

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

August 20, 2015

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Kevin Provencher, Chair
Andres Shveda, Vice-Chair
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Randolph Bloom
Robyn Conroy
Cheryll Holley

Commission Members Absent: Devon Kurtz
Karl Bjork, Alternate

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

Approval of the Minutes: 8/6/2015-Held

OLD BUSINESS

1. 80 Pleasant Street (HC-2015-047)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Spiro Giannopoulos
Present Use: Mixed Use Building
Year Built: Circa 1870
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, fka Ripley Block
Petition Purpose: Demolish building

Spiro Giannopoulos appeared on behalf of the application. He stated that he is looking to demolish one of the of the four row houses at 80 Pleasant Street as the building had a fire in March 2015 and the Department Inspectional Services issued an order to him requiring him to make repairs to the building. Mr. Giannopoulos stated that he has been trying to sell the property and had some interested parties in it but they bailed out as they could not get financing.

Secretary McCann stated that much of this building remains intact from when it was originally built and has a lot of architectural value and it would be a loss for the city if the building is razed.

Commissioner Bloom stated that this is one of the more unusual apartments buildings in the city and a rare survivor from the second half of the 19th century so he would not want to see it torn down.

Deborah Packard from Preservation Worcester urged the Commission not to approve the waiver in order to give the owner more time to see if he can sell the property as opposed to demolishing it as this building is an asset to the city.

All the Commission members agreed that the building had historical value even though it is in need of repairs.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Giannopoulos was presenting a case for economic hardship and had data for that request.

Mr. Giannopoulos stated that there are Historical Grants available and that would be the type of financing he would be looking to obtain and hopefully in the next year he can either obtain a grant or market the property.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 0-6 that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was denied.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated June 16, 2015 and received June 16, 2015.

Exhibit B: Request to postpone item dated July 1, 2015 and received July 1, 2015.

Exhibit C: Letter from Norton Remmer dated July 31, 2015 and received August 20, 2015

2. 200 Institute Road (Alumni Gym) (HC-2015-053)

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Present Use:	Vacant Gymnasium
Year Built:	Circa 1916, with additions in 1928, 1958, 1968
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed
Petition Purpose:	Demolish building

Jeff Solomon, Samantha McDonald, Alfred DiMauro and Maureen Cavaunagh appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Solomon stated that they are requesting a waiver of the one year building demolition delay to meet the needs of the campus. They would like to demolish the Alumni gym to make way for the construction of a \$45 million innovation center. The innovation center is envisioned as becoming a flagship building for the WPI campus with many unique functions. It would be for academic purposes and student housing.

Mr. Solomon stated that the building was built in 1916 and has been vacant for the past few years after WPI opened its new Sports and Recreation Center in 2012. He stated that the building is considered obsolete for many modern-day academic and recreation uses because of its many deficiencies and limited infrastructure.

Secretary McCann asked why there was a rush to demolish the building now.

He stated that WPI is working with an architect for the innovation center building project and stated that the architect is expected to be selected by the end of September but in the meantime the college wants to get started on doing necessary abatement work inside Alumni Gym before the demolition can begin and he stated that WPI is seeking the delay waiver now so the demolition could take place within the year and construction of the new building can begin right after and if the waiver was not approved the delay would lengthen the construction timetable for the new building and possibly lead to higher construction costs down the road.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what would be the construction cost for the new building.

Mr. Solomon stated \$45 million and that would include the cost to demolish the building.

Mr. Solomon stated that they have done several feasibility studies during the past decade to try and identify potential re-uses of the building but it was eventually determined it would not be fiscally responsible for the college to invest \$18.4 million needed to renovate Alumni Gym as such an investment would yield at the most only about 19,000 square feet of usable space, equating into roughly just a 53% efficiency of the building space while the new innovation center is expected to have 40,000 square feet of usable space with residential uses above the academic portion of the building and stated that they did not feel an investment of \$18 million into the building will not meet the needs of students, staff and WPI and they don't want to make an investment that doesn't make sense especially with a 100 year old building.

Mr. Solomon stated that they have also discussed the project with Preservation Worcester and they have no objection to the demolition.

Mr. DiMauro stated that that the college fully recognizes the Alumni Gym's historical and architectural significance and went to great lengths to find alternative uses for it and stated that this is something that they do not take lightly and they have worked on this for 10 years to try and find a solution.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the building could be seen from Park Avenue as believed it was contained inside the campus.

Mr. DiMauro stated that it is inside the campus and not visible from Salisbury Street or Park Avenue.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that WPI has done its due diligence and has done years of studies and asked if WPI looked at saving any small portions of the existing building.

Mr. DiMauro stated that they are working with their archivists and looking at opportunities of what could be saved and re-used in the new building but they have not determined how that will be done.

Chair Provencher stated that he sees the need for additional classroom space and housing but asked if WPI had other areas where these needs could be met.

Mr. Solomon stated that all of their other buildings are occupied and this is a vacant building that is underutilized so it would be a perfect space for the Innovation Building.

Chair Provencher stated that it made sense but WPI has buildings off their campus so doesn't know the compelling need to place these programmatic needs at this location.

Mr. Solomon stated that most of the programs are on the main campus and given the fact that most of the residence halls are on the quad and most of the programs are in the area the conclusion was that since they have a building that they weren't using and that this building in a central location it would be the perfect place for the Innovation Building.

Commissioner Conroy stated that this is a tough one as building is historic but she understands the university's space constraints and stated that she was trying to think of this as economic hardship but based on the numbers she does not see it.

Mr. Solomon stated that they are not seeking the economic hardship argument.

Ms. McDonald stated that the building as it stands now is over 100 years old and it is not being used so you have a prime space in the middle of the institute and one of the things the City is trying to do is draw students into the fabric of the city and if this is built off campus it will be detrimental to the city as a whole.

Chair Provencher stated that the Historical Commission's purview is limited and they are looking at what is the historic value of the existing building and whether allowing WPI to demolish the building would be detrimental to the City of Worcester.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the decision would be easier for him if they have more information of what was going onto the site.

Chair Provencher stated that he would like more detail on what the gym is going to be replaced with as once they give permission to let a structure be demolished it is gone forever and would like to see some renderings and elevations of what the new building will look like and knows that would take time and at this point he would not be comfortable approving this without knowing what it is being replaced with.

Ms. McDonald stated that she believed the purpose was very clear. They need an Innovation Center and they hope to include some residences on top as well.

Secretary McCann stated that he has no doubt it would be a nice building but believes it should be on the periphery of the campus.

Commissioner Bloom stated that they have not discussed the aesthetic value of the current building and just because it 100 years old doesn't mean it is architecturally significant.

Secretary McCann stated that from architectural value Commissioner Bloom may be correct but the fact that it is 100 years old makes it have historic value.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would agree but not all old buildings need to be saved.

Chair Provencher stated that what the Commission typically discusses is the architectural value of about what is existing.

Commissioner Bloom stated that they need to know how architecturally significant the building is.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the denial of the application would cause a hardship.

Mr. Solomon stated that it would be significant impact if they needed to wait.

Secretary McCann stated that where the building will be placed will not be the most efficient use of space and you are going to lose something from the fabric of the campus.

Mr. Solomon stated that it is the perfect location as it would serve the rest of the campus and they do have a lot of older buildings on campus but this one doesn't fit their needs and they spent several years determining that.

Chair Provencher stated that from his perspective he doesn't have a sense of what this building would look like and asked if WPI had a time frame of when they have concept of the new building.

Mr. Solomon stated that they are interviewing architects and expect to be in construction in 9-12 months.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if any portion of this building was visible from the public way.

Mr. Solomon stated that on Institute Road at a certain point when their no foliage you may be able to see the building.

Jo Hart stated that if they are going to build a building they should build with the newer buildings and Worcester has loss significant properties because they don't care and she doesn't believe Historic Commission should be concerned with what it is being replaced with as it about the loss of the property not the replacement.

Barrett Morgan stated that WPI should build a cutting edge building on the campus.

Deborah Packard stated that members of Preservation Worcester did tour the building and they feel like the use of the building now is something that the college needs due to the new rec center and felt WPI did its due diligence in trying to find a new use for the building.

Susan Ceccaci stated that she thinks the building is well constructed and wondered if WPI could keep two walls of the building and innovate within that existing structure adding perhaps westward so the face of the building survives on the campus.

Chair Provencher stated that they had received a letter from Walter Henrtize relative to the project.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 4-2 (Kevin Provencher and Timothy McCann 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.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated June 30, 2015 and received June 30, 2015.

Exhibit B: Supporting Documents dated August 10, 2015 and received August 10, 2015.

The Commission took a five minute recess.

NEW BUSINESS

3. 14 Goulding Street (HC-2015-057)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Petitioner: VF Properties East LLC

Present Use: Multi Residential Building

Year Built: Circa 1880

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed

Petition Purpose:

- Remove/replace existing asphalt shingle roof
- Install ice/water shields, 8' drip edge, and flashing on chimney

Leonard Vairo appeared on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Vairo stated that the roof is leaking and he wants to replace the roof.

Mr. Vairo stated that they are only replacing on top where it is leaking and will keep the same shingle design.

Commissioner Bloom stated that with a mansard roof it is very difficult to see it from the street.

Chair Provencher stated that based on the images presented and based on the date of the property it is obvious that this isn't the original roof.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if any repairs to the chimney would be done. Mr. Vairo responded that they will do some repointing.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Conroy the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed demolition with the addition of the repointing of the chimney 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 dated July 20, 2015 and received July 20, 2015

4. 36 Sever Street (HC-2015-060)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Petitioner: Patrick & Nicole DiCello

Present Use: Single Family residence

Year Built: Circa 1886

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, fka Edward W Lincoln House

Petition Purpose:

- Replace four casement windows with aluminum clad wood double hung windows
- Add a wood screen door to front door

Patrick & Nicole DiCello appeared on behalf of the item.

Ms. DiCello stated that they are looking to replace four of the windows on the second floor as they no longer close properly and they are rotting at the top and provided photos of current windows and stated that she wants to replace with aluminum clad as they are more practical.

Secretary McCann asked where windows were located. Ms. DiCello stated that they are on the side of the house.

Secretary McCann asked how she would frame in the double hung windows.

Ms. DiCello stated that there is a wall in between each window.

Chair Provencher asked if each rough opening would be replaced with a double hung window. Ms. DiCello stated yes.

Chair Provencher stated that the look will be a departure from the look that is on the home now.

Ms. DiCello stated that they will eventually be replacing the storm windows but that would be at a future date and she would come back before the Commission.

The Commission stated that the applicant would not need to come back before the Commission for that.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the replacement if the double hung windows may reduce the amount of air circulation.

Ms. DiCello stated that they intend to keep windows as close as possible to original but these windows are in rough shape so they need to be replaced.

Chair Provencher stated that the application also mentions a screen door. Ms. DiCello stated that they are adding the door as there isn't one now on house. Chair Provencher stated that would not need to be heard by the Commission then as it an addition.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that only item of concern is that in the back up material in the application it stated that there was a plan to do vinyl siding. Ms. DiCello stated that is in the future and they plan to come back before the Commission in four or five years for that.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that his concern is that the gable edge is the vertical face of the building and roof come to a razor sharp edge and very distinct and you cannot get that with vinyl so that would be a hard sell for Commission.

Chair Provencher stated that item is not on agenda so the Commission cannot discuss and the applicant can come back at a future date for that.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed demolition with the addition of the repointing of the chimney 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 dated July 15, 2015 and received July 23, 2015

5. 45 Grand Street (aka 30 Wyman Street) (HC-2015-061)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Crystal Park Limited Partnership
Present Use: Multi Unit Building
Year Built: Circa 1909
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRMRA (National Multiple Resource Area) and fka Worcester Corset Company & Factory

Petition Purpose:

- Remove and replace windows
- Restoration of Doors

Stewart Gregerman, Carey Mansiello and Bob Quinn appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Gregerman stated that the project is for the removal and replacement of 711 wood windows with replicant aluminum windows approved by the National Parks and there are also 112 windows and twelve doors that will be removed and refurbished and the windows being refurbished are not in the units and they are in common areas and stairwells and the reason they are doing those as replacements is they are no longer efficient and are rotted and have no thermal factor and the new windows meet the stretch code and their company takes great pains to make sure the products going back in are historic and energy efficient.

Mr. Gregerman stated that the project is receiving federal and state credits and they took great care to duplicate the brick mold and presented some photos of what is planned.

Chair Provencher asked how the screen is applied.

Mr. Gregerman stated that it on the inside.

Mr. Gregerman stated that the other concerns were egress and security as the windows on the ground floor could be kicked in as they are old and next to the sidewalk and they are addressing that with the National Parks.

Chair Provencher stated that the cover letter references the removal and replacement of the existing windows but does not mention demolition of the existing buck, casement, brick mold or header.

Mr. Gregerman stated that the brick mold does come off and will fit over the buck of the original window and the original arches and casings will stay.

Chair Provencher asked if original window has weights and pulleys.

Mr. Gregerman stated that they do.

Chair Provencher stated that the window sits in the masonry opening and doesn't change the site line. Mr. Gregerman stated that it will change a little but National Parks has approved.

Chair Provencher asked since the owner is receiving federal and state tax credits if it has to meet the National Parks Standards. Mr. Gregerman responded yes.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the color of the window being presented is going to be the one used and Mr. Gregerman feels that was what the color was in 1909. Mr. Gregerman stated that is what the architects and the National Parks Service believe and they were the ones who came up with the colors and the finish.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that there are some awning windows and asked if the openings are what are existing. Mr. Gregerman stated that those are new and they aren't touching them.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked about windows on the old power generation portion of the plan and stated there are some fan top windows on that portion. Mr. Gregerman stated that those windows will be refurbished in place.

Commissioner Bloom stated that it looks like a lot of work to make sure these windows will look like they did 100 years ago.

Chair Provencher stated that there also some roof work done.

Ms. Mansiello stated that the roof work was already done and they had received a building permit but all the original copper flashing was not touched and original crown moulding is still existing and it is a rubber membrane roof.

Secretary McCann stated that they will need to vote on retroactive approval for the roof.

Chair Provencher stated that not sure how that happened as Inspectional Services usually flags the historical ones and lets applicant know it is historical.

Secretary McCann asked if staff could check with Inspectional Services and maybe there was multiple addresses for the location.

Mr. Rolle stated that staff would follow up.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the doors and transom above the main entry door were being refurbished. Mr. Gregerman stated that they are being refurbished.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed demolition including retroactive approval of the roof replacement 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 dated July 27, 2015 and received July 27, 2015.

6. 80 William Street (HC-2015-062)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Becker College
Present Use: Academic Building
Year Built: Circa 1909
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRMRA (National Multiple Resource Area) and fka John Woodman Higgins House

Petition Purpose:

- (1) Patch/repair existing clay roof tiles and flashing with matching materials, where required;
- (2) Remove/reuse copper and bronze gutters, downspouts and conductors; replace with like materials, where required;
- (3) Remove/replace all dormer windows and frames;
- (4) Repair/recaulk/repaint elliptical windows (east elevation);
- (5) Repair leaded glass window (east elevation);
- (6) Replace all windows and doors with aluminum clad units (except leaded glass units or unless otherwise noted);
- (7) Repair/replace trim to match existing;
- (8) Repair/patch all stucco to match existing, where required;
- (9) Repair/replace/repaint all shutters
- (10) Remove/replace garage doors with new custom window and paneled door façade with stile & rail frames to resemble existing carriage house doors; and

- (11) Demolish east garden wall and house basement stair to construct a 1,600 SF two story additions and pergola structure using materials to match existing
- (12) New addition linking house and carriage house
- (13) New accessible entrance and student patios
- (14) Removal and replacement of doors and windows along the facades

William Masiello and David Ellis appeared on behalf of the item.

Chair Provencher stated that this project had come before the Commission before.

Mr. Masiello stated that was correct but work did not commence within the one year period. They have made some changes to the project as they intend to make the addition larger and the addition goes toward the other side of the property and does connect the main house with the carriage house with a flat connector to the carriage house side and one the existing house.

Mr. Masiello stated that they also want to want to create a new accessible entrance and patio which was part of their last proposal but really wasn't discussed at that time.

Chair Provencher stated that scope looked similar to what was approved before.

Mr. Masiello stated that it was but the addition being requested now is a bit larger.

Chair Provencher asked if funding was available now to begin the project.

Mr. Ellis stated that it was and that is why they would like to go forward with the project now.

Secretary McCann asked how much larger was the addition than what was approved in 2013.

Mr. Masiello stated that the addition in 2013 was 1600 SF and now it is 3200 SF and the additional SF that was added since the 2013 design is not open to public view.

Commissioner Bloom asked if he was standing on the street could he see the addition. Mr. Masiello responded that he would not be able to.

Secretary McCann asked if there were any other changes since the 2013 presentation besides the increased size of the addition.

Mr. Masiello stated that they are redesigning the patio and handicapped curb cut.

Secretary McCann asked if any removal of any original windows in the historic portion of the house.

Mr. Masiello stated that yes that is part of the request.

Secretary McCann stated that portion was denied in 2013 and asked what has changed since then.

Mr. Masiello stated that nothing and showed renderings of what was proposed in 2013 and what is now being proposed in 2015.

Commissioner Bloom stated that his concern would be that the surrounding area on William and Roxbury are residential and what is being proposed for the connector looks commercial opposed to residential.

Mr. Masiello stated that his argument is that it is natural material and they can argue all day what is residential and what isn't and what they are trying to do is develop something that is appropriate for the college and their purpose to get students to come to the college.

Secretary McCann asked if there have been any increase in size in the connection from the main house to the connector.

Mr. Maseillo stated that the two story dimensional piece of it has not changed.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission had received a letter from an abutter at 12 Somerset Street that she expressed her concern that if the work was not approved that Becker may eventually sell the property and she had concern that a potential buyer may not have the funds to maintain it and did not have any concerns about the design.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked how many openings were being infilled.

Mr. Masiello stated about half a dozen.

Secretary McCann asked what the roofing material would be on the addition would be.

Mr. Masiello stated that it be a standing seam roof.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if they were obtaining federal tax credits. Mr. Masiello stated that they were not.

Secretary McCann asked what would be the siding material on the addition.

Mr. Masiello stated limestone, natural aged copper and metal.

Chair Provencher stated that in 2013 there was some disagreement about removal and replacement of doors and windows and that seems to have been the key issue and a lot of this is patching and replacing in kind and they usually don't have issue with that but from the minutes of 2013 there was a split vote on the doors and windows and Commission should review that topic.

Mr. Masiello showed renderings of where the doors and windows are located and stated that the windows are in need of repair and have lead and there is substantial rot on the doors and they like to remove the doors with an aluminum clad.

Chair Provencher asked if the French doors wood single glazed. Mr. Masiello responded yes.

Chair Provencher asked if they are in need of replacement.

Mr. Masiello stated that Becker would like to replace with something with lower maintenance but they will leave the jams and casing.

Chair Provencher asked about the front door.

Mr. Masiello stated that would be sanded, patched and repainted as that was in good condition.

Mr. Masiello stated that the four double hung would be replaced and that would change the site line.

Chair Provencher asked about the French doors in the entry.

Mr. Masiello stated that there are three French doors that are pretty hazardous and what they would like to do is replace with a tempered glass but the profile would be the same.

Chair Provencher asked about the dormer windows.

Mr. Masiello stated that those windows are not original and are from the 1970s.

Mr. Masiello stated on the Roxbury Street side stated that the existing elliptical top will be maintained and the door on the roof will be maintained. The double hungs would be the ones that they want to replace and the windows on dormer have failed but aren't original windows.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the double hung would make the building look different.

Mr. Masiello stated that the site line would be different and showed renderings on what it would look like.

Chair Provencher stated that the proportion of glass to frame would get a littler smaller.

Mr. Masiello stated that is due to how the replacement windows would work without changing the opening.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it is very difficult to replace a window as there is structure that has to remain and in order for the window to be manufactured it needs to be framed so you are taking a manufactured windows and trying to put it in an existing opening so the window opening will always get a little smaller.

Mr. Masiello stated that they are only talking about the windows that are in the public view.

Secretary McCann stated that since this is a corner lot he is not sure what is considered visible from the public way and believes the two rear sides of L aren't but on the back side of the L's the gables are visible.

In regard to the garage doors Mr. Masiello stated that that they are in poor condition and they want to replace them and presented photos of what was being proposed and stated that they will replace them with three doors similar but they would like the center panel to be glass similar to the upper panes and they would be garage doors.

Chair Provencher asked about the shutters.

Mr. Masiello stated that they want to repair and replace what is there as it was part of the original house.

Chair Provencher asked how disruptive it would be making the connections between the addition of the existing house and the carriage house.

Mr. Masiello stated that they are making an expansion joint between both buildings as each building is consider historically significant so they were able to obtain a waiver from Mass Historical on the building code as that is important as they do not want to touch the structure.

Chair Provencher asked if the overall roofline of the house and Carriage house would look the same. Mr. Masiello stated that it will.

Chair Provencher stated that in 2013 members discussed window replacement and some members wanted to retain existing windows and believes that is why there was split vote in 2013.

Secretary McCann stated that he doesn't want to see the windows lost and there are ways to restore the windows and still have them be energy efficient and he thinks it would be a great loss to the building especially with the addition of the connector as it will be a dramatic change from the original building and what was proposed in 2013 and thinks maintaining more of the historic material in the main building would go a long way in maintaining the character as it will dramatically change with the addition.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that while losing a portion of material from the building he feels that the inclusion of storm windows is more detrimental to the aesthetic of the building and while he agrees with Secretary McCann he believes that they are saving the most important windows and the ones that are unique and the more functional operational windows he can see them being replaced without being a substantial loss to the building.

Mr. Masiello stated that the most difficult thing is to make the windows energy efficient is the pocket jams.

Secretary McCann stated that with the use of friction jams you could fill the weight pockets and you could use other methods and still have operable windows.

Mr. Masiello stated that Becker has an excellent record of keeping up the properties in the neighborhood.

Secretary McCann stated that this property is a truly unique home, a architecturally important and historic home, as the owner was one of the most important people in his days so he believes it is important to maintain the windows for this structure and Becker has the means to maintain the property and still reach its energy efficient requirements for the building.

Commissioner Conroy stated that she feels like Secretary McCann and would hate to see all the work and detail disappear.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it not really disappearing as they aren't talking about all the windows and the ones that are really visually appealing those are being refurbished.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he still has concern about the design as it takes a residential neighborhood and makes it look commercial.

Chair Provencher stated that this application is in not in a local historic district so they would need to frame the discussion around the Building Demolition Delay Waiver but asked if Mr. Masiello would like to respond.

Mr. Masiello stated that at this time he would not but reiterated that they will be using natural materials.

Chair Provencher asked where the accessible entrance to the facility would be located. Mr. Masiello showed on the rendering where the entrance would be located.

Chair Provencher stated then that the public entrance would be through the entrance at grade. Mr. Masiello stated that would be correct.

Chair Provencher stated that they can take break up the request and make separate motions as the most concern was about the windows.

Mr. Masiello stated that they weren't necessarily asking for that.

Mr. Masiello stated that they were encapsulated in the addition but they have two choices, they could take them out or leave them right in the wall.

Chair Provencher stated that it not specifically called out in the application but think it is in implied based on the design drawings that would occur.

Deborah Packard from Preservation Worcester stated that she sent a letter to Becker College in 2013 explaining Preservation Worcester's position about the windows and one of the things in

the letter was that architect Bill Masiello noted that the cost of replacing the windows far exceeded the cost to repair and asked if that still the case.

Mr. Masiello stated that he believed so and it is the long term maintenance cost that is the tradeoff.

Ms. Packard stated that the doors are an important part of the building and would encourage the Commission to deny that portion of the application.

Mr. Masiello stated that the main entry doors would be preserved and maintained.

Commissioner Conroy stated that he believed Ms. Packard was referring to the French doors.

Susan Ceccaci stated that she feels strongly that the existing windows should be repaired and the doors if they are so far gone should be repaired or replaced in kind.

Pasquala Taranto stated that Becker is a good neighbor but he and his wife have concern about light pollution as it will be a two story building.

Mr. Masiello showed Mr. Taranto the renderings of what was proposed.

Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed demolition detailed items #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, #12 and #13 of the application 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 reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 2-4 (Kevin Provencher, Timothy McCann, Randolph Bloom and Robyn Conroy voting against) that proposed demolition detailed in items #6, & #14 of the application would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was denied.

Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the removal and replacement of the windows on the north & west portions of the interior L of the main house would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester because they are not under the Historical Commission's purview and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated July 24, 2015 and received July 27, 2015.

OTHER BUSINESS

7. CLG Annual Report – Fiscal 2015

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the report as submitted.

8. Preservation Plan Historical Commission representatives

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 6-0 to appoint Commissioner Cheryl Holley and Commissioner Randy Bloom as representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.