

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
November 1, 2012**

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Timothy McCann, Vice-Chair
Kevin Provencher, Clerk
James Crowley
Andrew Schveda

Commission Members Absent: Thomas Constantine
Meagen Mulherin
Erika Dunn

Staff Members Present: Marlyn Feliciano, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chair McCann called the meeting to order at 5:33 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes for the October 4, 2012 meeting were approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 7-9 Goulding Street (HC-2012-062)

Charles Wilmot, contractor representing J&J Girouard, LLC, stated that the proposed work at 7 Goulding Street is to remove the rear three story porches and fill in the three doors to install with three windows. Mr. Wilmot stated that original to the house are the windows immediately to the right and the left of the porch and the doors but they are not visible from the street. Mr. McCann stated that on his site visit he could only see the side of the porch and the windows and doors were not discernible from the street.

Mr. Provencher asked the contractor what work is proposed for 9 Goulding Street. Mr. Wilmot stated that he seeks to remove the enclosed front and side porch to construct a new first floor porch with a roof overhead, close the two existing doors to construct a new front door, install vinyl siding to match existing remainder siding, and create a new window. Mr. Wilmot stated that he also plans to match the mansard line in order to make the house look symmetrical. Mr. Provencher asked if the cornice, dormers, roof, moldings, brackets would remain. Mr. Wilmot assured him that those will remain and his plan is to bring the details that exist on the

rest of the house to the portion that he is building. In essence, he will be restoring the original look of the property. The only thing original to the property that is being removed is the asphalt siding but 30-40% of the property already has vinyl siding.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley, and seconded by Mr. Schveda, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition for 7 Goulding Street.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley, and seconded by Mr. Schveda, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition for 9 Goulding Street.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated September 18, 2012 and submitted on September 21, 2012 for 7 Goulding Street.
- Exhibit B: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated September 18, 2012 and submitted on September 21, 2012 for 9 Goulding Street.
- Exhibit C: Photographs of both properties submitted November 1, 2012.

2. 12-14 Goulding Street (HC-2012-063)

Charles Wilmot, contractor representing J&J Girouard, LLC, stated that the petition purpose is to replace the first floor rear porches and replace with like materials. He stated that they are not original and are a safety hazard.

Upon a motion by Mr. Provencher, and seconded by Mr. Crowley, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition for 12 Goulding Street.

Upon a motion by Mr. Provencher, and seconded by Mr. Crowley, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition for 14 Goulding Street.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated September 18, 2012 and submitted on September 21, 2012 for 12 Goulding Street.
- Exhibit B: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated September 18, 2012 and submitted on September 21, 2012 for 14 Goulding Street.
- Exhibit C: Photographs of both properties submitted November 1, 2012.

3. 31 Elizabeth Street (HC-2012-065)

Brian Beriau, Cabe Roofing, stated that there is a tower over the main entrance to the condominium that is losing slate. He stated that he attempted to repair it but the nails are rotted and the slate still continues to fall. The petition is to remove the existing slate roof on all four sides of the tower that faces the street and replace it with grand slate asphalt shingle with copper ridges.

Mr. McCann asked what it would cost if slate was used for the project. Mr. Beriau stated that it would cost \$45,000-\$50,000 to re-slate the tower due to the additional staging needed. He stated that the weight of the slate would be prohibitive to doing the work off of a boom lift. He also stated that re-roofing the tower with shingle would only be \$15,000. Mr. McCann asked how much of the roof is currently shingled. Mr. Beriau responded that ~600 SF area is shingled, the rest of the roof is still slate.

Mr. Provencher asked the contractor who pays for the work when a condo association is involved. Mr. Beriau stated that he gets paid by the property management company, who would then pass the costs onto the condo owners. There are 27 units in the building.

Mr. Crowley asked if Mr. Beriau could use a second boom lift in order to carry the materials. Mr. Beriau stated that it was possible but the space was really tight with just one boom and he was unsure that a second one would fit. Also, it would take months to re-slate from two booms rather than a week with the proper staging. Also they would have to be concerned with damage due to storms, wind, etc.

Mr. Crowley stated that he believed the slate roof was an important architectural feature and would like to understand what the plan is for the rest of the roof in the future. He stated that he would like to see something that looked more like slate. Mr. Beriau stated that another challenge was how steep the roof was and explained that some of the products on the market would split or sag over time.

Mr. Schveda stated that he would like more information explaining how the management company passes the fees to the condo owners before making a decision based on economic hardship.

Deborah Cotta, resident at 31 Elizabeth Street Unit 205, stated there is water damage in her unit and in the unit above hers. She stated that there have been foreclosures in the building already and condo owners cannot afford an additional charge in their fees.

Dean Moss, resident at 31 Elizabeth Street Unit 201 and trustee of the board, stated that currently there are 5 or 6 empty units. He also stated that repairs have been done over time to the existing slate roof and that the association has budgeted \$5,000 to keep up the repairs over time. He explained that the condo association had taken out a loan to make the repairs and two months ago there was already an increase in the monthly condo fees of ~12%.

Mr. Crowley stated that his decision, in regards to economic hardship, would be different if the entire roof will be replaced in the near future and this is the first stage of the process than if they are planning to maintain the rest of the slate roof and just replace the tower's roof. Mr. Provencher stated that he would like to see a maintenance schedule.

Mr. Crowley suggested that the management company, the condo association, and the roofing company need to agree on what can be done taking into account the plans to replace the rest of

the roof, if needed. Mr. Provencher stated that the roofer should bring a sample of the product and a cost estimate for doing the work.

Mr. Moss stated that he would prefer to come back in two weeks with the information the commission requested and Mr. Beriau requested a continuance to the next meeting.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Provencher, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the matter to the November 15, 2012 meeting. Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Provencher, the Commission voted 4-0 to extend the constructive grant deadline for two weeks.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated and submitted October 1, 2012.
- Exhibit B: Cabe Roofing quote, dated November 1, 2012.
- Exhibit C: Picture of turret and aerial picture of building, received November 1, 2012.

4. 29 Greenwood Street (HC-2012-066)

Bob Lynch, representing Denyse Curran, stated that the petition purpose is to remove the existing vinyl bow window on the rear wall of the structure and replace with a double hung vinyl window. The petitioner also seeks a waiver to replace the existing aluminum siding with Certain Teed vinyl siding.

Mr. McCann asked the applicant how they plan to treat the windows. Mr. Lynch responded that they would wrap the windows with the vinyl siding and go over the sill. He does not plan to touch the soffits, brackets, or scrolls on the house and stated that they will not be boxed in with vinyl. The vinyl siding will extend to the back of the garage, where the rotted clapboard will be removed. The rest of the house is aluminum siding.

Mr. Provencher stated that the window looks to be a replacement window and not original to the house. Mr. McCann stated that they generally do not have an issue if nothing original is being replaced.

Upon a motion by Mr. Provencher and seconded by Mr. Schveda, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated and submitted on October 2, 2012.
- Exhibit B: Proposal estimates by Scott's Siding & remodeling dated August 8, 2012.
- Exhibit C: Photographs of property.

5. 88 Elm Street (HC-2012-067)

There was no representative present for this petition. Mr. McCann stated that he viewed the house and there is no slate. The petition is to remove the existing asphalt shingle roof and

replace with asphalt shingles of similar color and appearance. He stated that the roof is barely visible from the street.

Mr. Provencher stated that he did not see any special features on the photographs but would make it a condition that they not be removed or covered in vinyl.

Upon a motion by Mr. Provencher and seconded by Mr. Schveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the re-roofing project is not detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City subject to the condition that existing fascias, soffits, and brackets are not covered with vinyl material.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated and submitted on October 2, 2012.

Exhibit B: Photographs of property.

6. 3 Harvard Place (HC-2012-068)

Mark Shulman, representing Theresa Chabot Trustee, introduced Edward Kooyomjian, who rehabilitated the building in 1961. Mr. Shulman stated that the petition purpose is to renovate the nine studio apartment building damaged in the fire by replacing the original slate roof with black architectural shingles, replace the windows with aluminum thermal windows, and repair the existing brick façade.

Mr. McCann asked about the existing condition of the slate and the decking. Mr. Shulman stated that due to the fire, the slate is brittle and irregularly shaped and it is hard if any of it would be salvageable. They have been falling down because they are loose. The rafters are salvageable but everything above that has to be replaced. Mr. Shulman stated that Inspectional Services thinks the building is salvageable and has already issued a building permit for the interior work.

Mr. Provencher asked Mr. Shulman if the intent is to replace all the windows and to re-point the brick. Mr. Shulman stated that the intent is to replace the windows with green aluminum windows and to salvage enough brick to make the exterior look the same as it once did. The stone sills will be cleaned and stained. There are also two dormers that will be replaced when the roof is done and all the detail will be maintained.

Mr. McCann asked what the applicant planned to do with the door. Mr. Shulman stated that the original door is not there anymore and he would put an aluminum door that matches the new windows and it will be handicapped accessible.

Mr. Schveda stated that the Form B showed a section in the back of the building that has vinyl siding. Mr. Shulman stated that at one point someone made an addition and put white vinyl siding on it, and his plan is to replace it.

Mr. Crowley asked how much the project will cost. Mr. Shulman stated that the total cost of the project, interior and exterior, is roughly \$200,000 and the property value presently is ~\$113,000. They will be studio apartments to be rented for \$500 - \$550/month.

Deborah Packard, executive director of Preservation Worcester, stated that this property is on the most endangered list.

Mr. Provencher stated that there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed in order to save the building and looking at the slate in context of the entire project puts the entire project at risk. Mr. Shulman stated that he has only been able to secure \$153,000 in loans for this renovation, everything above that comes out of his pocket and he is not able to cover the extra expense of the slate roof.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, asked if the existing shingles could be re-used. Mr. Shulman stated that in their present shape they would be unable to re-apply them because they are too brittle.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Schveda the Commission voted 0-4 that the proposed demolition 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 denied.

The Historical 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 4-0 that the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship and approved the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project based on the economic hardship.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 1, 2012 and submitted on October 4, 2012.
- Exhibit B: Estimate of work proposed prepared by Edward Kooyomjian dated September 22, 2012.
- Exhibit C: Cambridge Architectural Shingle sample packet presented November 1, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Timberline High Definition Shingle sample packet presented November 1, 2012.

7. 162 – 174 Millbury Street (aka 156-174A Millbury Street) (HC-2012-069)

John Pusk and Guiseppe Ratacco stated that the roof has failed and that their intent is to fix the existing roof and replace it with like materials.

James Lukes, owner of the parcel, stated that there are other buildings on the same plot but the diner, where the work is proposed, is located on 162 Millbury Street. He also stated that the diner used to be an old trolley car that was relocated in the 1950s from another site.

Mr. Pusk stated that they intend to replace some of the windows to allow ventilation. Mr. Provencher asked what changes will be done to the front wall since the application states that

wainscoting will be replaced. Mr. Pusk stated that it is not wainscoting but a faux brick and plans to replace it with a stucco brick.

Mr. Schveda asked the applicants if they planned to keep the rounded edge on the roof because that is a recognizable architectural feature. Mr. Ratacco stated that they will frame the roof square and then install something to round out the edge to closely resemble what is currently there.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Provencher, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated and submitted on October 4, 2012.

Exhibit B: Photographs of diner submitted November 1, 2012.

8. 85 Prospect Street (HC-2012-070)

Francisco Argueta, representing the owner, Prospect Street Properties, LLC, and the purpose of the petition is to remove and replace the existing asphalt roof with architectural shingles.

Mr. McCann asked Mr. Argueta if he plans to change any of the soffits, rakes, or eaves while replacing the roof. Mr. Argueta stated that he will not change any of the soffits, rakes, or eaves. He only plans to strip, remove the drip edge, install a new ice and water barrier, and re-shingle. He also stated that he plans to repair a hole on the existing aluminum siding with the original siding that has fallen off.

Mr. Schveda asked the applicant if there was any slate on the mansard roof. Mr. Argueta stated that it must have been stripped before because he did not see any slate.

Upon a motion by Mr. Crowley and seconded by Mr. Provencher, the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the petition.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 12, 2012 and submitted on October 17, 2012.

Exhibit B: Estimate of work proposed prepared by Francisco Roofing submitted November 12, 2012.

RECEIVED COMMUNICATION:

- **Re: Holiday Stroll Volunteering from Preservation Worcester** dated October 23, 2012.

The Commission had no comment

MEETING ADJOURNMENT:

The Commission voted 4-0 to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 PM.