

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

**July 26, 2007**

**CHASE BUILDING, 44 FRONT STREET, WORCESTER  
SUITE 300 – CONFERENCE ROOM**

**Commission Members Present:** Peter Schneider, Chair  
Thomas Constantine, Vice-Chair  
Thomas Conroy, Clerk  
Michael Theerman  
James Crowley  
Janet Merrill

**Staff Present:** Joel Fontane, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services  
Edgar Luna, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services

**REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Schneider called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Upon a motion by Thomas Constantine and seconded by Michael Theerman, the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the minutes from the July 12, 2007 meeting.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Mr. Luna informed the Commission that there were no updates regarding the Historic Commission procedures and guidelines.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. 23 Watt Road (HC-07-19) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Neil Medin, owner of the property and petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Medin stated that he was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on site:  
(a) repair and enclose the existing front porch utilizing cedar shingles for siding and  
(b) build a 10-foot by 23-foot deck behind the house, which will merge with the existing porch on the easterly-side. Mr. Medin also stated that while enclosing the porch was not an original design characteristic of the house, other historic homes in the Indian Hill - National Register District have enclosed their porches over the years. In addition, Mr. Medin stated that the enclosed porch would retain its original dimensions, architectural characteristics and overall design, including the latticework details on the pediment gable. Commissioner Conroy stated that he believed that the

intent of the original architectural design was to have the porch open; therefore, he indicated that he would not support enclosing it as it would be a deviation from the intent of the original design. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Constantine and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, it was voted 6-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

- 2. 17 Haviland Street (HC-07-20) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Carolyn Curtis, trustee and petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Curtis stated that she was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on site: (a) remove the roof and replace it with architectural shingles, (b) clean, repair and re-point all brick on the chimney, (c) re-point the existing stone cap on the chimney, add a new cement cap, and install a flue liner, (d) remove the roof over the front entrance, replace it with architectural shingles, and extend it six inches on both sides following the same roofline curvature, (e) repair all wooden moldings over the entrance and extend them six-inches on both sides following the same roofline curvature, (f) remove and replace the back stairs utilizing same materials, (g) remove and replace the bulkhead that gives access to the cellar stairway and (h), build a new deck, measuring 14 feet by 10 feet, on the back of the house between the existing screened porch and the back stairs. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, it was voted 6-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.
- 3. 23 Germain Street (HC-07-21) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Ricky Miller and Carleen Miller, petitioners, presented the petition. Mr. Miller stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove and replace the exterior stairway that gives access/egress to the two residential units in the building. Mr. Miller also stated that the current stairway was not original to the period of the house, and its deteriorated condition had become a safety hazard to the residents. In addition, Mr. Miller stated that the new stairway would include decorative wooden spindles which will enhance and be more appropriate, to the period of the house. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, it was voted 6-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.
- 4. 55 Highland Street (HC-07-22) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Ignatius Chang, owner and petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Chang stated that he was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to add a second layer of synthetic architectural shingles to the roof of the multi-family dwelling located on site. He also

indicated that the current roof was not the original roof as it appeared to be a replacement from approximately twenty (20) years ago. In addition, Mr. Chang stated that the roof was in poor condition and was causing damage to some areas of the building due to rain and melted snow. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, it was voted 6-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

5. **26 Institute Road (HC-07-23) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Brent Heinzer and Nicholas Pelletier, representatives for the petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Heinzer stated that the petitioner was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on site: (a) reconstruct the roof to correct structural weaknesses and (b) remove the enclosed porch on the westerly side, and replace it with a new rectangular staircase. Mr. Heinzer also stated that while inspecting the roof for repairs, it was determined that several beams supporting the roof structure were damaged beyond repair as a result of rain leakage. He further emphasized that the structural damage would require removing the roof, removing and replacing damaged beams, and reconstructing the entire roof to make it structurally sound. In addition, Mr. Heinzer stated that the enclosed porch on the westerly side appeared to be a later addition to the structure, was not insulated, and was sinking at the bottom due to its poor construction. Commissioner Conroy expressed concern that the proposed replacement of the porch would not include replacing the turret, which in his opinion was a unique architectural feature of structure. Chair Schneider also expressed concern that the proposed project would remove the porch and replace it with a rectangular porch without the turret. Therefore, he asked Mr. Heinzer if the petitioner had considered repairing the current porch instead of replacing it. Mr. Heinzer stated that repairing current porch would require insulating it which would be costly and difficult to achieve. In addition, Mr. Heinzer stated that the current porch also does not have a sprinkler system and, consequently, does not meet City regulations. Chair Schneider asked Mr. Heinzer if he had considered the alternative to rebuilding the porch utilizing the same floor plan and dimensions. Mr. Heinzer stated that this alternative had been considered by the petitioner but was discarded after preliminary budget estimates indicated that such plan would be more expensive. Mr. Pelletier stated that the petitioner, Aquinas Association Inc., had a limited budget of \$100,000 to complete the entire project, and indicated that repairing the porch or replacing it with the same floor plan would put the project over the budget. Commissioner Conroy stated that he was not convinced that either of the two alternatives mentioned by the Commission could not be implemented with the current budget. Nevertheless, Commissioner Conroy asked Mr. Heinzer if the petitioner had considered requesting approval based on hardship. Mr. Heinzer stated that he would like to have an opportunity to discuss it with the petitioner; therefore, he asked the Commission to continue the hearing until August 9, 2007 to allow additional time to review the proposed project, consider alternative solutions, and address the concerns of the Commission with the petitioner. Upon a motion by Commissioner Theerman

and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the hearing to August 9, 2007 to allow the petitioner additional time to review the alternatives suggested by the Commission.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

- 6. 1 Montvale Road:** Mr. Fontane informed the Commission that the Montvale Historic District bisects the parcel at 1 Montvale Road. Commissioner Crowley requested that the City Administration research the parcel's ownership to determine if both parcels were in common ownership at the time the Montvale Historic District was created. Upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 6-0 to request a legal opinion from the Law Department regarding 1 Montvale Road.

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.