

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER  
July 10, 2014**

**LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL**

**Commission Members Present:** Kevin Provencher, Chair  
Andrew Shveda, Vice Chair  
Timothy McCann, Clerk  
Randolph Bloom  
Robyn Conroy

**Commission Members Absent:** Karl Bjork  
Erika Dunn

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

**REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)**

**Call to Order:**

Chair Provencher called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m.

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bloom the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the minutes of June 19, 2014 with two edits.

**New Business:**

**1. 100 Chatham Street (HC-2014-024)-**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness  
Petitioner: 100 Chatham Street LLC  
Present Use: Single Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1857  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, Crown Hill Local Historic District  
Petition Purpose: (1) Paint exterior white with black doors and shutters  
(2) Replace two concrete steps to front entry

(3) Remove three windows from front of home

Harry Avery, 100 Chatham Street LLC appeared on behalf of the petition for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness to

- Paint exterior white with black doors and shutters
- Replace two concrete steps to front entry
- Remove three windows from front of home

Chair Provencher stated that they would begin the discussion with review of the windows.

Mr. Avery stated that he had submitted a drawing showing the reinstallation of the three windows. Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Avery planned to re-open the openings and re-install the windows. Mr. Avery stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher asked if the windows that were removed were original or replacement windows. Mr. Avery responded that when he bought the property most of the windows were vinyl. Chair Provencher asked if the replacement windows would be vinyl. Mr. Avery stated he would leave it up to the Commission.

Chair Provencher stated that Mr. Avery had appeared before the Historical Commission meeting at a previous meeting and some code compliance issues arose and Inspector Joseph Atchue from Inspectional Services was present tonight and will provide the Commission direction with regards to code compliance for the property.

Mr. Atchue stated that currently there are a series of code compliance issues for this property. How Mr. Avery needs to proceed depends on what Mr. Avery plans to do with the dwelling. Currently the property is a single family dwelling and Mr. Avery has petitioned the Zoning Board of Appeals to convert it to a two-family. Depending on the outcome of that meeting, Mr. Avery may have to do additional work on the interior and exterior of the property. The windows are pre-existing so there is no code violation if it remains a single family dwelling.

Chair Provencher pointed out that the Mr. Avery had covered up the window openings so they are no longer there and no longer a pre-existing condition. The Commission is concerned that the removal of those windows has compromised the historical value of the structure and the applicant has proposed to reinstall the windows. The original windows came within a few inches of the floor. Chair Provencher stated that his understanding of the residential code is that a new window installation in a residence would be required to have a sill that is a minimum of 18 inches from the floor. Mr. Atchue stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that they have a situation where the original material is gone so they can't restore that condition as what is being proposed is a new window installation.

Mr. Rolle asked whether the windows had been removed been fully removed and the spaces been plastered over. Chair Provencher asked if the rough opening was still there. Mr. Avery stated that he believed the pockets are still there.

Chair Provencher stated that the rough openings are still there but the window opening is gone so under the building code the new windows would need to comply with current requirements.

Mr. Rolle asked whether there are provisions for certain windows that would allow you to place an insert into a rough opening. Chair Provencher stated he believed it could but deferred to Mr. Atchue, who stated it would depend on what Mr. Avery planned to do with the property. If Mr. Avery planned to do a full historical restoration of the property then code has means for that to happen but Mr. Avery has application to go before Zoning for a change to a two family so that would change the requirements.

Chair Provencher asked if it remains a single family there may be a way to restore the windows to their original configuration. Mr. Atchue stated that was correct.

Commissioner Shveda asked that since the windows were removed illegally is there any way in the building code to replace them whether they are a two family or three family. Mr. Atchue stated that he would need to look into.

Mr. Rolle asked if the code requirement is triggered as a result of the conversion to a two family or as a result of the removal of the windows. Mr. Atchue stated that if the house remains as is, the applicant would just need to put up guards.

Mr. Avery stated that according to Assessing records the house is listed as a single family but historical records shows it as a two family.

Chair Provencher stated that the current legal use is a single family.

Secretary McCann asked Mr. Avery why he wanted to replace the windows in the first place. Mr. Avery stated that it was a liability issue as they were so close to the ground. Secretary McCann pointed out that if Mr. Avery had gone to Inspectional first this problem would have not occurred.

Mr. Avery stated that he had the building permit and it stated for a roof and it didn't say anything about historical.

Chair Provencher stated that the pending application before zoning presents another problem because if Mr. Avery gets approved at zoning more work may be required. Mr. Provencher asked if Mr. Avery planned to come back before Historical again. Mr. Avery stated that he did not.

Chair Provencher stated that according to staff's memo the zoning board is waiting from input from Historical Commission before they make their decision. Mr. Avery stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that the dilemma is that the Commission could give Mr. Avery an approval to put the windows back to the original for a single family home but then if the Zoning Board approves a two family then the windows won't meet code and Mr. Avery would have to come before Historical.

Secretary McCann asked for clarification on whether the restored windows would be historic or replacement. Mr. Atchue told the Commission that if the property is converted to a two family dwelling they will have to make certain adjustments to bring it up to code, including the window sill height.

Secretary McCann asked if guards could be installed internally and not affect the height of the window. Mr. Atchue stated that if Mr. Avery had left the windows in and converted to a two family he could have put guards in but Mr. Avery had done a lot of interior renovations as well that has changed the property.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the rough openings would allow for a window large enough for egress for a bedroom. Mr. Atchue stated that they did not have to act as egress.

Commissioner Bloom asked if a permit was required to replace windows and if so, was a permit pulled. Mr. Atchue stated that no permit was pulled for window removal/replacement. The permit that was pulled was for kitchen painting and plaster and roof, board and plaster. The amount of work done was beyond the scope of the permit and that is why Mr. Avery received a cease and desist to stop work.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the work was done illegally. Mr. Atchue stated that was correct.

Mr. Avery stated that he spoke to the Deputy Commissioner a few weeks ago and he told him to wait to amend the permit until the board approvals were received.

Commissioner Conroy stated that Mr. Avery put in his application that he couldn't insure the property due to the windows and asked Mr. Avery to elaborate on that. Mr. Avery stated that when he spoke to the insurance company the windows are a liability with them being closer to the ground.

Chair Provencher asked for clarification from Mr. Avery on whether or not the property could be insured if the Commission votes that the windows need to be put back in. Mr. Avery stated that it could be insured, he would need to put guards up.

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Atchue what would be the requirement for the guards. Mr. Atchue stated that the guard would need to be at a level where someone could kick the window or fall out the window.

Chair Provencher asked if the guard could be clear. Mr. Atchue stated that it can.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission seems to be heading towards having the windows restored and it seems that they can still meet code.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the MACRIS image shows a window on the first floor to the right of the door that had been covered over and asked Mr. Avery if his contractor had done that as well. Mr. Avery stated that he believed so and that it was converted into a closet.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if closet was new or pre-existing. Mr. Avery stated that the closet was there when he bought the property. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he was concerned that the window was not included in the application.

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Rolle for confirmation that it would be okay to proceed on that window since he believed that it could be included in the discussion as it is similar to what is on agenda. Mr. Rolle stated that he agrees it is similar in nature.

Mr. Rolle stated that according to the photos there is another window that has been covered on the left porch on Newbury Street. Chair Provencher stated that it will also be discussed.

Chair Provencher stated that there also looks like some work has been done on the porch in the same area. Mr. Avery stated that there was an overhang that was not part of the original structure.

Chair Provencher stated that it looks like a later addition but it is still part of the discussion and asked if the chimney was removed. Mr. Avery stated that he didn't remember but it must have been.

Chair Provencher stated that it was five window openings and some modifications to what appears to be an addition on the back side and Commission needs to some consensus of what the value of the addition is.

Secretary McCann stated that he would prefer to focus on the windows openings, chimney, things that had historical integrity and he doesn't believe the addition was original.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he feels the entire building has considerable architectural value but with the modifications done in the past few months it is serious detriment to the value of the building. The windows and the chimney are of historical value, and the small second floor windows are a unique type of architecture.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he agrees with Mr. Bloom and the addition is in a historic district so the Commission still has purview. He stated that the addition does look a little better but the windows are the main issue and all five windows need to be put back as currently the house does not look good and he would like it at least restored to the original fenestration. With regard to the chimney he was not concerned.

Chair Provencher stated that he would concur with his fellow Commissioners about what the focus of the Commission should be. He stated that in regards to the addition that if the application had been done properly the Commission would not have approved it.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked Mr. Avery plans to do anything else to the home. Mr. Avery stated that he was going to try and match the vinyl siding.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that knowing that would make it worse for him and asked about the set of windows on the side of the house and asked if they were existing. Mr. Avery stated that the frames were there when he bought the home.

Secretary McCann asked why Mr. Avery opened those particular windows. Mr. Avery stated that he hadn't and they were covered when he bought the home.

Chair Provencher stated that it looks like the roof edge was modified. Mr. Avery stated that he had.

Chair Provencher asked if any of that had been permitted. Mr. Atchue stated that it had not.

Chair Provencher stated that he also noticed three door openings in the picture and asked where they led to. Mr. Avery stated that into a patio, a door that goes up to the second floor and a cellar door going into the basement.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission needs to consider if this had come to the Commission before the work was done what would have they have done. In his opinion, they would not have approved it.

Secretary McCann stated that he would agree and does not think they would have approved this particular design and wondered how they can reconcile that.

Chair Provencher stated that it would be up to the applicant to present a design that would be acceptable to the Commission.

Secretary McCann stated that he would agree since the Commission cannot tell the applicant what to design. Especially considering that the work has already been done.

Chair Provencher stated that he would recommend that tonight they vote on the chimney, the stairs, the windows and paint color. They can continue the addition to another meeting and applicant would need to come to another meeting with a design that the Commission can review.

Secretary McCann stated that he would agree with that.

Mr. Avery asked if the Commission wanted him to redesign. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it would be helpful.

Secretary McCann stated that he believed it would be up to the applicant whether he would like to continue the portion regarding the addition. Mr. Avery stated that he would not mind coming back but would need help with the design but could do sketch.

Mr. Rolle stated that if it would be helpful staff could meet with the applicant at an Internal Review Team meeting where staff meets with applicants prior to the Commission meeting to give feedback on their proposal.

Chair Provencher stated that would be extremely helpful.

Secretary McCann also suggested Mr. Avery contact the Crown Hill Historic Association and they could provide Mr. Avery with feedback on a design.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the rendering shows black shutters and if they are vinyl shutters that are non-operable he did not think that would be approved.

Chair Provencher stated that there are few details on the windows and with regard to the shutters he would not be in favor. Commissioner Conroy stated that she would not vote in support.

Chair Provencher asked if anyone knew what the original configuration of the window was. Commissioner Bloom stated that it was most likely 6 over 6 as that is what the other windows in district have.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he was more concerned with the actual window size not the style of window. Mr. Avery stated that he can do whatever Commission requests.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he wasn't sure they aren't original windows.

Chair Provencher asked for guidance from Mr. Bloom as the district member as what might be an appropriate configuration. Commissioner Bloom stated that there are double hung windows of 6 over 6 in the District.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if Mr. Avery planned to remove the lone existing window. Mr. Avery stated he would not. Secretary McCann stated that he thought a one over one on the first floor and two over two or four over four on the second floor would be appropriate.

Chair Provencher stated that he would agree with the one over one for the first floor window but would recommend a two over two for the second floor. Secretary McCann stated that he was perfectly fine with that.

Chair Provencher asked if vinyl would be acceptable as the building has already been compromised and was not convinced it needed to be a wood window. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would be acceptable with that.

Secretary McCann stated that he would agree as it would be better to have a consistent façade.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Avery wanted to replace the concrete stairs at front entrance. Mr. Avery stated yes as it has deteriorated over time.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he believed most of the landings in the area were granite.

Commission Provencher stated that he likes granite but would that be over improving the property.

Secretary McCann stated that he thought that applicant's money would be better spent elsewhere.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would disagree as a granite stoop would be extremely appropriate as it would really stand out and be historically accurate.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Avery would be painting the aluminum. Mr. Avery stated yes and planned to paint it white.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that would be acceptable but there are various shades of white. Mr. Avery stated that he would paint what they would recommend.

Chair Provencher stated that since they are going to continue discussion on the addition then they could continue the discussion on the paint color.

Chair Provencher stated that with regard to the concrete steps that it would be agreeable.

Commissioner Robyn asked the difference in price between the granite and concrete. Chair Provencher stated it about four times more for granite.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what the landscaping plans were. Mr. Avery stated that he just planned to re-grass.

Secretary McCann asked if Mr. Avery planned to break up the cement landing. Mr. Avery stated that he only planned to add the step.

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Rolle if acceptable to take separate votes as there were many aspects to the item. Mr. Rolle stated that it was acceptable.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the curb cut is still another issue. It was added and it was not there before.

Mr. Avery stated that the company that did it had to go to DPW to do the curb cut.

Mr. Rolle stated that was correct and there wasn't a curb cut permit pulled and that will need to be done retroactively and he had done a site view of district and other driveways in the district are asphalt driveways but have a cleaner edge.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the brick sidewalk was one of the original 1850 brick sidewalks.

Secretary McCann asked if the brick was removed from the sidewalk. Mr. Avery stated that he did not think so.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if city sidewalks are part of the Historical Commission's purview. Mr. Rolle stated that should have been addressed when curb cut permit was applied for.

Chair Provencher stated that some of the brick looks like it is inside the property line.

Mr. Rolle stated that he would have to follow up with DPW.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he has issue with original sidewalk being removed. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he agreed.

Chair Provencher stated that he did not believe Commission had purview as it was in the public way.

Chair Provencher stated the Commission was disappointed that the brick sidewalk was removed and would ask staff to follow up on the item.

Chair Provencher stated that it's outside of protocol but he would make the motions on the continuances as there are so many different aspects to this application and he would ask that another Commissioner make motion on the windows and steps.

Mr. Rolle stated that the porch area would need to be advertised as different from original application.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 to continue the discussion regarding the addition to the August 7, 2014 Historical Commission Meeting and approved the extension of the constructive grant deadline to August 22, 2014.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 to continue the discussion regarding paint color to the August 7, 2014 Historical Commission Meeting where the applicant is to bring a sample of the paint color and approved the extension of the constructive grant deadline to August 22, 2014.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the chimney portion would be included in tonight's vote. Chair Provencher stated yes.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the five windows, four on the front elevation, one on the first floor to the right of the entry be reinstalled in its original opening, size as a 1/1 vinyl double hung. That the three windows on the second floor be reinstalled in its original opening, as 2/2 vinyl double hung and

the window opposite side that has been covered over be reinstalled in its original opening as vinyl double hung and those modifications would be appropriate for the Crown Hill Historic District.

Chair Provencher stated the Building Demolition Delay Waiver needs to be voted on.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 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.

Commission Bloom stated that he was confused by the vote. Chair Provencher stated it was a retroactive vote and that vote would need to reflect that so Commission should strike the vote and re-vote again.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 0-5 that the retroactive 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 denied.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 0-5 that the retroactive Building Demolition Delay Waiver with regards to the window is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was denied.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair and seconded by Secretary, the Commission voted 4-1 that the retroactive Building Demolition Delay Waiver with regards to the chimney is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 4-1 that the removal of the chimney would be appropriate for the Crown Hill Historic District. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the construction of a second step on an existing concrete landing was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the construction of a second step on an existing concrete landing was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Chair Provencher stated that they would not vote on driveway and that would be an enforcement issue.

## **LIST OF EXHIBITS:**

- Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay & Certificate of Appropriateness; received June 12, 2014; prepared by Harry Avery.
- Exhibit B: Cease and Desist issued by Department of Inspectional Services, Buildings/Zoning Division, prepared by Joseph M. Atchue, Building Inspector; dated May 21, 2014.
- Exhibit C: Historical Commission Decisions – Certificate of Appropriateness and Building Demolition Delay Waiver; recorded with the City Clerk June 11, 2014.
- Exhibit D: Variance and Special Permit application for 100 Chatham Street; received May 7, 2014; prepared by Harry Avery.
- Exhibit E: Special Permit Plan; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc., dated April 18, 2014.
- Exhibit F: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of appeals; re: 100 Chatham Street – Special Permit & Variance Application.
- Exhibit G: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Planning & Regulatory Services to the Historical Commission re: 100 Chatham Street.
- Exhibit H: Revised drawings submitted June 25, 2014.

## **2. 32-34 Clement Street (HC-2014-025)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Angela Montoya  
Present Use: Multi Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1922  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property  
Petition Purpose: Remove/Replace slate roof with architectural shingles and perform associated work

Franciso Aruguto appeared on behalf of Angela Montoya on a petition for a Building Demolition to remove and replace the slate roof with architectural shingles and perform associated work.

Mr. Aruguto stated that he planned to re-roof with architectural shingles as the roof was damaged and slate was falling off and showed an example of the material he would use.

Chair Provencher stated that looking at the images the roof has a lot of damage and a lot of patches have been made.

Chair Provencher asked if it was the homeowner's plan to replace. Mr. Aruguto stated that the slate is falling off and needs to be replaced.

Chair Provencher stated that the roof is probably about 90 years old and it is about the time when roofs start to fail.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that according to backup material provided with the application the cost for the work was going to be \$9,000.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if this was a rental property. Mr. Aruguto stated that it was rental but owners live on the first floor.

Chair Provencher stated that this property and other properties in the area have very distinct roof line and those are the really compelling features on the property and asked Mr. Aruguto if there were any plans to change the roof line. Mr. Aruguto stated that they were just replacing the slate.

Chair Provencher asked if the Commission wanted to open up discussion to economic hardship but typically slate comes in triple the cost of asphalt shingle roofing.

Secretary McCann stated that after being on the Commission a few years the board members are familiar with cost and agrees with Chair Provencher about life span of roof and would not have problem with applicant using a more economical way.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the shed in photo was rubber. Mr. Arguto stated it was rubber and would be replaced.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the application does not list economic hardship he would not feel comfortable voting on that but the home is beautiful and he does understand replacing roof would be expensive.

Commissioner Bloom stated that due to the shed dormer you can't see a lot of the roof.

Chair Provencher asked if any of the work would be done on eaves or gutters. Mr. Arguto stated that there will be no work on those.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 5-0 that the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

#### **LIST OF EXHIBITS:**

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Application; received June 12, 2014 and dated June 12, 2014.

**3. 171 Chandler Street (HC-2014-026)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: A&M Realty Trust  
Present Use: Multi Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1887  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property

Petition Purpose: Repair rear porch, replace rotted wood as needed and replace deck

Arthur Mooradian of A&M Realty Trust appeared on behalf of the petition for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to repair the rear porch, replace rotted wood as needed and replace the deck.

Chair Provencher asked if the porch was visible from the street. Mr. Mooradian stated that it was not.

Secretary McCann asked the age of the porch. Mr. Mooradian stated that it was most likely original but had been repaired over the years.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he did not have chance to view the property but believes property would be visible from Austin Street. Mr. Mooradian stated that you could not as there is a house in front of this house and showed some photos and stated there is nothing on the porch that was original.

Secretary McCann stated that the house is very nice and Mr. Mooradian has done a nice job keeping up the property and doesn't have any doubt what Mr. Mooradian will do what is in keeping with what is there. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he agreed.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS:**

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Application; received June 13, 2014 and dated June 12, 2014.

**4. 244 Park Avenue (HC-2014-027):**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Paul & Marilyn Howley  
Present Use: One story commercial building

Year Built: Circa 1922  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property  
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace existing storefront window with bronze storefront window

Dave Cole appeared on behalf Paul & Marilyn Howley for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace existing storefront window with bronze storefront window.

Mr. Cole stated he had appeared last year for a window but they are so expensive applicant can only do one a year and showed photos of the window to be replaced. Mr. Cole stated that he had put a wood trim around the window replaced last year and went over with bronze so it would match the window. Chair Provencher stated that he had clad the window.

Vice-Chair Shveda would have preferred to see a shape but this was okay.

Chair Provencher stated that with regards to the configuration of the opening it was divided into four sections vertically and two sections horizontally and asked if the new window would be the same. Mr. Cole stated it would have same configuration but maybe a bit smaller.

Chair Provencher asked if all the windows would be replaced. Mr. Cole stated that one would be every year.

Chair Provencher stated that they have been through the process before with the applicant and they have been good working with the Commission and it would be their expectation that they would do exactly what they did on the front to this window. Mr. Cole stated that was the exact plan.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 that the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

#### **LIST OF EXHIBITS:**

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Application; received June 16, 2014 and dated June 16, 2014

#### **5. 20 Haviland Street (HC-2014-028)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Thaddeus Magerowski  
Present Use: Single family home  
Year Built: Circa 1899

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, NRDIS (National Register District) and NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area)  
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the existing three tab roof with Architectural shingles

Thaddeus Magerowski and Francisco Aruguto appeared on behalf of the petition for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace the existing three tab roof with architectural shingles.

Mr. Arguto stated that the roof was damaged and it needed to be replaced. Chair Provencher stated that based on the pictures the roof is in bad shape and needs to be replaced.

Mr. Magerowski stated that he had problem with ice damming but no water has gotten in yet.

Chair Provencher asked about the condition of the fascia and soffits. Mr. Magerowski stated that they looked good.

Mr. Magerowski stated that the previous owners never flashed it and water goes into the front of the house and he has lost two ceilings in the front hallway so contractor will cut back some of the clapboard and then put another board along the edge. Chair Provencher asked if board would match. Mr. Arguto stated that it would.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 5-0 that the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

#### **LIST OF EXHIBITS:**

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Application; received June 19, 2014 and dated June 18, 2014.

#### **Other Business**

##### **Communication Received:**

- a. Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission, re: Whittier Terrace Apartments; dated June 27, 2014 and received June 30, 2014. – No comment.
- b. Letter from FC, re: Section 106 filing; received June 30, 2014-Mr. Rolle stated he would follow up.

- c. Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission, re: Donker Farm Conservation Restriction dated June 25, 2014 and received June 27, 2014. No comment.
- d. Letter from EBI Consulting, re: 128 Providence Street; dated June 18, 2014 and received June 23, 2014. – No comment.

### **Adjournment**

Upon a motion the Commission voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m.