



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

Thursday, February 15, 2024

Commissioners Present: Diane Long, Chair
Janet Theerman, Vice-Chair
Erika Helnarski - *Participated Remotely*
Donald Northway
Vanessa Andre, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Devon Kurtz
Steven Taylor

Staff Present: Michelle Johnstone, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Amy Beth Laythe, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)

Call Commission to Order – 5:30 PM

Approval of Minutes - NONE

New Business

Building Demolition Delay Waiver

3. 15 Whitney Street (05-032-00006) – (BDDW-24-4)

Petition purpose: Replace corner trim, railings & newel posts, Install new vent.

Ariel Lim o/b/o Richard Chysna requested a continuance to next meeting 2/29/24.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed to postpone the item to 2/29/24.

Building Demolition Delay Waiver

4. 167 Vernon Street (10-006-00011) – BDDW-23-66

Petition purpose: Replacement of 3 windows and exterior trim (retroactive)

The petitioner presented via an interpreter.

Chair Long said she understood the windows had lead paint.

Escobar Maynor, owner, answered yes.

Chair Long asked if there was a reason why the windows were replaced before coming before the board.

Mr. Maynor answered that he first did a request, but I didn't receive an answer quickly, so he replaced the windows because the windows were broken and due to having children and had to move quickly.

Chair Long asked if he is moving out of the house.

Mr. Maynor answered, no, that he bought this house last December, so he had a short window to work on it before he needed to move in because he had nowhere else to live.

Chair Long stated asked if all other windows were already replaced, and requested confirmation that these were the original windows left.

Mr. Maynor answered, to clarify, that December 2022 was the month he moved into the house. Those 3 were the only windows left to replace when they moved in, and they were damaged. He applied and didn't receive an answer. When he replaced them, that's when he received a letter and that's why he was before the Commission.

Michelle Johnstone stated that the applicant had applied for a building permit to replace the windows that was denied because the house is historic, and a historical commission application was never submitted.

Chair Long clarified that these windows are on the side of the house, not on the front of the house.

Ms. Johnstone wanted to make clear that moving forward, any time historic fabric is altered on the exterior of the building, he will have to come to the historical commission before any work takes place.

Mr. Maynor stated that he understands that his house is historic, but the inside of the house is almost all new. He stated that he bought this house because he wanted to give his family a good place to live. He always tries to ask for permission to make changes. He only changed the paint and holes on the inside, for which he asked for permission.

The board had no further questions.

Public comment - None

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed to close public comment.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the Commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) proposed that the retroactive replacement of 3 windows that are not visible from the street would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City of Worcester.

Exhibits

Exhibit A – Building Demolition Delay Waiver submitted by Escobar Maynor, received January 26, 2024.

Exhibit B – 2 slides showing exterior views of the house pre home purchase and current existing conditions.

Old Business

Certificate of Appropriateness & Building Demolition Delay Waiver

1. 34 Irving Street (03-017-00007) – (COA-24-1)

Request for Certificate of Hardship to replace asbestos siding with vinyl siding.

Derrick St. George, owner of 34 Irving Street Worcester, LLC, from Chicopee, appeared in person before the commission. He presented an exhibit to show sample colors for the vinyl siding they propose. He stated that he tried to get it with a picture of the actual house, but that the exhibit should give a feel of the siding proposed.

Chair Long stated that the applicant had applied for financial hardship and the estimates show the difference in pricing.

Mr. St. George stated the difference is a substantial difference in the costs. There is a difference of about \$60-\$70 thousand dollars. The reason that he got into real estate was for the long-term investment to provide his children opportunities in the future. He doesn't have that much extra money for asbestos removal and Hardy board.

Chair Long asked for clarification of, if vinyl siding is installed, whether the asbestos would need to be removed.

Mr. St. George stated that it could be encapsulated, and they would try to make it look really nice with the budget they have.

Chair Long asked if they couldn't try to keep the asbestos siding and just repair it.

Mr. St George stated there is leakage and dry rot and that he is afraid if it isn't done correctly, the building will continue to deteriorate.

Chair Long asked if encapsulating it will take care of that issue.

Mr. St. George stated yes. It will cover up all the holes.

Commissioner Andre asked about the certificate of hardship.

Ms. Johnstone stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness was denied, and they are back for the certificate of hardship.

Commissioner Theerman asked if the siding was textured at all to appear like clapboard.

Ms. Johnstone stated that when it was installed, it was probably supposed to resemble wood shingle.

Mr. St. George stated the new vinyl will be semi grained to look like wood.

Ms. Johnstone stated the board is not reviewing the materials, just the hardship as the petition has already been denied.

Mr. St. George stated it is a sizeable amount of money. It is above what our budget will allow.

Commissioner Theerman asked if he realized how expensive it was going to be when you bought the house.

Mr. St. George stated no. There were things overlooked during inspection, there is a pipe broken now. I have never resided a building before. I can paint and put baseboard in and stuff like that. I am learning and hope to get better, but I am very much over my head. I purchased the house in October of last year.

Commissioner Northway asked Ms. Johnstone for some guidance or when the commission allows a financial hardship.

Ms. Johnstone stated it's at the discretion of the commission whether or not enough information has been provided to decide a hardship has been proven. In the past, it has included many different variables – disability, projected earnings on the building, how the return on investment would change over time, an included portfolio of investment properties – those are typical of what has been requested. This shows a large price difference, but the commission usually requests reasons why this is a hardship to the petitioner.

Mr. St George stated that this property is a long-term investment and doesn't have disposable income. The cash return expected is 2 or 3% per year with the budget in place.

Commissioner Northway stated that he is not questioning that this is more than the petitioner can reasonably afford. He stated that he would really like this to not be vinyl sided because the other two near it are and before you know it, the whole edge of the district is vinyl sided. He also understands that as the owner, the petitioner wants to fix it up and start generating income. Commissioner Northway stated that he would rather it be fixed up.

Chair Long responded that's why the commission denied the appropriateness, because they didn't think it was appropriate for the Crown Hill Local Historic District. Now, the applicant is asking us to approve it because he doesn't have the money.

Commissioner Northway responded that being asked, he is torn on it.

Ms. Johnstone offered that the commission could ask additional specific information that lays out, for example, the inability to obtain additional financing or things of that nature if that's something the commission is interested in, or the commission could take a vote.

Chair Long stated that she doesn't feel she needs more, but if others want more, it can be explored.

Commissioner Northway said he doesn't think more is going to change things.

Commissioner Theerman stated she would rather not see vinyl siding happen and doesn't want to set a precedent for future projects.

Chair Long stated that this isn't necessarily precedent setting because the commission has denied it already.

Public Comment – None

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed to close public comment.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the Commission voted three (3) in favor and two (2) opposed, with Commissioners Theerman and Helnarski and Chair Long being the yeas and Commissioners Northway and Andre being the nays, that a certificate of hardship is necessary to avoid an undue economic hardship to the property owner.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Certificate of Appropriateness & Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated January 3, 2024, submitted by Theodore Labonte of Hemlock Contracting, on behalf of Derrick St. George, owner, and received January 4, 2024.

Exhibit B: 3 slides showing existing conditions and proposed siding and coloring.

New Business

Certificate of Non-Applicability

2. 63 Austin Street (03-017-00020) – CNA-24-4

Petition purpose: Replace roof

Brian Beriau, Cabe Roofing o/b/o Stockton Realty, participated in the meeting remotely. He stated that the property owner is looking to pull a permit for the roof that is beginning to fail. Will be replaced with like materials. Flat roof that can't be seen from the street.

Public Comment – None

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed to close public comment.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the Commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) approved certificate of non-applicability granted.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Certificate of Non-Applicability Application dated February 19, 2024, submitted by Brian Beriau of Cabe Roofing on behalf of the owner, Ilan Carmi, DBA Stockton Realty, and received February 19, 2024.

Exhibit B: 2 slides showing current conditions.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & BUILDING DEMOLITION DELAY WAIVER

5. 160 Russell Street (02-041-00058) – COA-24-3

Petition purpose: Replace windows and exterior trim (retroactive)

Anthony Linn, owner, appeared in person. He stated that he put in a long scope of work. He has lived in the house and kept it as investment property He has a tenant that has lived in the house, the same tenant, since 1995. After he left, he redid the second floor, as the tenant did not want to move to the third floor. He replaced the windows

on one side of the house at that time. It was rented until last year until the heat failed causing substantial damage. He replaced the heating system on the first and third floors with warm air heat. All the heating systems engineering were based on using modern windows. He failed to realize that this change wasn't done by October 5th. We would have been done by October 5th if he didn't have to refinance the house. He had no idea the house was historic.

Ms. Johnstone stated that the house was listed on a state level historic district since the 90's. Showed history of permitting at the address and stated that the only building permit was in January of this year for interior work.

Mr. Linn stated he never pulled a permit for the windows, he missed it.

Chair Long asked how many windows have been replaced with the vinyl between the grids/glass.

Mr. Linn answered all the windows on second floor have been replaced now all the way around the house.

Chair Long stated these windows are not appropriate for an historic home or an historic district. Had he had applied for the permit, he would have been told that he had to come before this commission, and the commission would have explained that these windows weren't appropriate. The commission probably would have approved appropriate windows.

Mr. Linn said that these windows have divided lights are the same size and style of window as was there before.

Chair Long said these are vinyl with grids between the glass, right?

Mr. Linn said yes. The rest of the house is basically the same. This house has storm windows on the outside of the house that hides the grids anyway and doesn't see what the difference would be personally.

Chair Long stated that the difference is materials and windows are required for replacement along with approval for historic districts. She stated that the windows were replaced in October and a permit was filed in January.

Ms. Johnstone stated the permit that was submitted was for a whole host of work including interior work. The permit is conditioned that the windows are not allowed to be permitted, that anything on the exterior work is not allowed to be permitted until after they go through this process.

Chair Long said it's done, and the commission is not voting whether the windows can be replaced or not. The commission is voting whether what has been done is appropriate for that local historic district. If the vote finds that it is not appropriate for the district, removal/replacement or the windows to meet the guidelines for the district would need to be replaced.

Mr. Linn stated there are other houses nearby on both sides with the same windows along the entire street. He understands this was done without approval, but it's not without precedent certainly. In fact, there are houses on the street that have been entirely converted to vinyl from what he can tell.

Chair Long said we aren't making decisions on any other house tonight; the decision is about this house.

Mr. Linn stated earlier the commission mentioned creep with vinyl and there is precedent here and something you would consider.

Chair Long said that the commission would have preferred to have had this conversation before the work was done. It would be a conversation, in this instance, the commission doesn't have that option. Because this is a local historic district, it has its own specific guidelines. In the past, the commission has had people state they would maintain all wood windows in the front of the house where it is most obvious. There can be a conversation where in this instance, the commission doesn't really have that option. They can only vote whether what is there is appropriate.

Mr. Linn stated he feels what he did were representative of what was there before. While he can't argue they are no longer wood, these windows meet the Massachusetts energy code today. They look exactly as they did before, including the interior. He offered his willingness to talk about alternative grids. Keeping this house in the period is something he thinks is very important to him.

Commissioner Andre asked if he looked into having the windows repaired. She stated that if you repair windows and put a storm on the exterior, they typically meet energy code. She stated that the applicant could have just replaced exterior storms. She noted that if you leave the original windows, you are leaving the original windows for someone with an option for the future; once they're gone, you can't bring them back.

Mr. Linn stated he has repaired them once. The sun porch sagged 6-8 inches and it was not practical once the house was leveled. From the original photos, one can see it looks like the original windows.

Public comment

None

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed to close public comment.

Ms. Johnstone stated that the applicant also submitted a hardship supplement that could be considered now or a later date.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the Commission voted zero (0) in favor and five (5) denied that that the proposed work on windows are appropriate for elm park historic district.

Ms. Johnstone next steps could be application for hardship, options, or other options.

Chair Long stated she did take a look at the application and there wasn't a lot of information, and doesn't think the commission can vote on that.

Mr. Linn stated the house was refinanced to what he could afford to pay for the work on the house.

Chair Long stated that the commission requires estimates in cost between wood windows and what you chose and that's how we compare and try to make decisions for financial hardship.

Mr. Linn asked if the issue is the exposed or unexposed rails and styles in the glass? Would a simulated divided light window work.

Chair Long stated that he could change them over to meet the approval of the commission in historic districts.

Mr. Linn stated whatever action happens, he needs to come before the board again, and is looking to see what would meet the approval to the commission. He stated that he is offering to replace the ones in the front/visible to the street.

Ms. Johnstone recommended that perhaps the applicant proposes a new window with estimates, and noted that what is usually approved is not in vinyl.

Chair Long asked for the number of windows proposed. How many windows have been changed, and how many remain.

Mr. Linn stated that he will put it in the proposal, but for now, in 2012, 7 windows were replaced. Front facing, 8 were replaced. Manufacturer can provide sash with exterior grills.

Ms. Johnstone offered February 29th as a date for continuance (to next meeting) for a proposed plan for hardship and a compromise for windows with a more appropriate option and an updated constructive grant deadline of March 15, 2024.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) to continue to 2/29/2024.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Certificate of Appropriateness and Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated January 26, 2024, submitted by Anthony Linn, owner and received January 26, 2024.

Exhibit B: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Undue Financial Hardship Supplement submitted by Anthony Linn, owner.

Exhibit C: 4 slides showing conditions previous to work done and current conditions as well as history of permits in open gov.

Communications

None

Other Business

A. 36 Butler Street LHD Preliminary Study Report.

Ms. Johnstone opened discussion with overview. The subject property came before the commission for a Demolition Delay Waiver in July 2023, it was denied, was subsequently sold, and on January 18, the commission voted to initiate a single building local historic district study of the property. In the interim staff has been working with the buyer. What was found as part of the study and background was given from the study, which is available on the City's website.

Ms. Johnstone went on to state that the owner has been forthcoming in working with the city since he was made aware of the extreme importance of this building and presented a potential realignment/relocation of the current building closer to the street while still having their development/housing and preserving the building. She stated that it is of little importance whether the building is moved as long as it is within its same environs. The land has been reorganized and chopped up, the building itself is the most important thing in this case.

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith, Bowditch & Dewey, appeared in person & George Markopoulos, GM Properties, LLC, the owner participated online. Mr. Smith stated that George has been very forthright with his intentions for this property, and he was not aware of the historic nature of this building. He was aware that the previous owner came before this commission to seek a demolition delay waiver and that it was denied. He didn't realize how significant it was. Mr. Smith and the owner attended an IRT meeting on 12/7 before he closed on the property, and still was unaware how important this property was to the city, but it was received loud and clear at that meeting as they learned how important it was.

Originally, the owner proposed a townhouse project in which the building would be razed and removed. After learning of the importance of the building, George pivoted and tried to figure out a way to preserve this building and how the layout and alternative design could work at the site. That was accomplished and a new design was drawn up. That design has been shared with the Planning Division, staff members of which have provided feedback from a zoning perspective. Mr. Smith noted that he believes folks are pleased that the owner is looking to preserve the building. In mid-January, the project team learned that the study would be potentially initiated. That was a surprise, because efforts had been made to do a redesign to preserve the building. The project team acknowledges and agrees that this is an historically significant building. The owner has no intention to raze and remove this building. It should remain onsite. The team is looking to move forward with all discretionary zoning permits and approvals with commissions and boards in good faith, which has substantially progressed to date.

Mr. Smith stated that his client is proposing 15 townhouse style units while preserving the building. He knows that there was a lot of interest in the preservation of this building and noted that his client is supportive of that and feels like he has come up with a good alternative.

Mr. Smith respectfully requested that the commission puts a pause on the study for a local historic district, noting that he and his client are concerned about a single lot local historic district designation. They believe that it doesn't set a good precedent for developers or for property owners. This is a unique circumstance because his client is not fighting the preservation of this building. He stated that they will file with DPRS in the coming weeks. If it moves forward, there will be much time taken for this process and will delay the development and cost a lot of money. He is looking to see how this building can be architecturally maintained as well. He offered that

if his client deviates or if his proposal is for whatever reason denied, the commission would be within its right to move the study forward.

Chair Long stated that she is very pleased that the owner is willing to save this building. It is important to the city of Worcester. She expressed that she is not sure she understands why the commission would want to put it on hold. She thought that the project team was going to ask permission to move the house and reduce the size of the local historic district to just the under the house so that it can be moved, protect the house, and still be able to build the townhouses around it - which she felt sounded like a great compromise. As for as moving the study forward to the Massachusetts Historic Commission, that is not a done deal, that is just a part of the process before anything can even be considered for a local historic district. It doesn't mean that it's going to be or that it's even going to be approved - it's simply being looked at. If the commission moves forward, it will not prevent the owner from moving forward with the work he wants to do. She asked whether there a reason why the commission is not looking at moving the building and reducing the size of the local historic district.

Mr. Smith stated that reducing the size of the historic district was discussed. If the study is to move forward and if there is going to be a local historic district designated anywhere on this existing parcel, the owner would want the district to be isolated in and around building itself, and don't think it should include the new construction. The owner would like the whole process on hold because of resources needed. And because they don't feel it isn't necessary currently. The owner did his best to accommodate his project and preserving this building in good faith.

Chair Long stated she appreciates the good faith and doesn't doubt the owner's intent. Her concern is the demolition delay waiver that expires in six months. The law department has stated it is in effect and does transfer and runs to the middle of the year this year. Her concern is what if something happens to Mr. Smith's client or to his investors, noting that Mr. Smith is asking the commission to put all their hope and faith into this one person and if for whatever reason that falls apart, there is a demolition delay waiver that expires in July and anyone, including the owner, can take this building down.

Commissioner Helnarski agreed, stating that she does not question the intent of the client. The purpose of these studies is to protect the building when and if there is a case that the building ever changes hands. It's to ensure this property will forever be protected. She questioned who knows what could happen later down the road if the building is ever sold to someone else. It's a protection put in place for the building itself.

Commissioner Andre asked if any structural engineer has been out to check the house to make sure it's fit for moving.

Mr. Smith stated that his client has spoken with contractors who specialize in relocating historic buildings but is not sure if a structural engineer's report has been prepared.

Commissioner Northway asked if the investor believes the building can be rotated.

Attorney Smith responded yes, that is part of the plan.

Ms. Johnstone responded that the idea is a great compromise. The townhouses will be on lawn and asphalt which is underutilized land. The building is already out of its historic setting. A good compromise would be to rotate the building toward the street while providing new housing needed in Worcester while keeping the historic building. Weighing Attorney Smiths request, the commission will need to vote whether or not to transmit the report to the Massachusetts Historical Commission and Worcester Planning Board.

Commissioner Northway asked if the commission could vote to continue the study and move the building at same time.

Ms. Johnstone responded that they could happen at the same time. Attorney Smith is asking to pause the study. The concern if is the entire parcel is designated historic then they would need design review on all new construction. The boundaries can always change as the study continues. It is just the building that is significant here.

Commissioner Northway asked if they could continue forward with just the building.

Ms. Johnstone answered no because it needs to be attached to land. The commission needs to vote whether or not to transmit the report as it's been written to the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the Worcester Planning Board or as Attorney Smith has requested, pause the study.

Chair Long asked when the compromise to bring the Local Historic District boundary to just under the house/land under the house vs. the whole property take place.

Ms. Johnstone replied once the land is ANR'd (subdivided)

Chair Long said that's not something that can be done tonight; tonight, the commission can only vote on whether to forward the study to Mass. Historic and Planning.

Ms. Johnstone answered that is correct. That is the only action the commission can take.

Commissioner Northway asked if, as Attorney Smith stated, his client failed to meet certain deadlines, how the commission would know if those deadlines were not met.

Attorney Smith asked which deadlines he was referring.

Commissioner Northway said that Attorney Smith stated that if they failed to meet certain benchmarks then the commission had all rights to continue forward.

Chair Long stated that's not what can be done tonight. That is hypothetical. Tonight, the commission needs to decide if the study should be forwarded to Mass Historic to be reviewed as a local historic district. That's the only vote being taken; whether the commission wants the report to go forward, or for it to be paused, which is what the attorney's request is.

Commissioner Andre said her concern is that if the study is paused and time runs out, then the demolition delay will have expired. It takes so long for things to go through. The time to give notice is extended, so if the study is put on hold, it will be beyond the time of the delay waiver, and anyone can do whatever they want with the house. She stated that she sees that they are willing to compromise, which is great, but it's not set in stone.

Commissioner Theerman said she thinks the commission needs assurance the building will not be torn down.

Chair Long said that's not what is up for a vote either. A vote is simply to be taken on whether the survey should be forwarded.

Commissioner Theerman said that the reason the commission is taking the vote is so that it can be ensured that the building doesn't get torn down. If that wasn't an issue, it wouldn't be as much of a concern.

Ms. Johnstone reminded the commission that they did vote this along with two other single building local historic districts which are not and have not been under any threat. What precipitated the vote to study was, first, the fact that the building was on Preservation Worcester's endangered list and, second, that the Executive Director of Preservation Worcester requested that the commission do so.

Mr. Markopoulos, owner spoke to say that he wasn't planning on speaking tonight as he is out of town but mentioned his appreciation to the commission for taking the time to discuss. When he purchased the property, this [saving the building] was never a thing, this was never on the agenda, this was never a possibility. He noted that he is being asked to exhaust a substantial amount of resources and funding to get this to the finish line and that is why Josh is before the commission. He asked the commission to consider the

position he has been put in as the developer and to consider his point of view, reiterating that he has taken all the necessary steps to preserve the building.

Mr. Smith said another wrinkle/complication is that he and his client don't feel like it's been figured out how the parcelization would occur. The building is not in the desired footprint today. If it gets all the way to the end to City Council to vote, what are they voting on? Are they voting on the relocation position or on what currently exists? If the timeframe is six months or more from now for this process to be completed, the building will not be relocated in that time frame. This is a novel situation. From a legal perspective, he would like to understand the path forward so he can explain the risks to my client. He doesn't want to have this process move forward and then more land is actually put into that local historic district and it cannot be amended later. Or, if amended, will it be required to go through another six month process to do that. He noted that that could impact his client's ability to pull permits to move the building and time is money in that circumstance. Once his client receives zoning approvals, which he is looking to do in the coming weeks, he is ready to move forward with his building permit, he doesn't want to have to wait more time for further amendments on the local historic district.

Ms. Johnstone stated that something that was tossed around just today, which we would need to be cleared through a legal opinion, was linking the Local Historic District to the Map Block Lot number of the property and the address so that the boundary description justification could be conditioned such that even if the house moved, the condition would trigger a change to whatever the new description of land would be. She reminded the commission that they have 60 days to decide what they want to do with boundaries, which will ultimately be decided by City Council. The commission provides the boundary justification to City Council. There is an example in Springfield where they put 100ft buffer around a trolley waiting barn, so they didn't have to review anything else in the park. It's tough here because it has to be tied to land, and then if it's moved, the commission would have to think about it differently.

Chair Long asked if we vote to forward the survey tonight whether any permits from being issued would be prevented.

Ms. Johnstone replied no.

On a motion made by Vice-Chair Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Northway, the commission voted five (5) in favor and zero (0) to transmit the local historic district study to Massachusetts Historical Commission and Worcester Planning Board for 36 Butler Street.

Ms. Johnstone went over the next local historic district process steps from now. Presented through a slide visual.

B. Status update for 100 Chandler Street.

No Update

C. The Now|Next Draft Plan is available for public feedback! Deadline for comments is Sunday, February 25th.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Commissioner Long, the Commission voted five (5) to zero (0) to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.