

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

June 25, 2015

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Andrew Shveda, Vice-Chair
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Randolph Bloom
Devon Kurtz
Karl Bjork, Alternate
Cheryl Holley-Alternate

Commission Members Absent: Kevin Provencher
Robyn Conroy

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

Commission Site Views -

Call to Order – 5:30 pm

Approval of the Minutes:

5/14/2015 – Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the minutes of May 14, 2015.

6/11/2015- Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bloom, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the minutes of June 11, 2015.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 167 Pleasant Street (HC-2015-030)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of
Appropriateness
Petitioner: S&L Realty Trust
Present Use: Vacant Lot
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and located in the Crown Hill Local Historic
District
Petition Purpose: Construction of a parking lot for 22 cars

Anthony Vigliotti appeared on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that the item had appeared before the Planning Board and that the Planning Board did not require any lighting or fencing and the only changes were that there will be more plantings on the front portion of the lot and the snow storage area that was on the front is now going to be moved back and the catch basin that was closer to Pleasant Street is being moved into where the parking space area so you have more pleasant visual effect. The handicapped parking required by the Planning Board will adhere to ADA regulations.

Secretary McCann asked if the layout of the plan had changed from the last Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Vigliotti stated that it had not.

Mr. Rolle stated that the recommendations to Planning Board were from staff based on the feedback they had received at last Historical Commission meeting regarding having more landscaping in the front of the property.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the type of plantings had changed from the last meeting. Mr. Vigliotti stated that it had not changed and that there just will be more landscaping.

Commissioner Bloom expressed concern with the type of landscaping species proposed and how it will be maintained as Dogwood trees are listed on plan and are very hard to maintain.

Mr. Rolle stated that the condition imposed by the Planning Board is that the trees be Asian Longhorn Beetle resistant and stated if Commission would prefer a different type of tree he would suggest that the applicant be given some latitude in what they choose.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that the Dogwood is Asian Longhorn Beetle resistant and the owner and developer is aware that there is maintenance required in the upkeep of the lot.

Mr. Rolle stated that Dogwoods are suitable trees for a landscape buffer.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that at the last meeting the attorney mentioned that an existing concrete sidewalk was going to be removed and it was believed they were granite slabs and Commission was hoping those granite slabs would be incorporated into the new design. Mr. Vigliotti stated they were not granite slabs. It is a six foot concrete sidewalk that would be removed and replaced with landscaping around the parking but closer to the left hand side of the parking lot there is some fencing and stones and they will remain.

Commissioner Bloom asked for more specification on the maintenance of the property.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that a landscaping company will be hired to maintain the property.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-1 (Commissioner Bloom voting against) 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 approved.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 5-0 that the petition was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness received April 16, 2015 and dated April 16, 2015

2. 35 Hermon Street (HC-2015-022)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: 35 Hermon Street, LLC
Present Use: Commercial Building
Year Built: Circa 1888
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area), fka Junction Shops and Hermon Street
Petition Purpose: Demolish 35 Hermon Street including the main block and circa 1950 addition

Tyler Langlois from Epsilon Associates appeared on behalf of the item.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that they had requested cost estimates for rehabbing the building and asked Mr. Langlois if he had any additional information as to how much it would cost to demolish the building and redevelop it.

Mr. Langlois stated that he did not.

Secretary McCann stated that it will make it very difficult to make a decision without a cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Langlois stated that there are a few components. There be the cost to demolish the building and environmental abatement of the property and he would estimate the cost to demo the building would be \$200,000 - \$300,000 and the parking lot would be \$100,000.

Commissioner Bjork asked if Mr. Langlois believed those numbers would be firm. Mr. Langlois stated no.

Commissioner Bloom stated that at the last meeting they heard the item they had requested this information. Mr. Langlois stated that Doug Kelleher had been present at the last meeting and he had thought it was the redevelopment cost the Commission was looking for.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he is trying to determine whether this building should be torn down or not and the Commission has viewed the premises and Commission thought it was a nice building but they understand there is cost involved but they do not have the facts they need to make a judgement.

Commissioner Bjork stated that it was just numbers that was provided with no backup documentation.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he believes the numbers provided are a inaccurate. Typically with construction cost, acquisition design costs are not included and the full square footage was not included in the cost estimate provided.

Mr. Langlois stated that they see a demand in the market for residential units and that is the plan is for the property.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked how many units were planned in Junction Shop. Mr. Langlois stated 173.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that a glaring absence in proposal was no mention of historical tax credits to off-set cost and asked if they were planning to apply for any. Mr. Langlois stated that could be a possibility.

Secretary McCann asked if any money was available for environmental abatement. Mr. Langlois stated that he did not know.

Secretary McCann asked how long ago the property was acquired and what was the expectation when they purchased the property. Mr. Langlois stated that it was purchased 3-4 months ago and the hope was that the land behind the property be incorporated into 64 Beacon Street and they had explored what/if any potential there was in 35 Hermon and if none they would demolish.

Secretary McCann stated that it was purchased primarily for the land. Mr. Langlois stated that was correct.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked how the building frontage going to be dealt with and the cost of dealing with the retaining wall. Mr. Langlois stated that he was uncertain of the cost.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that what was provided was not enough for him to make a decision that this building should be demolished and there still a lot of unknowns.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he was disappointed that the Commission didn't get the information requested and what was provided did not have enough detail.

Mr. Langlois asked what exactly they were looking for.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated they would like to see the cost associated with demolishing, reconstruction of the site, cost of any work to retaining wall and abatement costs, etc.

Secretary McCann stated that without that information it would be very hard for the Commission to discuss an economic hardship on the application.

Secretary McCann stated that he would like Williams Engineering to provide something specific.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that they would also like to see the income potential for the property and asked Mr. Langlois if he would like a continuation. He stated that he would.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the item until the July 9, 2015 Historical Commission meeting and to extend the constructive deadline until July 24, 2015.

The Commission requested Mr. Langlois provided the additional information by July 6, 2015.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received April 2, 2015 and dated April 2, 2015.

Exhibit B: Request to continue dated May 1, 2015 and received via email May 1, 2015.

Exhibit C: Report from Williamson Environmental LLC dated May 12, 2015 and received via email May 11, 2015.

Exhibit D: Request to continue dated May 28, 2015 and received via email May 28, 2015.

Exhibit E: Financial data received via email June 25, 2015

NEW BUSINESS

3. 190 Salisbury Street/0 Montvale Road (HC-2015-036)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness

Petitioner: American Antiquarian Society

Present Use: Museum

Year Built: Circa 1905

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRIND (National Register Individual Property), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area), and located in the Montvale Historic District

Petition Purpose:

- Repair/replace damaged stonewall and iron railing along Montvale Road from Salisbury Street to 0 Montvale Road.
- Replace damaged concrete stairs at 0 Montvale Road
- Replace drainage system and repave driveway at 190 Salisbury Street
- Replace damaged concrete stairs behind 190 Salisbury Street
- Landscaping improvements

Ellen Dunlap, Matthew Shakespeare, Susan Forgit, Andrew Cargilia and Michael Andre appeared on behalf of the application.

Ms. Dunlap stated that this is for the parking lot that is immediately adjacent to the Goddard Daniels House and showed the existing conditions of the parking lot.

Mr. Andre stated that the Goddard Daniels House is the main building and the parking is in the back area and the existing drainage is failing. They continue to have a problem with puddles and icing in the winter and his firm has designed a drainage collection system which consists of two small catch basins set in the ground settled on two low points and reviewed on a plan where they would be located. He stated that they would be on the back of the Carriage House and would tie into a manhole that was installed as part of the parking lot project last year on Park Avenue. He stated that they will repave the existing driveway and they would also like to create two more parking spaces.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the new drainage line proposed would require the removal of any trees. Mr. Andre stated that there are no trees in that proposed area.

Secretary McCann asked if the two extra parking spaces were necessary.

Ms. Dunlap stated that they would be an advantage for visitors to make the property more accessible to the public.

Secretary McCann stated that the spaces would not be his preference as not in keeping with original design of property. Ms. Dunlap stated that it is also a snow storage space.

Mr. Carglia stated they had hoped that location would be used for the extra snow storage.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked why removable fencing would be required. Ms. Dunlap stated that it is one of the snow push out areas and fence would be there but could be pulled out for the snow.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the retaining wall had to be reconstructed. Ms. Dunlap stated that they do not intend to if they don't have to.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would like to see more information on the fence. Ms. Dunlap stated that they could come back on that item.

Mr. Carglia stated that on the Montvale steps they intend to pull out and replace with granite and they will be similar to the 90 Park Avenue portion of the property. The wrought iron fence will be sent out to be sandblasted, repaired and they will bring the fence back to original. The wall is granite field stone and they intend to pull out entire length and propose to replace with material that is already there and they are going to replace the entire length of the wall with granite capstone.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the granite steps were going to be replaced with granite steps. Mr. Carglia stated that was correct.

Mr. Carglia stated that they also intend to rip up the city sidewalk and will replace afterwards.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 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 approved.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, 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: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver and Certificate of Appropriateness received May 28, 2015 and dated May 27, 2015.

4. 1 Drury Lane (HC-2015-037)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Present Use: College Building
Year Built: Circa 1914

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, and located in the Montvale Historic District, fka the Frank O Woodland-John Jeppson House

Petition Purpose:

- New patio, landscaping and landscape seating areas to be constructed
- Drainage repairs will be made to existing roof downspout connection points

Matt Mevera, Jeff Solomon, Alfred DiMauro and Tim Bedard from WPI appeared on behalf of the application

Mr. Mevera stated that this work is proposed for the WPI President's house.

Mr. Mevera stated that out the back of property there are just some steps and then it heads out to the landscaping area and their proposal is in two parts. One is drainage repairs that need to be done to the existing roof and they want to put the roof leaders on the outside of the house and tie into the existing stormwater line and that will help with flooding issues on the property and that is all subsurface. For the house they are just adding paving on the terrace that would provide outdoor dining and seating for events that WPI holds. The patio would be bordered by a new proposed wall with a granite cap. There would be some indirect lighting and some floodlights that would light the path and they are also proposing to redo the paving along the sidewalk. There would be no risers or ramps in the area. They will also demolish the existing concrete under the portico. They are also proposing to remove the overgrown landscaping and replace it with similar material. The materials would be a precast concrete paver so it simulates a stone look and the paver field would be banded by a granite band.

Commissioner Bloom asked if anything that is being changed is from the 1914 original or has this been an evolving project over the years. Mr. Mevera stated that his understanding is that this has been an evolving project over the years and the pavers are a pre-cast concrete paver and they plan to replace with granite.

Secretary McCann asked if the steps were part of the application. Mr. Mevera stated that they would like the option to do that.

Mr. Rolle stated that the advertisement was generic enough that they could include the steps.

Secretary McCann stated that the application stated that no changes to the building but replacing the steps although the granite will be an upgrade so it is a change.

Mr. Rolle stated he would leave it up to the Commission whether they consider the steps part of the patio.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that in the past they have included steps into the building as part of proposal and this is such a minor element and an upgrade and it is not a particularly historic element.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he did not believe the steps would even be original material.

Secretary McCann asked from Park Avenue what if any obstruction would be caused by this patio.

Mr. Mevera stated that the wall would be 18 inches above grade and doesn't believe it would obstruct the view.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the building sits much higher than Park Avenue so doesn't see there would much obstruction.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what would be the wall material. Mr. Mevera stated it would be a fieldstone and would match the adjacent walls but would have a granite cap.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if post hole would be placed in patio. Mr. Mevera stated that they are looking at different options for that.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked the handrail for the new proposed steps what would be the material. Mr. Mevera stated it would just be a black wrought iron fence.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 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 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: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver and Certificate of Appropriateness received May 28, 2015 and dated May 27, 2015.

5. 39 Litchfield Street (HC-2015-038)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Maritza Byran
Present Use: Three family residence
Year Built: Circa 1906
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed
Petition Purpose:

- Remove and replace vinyl siding on house and garage
- Install new exterior house wrap
- Remove and replace windows on third floor
- Remove existing roofing and roof framing
- Install engineered roof trusses
- Install 5/8” plywood sheathing over roof
- Remove and replace front and rear exterior doors
- Replace three exterior light fixtures
- Replace pressure treated decking and rails
- Replace screens on all windows, as necessary
- Install new gutters and downspouts

Michael Bonnett appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Bonnett stated that the building had a fire on the third floor and the majority of the framing for the roof is gone. It is all intact and only way to rebuild to code requirements is to rebuild the entire thing.

Secretary McCann asked if it was asphalt roof. Mr. Bonnett stated it was hip roof with asphalt shingles.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if Mr. Bonnett knew what was under the vinyl. Mr. Bonnett stated that he did not know.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what the window material was. Mr. Bonnett stated they were all vinyl replacement windows.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the soffits were still there. Mr. Bonnett stated he believed that they had all been removed.

Secretary McCann stated that it looks like they have been covered.

Secretary McCann stated that the siding, widows and soffits looked they had already been replaced in kind so does not see any problem with what is being proposed.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that even though the vinyl sided had been destroyed they still do not know what is under the vinyl and could be original clapboards.

Mr. Bonnett stated that a third of the house is melted and he cannot match that existing green color.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it historically looks like it was clapboard.

Secretary McCann stated that if it did have clapboard it probably have to be replaced due to fire damage.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the fire was only on the third floor.

Secretary McCann stated that they could ask applicant to keep any original sub-straight.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that they could ask that the siding be maintained and if any decorative brackets that they be maintained.

Mr. Bonnett stated that all the original decorative mouldings are long gone.

Secretary McCann stated that the motion they make will be that the applicant be allow to apply the product as requested but not allow for any further demolition of any material that is underneath and request is just to vinyl side.

Secretary McCann asked if applicant was just asking to cover over or do they intend to remove anything.

Mr. Bonnett stated that the intention is just to put over as basically they have to rebuild the house with insurance dollars and company doesn't take into account that there is multiple layers to deal with.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 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 approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received June 1, 2015 and dated June 1, 2015.

6. 108 Grove Street (HC-2015-039)

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	North Works Property Inc.
Present Use:	Commercial Building
Year Built:	Circa 1863
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District, NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area)
Petition Purpose:	Remove and replace windows on third floor

Eugene Mariani and Ellen Lowain.

Mr. Mariani stated that they would like to replace in kind the windows that are on the back of the building similar to what they have already done of the front of the building a few years ago.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked when the front window replacement had come before the Commission. Mr. Mariani stated that he was unsure as was different management company.

Secretary McCann stated that he did not recall the building coming before the Commission and he has been on Commission six or seven years.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the same profiles used previously would be used. Mr. Mariani stated that it will be.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if they are installing new windows. Mr. Mariani stated that they are because old ones are leaking.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if they are the last original windows. Mr. Mariani stated they were the last ones.

Commissioner Bloom asked how many panes would be in the replacement window. Mr. Mariani stated six.

Secretary McCann asked if all the windows are visible from Prescott Street. Mr. Mariani stated that they weren't because it was somewhat blocked by other buildings.

Secretary McCann stated that he is always in favor of a consistent design instead of having a muddled look and understands the applicant is just trying to have a consistent look so would not have an issue with the petition.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would agree with Secretary McCann.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 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 approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received June 1, 2015 and dated May 29, 2015.

7. 258 Pleasant Street (HC-2015-040)

Petition: Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Steven McElwee
Present Use: Restaurant
Year Built: Circa 1925
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, located in Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose: Installation of mural

Christopher Bettencourt appeared on behalf of the application.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that this item had appeared before the Commission before and was approved but this is an entirely new application and because the mural is proposed within the Crown Hill Local Historic District, the Historical Commission has to decide whether it is appropriate for the district or not.

Mr. Bettencourt stated that he would like to install a mural and that he is putting up the funds for the mural, which would be painted on the foundation of the Newbury Street side of The Raven nightclub, located at 256-258 Pleasant St. He stated that the mural is to depict local musicians and performers who came out of the Crown Hill area.

Mr. Bettencourt stated that originally he was working with the Crown Hill Neighborhood Association and was supposed to cover the entire length of the foundation - roughly 100 feet long - depicting various historical and cultural characteristics of the neighborhood and the mural would now only cover 60 feet along the Newbury Street foundation.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked how the mural will be applied and who would be the artist. Mr. Bettencourt stated it would be painted by artist Tom Grady.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the content of this design has changed from the original proposal and does not have a specific image related to Crown Hill.

Mr. Bettencourt stated that one image he provided does show the performers in front of a house. Commissioner Bloom stated that was harder to see on what was being presented and was hoping to see some stronger connection to Crown Hill.

Secretary McCann stated that the Commission's purview is whether the mural is appropriate for the district so while the Commission may be interested in the content this is a private business owner trying to make his business look better and not sure the content is any of the Commission's business.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would slightly disagree as the application is for a Certificate of Appropriateness and does think content is appropriate for their review and his problem is that this is an artistic endeavor and the quality of the painting is not being presented and all they have photos so he doesn't get a feel for the artist's hand or style and he cannot tell whether this would be appropriate for the district and would need a real solid sketch from the artist. He stated that he is fine with the content but can't tell if it is appropriate without all the information.

Commissioner Holley asked how the mural will be maintained. Mr. Bettencourt stated that what is on there will stay on there and if someone were to tag it he would have to pay for the artist to come back and fix it.

Mr. Rolle stated that the applicant is part of the mural program and will have a wall easement with the City of Worcester and will enter into a memorandum of understanding with the City of Worcester regarding the specific upkeep of the mural.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what mural is put up would it be protected as much as the building and if applicant wanted to remove mural would he have to come back before Commission.

Mr. Rolle stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness application would be required if there is a change.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he really likes the project but there is just not enough detail and would like a more finite representation of what the mural is going to look like.

Commissioner Bjork stated that seeing the artist's other examples would be helpful in making a decision.

Secretary McCann stated that he has no issue with the mural as is and thinks it is a very subjective question to ask for examples of artist work to determine whether he has enough ability to put up the mural.

Vice-Chair Shveda and Commissioner Bloom stated that their problem isn't with the artist's ability but with the style and the general aesthetic of the mural and whether it appropriate for the district.

Secretary McCann stated that he thinks it be difficult to define appropriateness for an artist style.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he does understand Secretary McCann's point of view but needs more detail.

Commissioner Bloom stated that seeing an example would be helpful.

Mr. Bettencourt asked what would they need for an example.

Commissioner Kurtz stated that he would like to see examples of other murals that the artist has done.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he would be judging the ability of the artist and if he could see other examples of his work he could make a decision.

Commissioner Bloom stated that working with as much information as possible would be helpful in making a decision.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that they could continue this item for two weeks in order that the applicant could come back with more details. Mr. Bettencourt stated that he would prefer the item be voted on.

Mr. Rolle stated that this item had gone to City Council and a memorandum of agreement still needs to be drafted and signed and most likely would not be completed until after the next Historical Commission meeting.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked Mr. Bettencourt if he was under any time constraints. Mr. Bettencourt stated that he was as the artist has to go back to teaching.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what was the proposed completion date of the project. Mr. Bettencourt stated the end of August.

Mr. Bettencourt stated that he would prefer the Commission vote on the item.

Mr. Rolle stated the options would be the Commission could vote on the item the paperwork from the memorandum of agreement would still need to be finalized if it is approved. The item could be continued or if the application is denied the applicant could reapply with a new application and have some new evidence as to why the application should be approved.

William Belcher, local resident, stated that he does support the mural but not enough detail has been provided and Commission should not vote on item until they receive all the necessary details.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 3-3 (Secretary McCann, Commissioner Devon Kurtz and Commissioner Randolph Bloom voting for and Vice-Chair Shveda, Commissioner Karl Bjork and Commissioner Cheryll Holley voting against) that the petition was appropriate for the district. The motion failed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was denied.

Exhibit A: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness received June 2, 2015 and dated May 29, 2015.

OTHER BUSINESS

HC-2014-068-Request to substitute painted aluminum for copper for project at 35 Hamilton Street

Father Reidy and Ralph Berthiaume appeared on behalf of the request.

Father Reidy stated that they had come before the Commission last year on a request and they would like to change one item and that is to substitute painted aluminum for copper due to the cost involved and the aluminum will be painted to look like copper. He stated that nine church properties have had copper stolen off them in the last several years and the cost to install copper exceeded their budget projections.

The Commission stated that they had reviewed this item last year and it was approved under an economic hardship so they would need to vote on the item as an economic hardship.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bloom the Commission voted 6-0 that the request to use copper for 35 Hamilton Street was an economic hardship and will allow the substitution of painted aluminum.

Exhibit A: Letter from Diocese of Worcester dated June 17, 2015 and received June 17, 2015.

Communications Received:

- a.** Letter from Attorney Mark Donahue re: WPI Alumni Gymnasium received June 12, 2015 via email requesting informational hearing for WPI Alumni Gymnasium.

Samatha McDonald, Jeff Solomn, Alfred DiMauro and Jim Bedard appeared on behalf of the item.

Ms. McDonald stated that they are just here informally about a project and just wanted to receive some feedback on what is being proposed.

Mr. DiMauro stated the building was constructed in 1918 and the building has now been vacant for the past three years over the past nine years they have done several studies about what could be done with the building and the conclusion is that the best use would be to demolish the building and put up a new building for academic use and would provide a more useful building and would tie into their campus master plan.

The Commission stated that the applicant would need to apply for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver that the Commission could review and would recommend that the applicant provide the studies they have done as back up in order for the Commission to make a decision.

- b.** Letter from Epsilon Association requesting determination of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places for Saint Joseph's Home for Working Girls at 52 High Street received May 29, 2015 and dated May 29, 2015.

Brian Lever from Epsilon Associates appeared on behalf of the request.

Mr. Lever stated that the vast majority of the interior and exterior of the building remains true to its original construction and materials with only some minor changes having been made over the years.

Mr. Rolle stated that this building is a representation of a group home run by a charitable organization established in Worcester during the early 20th century in response to the rapid influx of immigrants during the Industrial Era.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated this is wonderful example of how to take care of a building.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to approve a Letter of Support.

- c.** Letter from MacRostie Historic Advisors, LLC, re: 18 Chestnut Street received June 12, 2015 and dated June 11, 2015.

Mr. Rolle stated that this building is significant as it was developed as a building for the insurance industry which has been very important to Worcester's history and one of the few remaining prominent commercial buildings located west of Main Street.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to approve a Letter of Support.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m.