

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

**May 14, 2015**

**LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL**

**Commission Members Present:** Kevin Provencher, Chair  
Andrew Shveda, Vice-Chair  
Timothy McCann, Clerk  
Randolph Bloom  
Robyn Conroy  
Karl Bjork  
Devon Kurtz

**Commission Members Absent:** None

**Staff Members Present:** Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

Commission Site Views - 5:15 p.m. – 35 Hermon Street

**Call to Order**

Chair Provencher welcomed new member Devon Kurtz to the Commission and called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Approval of the Minutes:** 4/16/2015 & 4/30/2015 - Held

**OLD BUSINESS**

**1. 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

Doug Kelleher from Epsilon Associates appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission members had viewed the site prior to the meeting. He stated that they were unable to view the inside of the premises due to the conditions inside but were able to view the outside.

Secretary McCann asked if any brownfield money would be used for site cleanup. Mr. Kelleher stated that he did not believe so.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission agrees that the building does have historic value and is part of an example of a former manufacturing company and after they have viewed the building the masonry looks to be in reasonable condition and looks solid and could be rehabilitated. Most of the windows are missing and ones remaining are in need of replacement and the Commission understands there is cost involved in mitigating the hazardous material on site and a report was also submitted about the structural integrity of the frame and based on that the applicant hasn't demonstrated that there is not an economic viable use for this property and in order to approve the waiver the Commission would need to see a financial case from the applicant showing that the cost for rehabilitating this property is excessive and believes the applicant has some additional homework relative to the financing that would need to be provided that information to the Commission.

Secretary McCann stated that he would agree with that and asked that the applicant come back with some financial numbers in order for the Commission to review an economic hardship.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would assume whether the building is demolished or rehabilitated the waste clean up still has to occur. Mr. Kelleher stated that the cleanup has to occur no matter what.

Mr. Kelleher asked if it would be helpful to have a more detailed structural report presented to the Commission and would that be considered. Chair Provencher stated that would be helpful but the real question is what is the cost involved.

Commissioner Conroy stated that the Commission has asked for similar financial data from applicants in the past.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the item until the May 28, 2015 Historical Commission meeting and extend the constructive grant deadline until June 15, 2015.

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

Exhibit B: Request 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.

## NEW BUSINESS

### 2. 201 Salisbury Street (HC-2015-026)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness  
Petitioner: Michael & Janet Theerman  
Present Use: Single Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1889  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRD (National Register District) located in the Massachusetts Avenue Local Historic District and formerly known as the Jessie W. Moore House

Petition Purpose:

- Roof replacement on home and garage

Michael Theerman & Janet Therman along with Francisco Argueta appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Theerman stated that they are looking to replace the roof as it has been leaking and they are looking to put on architectural shingles. He stated that the roof is over 24 years old and there is no membrane underneath the roof and they would like to replace with similar materials. The roof was probably originally slate prior to their ownership but roof had been replaced and is simple triple flat tab shingles. He stated that he did look into obtaining slate but the cost of slate would be \$80,000 or \$90,000 where the triple tab shingle is about \$35,000 and they would also put the ice blocking membrane over the ridges of the house so there no chance of internal damage in the future.

Mr. Argueta stated that on the dormers on the front they will remove the clapboard and will install new clapboard but will be exactly the same.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if that was for every dormer on the house. Mr. Argueta stated yes.

Chair Provencher asked if any work would be done at edge of roof. Mr. Theerman stated that he didn't believe there was much rot in the fascia and the gutters may be replaced with like material.

Chair Provencher asked if there would be reflashing of the chimney. Mr. Argueta stated that there would be.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 7-0 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 Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 7-0 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 & Certificate of Appropriateness received April 10, 2015 and dated April 6, 2015.

### 3. 7 Newbury Street (HC-2015-027)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness  
Petitioner: Wandy Rodriguez (Worcester Common Ground, Inc.)  
Present Use: Two Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1869  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, located in the Crown Hill Local Historic District and formerly known as the John H. Watson House & The Tolbert Smothers House.

Petition Purpose:

- Retroactive approval for renovation and restoration of an existing porch

Noel Nuvez translator for Wandy Rodriguez along with Mr. Rodriguez appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Provencher stated that they have a letter from Inspectional Services stating that the work on the porch was done without a permit but has now ceased. Chair Provencher stated that they also have letter from Worcester Common Ground explaining who owns the property.

Kristine Kalouis from Worcester Common Ground stated that Worcester Common Ground owns the grounds and they lease it to Wandy Rodriguez.

Chair Provencher stated that some paperwork was provided by applicant that stated porch was just an existing structure that was just being repaired and building permits are not necessary if porch was just being repaired and would like the applicant to address that.

Chair Provencher stated that an abutter, Susan Lozairizis, has submitted a letter stating that she did not have concerns with the porch.

Commissioner Bloom stated that in the letter that she does mention that the supporting structures, the post that hold up the structure, be removed from her retaining wall.

Chair Provencher asked the applicant to address whether the porch was existing when the work was performed.

Mr. Nuvez stated that Mr. Rodriguez would like to apologize for the work being done without Historical Commission approval but as far as he knew that porch was existing and he was just

repairing the porch and therefore did not need a building permit and they have talked to the building inspector who advised him to go before Historical Commission and once they have reviewed it then Inspectional Services would come back and do a complete inspection of the porch to make sure it's safe.

Chair Provencher stated that the safety concerns would be under the purview of the Inspectional Services and the Commission's concern is whether the work is in keeping with the district.

Chair Provencher asked when the work was done on the porch. Mr. Nuvez stated that all the work was done in 2012.

Secretary McCann asked what recent work was done. Mr. Nuvez stated that it was just the repair work.

The Commission had a brief discussion about when the Crown Hill Historic District was adopted and determined that the work on this porch was done in 2012 prior to the establishment of the Crown Hill Historic District and therefore predated the adoption of the historical rules and the Commission would need to look at Leave to Withdraw of the application.

Secretary McCann asked if property was MACRIS listed. Vice-Chair Shveda stated that looking at the Form B it was a listing specific for the creation of the Crown Hill Historic District.

Chair Provencher reminded the applicant that he would still need to follow up with Inspectional Services for the safety issues and if any additional work needs to be done then the applicant will need to come back before the Commission.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 7-0 to allow Leave to Withdraw for this application due to the fact that the work on home was done prior to this home become part of the Crown Hill Local Historic District.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness received April 10, 2015 and dated April 10, 2015.

Exhibit B: Letter from Worcester Common Ground dated April 9, 2015 and received April 9, 2015.

Exhibit C: Letter from Susan Lozoraitis dated May 12, 2015 and received May 12, 2015.

#### **4. 12 West Street (HC-2015-028)**

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	Worcester Common Ground, Inc.
Present Use:	Three Family Residence
Year Built:	Circa 1849
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed, and formerly known as the Willard Richmond House.

Petition Purpose:

- Install vinyl siding
- Repair columns
- Repair floor on front porch

Noel Nuvez appeared for Miss Santiago and stated that this is similar situation where Worcester Common Ground leases the ground to Miss Santiago. Francisco Argueta from Francisco Roofing appeared as the contractor for the project.

He stated that there has been extensive damage to the siding and column and they would like to install vinyl siding as it would be more durable but the home would look exactly the same once the work is done.

Chair Provencher asked if the trim would remain wood. Mr. Nuvez stated that it would and would not be covered with vinyl.

Chair Provencher asked if all the trim around the windows, fascia around the roof and roof edges would remain wood.

Mr. Argueta stated that most of the trim is rotted and they would plan to cover with aluminum so they won't have the issue again.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the windows in the front of the house are slightly different than the side of the house and asked how they would be handled.

Mr. Argueta stated that the ones in the front have to be scraped and painted and will remain wood.

Chair Provencher asked about the fascia around the porch. Mr. Argueta stated that has to be scraped and repainted but they would like permission to wrap all the fascia board that meets the roof. The rakes would be hard to paint every 4-5 years due to their height.

Chair Provencher asked about the eaves on the side. Mr. Argueta stated that would stay wood.

Chair Provencher asked if the rakes being proposed to be covered are in the front and in the back. Mr. Argueta stated yes.

Secretary McCann stated that he was having a hard time with the fact that part will be wrapped and part painted and it will not look consistent.

Chair Provencher stated that he would agree that if the wood was going to remain then it should remain everywhere.

Mr. Argueta stated that if the trims have to remain wood and can be painted that the property owner would be fine with that.

Chair Provencher asked when property was last painted. Mr. Nuvez stated that Worcester Common Ground renovated the whole property in 2002.

Commissioner Bloom stated that Worcester has very few temple front housing and to have any alterations to this house would be a big loss to the city. Commissioner Bloom stated that he would prefer a good paint job since that would be a better option.

Chair Provencher asked if the applicant had an estimate for painting. Mr. Arueta stated that he did not.

Chair Provencher stated that he looked at the house and thought the paint was 30 years old and would question whether the work was done properly in 2002.

Chair Provencher stated that he would agree with Commissioner Bloom that this is unique house.

Commissioner Bloom stated that some railings had been installed and it changes the character of home.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the clapboards on all four sides of the house were bad and said he may not have problem with just the back being vinyl sided.

Commissioner Conroy asked how much damage would the vinyl cause. Mr. Argueta stated that they first install insulation and cover with vinyl siding and install with nails.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated then they will be nailing into historic material and the vinyl siding may not be reversible.

Chair Provencher stated that Vice-Chair Shveda made a good point about the issue of reversibility.

Chair Provencher stated that he would like to suggest a compromise that applicant be allowed to vinyl side on the sides and rear of the home and leave the front façade intact.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he would agree with that as it would help the value of the home and someone at a later date may want to buy the home and restore it.

Commissioner Bjork stated that he would agree with that.

Mr. Nuvez stated that the homeowner would be fine with the compromise proposed by the Commission.

Commissioner Bloom stated that balusters had been put up on the home and asked if they could be removed as don't go with the characteristics of the house.

Mr. Nuvez stated that they could be removed.

Chair Provencher stated that Commissioner Bloom's request is only a comment and the Commission cannot require.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the property is MACRIS listed. Chair Provencher stated that it was not in a historic district and the application is only for a Building Demolition Delay Waiver and their purview is only on what is being taken away.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 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 with the condition that the house be vinyl sided on the rear, left, and right façade but the front façade that faces east toward West Street be painted and maintained in kind.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received April 14, 2015 and dated April 13, 2015.

### **5. 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

Tony Vigliotti appeared on behalf of the applicant, S&L Realty Trust.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that this was for construction of a lot for 22 cars and they plan to surround the perimeter with plantings but they do not plan to install any signs or gates.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked who will be parking in the lot.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that the parking is for Rob Roy students.

Chair Provencher stated that this is a unique application for the Commission as it is for a parking lot and they are here to review whether the design is appropriate for the District.

The Commission members reviewed the plans presented.

Chair Provencher stated that the design is straight forward but it looks like some re-grading needed to be done. Mr. Vigliotti stated that there is still some re-grading that needs to be done and that needs to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

Chair Provencher stated that along the edge of the sidewalk there are some existing granite slabs that extend to the back of the property and the granite slabs are not noted in the plans and those

granite slabs add character as a site element and would like them to be maintained as he felt it would enhance the value of the lot.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that he would take that suggestion but he would ask that the applicant be allowed to just incorporate it into the landscaping.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he like more landscaping to shield the parked cars from the street so if you drove down Pleasant Street you would look into a landscaped area and not just a parking area. Mr. Vigliotti stated that landscaping has been incorporated and they do not want to add too much that would not allow drivers a clear view.

Mr. Vigliotti stated the site has been minimized and there is a landscaped area which was preserved instead of adding more parking in order to give it a better aesthetic feel.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that the applicant could look at an off-set entry so you would see background of vegetation and more screening in front and moving entry toward the church which cause the loss of the snow storage and maybe three parking spaces.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that the lots was designed to comply with City requirements.

Mr. Rolle stated that Planning Board does require snow storage and given the size of the lot it would be tricky to accommodate what was suggested.

Chair Provencher stated that the design does accommodate the amount of spaces proposed.

Commissioner Bjork asked how long it has been a dirt lot.

Mr. Rolle stated it has been about five or six years.

Commissioner Bjork stated that neighbors have come to him and stated that they did not want a parking lot instead they want more green space and he does not feel a parking lot would enhance the buildings on either side of the lot.

Chair Provencher stated that he would rather see an improved lot and perhaps it not the highest and best use but have rather have nice parking lot than nothing at all.

Secretary McCann stated that if the lot was developed it would most likely not be in keeping with the charm of the district and a somewhat hidden parking lot may not be the worst use.

Secretary McCann stated that he did not see any lighting on the plans presented. Mr. Vigliotti stated that there is no lighting as lot will be used during daylight.

Secretary McCann stated that he believed that Rob Roy had evening classes. Mr. Vigliotti stated that was correct.

Secretary McCann stated that they do not have purview whether lighting is required but the Commission has purview if it is required on what would be the style and whether it was appropriate for the district.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that they would ensure that the lighting met the standards of the District.

Chair Provencher stated that there are potential revisions that may be required by other Boards and applicant would be obligated to appear before the Commission again.

Mr. Rolle stated that a potential solution is that they wait to see if the Planning Board requires lighting and continue this item until after the Planning Board meeting and that way the applicant would not have to re-notice abutters or the applicant can ask for a vote tonight and if Planning Board made changes the applicant would need to come back before Commission with new application for the changes.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that he would like Commission to consider application and if Planning Board makes changes they would come back before Commission.

Chair Provencher stated that he was just trying to figure out the most effective way to do this in a timely fashion.

Mr. Rolle stated that if they continue the item until after Planning Board meeting it could be heard at a June Historical Commission meeting but if it is a new application it requires legal advertisement and abutter notice so could be a month in between Planning Board and Historical Commission meeting.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that he would request continuance to the June 11, 2015 Historical Commission meeting.

Mr. Vigliotti asked if the Commission had any recommendations for the lighting.

Chair Provencher stated the could not provide recommendations but would suggest the applicant bring options to the meeting and bring images of the types of fixtures.

Mary Keefe, resident of the Crown Hill District, stated that this lot has been a monthly conversation since the building burned down and an illegal parking lot evolved so to see an improvement is great and hopes that the applicant makes it as much as an asset as possible to Pleasant Street.

Pastor Noel from Pleasant Street Baptist Church stated that the church abuts the lot and they think the lot will be an asset for the Rob Roy and the church especially with landscaping and to give him some extra parking on Sunday.

Steve Callahan, an abutter to the property and head of the El Dorado Condominium Association , stated he feels it is an improvement as parking is difficult as he has been looking for a place to put 50 cars for a month and very difficult in that area.

Commissioner Bloom asked who would have access as it seems people think they are going to have access. Mr. Vigliotti stated that it was for Rob Roy.

Mark Tumeinskei, clerk for the Crown Hill Neighborhood Association, stated this became a parking lot by default and Rob Roy got along fine without parking and there are a lot of underutilized parking lots in the area and it just being assumed that a parking lot would be better and maybe it be better like Commissioner Bloom suggested that it be green space and maybe less spots and more green space.

Commissioner Bloom stated that when they approved the Antiquation Society parking lot proposal they heard what the greenery was and it would be helpful to know what this applicant plans. Chair Provencher stated that it is listed on the plans but it listed in Latin so can be confusing and asked if applicant could bring to the continued meeting a listing of plantings and images, images of the lighting and that some consideration of the granite slabs being incorporated to the design.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted to continue the item until the June 11, 2015 Historical Commission meeting and extended the constructive grant deadline until June 28, 2015.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness received April 15, 2015 and dated April 10, 2015.

8:20 p.m.-8:28 p.m.- Recess

## 6. 49 Millbury Street (HC-2015-031)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Patrick Patton  
Present Use: Restaurant  
Year Built: Circa 1950  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and formerly known as Messier's Diner  
Petition Purpose:

- Replace existing windows
- Install new roof over existing deck

Patrick Patton along with Peter Ward appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Patton stated that the deck is already there and they would like to put a cover over it and make it more aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood. He stated that the windows are over 30 years old and they have been sealed since then. He stated that a lot of changes had been made to the building over the years and he wants to improve the building.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission will review the components of the building that will be removed and suggested the Commission take the discussion in two parts, the deck work and then the windows.

Chair Provencher stated that some drawings were submitted that describe the work.

Secretary McCann asked if the proposed roof would attach to the façade on the mansard portion of the roof.

Mr. Ward stated that the existing mansard will be removed and a knee wall will be built on top of the existing building to gain to gain pitch.

Chair Provencher stated that there needs to be some clarifications as drawings showed new post so don't know why you would need to extend the wall. Mr. Ward stated that Inspectional Services requires a four foot foundation which would be difficult so he went with a knee wall on top of the existing building.

Chair Provencher stated that is a deviation from the drawings provided by the applicant as drawings show post and after being described applicant must do another way due to Inspectional Services requirements so he has to modify the proposal and asked if the knee wall would be a wood structure. Mr. Ward stated that it would be wood and the roof joints would attach to the top of the knee wall.

Chair Provencher stated that he had viewed the property and there is an addition in the rear of the property and he believes that it is a masonry addition in the back.

Chair Provencher stated that he is not following the masonry and according to the write up this was a sectional diner that dates to 1946. What makes this one different in the 1940's and 1950's the construction of the diner was a sectional diner which closely resembles a modular construction and believes this is the type of diner they are talking about. Chair Provencher stated that it is typical that the diner construction was usually made out of wood.

Mr. Ward stated that it is from the addition. There is a masonry wall that enters the cellar and in front it is wood structure and it will attach to that.

Chair Provencher asked if the plan was to attach to the masonry and the wood. Mr. Ward stated that was correct.

Chair Provencher stated that the issue with that is that the diner seems to have a rounded edge to the top and it looks like it was modified at some point and a mansard roof construction was added to the diner.

Mr. Ward stated that all that exists now is piece of two by four with 1/6 on the vertical with asphalt shingles on it and that support off the diner.

Chair Provencher asked if that wood construction would be used to support the roof. Mr. Ward stated that he would be using the knee wall.

Secretary McCann asked how far forward would the roof come. Mr. Ward stated that it would come to the guardrail.

Mr. Patton and the Commission reviewed previous photos of roof to current ones and there have been many changes to the roof and Chair Provencher stated the mansard roof appears to have been added over at some point and in order to support the roof for the deck additional wood construction needs to be added and a three foot wall will be built.

Chair Provencher asked about the windows being proposed to be replaced.

Mr. Patton stated that all the windows need to be replaced and some of them are leaking and when he replaces he believes that they will find rot and they are expecting additional work will need to be done. He stated that the windows have been rusted shut for over 20 years and they need to be replaced and they are Plexiglas.

Chair Provencher stated that looking at configuration of the windows they are the same as the historical images.

Mr. Patton stated that he had looked at several options on what the replacement windows would be but cannot be sure until they remove and see the extent of rot behind.

Chair Provencher stated on the windows with curve glass it would be a real loss to the building and is a key component to the diner and be a very hard thing to replicate if it has to be replaced.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked what exactly what was the plan for the windows.

Mr. Patton stated that he has few estimates and wants windows that open and needs modern windows so when people drive down the street they can tell from the street that establishment is open and the windows are so old they are not energy efficient.

Chair Provencher stated that he believes the windows are original based on the sashes and he understands that some windows may have plexi glass but the frame itself is original. Vice-Chair Shveda stated he would agree that windows have not been changed since building was built.

Chair Provencher stated the Commission doesn't feel comfortable on the windows portion of the application as there is not enough detail provided on the replacement windows and the Commission would suggest the applicant come back at next meeting with example of the type of window, a drawing of the configuration of the window, and explain how they will open.

Secretary McCann stated that he would also like to see if applicant would consider repair to the one corner window that he planned to replace.

Chair Provencher stated that to help out the applicant what the Commission could do is vote on the deck portion of the application and continue the window discussion to the next meeting to give the applicant to provide more details.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 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 Chair Provencher and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 7-0 continue the window portion of the application until the May 28, 2015 and extended the constructive grant deadline until June 15, 2015.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Conroy the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed demolition relative to the construction of the canopy over the existing deck 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 April 21, 2015 and dated April 21, 2015.

#### **7. 6-8 King Street (HC-2015-032)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Worcester Community Housing Resources, Inc.  
Present Use: Multi Family Residence  
Year Built: Circa 1875  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, formerly known as the Henry W. Double Eddy House  
Petition Purpose:

- Replace the rubber membrane roof
- Repoint and repair masonry
- Repair fire escape and front steps
- Replace door and upper trim of non-period band
- Install handrail & alarm emergency systems
- Repair & restore trim

Andy Howarth from Worcester Community Housing Resources, Inc. appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Howarth stated that that they are doing rehab work at 6-8 King Street and it will be an agency owned rental property. It is a four unit masonry building with a rubber roof. Mr. Howard stated that city and state funds will be used to rehab it and basically what they are doing is replacing a rubber member roof that was installed in 1997 that was not maintained properly and is not visible from the street. They are replacing shingles on the mansard with like materials, the front and rear doors which are plain steel products will be replaced and additional

work may be done on the fire escape in the area which is not original to bring up to current fire exit codes. Mr. Howarth stated that they will be repointing the front face and 30 to 40% of the sides of the building and they will try to match the mortar colors as best they can. He also stated that the left cheek wall under the front steps is crumbling and must be replaced and they propose to use a hardened brick that will be chosen in a color to match the old brick as closely as possible. He also stated that to meet code requirements the existing center and side rails which are not original will be replaced and two new side rails will be installed.

Secretary McCann thanked Mr. Howarth for the excellent presentation and stated that he had no issue and is just a lot of like for like and improvement over a bad bit of remodeling that was done in the 90's and would just request that mortar color try to be kept the same.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the integral gutter system was copper. Mr. Howarth stated that it was rubber and it is staying and being relined as part of the roof work.

Chair Provencher asked if the doors need to be replaced. Mr. Howarth stated they did and they will use solid fiber glass doors.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 7-0 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 April 21, 2015 and dated April 21, 2015.

8. Main Street Project - The Commission stated that they would like time to review materials presented by Mr. Rolle and would like to hold the item until the next meeting.
9. Determination of Eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places for the Storrs and Dworman Area (22-26 25-27 Ethan Allen Street)-

Brian Lever, Epsilon Association and Adam Stein, representing the owner of the property, appeared on behalf of the petition. Mr. Lever stated they are pursuing historical tax credits for the building and the buildings needs to be listed in order to be eligible.

Chair Provencher stated that collectively the buildings he would be in support.

Mr. Rolle stated that he will provide the form and letter of support to the state if the Commission chooses to support the project.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 to provide a letter of support for Determination of Eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places for the Storrs and Dworman Area.

#### **10. Communications Received:**

- a. Email from MacRotsie Historic Advisors dated May 4, 2015; re: 551 Main Street, Request for Letter of Support - No comment

- b.** Email from MacRotsie Historic Advisors dated May 4, 2015; re: 18 Chestnut Street, Request for Letter of Support - No comment

**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.