

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

October 29, 2015

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Kevin Provencher, Chair (arrived at 6:08 p.m.)
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Robyn Conroy
Randolph Bloom
Devon Kurtz
Cheryll Holley, Alternate

Commission Members Absent: Andrew Shveda, Vice-Chair
Karl Bjork, Alternate

Staff Members Present: Stephen Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Marlyn Feliciano, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

The meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m. by Clerk Timothy McCann.

Approval of the Minutes: 8/6/2015, 10/1/2015, 10/15/2015

The minutes for August 6, 2015 were tabled because there was not a quorum of members present to vote on them.

Upon a motion by Mr. Bloom and seconded by Mr. Kurtz, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the minutes for the October 1, 2015 meeting.

Upon a motion by Ms. Conroy and seconded by Ms. Holley, the Board voted 4-0 (Mr. Kurtz was not present at that meeting) to approve the minutes for the October 15, 2015 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Worcester City Hall-Installation of Cameras - Request for Letter of Support

Matthew Urban, Energy and Asset Management Division, stated that the City of Worcester is requesting support from the Historical Commission with their application before the Massachusetts Historical Commission to install three additional security cameras on the exterior of the building. Two would be installed in the front in the upper corner of the window cavity of the window furthest to the left and further to the right. In the back side of the building they plan to install a pivotal camera in the northeast corner of the building to get a better view of the common, the oval, and the rear plaza. The bodies of the cameras can be painted to match the exterior material that it is mounted on. These cameras would be hard to see from the ground.

Mr. McCann asked how they will be affixed to the building.

Mr. Urban stated that they have two options: they can anchor them to the granite or to the upper sash of the windows. They are leaning towards the window sash because it is easier to repair wood if these need to be moved or replaced in the future than it is to repair granite. Mr. Urban explained to the Commission the size and installation requirements.

Mr. McCann stated that he prefers that these are installed on the window sash and not on the granite and that they be painted to match, although the commission can't compel him to paint it any particular color since they do not have purview over that as it is outside of a local historic district.

Mr. Urban stated that they will only affix to the masonry if the manufacturer requires all four screws to be used for installation in order to allow for the 3 year warranty.

Jo Hart, Worcester, stated that they should look at other locations like the flag poles to install the cameras instead of damaging the building.

Upon a motion by Ms. Conroy and seconded by Mr. Bloom, the Commission voted 5-0 to provide the letter of support to City Hall for installation of 3 security cameras.

2. Worcester County Courthouse, 2 Main Street - Presentation of the Proposed Redevelopment

Mr. Rolle stated that they will not be hearing this item tonight. It will be heard on November 12, 2015 and the materials on the matter will be distributed to the Board ahead of that.

3. 264 Highland Street (HC-2015-075)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Diane & Robert Surette
Present Use: Single Family Residence
Year Built: 1885
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area)

Petition Purpose:

- Repair Roof
- Remove and replace porch ceiling

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: November 8, 2015

Robert Surette stated that a large chunk of ice come down and it took the porch roof down. It punctured the understructure and will require that they remove the under ceiling and replace it. He intends to replace it with the tongue and groove made out of white pine similar to what's existing. Mr. Surette stated that the porch roof will also have to be

completely replaced because there are three layers of rolled roofing on it now. He plans to rubber roof it due to the flat pitch of the roof.

Mr. Bloom stated that his concern is with the black line that will be visible all around the porch structure. Mr. Surette stated that if visible they will re-trim the outer edge because of damage but it wasn't original anyway and he can always paint it to match the house and cover the rubber rolled roofing.

Upon a motion by Ms. Conroy and seconded by Ms. Holley, the Commission voted 5-0 that the changes proposed are not detrimental to the architectural or historic resources of the City.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application for 264 Highland Street; dated and received September 24, 2015.

Exhibit B: MACRIS listing for 264 Highland Street.

4. 904 Main Street (HC-2015-077)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Petitioner: Hampton Properties LLC

Present Use: Two Family Residence

Year Built: 1885 fka Alexander Bigelow House

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed

Petition Purpose:

- Remove and replace asphalt shingles on main roof, porches and dormers
- Remove and replace cedar shingles on all dormers
- Enlarge existing dormer on the rear of the house
- Remove rear partition and shed roof

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: November 15, 2015

Russell Haims, Hampton properties, LLC, stated that he is looking to replace the asphalt three-tab roof, which is not original. He wants to enlarge a dormer that's located at the back of the house. The reason he wants to do that is because there is living space on the third floor, constructed by the previous owner, but in order to be able to use it the Building department requires that natural light windows be installed in order to make the space livable. Rather than make two additional dormers he prefers to extend the existing one to the right and to the left to provide the natural light.

Mr. Haims stated that the chimney has been repointed and re-leaded. Mr. McCann stated that should be part of the petition. Mr. Rolle stated that that work can be deemed repair by the Building Commissioner but its minor enough that the Commission can add it to the petition and vote on the matter.

Mr. McCann stated that he wanted to add that to the petition and stated that the applicant should take great pains to match the mortar joints in size, depth, and color.

Chair Provencher arrived at 6:08 pm.

Mr. Haims stated that when extending the dormer they will keep the same pitch and height and mimic the decorative aspects.

Mr. Bloom asked if the dormer can be seen from the street. Mr. Haims stated that since the house is on a corner it can be seen from the side street but not from Main Street.

Mr. Provencher stated that according to the drawings provided he wasn't sure how the dormer extension would work when coming to the edge of the roof. Mr. Haims stated that he originally planned to add two windows to the left of the existing dormer and one to the right but he can reduce the number of windows on the left from 2 to 1 so that would take care of that concern. That would still meet the building departments' requirements.

Mr. Haims also stated that the removal of the rear partition and shed roof is now a retroactive approval. That portion was not original but a later add-on to the property but it was in such dilapidated shape and structurally unsound that he had to take it down before the meeting. Also, illegal activity was happening in that area every night because it was the perfect hideaway.

Mr. Provencher stated that it is clear it is not part of the original structure.

Mr. Haims stated that the prior owner had already replaced the windows with vinyl so he is adding with like kind for the dormer.

Upon a motion by Mr. McCann and seconded by Mr. Bloom, the Commission voted 6-0 that the changes proposed (future and retroactive) are not detrimental to the architectural or historic resources of the City.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application for 904 Main Street; dated and received September 29, 2015.

Exhibit B: MACRIS listing for 904 Main Street.

5. 1 Drury Lane (HC-2015-076)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness

Petitioner: Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Present Use: Multi family residence

Year Built: 1914 fka Frank O. Woodland-John Jeppson House

Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and part of the Massachusetts Avenue Local Historic District

Petition Purpose:

- Remove and replace three existing garage doors with similar doors
- Remove and replace copper gutters and leaders with like materials

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: November 15, 2015

Michelle Tuck, Tuck & Tuck Architects, and Jim Bedard, facilities director at Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI), were present for this application. Ms. Tuck stated that it is the WPI president's house. There are two issues: the existing garage doors and the gutters. The garage doors are old, heavy and are not weather tight. The garage door openers have a difficult time raising these so they are asking to replace the doors with new custom wood doors to match the design of the existing doors. They will be painted to match the existing color. The new lighter door will be insulated and will provide a weather tight seal.

Ms. Tuck stated that the existing gutters are aluminum finished to look like aged copper. The main house has copper gutters so they think these must have been replaced at some point. The gutter system is failing and they want to replace it with copper gutters to match the existing profile in the existing orientations and existing leader system that will tie into the existing drainage system. The strappings holding the leaders into the walls are a mix of designs but they would like to use copper strapping that is the same as the main house, which are embossed with a fleur-de-lis design.

Mr. Provencher stated that he had no issues with the gutters and downspouts.

Mr. Bloom asked if the garage doors are original. Ms. Tuck stated that they are old but she is not sure they are original.

Upon a motion by Ms. Conroy and seconded by Mr. McCann, the Commission voted 6-0 that the changes proposed are not detrimental to the architectural or historic resources of the City.

Upon a motion by Ms. McCann and seconded by Ms. Kurtz, the Commission voted 6-0 that the changes proposed are appropriate to the Massachusetts Avenue Local historic District.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application for 1 Drury Lane; dated September 28, 2015 and received October 1, 2015.

Exhibit B: MACRIS listing for 1 Drury Lane.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. Preservation Plan Update

Mr. Rolle stated that this item is in conjunction with Communication #8, which is a communication from the Massachusetts Historic Commission that they have approved our selection of the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission to conduct the Preservation Plan. We are in the process of signing the consultant contract with them and will keep the Commission informed as the process moves along.

7. Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission, re: 39-41 Irving Street, received October 19, 2015 and dated October 13, 2015.

The commission had no comment.

8. **Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission, re: Survey & Planning Grant Project, received October 19, 2015 and dated October 14, 2015.**

The commission had no comment.

9. **Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission, re: Telecommunications installation-St Joseph's Church, 35 Hamilton Street, received October 19, 2015 and dated October 16, 2015.**

The commission had no comment.

10. **Letter from BSC Group, re: Route 122 at Tatnuck Brook, received October 7, 2015 and dated October 2, 2015.**

Mr. Provencher stated that while typically the kind of work described (drainage infrastructure) in the letter occurs underground they would like to get more information to determine that it won't disturb historic properties.

11. **Letter from EBI Consulting, re: 620 West Boylston Street, received October 13, 2015 and dated October 8, 2015.**

The commission had no comment.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned at 6:46 p.m.