Commission Members Present: Kevin Provencher, Chair  
Andrew Shveda, Vice-Chair  
Randolph Bloom  
Robyn Conroy  
Karl Bjork-Alternate  
Cheryll Holley-Alternate

Commission Members Absent: Timothy McCann, Secretary  
Devon Kurtz

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

Commission Site Views -

Call to Order – 5:30 pm

Approval of the Minutes:

6/25/2015 – Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 to approve the minutes of June 25, 2015.

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 and fka the Ripley Block  
Petition Purpose: Complete Demolition of the Building

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 31, 2015

Chair Provencher stated that the applicant had requested to postpone the item until the August 20, 2015 Historical Commission meeting.
Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to postpone the item until the August 20, 2015 Historical Commission meeting and to extend the constructive grant deadline until September 1, 2015.


Exhibit B: Request to postpone received by Spiro Giannopolos received July 2, 2015 and dated July 2, 2015.

OLD BUSINESS

2. 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

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 24, 2015

Doug Kelleher from Epsilon Associates appeared on behalf of the item. He stated that he had provided the Commission with two scenarios. The first scenario is the owner rehabbing the building and the second is the one they prefer which it to demolish the building and create 55 parking spaces. Mr. Kelleher presented the following financial information.
Chair Provencher stated that he sees the data but is unclear what it means. Mr. Kelleher stated that based on the figures it does not work as it is not financial feasible.

Commissioner Bjork stated that this is third or fourth meeting regarding this item and the 55 parking spaces presented tonight based on the square footage wouldn’t fit on the parcel.

Chair Provencher stated that he would agree with Commissioner Bjork and thinks it would accommodate a lot less.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that based on square footage it would fit ~ 36 spaces.

Mr. Kelleher stated that the number of parking spaces would not affect the financial feasibility.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he had made comment at last meeting that the cost per square foot was particularly high and stated that the project value is going to be $745,000 profit according to what was submitted and asked over how long a time period that would be. Mr. Kelleher stated that he was not sure what the projected term was.
Chair Provencher stated that there is also no information being provided on financing. Mr. Kelleher stated that he believed that was part of the estimated expenses.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the option B doesn’t show any financial potential and once the building is gone the streetscape is changed forever and he would need every bit of proof to let them take the building down.

Chair Provencher stated that he would agree and asked if the plan was to use the parking for the Junction Shops. Mr. Kelleher stated that it will be an accessory parking for Junction Shops and each unit gets at least one space.

Chair Provencher stated that the lot behind Jackson/Beacon is an open lot and asked if the developer owns that lot and if that is also available for parking. Mr. Kelleher stated that it was.

Chair Provencher asked if the Junction Shop project had received site plan approval and how did they receive approval without required parking.

Mr. Rolle stated that the project has sufficient parking to meet zoning requirements.

Chair Provencher stated that the amount of parking that would be provided by taking down this building would be minimal and they already have sufficient parking for Junction Shops.

Commissioner Conroy stated that she appreciates Mr. Kelleher providing all the information but once the building is demolished it is gone so they have to arrive at the right decision.

Chair Provencher stated that he believed that they are at a point that they should vote and does not believe that the applicant has provided enough information for an economic hardship for the Commission to vote with enough clarity on an economic hardship.

Mr. Rolle stated that the Commission should vote on the economic hardship.

Jo Hart stated that the building was bought this past November for $70,000 at auction and she would prefer the Commission get all deeds and relevant financial information as there is no economic hardship.

Susan Ceccacci, Preservation Worcester stated that this is an important industrial landscape in the City of Worcester and for that reason it is very important to determine whether it is necessary to demolish.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 0-5 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.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 0-5 that the issuance of a demolition approval is necessary to avoid an undue economic
hardship to the property owner. The motion failed and the application for economic hardship was denied.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver received April 2, 2015 and dated April 2, 2015.
Exhibit B: Request to 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.
Exhibit D: Request to continue dated May 28, 2015 and received via email May 28, 2015.
Exhibit E: Financial data received via email June 25, 2015
Exhibit F: Request to continue dated June 25, 2015 and received via email June 24, 2015.
Exhibit G: Additional financial data received via email July 6, 2015.

**NEW BUSINESS**

3. **14 Whitman Road (HC-2015-042)**

   Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
   Petitioner: Wardens and Vestry of all Saints Church
   Present Use: Single Family Residence
   Year Built: Circa 1920
   Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRD (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area), fka Harold Ashley House, Located in the Montvale Local Historic District

   Petition Purpose:
   - Construct a cedar board fence in the backyard
   - Remove and replace overgrown shrubbery on the front side house
   - Place three AC condensers at rear of house

   **BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 25, 2015**
   **COA Constructive Grant Deadline: August 8, 2015**

   Charles Garniewicz, David Okerlund and Reverend Gregory Lisby appeared on behalf of the application.

   Mr. Garniewicz stated that they are looking to remove some overgrown shrubbery in the front and the side of home and to install some cedar fencing in the back.

   Chair Provencher stated that the applicant had provided two styles of fences.
Mr. Garniewicz stated that they had chosen two styles of fencing as they thought it would be more appropriate on the side facing Whitman Road and side facing adjacent to neighbor to put up the cedar panel with the privacy lattice at the top.

Chair Provencher asked if it would be a natural finish and what would be the height. Mr. Garniewicz stated that it would be a natural finish and would be five feet tall.

Chair Provencher stated that there is also a request for air conditioners.

Mr. Garniewicz stated that has been temporarily put on hold due to cost and they just may go with window units.

Chair Provencher stated that he would suggest that they leave on just in case funding becomes available but not even sure window units would have to come before the Commission.

Mr. Rolle stated that they are removable so they would not have to come before Commission.

Chair Provencher stated that he believed the fence is attractive and appropriate for the district.

Chair Provencher stated that the second item is landscaping maintenance and doesn’t see any issues but asked what the shrubs would be replaced with.

Mr. Garniewicz stated that they would hire someone to do the landscaping. Mr. Okerlund stated that it would be minimal landscaping as has beautiful granite foundation that sets off the house very well.

Chair Provencher stated that application states new shrubs but doesn’t mention the type or size and the Commission does have purview over the landscaping and does the Commission needs to know what type of shrubs.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would prefer to see what type of plantings are proposed and maybe they should just look at the removal of the shrubs tonight and at another time the applicant could back on the proposed plantings.

Chair Provencher stated that he liked that idea.

Mr. Garniewicz stated they had planned to do the plantings in the Fall.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission could vote on the other items and then applicant could have time to select their shrubs and then come back before the Commission.

Mr. Garniewicz stated that they were fine with that.
Commissioner Bloom stated that he likes the fact that the applicant chose a cedar fence.

Mr. Rolle stated that he did not believe anything presented requires a Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that the

• Construction a cedar board fence in the backyard
• Removal of overgrown shrubbery on the front side house
• Placement of three AC condensers at the rear of house

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


4. 19 McKeon Road (HC-2015-043)

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: CREI Worcester, LLC
Present Use: Commercial warehouse
Year Built: Circa 1911
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and, fka The Wachusetts Thread Company
Petition Purpose:

• Repair and repaint existing roof edge
• Repaint windows
• Fix fabric marquee to existing brick

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 25, 2015

Greg O’Connor, Scott Vale, Craig Sousa and Mike Hennigan appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. O’Connor stated that they were hired to figure out how to revitalize the façade and the building is currently used as a storage facility and the owner doesn’t want any windows so it was a test to see what they could come up with for a solution that would accommodate the owner and preserve the historic character of the building. The concept they came up with is that they will repair and repoint the roof edge and put banners in front of the third and fourth windows so they could preserve the windows behind the banners and that allows color and design to be introduced to the building without destroying any historic character of the building.
Mr. O’Connor stated that in order to attach there would be a frame system that would have fasteners at top and the bottom would be attached to the brickwork and it will be done to minimize damage to the building and then the fabric would be stretched over that frame work. The windows will be repaired and some will be swapped out and rearranged and none of the existing openings will change.

Mr. O’Connor stated that they have gone through the City Council for the mural design and that has to be finalized with the City Manager and the plan is to use things that are significant in Worcester’s history and this concept will preserve the windows.

Chair Provencher asked if the existing signs on the south side would be removed. Mr. O’Connor stated that they would.

Commissioner Bjork asked about the repairing and repainting of the existing roof edge.

Mr. O’Connor stated that there is some deterioration at the roof edge that they will repair.

Commissioner Bjork asked if it was for only two sides of the building. Mr. O’Connor stated yes.

Commissioner Bjork asked if the brick was in good condition. Mr. O’Connor stated that most of it is in good shape.

Chair Provencher asked if there would be any opaquing of the glazing. Mr. O’Connor stated that there was not, they are just painting frames and sashes.

Commissioner Bloom asked what the material would be covering the windows. Mr. O’Connor stated that it will be a fabric panel that will cover two levels. Mr. Hennigan stated that the sign is fabricated like an awning with a fabric wrap over it and typical of any awning you may see.

Chair Provencher asked if it would be a PVC type of material. Mr. Hennigan stated that it would have vinyl coating to make it last.

Chair Provencher asked if the bracket is attached to the masonry opening. Mr. Hennigan stated that the building has piers and they would go to the side of the piers.

Chair Provencher and Commissioner Bloom stated they like that as they cannot be seen.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that this is a very interesting solution to a problem and commends the owner for going through with this and likes the graphics proposed and appreciates that they are taking the history of Worcester and putting it on display.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would agree with Vice-Chair Shveda and it is a very artistic approach to the building.

Commissioner Bjork asked who has final say of the content of the mural.
Mr. Rolle stated that this building is not in an historic district so the Commission doesn’t have any say over the content and the City Manager will have the final say on the content itself.

Chair Provencher stated that the Commission had received an email in support of the proposal from the abutter at 16 McKeon Road.

Rob Para, Jr. stated that this is nice innovate way to breathe life back into this building and it is reversible.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bloom and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 6-0 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 June 10, 2015 and dated June 10, 2015.

Exhibit B: Email from Patricia Reardon dated June 20, 2015.

5. 99 Front Street (HC-2015-044)

| Petition: | Building Demolition Delay Waiver |
| Petitioner: | City of Worcester-DPW & Parks |
| Present Use: | WWII Memorial at Worcester Common |
| Year Built: | Circa 1871 |
| Historic Status: | MACRIS-listed |

Petition Purpose:

- Installation of a recirculating fountain within the center of the Oval Granite Monument.
- Installation of underground supporting mechanicals for the recirculating fountains.
- Installation of new Granite Piers with the names of the Worcester WWII Veterans who perished.
- Refurbishing and re-setting of the Dedication Granite Tablet.
- Installation of two new Information Panels/Kiosks.
- Installation of additional steel ornamental railings/fence
- Refurbishing and enhancing the Flagpole Memorial and Landscaping area.

**BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 26, 2015**

Mr. Rolle stated that there was not a building involved in this project so it does not require the Building Demolition Delay Waiver but the Worcester Parks Department is seeking a Letter of
Support for the project to send to Massachusetts Historical Commission. Rob Antonelli, Assistant Commissioner of Parks, will do a presentation on what is proposed.

Mr. Antonelli stated that in commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, City Manager Edward M. Augustus Jr. wants to enhance the World War II Memorial as a way to recognize the dedication of those from the greatest generation. The World War II Memorial Corridor was constructed at the center of the Common in 2008, as part of the park's reconstruction. The focal point of the improvements is the Memorial Fountain, located near the middle of the Common. He stated that a series of water jets will be embedded in the existing memorial fountain - two large jets representing the two main theaters (Atlantic and Pacific), six medium-arched jets representing the six military branches, and 65 small-arched jets representing the 650 Worcester residents who died in the war.

Mr. Antonelli stated that it is hoped the work can be done by November for Veteran’s Day.

All Commission members stated that they were in support of the project but did express concern with the height of two new granite piers that will be installed which will be engraved with the names of those Worcester residents who died while fighting in the war, and the way in which the names will appear on the memorial. They also expressed concerns with the fence around the Memorial Fountain which would restrict access to the fountain and asked if Mr. Antonelli could review those elements.

William Belcher, city resident, stated that he is in support of the project and encourages the Commission to issue the Letter of Support.

Jo Hart stated that she thinks Worcester should pay attention to space and less is more and stated that she would not do this at all and the fence around the memorial makes it inaccessible. She suggested just installing plaques.

Susan Ceccacci, Preservation Worcester, stated that the idea of the fountain to go along with the monument is a good idea but expressed concern with the number of elements and that there are so many parts to the monument it may be a little bit overwhelming and she is concerned with the height of the two panels that have the names of the veterans as the panels would block the view to the old cemetery. She stated there may be a way to lower the panels. Her other concern is the base of the fountain is basic in design but the fence gives the impression you don’t want people to get up there. Using the same design that is used around the perimeter of the Common is not in keeping with the modern linear pattern of the base and if it’s necessary to put a fence then it should be a simple fence without the arch top.

Mr. Antonelli stated that the issues and concerns raised by the commission will be taken under advisement as work on the final design is done.

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 6-0 to issue a Letter of Support for the project.


- **Petition:** Building Demolition Delay Waiver
- **Petitioner:** GKN Sinter Metals, LLC
- **Present Use:** Commercial Warehouse
- **Year Built:** Circa 1910
- **Historic Status:** MACRIS-listed and fka The Worcester Muslin Underwear Company
- **Petition Purpose:**
  - Complete Demolition of the Building

**BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 30, 2015**

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 6-0 to postpone the item until the July 23, 2015 meeting and extend the constructive grant deadline until August 8, 2015.


7. **22 Newbury Street (HC-2015-046)**

- **Petition:** Certificate of Appropriateness
- **Petitioner:** City of Worcester
- **Present Use:** Vacant Lot
- **Historic Status:** Crown Hill Local Historic District
- **Petition Purpose:** Converting vacant lot into a community garden which includes landscaping and installation of a white picket fence

**BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: July 31, 2015**

Charise Canales, a community organizer with Worcester Common Ground, and Joan Smiley, a resident of the Crown Hill Local Historic District, appeared on behalf of the application.

Ms. Canales stated that her organization reached out to residents in the Crown Hill neighborhood to see what they would like done with the lot. She stated that the 5,845-square-foot lot, located at Newbury and Chatham streets, was formerly owned many years ago by the Worcester Housing Authority, which used it as a tot lot. She stated that WHA sold the lot to the city for $1 and the resident of Crown Hill said it has pretty much remained a vacant and overgrown for more than 25 years.
Ms. Canales stated that Worcester Common Ground is working with residents from the Crown Hill neighborhood that are looking to reclaim a vacant and overgrown lot owned by the city and turn it into a community space.

Ms. Canales stated that neighborhood residents participated in a cleanup of that lot in April, and ended up hauling out enough rubble and trash from it to fill up a city dumpster. She stated it was at that time that the concrete walkways from the old tot lot were discovered, once the overgrowth was cleared out. She stated that the residents now want to build on that momentum and take the next steps toward reclaiming the lot.

Ms. Canales stated that in addition to making improvements to the existing walkways in the lot, the group also eventually hopes to replace the deteriorating chain-link fences along both sides of the property, clean out the remaining overgrowth and eventually start a community garden.

Chair Provencher stated that a retaining wall may also be needed on the north side of the property, because that portion of the lot is not very stable and could end up eroding into the abutting property.

Chair Provencher asked what would be the source of funding for the project.

Ms. Canales stated that Worcester Common Ground does not have a budget for the lot improvements. She stated that they will be relying on grants, fundraising efforts and contributions from local businesses and this is a long term project but they like to get started with the landscaping so people know it is not a vacant lot anymore.

Ms. Canales stated that there is no funding in place for the decorative fencing. She stated that Worcester Common Ground first wanted to see if it could get the new fencing approved before seeking out funding for it.

Commissioner Conroy asked if she had a list of what would be planted. Ms. Canales stated they would be getting donations so did not have any specifics.

All Commission members agreed that one of the top priorities should be ongoing maintenance of the lot and told Ms. Canales that the lot needs to be kept cleaned and mowed on a regular basis.

Chair Provencher asked if Ms. Canales would be constructing new walkways. Ms. Canales stated they would use the concrete walkways they found. Some of the concrete is broken but they will cover with wood chips to create a flow to the property and they can extend that to the seating area proposed.

Commissioner Bjork stated that the property is owned by the City of Worcester and asked how it will be leased to Worcester Common Ground.

Ms. Canales stated that Worcester Common Ground has negotiated an agreement with the city to lease the lot for $1 a year. The deed for the property stipulates that it can only be leased to a nonprofit entity for recreational programs.

Commissioner Provencher stated that he believed this application is a bit unusual as this is a nonprofit group engaging members of the community and he would not require as much in documentation as he would rely on the residents of the district on what is being proposed and he would not subject this applicant to the same level of documentation as he would a developer.
Commissioner Bjork stated that he would not agree with that and he knows the application is well-intentioned but whatever the lot becomes it may not be to the standards of the District and he would prefer more documentation and a budget.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he somewhere between Chair Provencher and Commissioner Bjork on how it should go. He stated that having a new decorative fence along the front of the lot would be a major improvement and stated that the neighbors are looking forward to seeing something positive happen there as it will be a tremendous plus and improvement for the neighborhood. One of the biggest challenges would be the maintenance but he would like a bit more information but is sympathetic that this is a different approach than other applicants but the more information they have the better decision the Commission can take.

Commissioner Conroy stated that she would agree with Commissioner Bloom and that this is a wonderful proposal and she would prefer this to a parking lot but in order to have consistency they have to ask what the plantings would be as they asked that of other applicants.

Mr. Rolle stated that this is an unusual applicant and any of these incremental improvements are a vast improvement over what is there now and the Commission could consider whether there are certain aspects of the application that they could approve and the applicant could start that work and then come back at another time when a better idea of rest of work and funding.

Ms. Canales stated that based on what was said she would like to see approval for the fence and then would come back at later time for the other work.

William Belcher stated that he initially approached the city back in 2012 about turning the lot into a community garden, but things never advanced. He stated that it is important that the lot be regularly maintained so it does not become a magnet for crime again.

Mr. Belcher stated that Worcester Common Ground should be treated no differently by the Historical Commission when it comes to making its case just because it is a nonprofit agency. He stated that this is a high crime area and the property has not been properly maintained at all and it needs to be maintained on a regular basis otherwise it will only exacerbate the issue.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 6-0 that the installation of a black aluminum picket fence is appropriate for the district. The motion passed and the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness received June 16, 2015 and dated June 8, 2015.

8:15-8:20 – Commission took recess

8. 600 Hamilton Street (HC-2015-048)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition:</th>
<th>Building Demolition Delay Waiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner:</td>
<td>City of Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use:</td>
<td>Lake Park Shelter and Community House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built:</td>
<td>Circa 1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed and known as the Lake Park Shelter and Community House

Petition Purpose:

- Exterior and interior rehabilitation including replacement of the existing asphalt shingles with asphalt
- Siding repairs
- Painting exterior
- Cleaning masonry
- Replacement of existing vinyl windows with new windows
- Replace of the decker with new work
- Roof rehab

BDDW Constructive Grant Deadline: August 2, 2015

Rob Para, Jr. from Paganno Architects along with Rob Antonelli Jr., Assistant Commissioner of Parks, appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Para stated that the building was built 1911 and the roofing is at the end of its life span and needs to be replaced. He stated that siding repairs, painting and other rehab is needed for general upkeep and maintenance of the building. He stated that at some point the windows had been replaced with vinyl windows and a wood deck was added. He stated that recently the building was made handicapped accessible by the Parks Department by putting a ramp in.

Mr. Para stated that this is a two phase project.
- Rehabilitation of the building
- Renovation of the interior

Commissioner Holley asked what the building was used for. Mr. Para stated that the building is used for voting on Election Day and used for community uses. Mr. Antonelli stated that the building is used extensively by the public and presently it is being used for summer youth program.

Chair Provencher stated that on the south side of the building there is existing deck that is shown to be replaced by a smaller deck.

Mr. Para stated that the railings on the deck don’t meet code and some of the boards are rotted so they are planning to replace.

Chair Provencher asked if it was original to the building. Mr. Para stated that it was not.

Chair Provencher stated that on the east side there is a landing that shows some railings are going to be replaced.
Mr. Para stated that it would be a simple railing that would match the other side of the building and that would meet code.

Chair Provencher asked if it was a steel railing. Mr. Para stated that it was.

Chair Provencher stated that the roof replacement looks quite straight forward.

Chair Provencher asked if there were any window replacement. Mr. Para stated the vinyl windows would be replaced with an aluminum type window.

Chair Provencher asked if there were any original windows. Mr. Para stated that the original building did not have windows.

Chair Provencher stated that there is really little demolition of any original material so this is a simple application.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Holley and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda, the Commission voted 6-0 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 June 18, 2015 and dated June 8, 2015.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

9. Communications Received:

a. Letter from MASSDot relative to Section 106 Review received June 16, 2015 and dated June 18, 2015. – No comment.

b. Letter from Tremont Preservation Services, LLC requesting a letter of support for 30 Wyman Street, Royal Worcester Corset Company received via email June 22, 2015

   Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to issue the Letter of Support.

c. Email from Winn Company, requesting a letter of support for the rehabilitation of the 10 buildings (the "Project") in Worcester, MA. The buildings are addressed as 6 Jacques Avenue, 22 Ethan Allen Street, 25-27 Ethan Allen Street, 26 Ethan Allen Street, 718 Main Street, 23 Wellington Street, 37 Wellington Street, 42 Wellington Street, 46 Wellington Street, 51 Wellington Street received June 22, 2015.

   Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 6-0 to issue the Letter of Support.

The Commission expressed concern about the amount of telecommunication towers being added to buildings and worried that they may become detrimental.

Mr. Rolle stated that he could do some research for the Commission regarding this as it a complicated as FCC has oversight and the regulations would need to be looked into.

e. Letter from MacRostie Historic Advisors, LLC, requesting four (4) Letters of Support

- Worcester Center for Performing Arts, 551-561 Main Street
- Osgood Bradley Building, 18 Grafton Street
- Worcester Boys’ Club, Lincoln Square
- Paul Revere Life Insurance Company Building, 18 Chestnut Street

Upon a motion a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to issue Letter s of Support for the four addresses.

f. Letter from Epsilon Associates, Inc. re: Letter of Support, 322-332 Main Street received electronically June 20, 2015

Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to issue a Letter of Support.


Upon a motion by Chair Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 6-0 to issue a Letter of Support.

h. Board Schedule 2016

The Commission reviewed the board schedule for 2016 and stated the dates look fine.

Commissioner Bjork asked if Mr. Rolle had any updates about the downtown streetscape and the gargoyles.

Mr. Rolle stated that the downtown streetscape he will have update later in the summer and the gargoyle issue is being handled by Preservation Worcester.
**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.