the architectural integrity he cannot see it being compromised greatly by an asphalt shingle roof.

Secretary McCann stated that he is reticent to set precedent when dealing with topics such as or removal of original slate and he thinks it would not be in the best interest of the Commission to tell an applicant that the removal of an original slate roof no matter what the condition is acceptable and that he would not need to look economic data to know that the cost to replace this roof is going to be cost prohibitive. He stated that he just wants to make sure they are being as fair as possible to all the applicants and wants to hold all applicants to the same standard, especially ones in historic districts. He understands that the slate is beyond it useful lifespan and believes that is how he will reconcile this application.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission can handle this by having two votes. One on the Demolition Delay Waiver and if it doesn't pass they can vote on an Economic Hardship.

Chair Provencher stated that the applicant had provided two samples of shingles that were being proposed, one for Timberline and one for Camelot and asked which option the applicant plans to use.

Ms. Savage stated that they were looking to go with the Camelot as that is the closest one to the slate.

Commissioner Bloom stated that looking at the photograph of the product it looked like slate.

Chair Provencher asked what would be the color.

Mr. Savage stated that they would choose color closest as possible to current slate but wasn't able to provide color sample.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he was excited to see the Camelot sample as it looks like slate.

Chair Provencher stated that Camelot is a product and may come in several colors.

Commissioner Bloom stated that color showed in the photo would be the one closest.

Chair Provencher asked if the photo provided by the applicant could be added into the record and stated that the applicant has made a very good presentation and would feel comfortable moving forward on that basis.

Chair Provencher asked if there was a brick chimney on the house.

Mr. Savage stated that there are two.

Chair Provencher stated that the smaller one is in rough shape and asked if that will be repointed and typically the roofer would need to re-lead the chimney and would think the lead would need to be all torn out and replaced.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 1-6 (Cheryll Holley voting for) that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was consider under Economic Hardship.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 that to deny the application would cause an undue economic hardship and the application passed.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed addition of an architectural shingle by GAF in the Camelot 2 Series to most closely resemble the color of the existing slate and the addition of a drip edge in the color of white was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received August 27, 2015 and dated August 25, 2015

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.