

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

July 24, 2014

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

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

Commission Members Absent: Timothy McCann, Clerk

Staff Members Present:
Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Provencher called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: July 10, 2014 –Held

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 2 Ives Street (HC-2014-029)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Justin Trudell
Present Use: Multi-Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1918
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace 49 windows with vinyl windows

Justin Trudell appeared before the Commission on a request for Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace 49 windows with vinyl windows.

Mr. Trudell stated that he purchased the property at the end of March and he has been doing some light rehab on the interior and plans to rent it out and when he went for lead inspection he was told by inspector that windows had lead so he purchased new windows and the contractor hired to install the windows went to get a building permit and informed Mr. Trudell that the home was historic and needed to get approval before windows could be replaced.

Mr. Trudell stated that during the sale it did not come up that the home was historic.

Chair Provencher stated that they have seen this scenario before and the Commission has been working on a way to get that information out to prospective buyers.

Chair Provencher asked if any other work was proposed. Mr. Trudell stated that he will also be wrapping the sills.

Chair Provencher asked if the work is proposed for all three floors. Mr. Trudell stated that it will be.

Chair Provencher stated that he was not too familiar with lead laws but he believed that the homeowner is obligated to address only the exterior that's within six feet of the grade. Mr. Trudell stated that's true unless the exterior is paint since paint could chip and fall to the ground.

Chair Provencher asked what the plans were for the casing. Mr. Trudell stated that the side casing will most likely be wrapped but not the head casing. It will just be painted to make sure it not chipping or flaking.

Chair Provencher stated that a lot of storm sashes had been placed around the porches and asked what was planned for that. Mr. Trudell stated that they were being left alone and they were there when he bought the home in March.

Chair Provencher stated that the property is not in a historical district and Commission is looking at the original historic material and whether what is going to be taken away diminishes the historic value of the home and the windows looked to be original and the Commission would need to consider that. The Commission also needs to consider that the applicant has shown that the property has a lead problem and one of the questions the Commission would ask the applicant would be how much it would cost to keep the original windows. Mr. Trudell stated that the lead inspector told him it was not feasible due to the lead and they must be replaced in order to get a lead certification for the home.

Chair Provencher stated that according to the law it is not feasible for the applicant to remove the paint. Mr. Trudell stated that that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission cannot compel the applicant on the type of window to install but they can make suggestions. The replacement windows shown are available with a muntin bar and the Commission would recommend that the two over one

pattern where the double hung window are on the sides be maintained. The applicant can get a vertical muntin bar for the top sash. Chair Provencher stated that the other distinguishing feature is the front bay picture window and each window has a distinctive pattern and he doesn't believe it could be replicated in vinyl and would prefer that something be done on those windows to keep the pattern and preserve the character of the house.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he agreed with the suggestions the Chair had made.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the windows' size will remain the same. Mr. Trudell stated that they would.

Chair Provencher stated that a motion would be made on the Demolition Delay Waiver and then the Commission would look at a second motion on economic hardship.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 0-6 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was denied.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 6-0 that the denial of the petition would cause an unfair economic hardship. The motion passed and the petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated June 24, 2014 and received June 24, 2014.

2. 15 Kingsbury Street (HC-2014-030)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Lakhveer Sahota
Present Use: Multi-Family Residence, formerly known as the William Maynard Three Decker
Year Built: Circa 1912
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the front porch

Lakhveer Sahota appeared on behalf of the petition for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace the front porch.

Mr. Sahota stated that he purchased the home last month and the porches are very unsafe and he would like to replace them.

Chair Provencher stated that he viewed the property and it is a three level porch and it is collapsing due to lack of maintenance and he saw a lot of rot and peeling paint and asked Mr. Sahota what the porch will look like when rebuilt. Mr. Sahota stated that he does not have

the money to make it look the way it did before and he also did not have photo of what the new porch would look like.

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Sahota if he had any cost estimates from a contractor. Mr. Sahota stated that contractor gave an estimate of \$10,000 for all three porches.

Chair Provencher stated that the porch has many historic features and it seems completely unaltered so it has historic significance. It clearly needs to be repaired but he is not sure it needs to be replaced entirely and the Historical Commission's goal is to preserve as much of the original material as possible. The Commission can also look at cost of repairing versus replacing but no data has been provided on that.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he drove by the building and was impressed with how much of the home still had original materials but was disappointed with the lack of maintenance. The home is an architectural gem and replacing the porch would change the character of the home.

Commissioner Dunn stated that she agreed with Commissioner Bloom's remarks and no cost estimates had been provided for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he would agree and asked whether all the columns were all rotted. Mr. Sahota stated that they were.

Commissioner Conroy stated that she agreed with the other Commissioners and was disappointed that the applicant didn't provide a drawing of what the porch would look like.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that what makes the house interesting is the placement of the columns and would like the applicant to take time to think about the design as he was not convinced that it requires a complete tear down.

Chair Provencher stated that there may be a way to salvage some distinguishing features of the porch and that should be investigated.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would agree with Commissioner Conroy that without any type of graphic of what porch would look like he would have a hard time making decision.

Chair Provencher stated that there are a few options for the applicant. The applicant could request to continue and come back with a drawing of the new porch and cost estimates or the Commission could vote on the application as presented.

Mr. Sahota stated that he would like to continue but would like some guidance as to what the Commission was looking for. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that Mr. Sahota should talk to his contractor and ask him to provide a drawing to scale of what the porch would look like and estimates on cost versus replacing and that Mr. Sahota may want to talk with other contractors who do this type of work.

Jim Hanlorn stated that he is contractor in the City and he would recommend that Mr. Sahota have his contractor come to the meeting and do a presentation to Commission. Chair Provencher stated that is excellent suggestion as no information was provided tonight for the Commission to make an informed decision.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the item until the August 7, 2014 Historical Commission meeting.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to extend the constructive grant deadline until August 22, 2014.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated June 24, 2014 and received June 24, 2014.

3. 46 Holden Street (HC-2014-032)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Patricia Gibb
Present Use: Single-Family Residence, formerly known as Arthur B. Holmes House
Year Built: Circa 1914
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace 19 vinyl windows with wood/vinyl composite windows

Jim Hanloren from Renewal by Anderson appeared on behalf of the applicant, Patricia Gibb, for Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace 19 vinyl windows with wood/vinyl composite windows.

Mr. Hanloren stated that the home already has vinyl windows and they are replacing the windows as close as what was there originally. He stated that they will match the grid pattern and use a double pane energy efficient window.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked why they were being replaced. Mr. Hanlonrn stated that for energy savings and no exterior casings would be removed.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Dunn, the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed 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.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated June 24, 2014 and received June 24, 2014.

4. 14 Stoneland Road (HC-2014-033)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Delfina Quinones
Present Use: Multi Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1915
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace roof with architectural shingles and perform associated roof work

John Hanlon appeared on behalf of Delfina Quinones on a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace roof with architectural shingles and perform associated roof work.

Mr. Hanlon stated that Ms. Quinones has owned the home for 16 years and they are looking to put a new roof. There is slate underneath a layer of asphalt shingles and the asphalt is not in good shape and she does have water leaking in. They are proposing to install a lifetime architectural shingle roof. The wood is in good shape and does not need to be replaced. They will install a six feet of ice and water shield on top of the wood and then a synthetic underlayment. A ridge vent will be installed along with a drip edge and flashing over the chimney.

Chair Provencher stated it looks like a gable roof with a large dormer on the side with a hip roof and the porch on the front that has a flat roof. Mr. Hanlon stated that on the porch section they will put entire ice and water shield that has ten year warranty.

Chair Provencher asked what condition the slate was in. Mr. Hanlon stated that when he walked on the roof and the roof started to break so the slate is not in good condition and he is not sure how they could remove the shingle without damaging the slate. The cost to put a new slate roof on would be hardship to the applicant as it would cost \$40,000 to \$50,000.

Commissioner Dunn asked when the shingles were put over the slate. Mr. Hanlon stated it was prior to the current owner so he wasn't sure.

Anna Jackson stated that this was her mother's house and stated that she had spoken with two other contractors who did not know the home was historical but this contractor as soon as he came into home knew it was historical and called City Hall to confirm it was listed.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed 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.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated June 24, 2014 and received June 24, 2014.

5. 21 Sycamore Street (HC-2014-034)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: The Rana Group
Present Use: Multi-Family Residence formerly known as Reverend G.P. Smith, House
Year Built: Circa 1851
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace roof with architectural shingles and perform associates roof work

Dan Ranniko appeared on behalf of The Rana Group for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove/replace roof with architectural shingles and perform associates roof work.

Mr. Ranniko stated that the current roof has leaks and they would like to remove and replace the shingles with 30 year architectural shingles and install ice and water barriers. The current roof doesn't have any drip edges and Mr. Ranniko showed some photos where roof is leaking and starting to rot.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that looking at the pictures that quite a few additions and alterations have been done over the years and one would be hard pressed to find any original material on the house.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he did a view of property and was very disappointed when he saw all the changes that had been made.

Commissioner Dunn stated that it looked like new construction.

Chair Provencher stated that he does not see any work that involves original material.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed 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.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated June 24, 2014 and received June 24, 2014.

6. 125 Salisbury Street (HC-2014-038)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Present Use: Educational building, formerly known as Atwater Kent Laboratories
Year Built: Circa 1907
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, NRDIS (National Register District) and NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area)

Petition Purpose: (1) Remove/replace double doors along Salisbury Street with two fixed windows and trimmed panels to match existing finishes
(2) Replace sign to match existing, if necessary

Michelle Tuck from Tuck and Tuck Architects and Jim Bedard from WPI appeared on behalf of Worcester Polytechnic Institute on a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to

- (1) Remove/replace double doors along Salisbury Street with two fixed windows and trimmed panels to match existing finishes
- (2) Replace sign to match existing, if necessary

Ms. Tuck stated that the doors are not original and probably only 40 to 50 years old and have no architectural significance. The transom above does look original and they plan on keeping it.

Ms. Tuck stated that this entrance is rarely used and is at the border of the campus and the doors are not required for egress and the windows installed would match existing adjacent windows and they would be a fixed casement.

Commissioner Bloom asked why the glazing wasn't being continued down lower. Ms. Tuck stated that they would like it to be clear as they don't want students to come up and see no door and school would like built-ins on the interior space.

Chair Provencher stated that this is a straight forward application as the doors are not original and the transom was being kept.

Chair Provencher asked whether any changes would be made to the size and shape of the masonry. Ms. Tuck stated that no changes will be made.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he had no real issue with removal of the doors but the landscaping of the school will point to this an entry. Ms. Tuck stated that she agreed and stated that they are working with a landscape architect on that.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Dunn, the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed 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.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated July 2, 2014 and received July 2, 2014.

OTHER BUSINESS

Communication Received

- a. Letter from MHC, re: Worcester County, 2 Main Street, dated July 1, 2014; received July 7, 2014.- No comment.
- b. Letter from MHC, re: Renovations and Improvements at Elm Park, 121 Russell Street, dated July 2, 2014; received July 7, 2014. – No comment.
- c. Letter from MA ALB Cooperative, re: Asian Longhorn Beetle Eradication Program; dated July 7, 2014; received July 10, 2014. – No comment.
- d. Letter from MassDOT, re: Millbury /Worcester – Resurfacing & Related Work on Route 146; dated July 9, 2014; received July 11, 2014. – No comment.
- e. Request for Letter of Support from Epsilon Associates, Inc., re: Worcester Junction Shops, 49-57 Hermon Street, 51-59 Jackson Street, 62-74 Beacon Street, dated July 2, 2014; received July 3, 2014.
- f. Request for Letter of Support from MacRostie Historic Advisors, re: Fire Alarm and Telegraph Headquarters Building, 230 Park Avenue; undated.
- g. Request for Letter of Support from MacRostie Historic Advisors, re: Grout’s Building, 379-385 Main Street; undated.
- h. Request for Letter of Support from MacRostie Historic Advisors, re: Osgood Bradley Building, 18 Grafton Street; undated.
- i. Request for Letter of Support from MacRostie Historic Advisors, re: People’s Block, 371-377 Main Street; undated.

Items e-i were taken contemporaneously and the Commission stated that these projects had been before the Commission before asking for letters of support.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the Commission had been discussing a re-designed web-site but would also like to look at outreach to the public. Ms. Steele informed the Commission that the web-site was being worked on and the staff was working on outreach through mailings and are proposing to do a seminar in Fall and more information would be provided at upcoming meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.