

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

**AUGUST 9, 2007
CHASE BUILDING, 44 FRONT STREET, WORCESTER
SUITE 300 – CONFERENCE ROOM**

Commission Members Present: Peter Schneider, Chair
Thomas Conroy, Clerk
Michael Theerman
James Crowley
Janet Merrill

Staff Present: Joel Fontane, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services
Edgar Luna, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services
Ruth Gentile, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services
Captain William Metterville, Worcester Fire Department

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schneider called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by James Crowley and seconded by Michael Theerman, the Commission voted 5-0 to continue the approval of the minutes from the July 26, 2007 meeting until August 23, 2007.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Luna informed the Commission that there were no updates regarding the Historic Commission procedures and guidelines.

- 1. 26 Institute Road (HC-07-23): Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Brent Heinzer and Nicholas Pelletier, representatives for the Aquinas Association, Inc., petitioner presented the petition. Mr. Henizer stated that following a recent meeting with the petitioner, three (3) different options to address the renovations and changes needed for this project were considered. Below are the three (3) options of the work involved and cost analysis for each:

Option #1: Existing porch to be rebuilt to current codes and identical in appearance to the existing porch.

(a) Remove the porch based on rotted deck material, inadequate bearing and support at the foundation level.

(b) Rebuild the porch back to its original state. This would include the following:

- i. New foundation piers for support (including excavation costs).
- ii. New deck and framing.
- iii. New rail and spindle system.
- iv. Stairs to grade.
- v. Dry sprinkler system.

Construction cost: \$126, 305.00

Construction cost, including modifications required by 521-CMR Architectural Access Board: \$198,305.00

Percentage of Cost Increase: 208%

Option #2: Existing porch rebuilt to current codes and that will be heated to allow for a wet sprinkler system to be used. This porch will be identical in appearance to the existing porch.

(a) Remove porch based on rotted deck material, inadequate bearing and support at the foundation level.

(b) Rebuild porch back to its original state.

- i. New foundation walls for support with crawl space (includes excavation costs).
- ii. Flooring framing (joists, plywood).
- iii. Roof framing (beams, rafters, plywood, insulation, shingles, rubber membrane).
- iv. Stairs to grade.
- v. Wall framing (studs, plywood, insulation, gypsum wall board, paint, and vinyl siding).
- vi. Heating System.
- vii. Windows and doors.
- viii. Electrical work.
- ix. Fire alarm.
- x. Re-work wet sprinkler system.

Construction cost: \$152, 535.00

Construction cost, including modifications required by 521-CMR Architectural Access Board: \$224,535.00

Percentage of Cost Increase: 236%

Option #3: Modify the existing porch as depicted on the original bid documents dated June 26, 2007 as submitted to the Historical Commission.

(a) Remove porch based on rotted deck material inadequate bearing and support at the foundation level.

- i. Foundation.
- ii. Floor framing (joists, plywood).
- iii. Wall framing (studs, plywood, insulation, wall board, paint, vinyl siding).
- iv. Roof framing (beams, rafters, plywood, insulation, shingles, rubber membrane).
- v. Windows and doors.
- vi. Heating system.
- vii. Stairs to grade.
- viii. Electrical work.
- ix. Flooring.
- x. Fire alarm.
- xi. Re-work sprinkler system.

Construction cost: \$95,325.00

Construction cost, including modifications required by 521-CMR Architectural Access Board: \$0.00

Percentage of Cost Increase: 0%

Mr. Heinzer indicated that the above costs included renovations to the kitchen, which represents the major cost of the project. In addition, Mr. Heinzer indicated that options 1 and 2 exceeded the \$100,000.00 threshold established by 521 CMR 3.3.1 Architectural Access Board and required additional work beyond the original scope of work. Such additional work includes, but is not limited to:

- 1. Accessible ramp/lift.
- 2. Accessible bathroom.
- 3. New phone.
- 4. Accessible kitchen design.
- 5. Additional site work to accommodate curb cuts and grading issues.
- 6. Re-work entire first floor with proper transitions.

In addition, Mr. Heinzer stated that saving the existing porch was not cost-effective, and that in his opinion, the porch was an addition to the original building, as it does not match the architectural features of the original building, which range from roof pitch, detailing at the peak, soffits and fascia detailing and columns. Mr. Pelletier stated that the Aquinas Association only had \$100,000.00 in their budget for the proposed restorations; therefore, options #1 and #2 would be impossible to fulfill. Captain William Metterville of the Worcester Fire Department stated that the proposed use required a sprinkler system, which could be satisfied by a “dry” extension originating in the adjacent heated rooms. Commissioner Conroy asked the petitioner if he had consulted with the Architectural Access Board to see if their requirements could be waived. Mr. Heinzer stated that the petitioner had not consulted with the Architectural Access Board regarding this request, but that if required by the Commission, he would do so. Therefore, Mr. Heinzer asked the Commission to continue the hearing until August 23, 2007. On a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, it was voted 5-0 to continue the hearing until August 23, 2007.

NEW BUSINESS

- 2 22 Russell Street (HC-07-24): Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Edward Hawes, owner and petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Hawes stated that he was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on site: (a) demolish a section on the mansard-roof on the easterly-side of the dwelling structure to create a door opening to access/egress the third-floor unit, (b) install a steel door on the newly created opening on the mansard-roof on the easterly-side of the dwelling structure to access/egress the third floor unit, (c) build an exterior stairway on the easterly-side of the dwelling structure to provide an access/egress for the third-floor unit and (d), demolish a small section at the bottom of the wall on the easterly-side to attach the platform necessary for the installation of the new exterior stairway that will provide an access/egress for the third-floor unit. Costas Marnerakis, an abutter, expressed concern that the building was not officially categorized as a three-family dwelling structure, and that the proposed stairway was too close to his parcel. Mr. Hawes stated that the building is categorized as a three-family dwelling structure by the City's Assessor Office, and indicated that the proposed stairway would be located within the appropriate setbacks of his property and away from Mr. Marnerakis' property. Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester and approved the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

OTHER BUSINESS

- 3 Local Historic District Study Committee Discussion/Update:** Ms. Gentile made a presentation regarding the Montvale Local Historic District. She stated that while researching the creation of the District, it was discovered that discrepancies existed between the narrative description and the map of the Montvale Local Historic District. She also indicated that the narrative discrepancies include the following: (a) at 15 and 28 Monadnock Road: the district line cuts through the property and does not follow the boundary line of the property, (b) 11 Montvale Road: the address did not exist at the time of the ordination of the District, the parcel was created through an ANR process. Ms. Gentile further stated that additionally there are the following narrative description problems: (a) 73 Sagamore Road: the parcel had an incorrect property line designated, as it was stated to be north instead of south, (b) 1 Montvale Road, the parcel has been reconfigured; therefore, it does not match the description, (c) the narrative description includes the address 0 Montvale Road, which is now known as 194 Salisbury Street. In addition, Ms. Gentile stated that on November 21, 2005, the map and ordinance establishing the Montvale Local Historic District, which was ordained by the City Council on April 27, 1993, was re-recorded at the Worcester Registry of Deeds. Commissioner Crowley stated that the information presented seemed to indicate that the westerly-side portion of the

parcel at 1 Montvale Road that is not depicted within the Montvale Local Historic District, was left out of the District in error, as it appeared to have been an integral part of 1 Montvale Road at the time the District was created. He also indicated that in his opinion, it would be in the best interest of the Historical Commission to amend the Montvale Local Historic District by including the portion of 1 Montvale Road currently not included. Robert Longden stated that in his opinion, the boundaries of the Montvale Local Historic District had been delineated correctly.

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.