

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
December 18, 2014**

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Kevin Provencher, Chair
Andrew Shveda, Vice Chair
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Erika Dunn
Robyn Conroy
Karl Bjork
Randolph Bloom

Commission Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Stephen S. Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

Mr. Rolle recognized Ms. Dunn for her volunteer service and presented her with certificate of appreciation from the City Manager for her service to the Worcester Historical Commission.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

11/20/2014 - Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 7-0 to approve the minutes of November 20, 2014 with one edit.

12/8/2014 - Held until next meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. 26 Louise Street (HC-2014-075)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: 26 Louise Street LLC
Present Use: Three-family residence
Year Built: Circa 1900
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRIND,NRMRA, formerly known as the David Hunt Three-Decker
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace siding and porch with like materials

Ms. Steele informed the Board that the applicant requested a postponement.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 7-0 to postpone the item until the January 22, 2014 Historical Commission meeting.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 7-0 to extend the constructive deadline until February 28, 2015.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated October 15, 2014 and received October 27, 2014.

NEW BUSINESS

2. 137 Providence Street (HC-2014-081)

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	Outlook Realty, LLC
Present Use:	Three-family residence
Year Built:	Circa 1928
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRMRA National Register Multiple Resource Area), formerly known as the Hyman Zive Three Decker
Petition Purpose:	Remove/replace cedar shake shingles with aluminum siding with associated work

Thomas Morway appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Morway stated that the property exterior is made up of two materials and he would like to create some consistency in the building and would like to finish off the siding on the third level of the property.

Chair Provencher stated that the proposal is whatever is to cover with aluminum the cedar shakes remaining on the third level to match the rest of the house. Mr. Morway stated that he was not sure if it would be aluminum but it would be a very similar material to the aluminum that is there now.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Morway had looked into taking off the aluminum and starting over. Mr. Morway stated that would be a significant cost.

Chair Provencher asked what the condition of the cedar was. Mr. Morway stated it was mixed and he did not know what was under the aluminum.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the mixture of textures on these three deckers is part of the architectural integrity of the building. Secretary McCann agreed.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the Form B shows several shots of Providence Street and you see a strong horizontal feature in all of the finishes which has been lost due to fact that many have been sided over.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if this was a rental property. Mr. Morway stated that it was a three unit rental property. Vice Chair-Shveda asked what the monthly income was. Mr. Morway stated that it was between \$3300 and \$3500 per month.

Mr. Morway stated that what he is trying to do with the property is improve the overall appearance of property as it looks odd with the aluminum and cedar shakes.

Commissioner Bloom stated that was the intended look with the clapboard, instead of the aluminum, as the home is meant to have those two different textures and the house was never intended to look uniform.

Mr. Morway stated that he assumed that aluminum siding already there had to come before the Commission. Secretary McCann stated that in the past before the Historical Commission had purview, work was done without coming before a board.

Mr. Morway stated that while not all the cedar shakes are in bad condition they will still all have to be removed. His contractor stated that the cost to paint and replace the cedar shakes would be close to \$18,000 and it could be more once all the shakes are removed and the cost to finish the property in other material would only be \$10,000.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that on Mr. Morway's application under economic hardship it states cost to remove and replace and paint was \$17,500. Mr. Morway stated that the paint was not included and he had completed the application in the office and it does not include paint.

Chair Provencher stated that the \$17,500 just represents replacing the cedar shakes. Mr. Morway stated yes and it was for a limited area and presented a quote to the Board.

Chair Provencher stated that the written quote is from WM General Construction and the first is for vinyl siding and cladding for top two levels of 137 Providence Street and second is to strip & replace cedar wood siding for top two levels of 137 Providence Street and the vinyl project total is \$10,250.00 and the cedar project total is \$17,500.00.

Secretary McCann asked if there was a public way behind the building. Mr. Morway stated he wasn't sure it was a public way as the city doesn't plow it. Secretary McCann stated that he believed on past rulings on property in this area it was considered a public way and therefore the house is visible from the public way.

Mr. Morway stated that he believed a public way would be a street maintained by the city.

Chair Provencher stated that would need to be clarified by the city.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the back side of the house is already covered in aluminum. Secretary McCann stated that he was unaware of that. Chair Provencher stated that can be taken out of the discussion then.

Mr. Morway stated that when you look at the cost variables involved here it is very significant.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission is looking at what historical elements the applicant proposes to demolish and the applicant is planning to add a layer of siding and does not plan to take anything away. Mr. Morway stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that this particular house is a great example of the three decker which is iconic to the city and has nice details and his preference would be that some of the aluminum on side and front be removed and maintain as is as he believed it would be best thing for the house but not something the Commission can compel the applicant to do and asked about Mr. Morway's long term plan for the home.

Mr. Morway stated that the house does not have a lot of curb appeal and with the contrast it could detract rentals and he has to maintain the property and there are some areas of concern on the outside that have to be addressed and the cost is a big component.

Chair Provencher asked what the plan was for the window jams and porch columns. Mr. Morway stated that the window sills and window jams have already been wrapped in aluminum and the wood on the porch column would be painted.

Chair Provencher asked what about the paired columns. Mr. Morway stated they would remain as is.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked about the wall surface inside the porches and whether they were shakes. Mr. Morway stated they were not and believed it was just painted plywood.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that on where the column on the knee wall it looks like the cedar shakes wrap around the knee wall and asked if the vinyl siding would wrap around as well. Mr. Morway stated that he didn't address that with the contractor.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if Mr. Morway was willing to absorb that cost to maintain the integrity of the house. Mr. Morway stated that he was not because he couldn't afford the additional cost.

Commissioner Bloom stated that Mr. Morway keeps saying that property is not uniform but it was never intended to look like that.

Mr. Morway stated that the property needs to be addressed and the cedar shakes in many areas are starting to crumble and he would like to deal with the problem.

Commissioner Conroy wondered if the price would drop if he only replaced the ones in need of work.

Mr. Morway stated that the quote is to repair and replace the cedar shakes on the property and it would make sense to do them all at one time.

Commissioner Bloom asked how many quotes the Commission expects from a homeowner as this is just one contractor and one quote.

Chair Provencher stated that it is up to the Commission to ask if they feel that more than one quote is necessary and he has done some math and repair of cedar and with the painting would be between \$20,000 and \$25,000 which is more than double the cost of the siding and even if they had applicant get more quotes it will probably not vary that much. He stated that this was a credible quote.

Secretary McCann asked Mr. Morway if his contractor had worked on historical properties before. Mr. Morway stated that there was a property on Vernon Street that had a tree fall on the porch during the tornado and he had received a compliance form and his contractor had done that work.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the quote it does state that all work shall be completed in accordance with the vinyl siding installation manual which does have section on historic preservation and he understands the vinyl siding is reversible.

Secretary McCann stated as the Chair stated the Commission can't compel the applicant to keep it historic but they can ask if applicant would be amenable to the third option that Chair had alluded to earlier which was to consider siding the two sides on the second and third floor in a vinyl product as closely matching the aluminum product as possible and maintaining the second and third floor in the current condition and do some minor fixes to the cedar but keep it the stained color and keep first floor as is and by doing that it would be difficult to say it was economic hardship as you would still have the low maintenance of the siding on $\frac{3}{4}$ of the building while still preserving the most important and visible part and in his opinion the part that would be most damaged physically by being vinyl sided.

Mr. Morway asked what defines economic hardship. Secretary McCann stated that it is very relative to the individual project and individual property owner.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that Mr. Morway stated he has six properties and they would have to know how much he makes to determine economic hardship. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the rental income is \$39,600 per year on this property. Mr. Morway stated that there are significant amount of expense that goes along with owning a rental property. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he understands that and Commission would need to know what those expenses are in order to understand applicant's ability to absorb the cost.

Secretary McCann asked what the assessed value of the home was. Mr. Morway stated he was not sure but he paid approximately \$215,000 for the property.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that his argument is not about the work itself since the original material is not being removed but covered up. His argument is that it is being presented as an economic hardship and Commission doesn't have enough information to determine economic hardship.

Chair Provencher stated that unfortunately there is not a great definition in the ordinance as to what consists an economic hardship and asked Mr. Rolle for an opinion.

Mr. Rolle stated that staff had been discussing but the Commission has covered it pretty well and each case is unique.

Mr. Morway stated that the Commission is using term economic hardship and it was brought up by panel. Secretary McCann stated it was on application. Mr. Morway stated that it was a question on the application and maybe there should be a sub-category on the application defining the difference in pricing as there sounds like there are some inconsistencies.

Chair Provencher explained how the Commission would vote on the item to the applicant.

Mr. Morway asked if what he was doing would be considered removal or demolition. Chair Provencher stated in his opinion it would not be removal or demolition. Commissioner Bjork stated that he concurs with the Chair.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated he agrees.

Chair Provencher stated that if the application is approved he wants to make sure applicant knows that all that is being approved is what was presented by the applicant and if additional work has to be done the applicant would need to come back before the Commission.

Mr. Morway asked if he wanted to paint house would need the Commission's approval. Secretary McCann stated that he would not.

Commissioner Bloom reiterated that the color difference and texture difference is what makes these three decker's unique.

Secretary McCann asked if Mr. Morway had any interest in what he suggested before. Mr. Morway stated he would prefer not to because he believed it would very costly.

Chair Provencher stated that the wood would still need to be maintained and the vinyl is maintenance free even though he is not in support of vinyl.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated vinyl is not maintenance free and it melts.

Secretary McCann stated that asking an applicant to maintain the property does not constitute an economic hardship.

Mr. Morway stated that he appreciates the recommendation but prefers not to take that route.

Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 3-4 (Commissioners Conroy, Bloom, Dunn and McCann voted no) that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this portion of the project was denied for the following reasons:

- Use of nails is detrimental to the siding; and

- The property is significant and any changes would be detrimental to the architectural resources of the city;
- The proposed façade uniformity and additional alterations will set precedent for other owners of three-deckers;
- The addition of vinyl siding inherently damages the cedar shake substrate and leads to demolition.

Because the motion failed, the Commission considered the Building Demolition Delay Waiver with respect to the petitioner’s evidence related to undue economic hardship. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 2-5 (Commissioners Shveda, McCann, Bloom, Conroy and Dunn voted no) that the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated November 18, 2014 and received November 18, 2014.

Exhibit B: Quote from WM General Construction dated November 15, 2014 and received at the December 18, 2014 Historical Commission meeting.

3. 36 Sever Street (HC-2014-082)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
 Petitioner: Patrick Warner
 Present Use: Single-Family Residence
 Year Built: Circa 1886
 Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area), formerly known as the Edward W. Lincoln House
 Petition Purpose: Remove/replace existing roof shingles with associated work

John Hanlon and Patrick & Nicole Warner appeared on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Hanlon stated that the Warners purchased the home in August and were told during a home inspection that the home was historical.

Mr. Hanlon reviewed the scope of the roof. A lifetime GAR black architectural shingle will be installed and underlayment six feet of ice and water shield and a new ridge vent will be installed and a new drip edge.

Mr. Hanlon stated that the wood around the casings, the soffits, fascia seems to be intact and the chimney will be reflashed.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the

historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated November 18, 2014 and received November 20, 2014.

4. 1 Tallawanda Drive (HC-2014-083)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: John McNamee
Present Use: Two-Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1835
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, formerly known as Robert Hutchings Goddard Birthplace
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace windows (porch, cellar, garage)
Remove/replace doors (porch) with associated work

James Brooks, health and home manager and lead paint rehabilitation specialist in the city's Housing and Development Division, told the Commission that a state-licensed lead paint inspector found lead paint at the property and in addition to removing lead paint from the exterior and interior of the historic home at 1 Tallawanda Drive, the project also calls for removing and replacing its 32 double-hung windows, two basement pop-out windows, and its front entrance door, all of which also have lead paint.

Mr. Brooks stated that the city is working with John McNamee, current owner of the 1.75-story, two-family home, on securing federal funding for the work. Funding is being sought through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's lead paint removal program and Community Development Block Grant program. Mr. Brooks said funding from those sources is available for low- and moderate-income homeowners.

The homeowner in this instance meets the income eligibility requirements. He added that the city will need to seek a waiver from HUD because its maximum allocation for lead paint removal is \$20,000 per unit.

For this property, that would mean it would be eligible for a maximum of \$40,000 in HUD funds because it is a two-family home. But because of the historical significance of the home he believes the city has a good chance of receiving the waiver.

Mr. Brooks noted that one of HUD's requirements is that any replacement materials used in abating lead paint on historic properties match as closely as possible the materials being removed.

As a result, he said, all the replacement windows will be made of wood and have patterns similar to the existing ones. He added that the windows will also meet Energy Star conservation requirements.

It is estimated that each replacement window will cost \$1,000 to \$1,200.

Mr. Brooks stated that several of the home's current windows are unusable because they do not function. He described the windows as old, but does not believe any of them are original to the 1835 home.

Once the lead paint issues are corrected, a certificate will be issued for the property indicating it has been cleared of lead paint and can be lived in by children under the age of 6 but before the city can apply to HUD for a waiver, it needs approval from the Historical Commission.

Because the house is listed on the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System, it falls under the purview of the city's demolition delay ordinance, which puts a 12-month hold on the demolition of historic structures to allow time to explore alternative uses.

The replacement of windows and doors is one of the many provisions included in the demolition delay ordinance.

Mr. Brooks stated that this will likely be a \$100,000-plus lead-paint job and is just the first step in the process, though. HUD won't even consider a waiver without first getting approval from the Historical Commission.

Members said they were pleased to see that maintaining the home's historical significance would be a priority as part of the work.

Chairman Provencher said he was glad to see that the plans called for using wood-framed windows rather than vinyl or aluminum, as is most often the case as not something the Commission sees often.

Commissioner McCann stated that he also felt comfortable with the project because of HUD's insistence regarding historic preservation.

Historical Commission members also broached the idea of possibly saving one of the windows that will be replaced and having it kept at the Worcester Historical Museum after it has been properly de-lead. Commissioner Conroy stated that applicant should contact the museum in order to discuss the matter.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated November 19, 2014 and received November 19, 2014.

5. 50 Water Street (HC-2014-084)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Petitioner: Amici on Canal LLC
Present Use: Commercial Warehouse
Year Built: Circa 1910
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, formerly known as Caplan & Sarlok Bottle Warehouse

Petition Purpose:

- Windows (Black 2/2 lite) & Doors (garage-full glass & main entry-metal glass);
- Board storefronts (glass/wood on Water St & glass/metal on Harding St);
- Remove/replace flat rubber roof with in-kind.

Edward Russo, the manager of Amici on Canal LLC and owner of 50 Water Street, appeared on behalf of the item.

He stated that he recently purchased the building and the property had been before the Commission before and the work had been previously approved but the demolition delay waiver had expired. The work did commence within one year but he wondered if the waiver was still active.

Mr. Rolle state it would be up to Inspectional Services whether enough progress had occurred to keep waiver active.

Chair Provencher stated that he knows the metal shroud has been removed from building and asked Mr. Russo to review what other work needs to be done as he did remember the Commission had reviewed some storefront designs.

Mr. Russo stated that is what he is looking to change from previous application is he would like to replace the roof with a rubber roof, paint the existing galvanized metal molding black to match store fronts and install a black metal cap on the roof line.

Chair Provencher stated what was approved in August 2013 was the following:

- Replace boarded up store fronts with first floor with glass;
- Remove metal wrap on façade;
- Replace windows with light green window;
- Replace garage doors with glass window; and
- Remove and replace rubber roof

Chair Provencher asked what worked had started. Mr. Russo stated that just the metal façade but he plans to complete the work with a few minor details added but he is not removing anything.

Mr. Russo stated that he has done research and he found a building that looks similar to what he wants to do and showed a photo to the Commission. The windows will be an architectural wood 1/1 on front in the back it would be 2/2 in a black wooden frame. The store front would be a custom made non modern window and he showed a photo of what he planned.

Chair Provencher asked if this is one continuous property. Mr. Russo stated that it has three addresses but it is one continuous property.

Chair Provencher stated that what is unique about this building is that it looks like it was built in two phases and one portion faces Water Street and one faces Harding Street and you also have storefront on both sides which is pretty unique. He asked Mr. Russo if he was planning to do work on both sides. Mr. Russo showed on plans the Harding Street work and stated that would be second phase of project and he may have to come back for that.

Chair Provencher stated that this building is not in district so not sure they need to have lengthy discussion.

Chair Provencher stated that the drawings showed an aluminum storefront that was proposed originally but is not going to be done now. Mr. Russo stated no and showed photo of what he planned to do.

Mr. Russo stated there would also be window work.

Commissioner Bjork asked if Mr. Russo had any idea how to improve the appearance of the brick wall. Mr. Russo stated that he was thinking maybe a mural or fake storefront. Secretary McCann suggested an old time advertisement could be part on the wall. Mr. Russo stated he fully agrees and he wants the building to look historical.

Mr. Rolle reminded the applicant that before he did that type of work he would need to check with Inspectional Services as the city has a sign ordinance on how large a sign could be.

Chair Provencher stated that the two store fronts are to be removed and asked if Commission had any concerns and stated that associated with the storefront there is a painted metal band which is galvanized metal and asked what the plan was for that. Mr. Russo stated it would be painted to match the storefront.

Chair Provencher asked if any structural modifications need to be done for the storefront. Mr. Russo stated no.

Chair Provencher stated it was hard to tell if the windows were original but they do look like they were wood windows but based on the date it conceivable the windows are original.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Russo had examined the windows because it is a pretty good chance they are original windows and the question to the Commission is to determine whether it is a detriment to replace the windows and the proposal is to replace in original configuration but the site lines probably would be a little different.

Secretary McCann stated that in the photos it shows ten windows have been boarded up and asked what the condition behind those windows were. Mr. Russo stated they are not boarded up but had been infilled and are no longer there.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the windows look like they are in rough shape. Mr. Morway stated they are.

Chair Provencher asked what they long term plan is for the building. Mr. Morway stated that the second floor level would be three apartments and first floor would be a restaurant that he will run with his family.

Chair Provencher stated that he sees a property owner that has purchased a building and plans to run a mixed used building, which is very positive for the area. He would support the petition as the end result would be an attractive building that maintains its historic character by maintaining the style of the windows and the muntin pattern and this is a vacant property that when work is completed will add value to the city.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the muntins would be on the exterior or interior. Mr. Russo stated the exterior.

Chair Provencher asked if the roof was a membrane roof. Mr. Russo stated that it will be a membrane roof as in past few weeks they have found several leaks.

Chair Provencher asked if the parapet had been inspected. Mr. Russo stated that some work had been done on the flashing but it looks pretty good.

Chair Provencher asked if the cast stone coping on the Water Street side was metal or stone. Mr. Russo stated that was stone and he plans to cap over it metal. Chair Provencher asked if it would extend over the top. Mr. Russo asked what Commission would like to see. The Commission showed a photo of what they would like to see and stated the Commission would probably not be in favor of the metal covering. Mr. Russo stated he would be okay with that but if a problem he would come back before the Commission.

Chair Provencher asked about the garage door on Harding Street side. Mr. Russo stated that will be replaced with a glass door.

Commissioner Bjork asked if the door is legal size. Mr. Russo stated that it was a standard size.

Secretary McCann asked how many windows are being replaced. Mr. Russo stated all of them and thought it was about 36 in total.

Commissioner Bjork stated that will be an outstanding building.

Chair Provencher wished Mr. Russo success with the building.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Dunn and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated November 20, 2014 and received November 20, 2014.

6. 140 Elm Street (HC-2014-085)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Stephen Manzi, Trustee
Present Use: Multi-unit apartments
Year Built: Circa 1904
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area) and formerly known as the Bowker-Mailman Three Decker
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace three-tab roof shingles with architectural shingles on the garage with associated work to repair soffits and fascia boards

Stephen Manzi appeared on behalf of the application. He stated that he had purchased the property in May.

Chair Provencher stated that the work proposed is on the garage. Mr. Manzi stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that the fascia boards looked like they were in rough shape.

Chair Provencher stated that he did not see any significance to the garage and anything done to the garage will be an improvement.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Dunn, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated November 20, 2014 and received November 20, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission voted to adjourn the meeting at 7:58 p.m.