

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
August 7, 2014**

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

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

Commission Members Absent: Timothy McCann

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 24, 2014 – **Held**

1. Chair Provencher took communication a) re: Heywood Tavern out of order to allow Randy Ormo to speak on the item.

Mr. Ormo stated that he had presented a petition to City Council regarding a historical sign to be placed in the City of Worcester regarding the Heywood Tavern. On September 6, 1774, twenty-five court officials appointed by King George III were held here. Having just been denied entry to the court house they were forced to sign documents disavowing their appointments; then marched back to the courthouse hat in hand through a gauntlet of 37 central Massachusetts militias made of 4,622 men, repeatedly recanting their oaths of office and their disavowals as demanded by each militia.

The Commission thanked Mr. Ormo for his presentation.

OLD BUSINESS:

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

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver

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

Bobbie Sakhota appeared on behalf of his father, Lakhveer Sahota.

Chair Provencher stated that this item had come before the Historical Commission at the last meeting and the Commission had requested that the applicant come back with some data on restoration costs and sketches of what the new proposed porch would look like.

Mr. Davis from Carmen Development Construction, Inc. stated that Inspectional Services had issued a violation order to the previous owner on March 12, 2014 finding that the property was in violation of Mass Building Code and the building needed to be made safe.

Chair Provencher asked if he had cost estimates done to restore the property. Mr. Davis stated that he would estimate it would be about \$15,000. Chair Provencher asked if any paperwork could be provided and Mr. Davis presented contract.

Chair Provencher stated that the contract is for replacement not restoration. Mr. Davis stated that he was not familiar with the house and he just provided the estimate.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if same if this was similar to proposal from last meeting. Mr. Davis stated that was correct and the applicant does not have that much money to do repair as they don't make the columns anymore.

Chair Provencher stated that he did not think the Commission could evaluate the petition fairly without the estimates. The Commission does acknowledge it is unsafe but there are measures that can be done to make it safe on a temporary basis.

Commissioner Conroy stated that the Commission had also asked for a drawing of what the new proposed porch would look like and that has not been provided.

Commissioner Dunn stated that she would have hard time voting on item without knowing what the porch would like.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission would need an estimate on cost to restore in order to compare versus replace and then could look at whether Commission could vote on economic hardship.

Commissioner Provencher stated that the applicant had option of continuing the item and applicant can provide information requested or they could vote on item as presented tonight.

Judy Ostegrao stated that she had sold the property to the owner and the applicant came in after violation order had been issued and just bought property in July and doesn't want them to be penalized as they just bought the property. Chair Provencher stated that they agree with that and understand the situation.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the building inspector has been out recently to see what is being done to make the porch safe. Mr. Davis stated they have been out and they were told it needed to be fixed.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the item until the August 21, 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 September 5, 2014.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he wanted to remind applicant to bring a rendering to the next meeting. Chair Provencher stated that a line drawing would be sufficient as he did not want to place an undue economic burden on the applicant.

Commissioner Bloom asked staff whether clarification had been made whether real estate agents are required to inform people when they purchase home they are historically listed.

Ms. Ostegrao stated she had called City Hall and was aware it was historically listed but there is a language problem with new owners and they may not have understood that.

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

NEW BUSINESS:

Commissioner Conroy recused herself from item.

3. 12 Hawthorne Street (HC-2014-035)

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	Trustees of Clark University
Present Use:	Academic Building
Year Built:	Circa 1900
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed property, NRDIS, NRMRA
Petition Purpose:	Install a handicap access (left side of building, along Woodland St) with associated work to the door and porch

Derek Lundstrom appeared on behalf of the item.

Mr. Lundstrom stated that the application is to install a ramp to the side entrance of the building in order to make the first floor handicapped accessible.

The Commission reviewed the photos presented by the applicant.

Mr. Lundstrom stated that the handrail would be removed and the porch would be extended on the left side of the building and that would be extent of the work.

Chair Provencher stated that the plans showed elevation on the porch and asked if that would affect the supporting columns and guardrail. Mr. Lundstrom stated that it would not.

Chair Provencher asked whether a riser would be on top of the porch and whether the baluster and column would be disturbed. Mr. Lundstrom stated that the baluster and column would not be disturbed.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked whether wood columns would be modified. Mr. Lundstrom responded they would not.

Chair Provencher asked whether a portion of the guardrail would come out. Mr. Lundstrom stated that it would.

Chair Provencher stated that the plans show some modifications being made to the columns.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the amount of original material being removed is minimal.

Chair Provencher stated that it is a great proposal and the architect has done a great job being sensitive to the building and it is an elegant solution.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the property is a good example of Colonial Revival and fortunately the ramp is being put around the corner so that there is minimal change to the property.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bjork and seconded by Commissioner Dunn, the Commission voted 5-0 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 13, 2014 and received June 30, 2014.

6:20 p.m.- Commissioner Conroy returned to meeting.

4. 47 & 49 Roxbury Street (HC-2014-036)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Dorothy M. O'Connor Irrevocable Trust
Present Use: Three-Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1940
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Replace and repair porches to match existing

Michael Cardamone appeared on behalf of Dorothy M. O'Connor Irrevocable Trust.

Mr. Cardamone stated that he has been hired to rebuild the porches as they are falling apart and submitted a proposal of the planned work. He stated that the plan is to completely remove everything on porch and roof will remain intact and everything else will be new composite material.

Chair Provencher asked if they are PVC components. Mr. Cardamone stated that they are.

Chair Provencher stated that he did not find the features of the porch particularly compelling and they do not look original.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the only interesting element is the very shallow arch on the front and questioned if that would remain. Mr. Cardamone stated that it would.

Chair Provencher stated that there doesn't look like anything historically significant being done and different from 15 Kingsbury Street as on Kingsbury Street all the original components are still there.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the presentation also done by this applicant was very well done and provided enough detail for the Commission to make an informed decision.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy 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 18, 2014 and received June 30, 2014.

Exhibit B: Scope of work; dated July 21, 2014 and received August 7, 2014.

5. 19 Stoneland Road (HC-2014-037)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Bennett J. Lazarus

Present Use: Single-Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1902
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: Replace a porch with associated work to the deck, columns, railing system, framing and trim

Bennett J. Lazarus appeared on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Lazarus stated that he has owned the home for 28 years and wants to restore the structural integrity and bring the property up to code. As far as restoring the aesthetic quality of the home, he did not research that. He obtained a quote for \$21,000 to restore what it is there and \$10,000 - \$13,000 to replace. Mr. Lazarus stated that he had just obtained photos from contractor and the photos show that porch would be very stark and he rather have a beautiful porch as it the face of the house and would like to spend the money on the porch but it would be more expensive and showed some photos of contractor was proposing.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission will be looking at what is being removed and whether it has any historical value. The proposal includes removal of the existing column, the porch framing and the lattice but the roof would remain. The Commission can see from the photos in the application that there is a lot of rot and it is in need of a full replacement. The quote in the application stated \$9,000 to replace vs. the \$21,000 to restore; an undue economic hardship can be considered. Mr. Lazarus stated that the quote to replace is now a little more now since he requested a better quality wood.

Chair Provencher asked if the other Commissioners had any comments on the application.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it is a beautiful home and has character and the one thing that adds to it is the expanding column which isn't particularly difficult to replicate and the other details on the porch are pretty standard.

Chair Provencher stated that the one thing that makes this application different from Kingsbury Street is the amount of photos provided in the application showing the amount of rot and based on the photos he does not see anything that could be salvaged.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he agreed with Vice-Chair Shveda that the columns are the dominant feature and if those could be replicated that would keep the basic look.

Mr. Lazarus stated that he would agree but the issue is money.

Chair Provencher reminded the applicant that the Commission is only looking at what is being taken away and suggestions on what to put back are just suggestions and the property is not located in a historic district so Commission's only purview is what is being taken away.

Chair Provencher stated that in his opinion, based on photos presented, the porch is not salvageable.

Commissioner Bloom asked whether the applicant should provide rendering and whether it needs the Commission's approval. Ms. Steele stated that the home is not in historic district, therefore only what is being removed is under the commission's purview.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the applicant wanted to repair next week and was denied what would happen. Chair Provencher stated that they could vote and deny it based on the fact it would be detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the City and then they could take a separate vote on economic hardship as applicant has provided cost data.

Susan Ceccacci, Preservation Worcester, stated that she wanted to commend Mr. Lazarus for his concern for the aesthetic quality of his building and for trying to do work that would preserve some of the characteristics of the home. She hopes that when work begins that some of the material can be reused and she agreed with Vice-Chair Shveda and Commissioner Bjork that the columns are a significant feature of the home.

Commissioner Conroy stated that on Kingsbury Street they required a drawing and she would really like to see a drawing for this application.

Chair Provencher stated that for Kingsbury Street the drawing would reflect the restored state and not the new construction.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he was interested in a drawing for the Kingsbury Street property to visualize what is being proposed. He doesn't need one for this one but if the Commission is asking one resident to provide additional information then the others should do the same for consistency's sake

Chair Provencher stated that he felt Kingsbury and Stoneland were different as Kingsbury Street didn't come to the table with enough information for the Commission to reach a good decision. This application included cost estimates and has given Commission extensive amount of photos and it is his belief that the porch is not salvageable and the Commission should vote on the Demolition Delay Waiver and then on an Economic Hardship.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would agree with the Chair and he does not see any reasons for the applicant to provide additional information since applicant has given sincere testimony about having pride in the home.

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

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-1 (Commissioner Conroy voting against) 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 30, 2014 and received June 30, 2014.

6. 39 Stoneland Road (HC-2014-039)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Le-Trung LLC
Present Use: Three Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1925
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property
Petition Purpose: (1) Remove/replace siding and porch window (rear); (2) Wrap door and window trim with aluminum

Timothy Hansen from the City of Worcester Housing Division appeared on behalf of the petition.

He stated that they are replacing a window on the rear porch and installing siding on the rear of the house because of existing flaking paint that is a lead hazard. They are also wrapping windows with aluminum, including the sills and trim to prevent paint from flaking and to cover up the lead.

Chair Provencher asked if all the work is in the rear of the property. Mr. Hansen stated that that some of the windows that are to be wrapped are elsewhere and that due to the federal guidelines they have to send the project notification form (PNF) to the Mass Historical Commission stating that there will be no adverse effect. Mr. Hansen provided a copy of the PNF to the Commission.

Chair Provencher asked which windows would be wrapped. Mr. Hansen stated Mr. Hansen there are windows on the front that will get wrapped.

Chair Provencher asked whether the casing or sill would be removed. Mr. Hansen stated that they will not be removed.

Chair Provencher stated that this is straight forward application and the window is not visible from the street.

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 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 7, 2014 and received July 7, 2014.

7. 67 Cedar Street (HC-2014-040)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Youth Opportunity Upheld, Inc.
Present Use: Two Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1890
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, NRDIS, NRMRA
Petition Purpose: (1) Remove/replace existing slate roof with architectural shingles;
(2) Remove/replace turret cedar shake siding with in kind

Andrew Mahoney appeared on behalf of the application and stated that they were looking to replace the roof with architectural shingles based on economic hardship.

Chair Provencher stated that the photos provided are from a distance and roof doesn't look that bad but application stated that the roof may collapse. Mr. Mahoney stated that is was what the contactor told the organization as some of the shingles are so old and they have a lot of ice damming in the winter.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the roof was rotting. Mr. Mahoney stated that it was and there are a lot of leaks coming in the building.

Commissioner Bjork stated that the application says some of slate was being kept on the turret. Mr. Mahoney stated that it was.

Commissioner Bloom asked how many estimates the organization got. Mr. Mahoney stated that just the one provided in the application.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he had viewed the property and from the street the roof looks like it is in good condition. Mr. Mahoney stated that they would not replace the roof if they did not have too.

Chair Provencher stated that the quote included in the application is for \$13,000 for architectural shingles and the second quote for \$24,950 would be a roof replacement on the front side of the roof, turrets not included.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if there was cedar shake on the turret. Mr. Mahoney stated that it was cedar shake.

Chair Provencher stated that the quote to replace the slate only includes the front section of the roof that faces the street and the gable that faces the street.

Chair Provencher asked whether architectural shingles and slate would be both on roof at same time. Mr. Mahoney stated that he was not sure.

Chair Provencher stated that the options provided to the Commission are to either remove the slate on the front and gable on the front or replace the whole roof with architectural shingles.

Chair Provencher as the applicant to show where the slate will be removed on the gable. Mr. Mahoney showed the Commission on the pictures..

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Mahoney to give a little background on the organization. Mr. Mahoney stated that it is non-profit that helps children and families and the home is a dormitory residence.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked about the extent of water damage. Mr. Mahoney stated that the third floor has water leakage.

Chair Provencher stated that this is beautiful building and he would be disappointed to see the slate go but under circumstances the cost to repair the slate would be double and the organization is a non-profit and has limited resources and would be a good candidate for economic hardship.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that slate can always be put back on in the future if the money becomes available but he understands they are a non-profit and it is not the entire roof.

Commissioners Bloom & Bjork both stated that they were disappointed that only one quote was provided.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the organization has looked into any grants to cover the cost. Mr. Mahoney stated that he was not sure.

Commissioner Provencher stated that he agreed with Vice-Chair Shveda and would request that any slate in good condition be salvaged and if the property is ever sold, the slate be given to the new property owner so that if the money is available in the future the slate could be put back.

Susan Ceccacci, Preservation Worcester stated that this house is spectacular and the slate roof plays an important part of the character of the roof and she is sad to see the loss of slate on portion of the roof and hopes the slate would be kept on the turret. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it would be according to the applicant.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bjork and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 0-6 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver was

detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion did not pass and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was denied.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 5-1 (Commissioner Dunn voting against) 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 18 and received July 10, 2014.

8. 144 Pleasant Street (HC-2014-041)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Justin Duffy
Present Use: Commercial Office Building
Year Built: Circa 1844
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, NRDIS, NRMRA & Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace column on the front porch

Justin Duffy appeared on behalf of the application. He stated that he had purchased the home a few months ago and part of the deal was that old owner was going to replace the column that needed to be replaced but then failed to do so. Then due to a structural problem a contractor tried to repair it but the column fell down and he has been working with a local historic restoration contractor who ordered a new column but when it arrived it had no fluting so he sent it back and then another one was sent and it still did not look correct. Speaking with the contractor the latest one sent is the closest he can get to the original look and Mr. Duffy stated that he would like to get one that looks as close to the original.

Chair Provencher asked if the column that fell down was rotting from the inside. Mr. Duffy stated that it fell down when someone tried to lean against it due to column being rotted.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Duffy's plan was to keep the current column up until a proper replacement could be found. Mr. Duffy stated that was correct as the temporary column is needed for the roof to stay up.

Chair Provencher stated that this would be tough as this in a Historic District so it places higher burden on the applicant to do work that is appropriate to the district.

Chair Provencher stated that it would be very important to match the column exactly for consistency. Mr. Duffy stated that he agrees and he would like to see if he could find someone who could find a column that matches more exactly and come back the Commission.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that they could always take the existing column that fell down and have a mold made of it in order to duplicate it.

Chair Provencher stated that since the applicant wants to explore finding someone who can duplicate the column that suggestion would be to see if the applicant would like to leave to withdraw and then come back at later time. Mr. Duffy stated that he would like to do that.

Commissioner Bloom asked if Mr. Duffy had looked into getting the column repaired. Mr. Duffy stated that he would love to do that but would need to explore the options.

Chair Provencher stated that Mr. Duffy has some options and he should try to find a restoration carpenter and then come back before the Commission.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission vote 6-0 to allow a Leave to Withdraw for the Building Demolition Delay Waiver and Certificate of Appropriateness.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness dated July 10 and received June 8, 2014.

9. 31 Newbury Street (HC-2014-042)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Henry Kasdon
Present Use: Two Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1865
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose: Replace existing siding with like material

Ron Valentine appeared on behalf of the applicant, Henry Kason.

Mr. Valentine stated that they are trying to go back to a two family and would like to replace the existing siding to bring it back to the original look since the siding on it now is like a shake and they want to bring back to the original cedar clad façade.

Chair Provencher asked if the original siding was intact. Mr. Valetine stated that it wasn't and it would cost approximately \$30,000 to bring back the original look.

Chair Provencher asked about if any work would be done to the sills, casings, and/or trims. Mr. Valentine stated that they will keep them as original as possible.

Chair Provencher stated that the application tonight is for siding only.

Mr. Valentine stated they do plan to paint the house. Chair Provencher stated that the applicant will need to come back for that as this property in Crown Hill Local Historic District and

Commission has purview over color and suggested Mr. Valentine fill out application and come back before Commission with paint samples for them to vote on.

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

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that the petition was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness Application received July 10, 2014 and dated July 10, 2014.

10. 100 Chatham Street (HC-2014-043)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: 100 Chatham Street LLC
Present Use: Single Family Residence
Year Built: Circa 1856
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed property, Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose: (1) Paint the building exterior; (2) Remove a portion of the sidewalk (retroactive); (3) Construct/pave driveway (retroactive); (4) Reconfigure patio and entrances fronting Newbury Street (retroactive)

Harry Avery appeared on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Avery stated that he had replaced the brick and has obtained a permit from Deb Davis from Department of Public Works (DPW) for the curb cut.

Chair Provencher asked if it was a shared driveway. Mr. Avery stated that it was not, the driveways are just close together.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he could not tell anything from the photographs. He thought there was fence between the two properties and a small asphalt driveway next to 100 Chatham. Mr. Avery stated that the driveway is not shared but the curb cut is.

Mr. Avery showed on the photos where the brick was put back and the curb cut was.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it appears that the applicant has restored what was originally there. Mr. Avery stated that was correct and he got the required permit from DPW for the curb cut.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission has discussed the items regarding the sidewalk and the paved driveway and the original portion of sidewalk was removed without approval but now it has been restored.

Mr. Avery stated that he had a meeting with city staff and they discussed different options for the design of the house. So a gable was added and he also has redesigned the front entrance on Chatham Street and instead of the aluminum overhang his architect has done changes to improve the property, as shown on the drawings.

Chair Provencher stated that the gable roof is a step in the right direction.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the drawings presented of the proposed work are much more appropriate and asked if the rectangular piece to the right of the two doors if it had a flat roof. Mr. Avery stated that it did.

Chair Provencher asked if the face of the new gable will be in the same plane as the door on the left. Mr. Avery stated that it will be and there will be a little soffit there.

Chair Provencher asked what type of siding would be installed. Mr. Avery stated it would be matched with the existing vinyl and then the entire house will be painted to match. Chair Provencher stated that the triangle portion in front of the gable would be vinyl. Mr. Avery stated that he could do that or whatever the Commission suggested. Chair Provencher suggested it would be wood so it's consistent with the District.

Chair Provencher asked if the shingles would be asphalt. Mr. Avery stated that it would be because that is what was there before.

Chair Provencher asked if the fascia boards would be painted wood. Mr. Avery stated that vinyl currently exists there but he could replace it with wood. Chair Provencher stated that he would be in support of wood.

Chair Provencher stated that this was another step in the right direction.

Chair Provencher stated that on the Chatham Street façade Mr. Avery was asking for approval on the portico with two columns and a gabled roof.

Chair Provencher asked what the columns were made of. Mr. Avery stated that they were made of wood.

Chair Provencher asked if the gable would have wood siding, trim and asphalt roofing. Mr. Avery stated that it would.

Commissioner Dunn thanked the applicant for making the effort to make it better.

Commissioner Bloom stated that this was a significant property but he wanted to know if the windows would be replaced. Mr. Avery stated that they would be put back since that's what was approved at the last meeting.

Commissioner Bloom asked about the configuration of the window. Chair Provencher stated that the windows item had already been discussed and voted on. Mr. Avery stated that the architect for the plans presented tonight wasn't aware of that and didn't included it but he would follow what was approved by the Commission.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the most appropriate column would be a Tuscan or a Doric.

Commissioner Bloom stated that most columns in the neighborhood are Doric columns.

Chair Provencher stated that Doric would be an appropriate style but fluting would be overdoing it and the motion and minutes should reflect what type of columns should be.

Chair Provencher stated that they would now discuss the paint colors.

Mr. Avery stated that he spoke with Tom Johnson in the Crown Hill District and Domenica Tatasciore in the Planning Office, who provided him with some suggestions and Mr. Avery presented some color options to the Commission.

Chair Provencher asked they were talking about painting the aluminum. Mr. Avery stated that he was planning to paint the house and the aluminum. Chair Provencher stated that at least two colors need to be chosen.

Commissioner Bloom stated that usually the body of the house is a darker color than the trim color and the other homes in the district the trim is white.

After discussion, the Commission decided that the color would be Coventry Gray or Putnam Ivory for the base and white for the trim.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 0-6 that the retroactive petition for partial sidewalk removal would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for partial sidewalk removal was denied.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 that partial sidewalk reinstallation would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for partial sidewalk installation was approved.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 that the retroactive request for driveway construction and paving would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for driveway construction was approved.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 that the retroactive request for patio and entrances reconfiguration would not be detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for patio and entrances reconfiguration was approved.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the exterior paint color and that the paint colors be – Coventry Gray or Putnam Ivory for the base and white for the trim would be appropriate and compatible with the preservation and protection of the Crown Hill Historic District. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that partial sidewalk reinstallation would be appropriate and compatible with the preservation and protection of the Crown Hill Historic District. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 that the retroactive request for driveway construction and paving would be appropriate and compatible with the preservation and protection of 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 Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that construction and alterations along Newbury Street with respect to a new dormer, wood siding and wood trim or composite wood as well as a covered entry way on Chatham Street with Doric-style columns would be appropriate and compatible with the preservation and protection of the Crown Hill Historic District. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

11. Communication Received:

b. Request for Letter of Support-Worcester Corset Company, Royal Worcester Apartments.

The Commission stated that they are willing to provide a letter of support.

c. City Hall café awning

Eric Batista from the City Manager's Office and Bill Scott from Seven Hills Foundation appeared on behalf of the item.

Mr. Scott stated that his organization has opened the City Hall Café and they would like to add an awning to the front as they have two other locations and they have the awnings at those sites and it is purely decorative and for branding purposes.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if it had lighting. Mr. Scott stated that it did not.

Chair Provencher stated that there was nothing to vote on and he supports what the organization is doing but he is not in support of the awning in City Hall.

Commissioner Bloom and Commissioner Conroy stated that they support what the organization is doing but don't feel the awning is appropriate for the building.

Mr. Batista stated that they also will be opening an information booth downstairs in City Hall and planned an awning for that location.

Chair Provencher stated that he appreciated the comments but this is a public building and the awning would be more appropriate in a retail center or a food court but this type of branding is associated with Seven Hills Foundation and not sure what it would say about City Hall.

Chair Provencher stated that the signage is small and discreet and that is okay but the awning is unnecessary.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission voted 6-0 to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m.