MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
September 18, 2014

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present:  Kevin Provencher, Chair
Randolph Bloom
Robyn Conroy
Karl Bjork

Commission Members Absent:  Andrew Shveda, Vice Chair
Timothy McCann, Clerk
Erika Dunn

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

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

September 4, 2014 Minutes – Held, the Commission had not reviewed the minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

1. 6 Crown Street (HC-2014-057)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Present Use: Three Unit Condominium
Year Built: 1865
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRIND (National Register Individual Property), National Register DOE, Preservation Restriction, part of the Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose: Repair two porches (front and rear) with like materials and replace if necessary
Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 to postpone the item until the October 2, 2014 Historical Commission meeting and extend the constructive grant deadline until October 21, 2014.


2. Union Station Wayfinding & Signage

George Saliba, on behalf of the Worcester Redevelopment Authority (WRA), and Robert Para, from Lamoureux Pagano, appeared on behalf of the proposal.

Mr. Saliba stated that the current signage at Union Station is not functional and the WRA has hired Lamoureux Pagano to put together a wayfinding and signage proposal to improve signage at Union Station and make it user friendly. The WRA is requesting a letter of support for this proposal to send to the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

Mr. Para went through a PowerPoint presentation showing the proposed signage for the building.

Chair Provencher asked about the dimensional letters in the main hall and asked how the signage will be affixed.

Mr. Para stated that they will drill them into the plaster and some signs will go into the limestone. The existing signage is installed that way.

Chair Provencher stated that plaster can be repaired so his concerns would just be with the signs going into the limestone. Mr. Para stated that the signs that are already there in limestone will be removed and replaced. Chair Provencher asked Mr. Para to identify those signs. Mr. Para stated that signs B2 & B3 on sheet 1.8 located in the back lobby would be one of the wayfinding signs installed on limestone.

Chair Provencher asked if there was a similar sign in that location right now. Mr. Para stated that he believed there was.

Chair Provencher stated that he would support the proposal but wherever the signs are installed that consideration be giving to the mounting techniques to lessen the effect of the historical portions of the building.

Mr. Saliba stated that two proposals had been prepared for the WRA and one is black and white and the other is color and asked the Commission which one they prefer. The Commission all stated they would prefer the color version.

Commissioner Bloom asked what the signs would be made of. Mr. Para stated plastic.
Chair Provencher stated that signage is an important element for the building and stated that Commission had received a letter of support from Preservation Worcester for this project.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 to issue a letter of support for the WRA’s signage proposal for Union Station.

Exhibit A: Signage Presentation received September 11, 2014.

3. 12 Monadnock Road (HC-2014-055)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Dean & Diane Alexandrou
Present Use: Single Family residence
Year Built: 1904
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRIND (National Register Individual Property), formerly known as the Frank Harrington House and part of Montvale Historic District

Petition Purpose:
(1) Remove/repair/reinstall stained glass window with associated work;
(2) Remove/replace exterior plexiglass with aluminum frame storm frame

Dean Alexandrou appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Alexandrou stated that he has a beautiful stained glass window on the second level of his home and it has been sagging since the home is over 100 years old. There are considerable issues on the exterior as the previous owner had put a piece of plexiglass over the window and a lot of the pieces are broken. The previous owner also filled it in with putty so the entire window has to come out. The contractor will take it out and replace with identical pieces all the pieces that are cracked or missing. The contractor will make it as if brand new and it will be all white with an aluminum frame.

Chair Provencher asked how Mr. Alexandrou would accommodate the glass top. Mr. Alexandrou stated that it will match the trim.

Chair Provencher stated that this appears to be a straightforward as the applicant taking original historic material and restoring to the same.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bjork and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.
Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the petition was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition and Certificate of Appropriateness received August 18, 2014 and dated August 18, 2014.

4. 6 Congress Street (HC-2014-056):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition:</th>
<th>Building Demolition Delay Waiver &amp; Certificate of Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner:</td>
<td>David Minasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use:</td>
<td>Three-family residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built:</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Status:</td>
<td>MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRIND (National Register Individual Property) formerly known as the Cyrus K. Hubbard Bridges Sumner House and part of the Crown Hill Local Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Purpose:</td>
<td>(1) Replace structural posts and wood trim to match existing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Install a gutter that extends the full length of the porch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Minasian appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Minasian stated that the column has taken on a lot of water and needs to be replaced and he had completely replaced the porch four years ago and sadly it has begun to sag again and it is not structurally sound and the gutter has no downspout so he would like to extend that gutter on the left side of the home.

Chair Provencher stated that it’s clear from the application that the intention is to replace in kind but the only departure would be the addition of the gutter on the front end and historically this porch did not have a gutter.

Chair Provencher stated that there is a fascia board at the roof edge so if the fascia large enough the profile of the gutter should fit right in the fascia without adding any dimension so the gutter should not change the site lines.

Commissioner Bjork asked if the water damage was just on the porch roof. Mr. Minasian stated that it was only damaged on the porch roof.

Commissioner Bloom asked if there was ever a built in gutter in the home. Mr. Minasian stated that he did not believe so.

Commissioner Bloom stated that putting in the built-in gutter was a much more expensive proposal than what Mr. Minasian has proposed on his application.
Chair Provencher asked what happened to cause damage to the porch so fast, since he had replaced it only 4 years ago. Mr. Minasian stated that he has been trying to figure that out himself and he thought it might be the shape of the tree in front of the house and it may be diverting the water in a different way. Chair Provencher stated that he was thinking the same thing as the edge of the tree there is overgrowth and part of the approach to solve the problem should be some significant pruning of the tree as it is contributing to the problem.

Chair Provencher stated that there is practical argument to having the gutter but the gutter really doesn’t meet the requirement of the style of the house.

Commissioner Bloom stated that his only opinion would be the difference between the aluminum gutter and cedar gutter but thinks cedar gutter might be more obvious than the aluminum gutter.

Commissioner Conroy stated that the gutter seemed to be a requirement for the homeowner.

Chair Provencher stated that an aluminum gutter is not a permanent installation and could be removed and will not permanently alter the porch and he appreciates the applicant’s approach by not including the downspout in the front.

Chair Provencher stated the vote for the certificate of appropriateness should include discussion on the tree pruning.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bjork and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the petition was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that there will be pruning of the tree in the front of the property.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition and Certificate of Appropriateness received August 18, 2014 and dated August 18, 2014.

5. **14 Congress Street (HC-2014-058):**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: Roger Comeau & Sharon Hobey
Present Use: Single family residence
Year Built: 186
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRIND (National Register Individual Property), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area) part of the Crown Hill Local Historic District

Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the chimney with new brick & mortar interior, interior liner and a rain cap
Repair/maintain house exterior that includes work to the driveway, porch roof/deck, clapboard, soffit and ventilation

Roger Comeau & Sharon Hobey appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Provencher stated that the application shows a chimney cap. Mr. Comeau stated that he plans to rebuild the chimney from roof line up and other homes in area have a chimney cap and he would like to add one also.

Chair Provencher asked if there would be a new liner. Mr. Comeau stated that they have been considering it.

Chair Provencher asked if the lead would be kept. Mr. Comeau stated that it will be.

Chair Provencher asked how old the roof was. Mr. Comeau stated that approximately 10 years old and is in pretty good shape.

Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Comeau had a sample of the brick. Mr. Comeau stated that he had two options. He stated he could use a new brick or they could use a used brick. Structurally and cost-wise both options are the same.

Chair Provencher stated that the chimney is not a real significant contributor to the home and does not see any distinguishing features to the chimney but currently there is weathered red brick and he would like the new masonry to be a weathered red brick. Chair Provencher stated that they like it to be as close as possible. Mr. Comeau stated that he was not sure the mason could do that. Chair Provencher suggested that the terminology be a salvaged brick and in the motion the mortar color should be discussed.

Mr. Comeau stated that the rest of the work is maintenance and getting it weather tight on the front of the property and they want to keep the home as original as possible and maintain its original character.

Mr. Comeau stated that the front porch’s roof is deteriorating and the fascia board behind it is rotted and he needs to take the molding down and put new fascia board in and then reinstall the molding.

Chair Provencher asked what other work was proposed. Mr. Comeau stated that he wants to caulk the siding in order to get it watertight and then paint it.
Chair Provencher stated that he wanted to go through exactly what applicant was applying for tonight which was to apply some sealant and do some painting. The application also mentions ventilation and asked the applicant to clarify what was proposed for that.

Mr. Comeau stated that he would like to put in a vent for an exhaust fan for a bathroom. Chair Provencher asked where the vent would be installed. Mr. Comeau stated that in the vicinity of the right hand window of the front façade.

Chair Provencher asked if there was any reason they couldn’t go through the roof as he wasn’t in favor of putting a vent on the front façade. Commissioner Bloom stated that he agreed. Mr. Comeau stated that he could look at that.

Mr. Comeau stated that he was also looking to do work on the driveway and was not sure what they going to do but right now it’s just dirt and weeds. Chair Provencher asked if he had a specific proposal. Mr. Comeau stated that he was thinking brick as they have a brick sidewalk in front of the house and just wanted to see if the Commission had any ideas. Chair Provencher stated that Mr. Comeau would need to come before the Commission with a design since it is not really in the Commission’s purview to provide a design. But when he does come back the Commission would except to see a sample of the brick or product and the pattern proposed.

Commissioner Conroy suggested Mr. Comeau may want to go to Preservation Worcester to get some ideas.

Chair Provencher stated that the applicant would need to come back at another time to discuss the driveway when the applicant has more detail on that portion of project.

Chair Provencher asked if the metal roof on porch would be replaced. Mr. Comeau stated that it will not, he is just waterproofing. Chair Provencher stated that he would consider that maintenance so that would be something the Commission could strike from application.

Chair Provencher asked about the fascia board and the crown molding and whether it would be replaced. Mr. Comeau stated that the fascia board would be replaced.

Chair Provencher stated that a vent cap would be installed on the roof for the exhaust. Mr. Comeau stated that it may not happen within the year. Chair Provencher stated that if it is not done in a year the applicant would have to come back before the Commission.

Mr. Comeau stated that the front sidewalk steps have been patched over time and he would like to infill the voids.

Commissioner Bjork asked if that was safety issue. Mr. Comeau stated that by Spring it will be since the bottom step is rotting out.
Chair Provencher asked if the walkway between the stairs would be replaced. Mr. Comeau stated that it will not, he is just stabilizing it but maybe next year they may do some work like that.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission could give permission for temporary maintenance but the replacement from top to bottom the applicant would need to come back as that hasn’t been advertised.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bloom and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the petition for

- Replacement of the masonry chimney from the top of the lead flashing utilizing salvaged brick and white mortar to match the existing color and texture.
- Replacement of the existing rotten fascia boards at the porch which also includes removal and replacement of the existing crown molding.
- Maintenance and repair of wood clapboards which includes application of sealants and paints.
- Installation of a vent cap for a bathroom exhaust fan on the roof surface.
- Repair of concrete steps at the sidewalk.

was appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness.


**Other Business**

6. Communication:

   i. **35 Hamilton Street – St. Joseph’s Rectory** - Was taken out of order.

   Jordan O’Connor along with Father Lebair and Ralph Bertheiaume appeared on behalf of the item. Mr. O’Connor stated that this was just an informal discussion to discuss a proposed renovation to St. Joseph’s Rectory which is on the MACRIS list. It is currently a rectory and it is intended to continue as a rectory.
Mr. O’Connor stated that plans include roof work, windows and other associated work shown in the photos.

Chair Provencher stated that the applicant should file an application with the Historical Commission and provide as many photos as possible outlining the proposed work as well as cost data on repair versus replace in order that the Commission can review the economic aspect of the project.

Mr. Rolle suggested that the applicant may want to come before the City’s Internal Review Team that reviews projects coming before the Boards and provides feedback to the applicant.

   No comment.

b. Letter from EBI Consulting re: 475 Burncoat Street (Telecommunications Facility Installation); dated August 24, 2014; received September 4, 2014.
   No comment.

c. Letter from MHC re: 10 Tuckerman Street; dated August 29, 2014; received September 5, 2014.
   Mr. Rolle stated that he had followed up on the item and all the work now proposed is interior.


e. Letter from City of Worcester Department of Public Works and Parks re: Worcester Common response to MHC; dated September 4, 2014; received September 9, 2014.
   Items d & e were taken contemporaneously. Mr. Rolle stated that he had been in contact with Preservation Worcester and they are doing research into the matter and will follow up and provide information to staff that can be provided to the Commission.

f. Letter from FST re: Main & Maywood Street; dated August 11, 2014; received August 13, 2014.
   Mr. Rolle stated that staff will follow up and request more information be provided for the Commission’s review.

g. Letter from Department of the Army re: 121 Russell Street; dated September 4, 2014; received September 10, 2014.
   No comment.
h. **41/43 Queen Street**

Mr. Rolle provided an update that he had been contacted by Inspectional Services that this building had been deemed structurally unsound and would need to be demolished.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.