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

February 16, 2017

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Andrew Shveda
Robyn Conroy
Devon Kurtz
Mark Wamback
Courtney Escobar, Alternate

Commission Members Absent: Randolph Bloom
Cheryll Holley, Alternate

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

Approval of Minutes

January 19, 2016

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the minutes of January 19, 2016.

Old Business

1. 21 Catherine Street – HC-2016-075

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Advocates, Inc.
Present Use: Rooming House
Year Built: 1848
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register Individual (NRIP), National Register (MRA), fka The Draper Ruggles House

Petition Purpose:
• Remove existing deteriorated front porch columns, including new concrete pier foundations. New columns to match existing

The Petitioner was not present.
Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted to postpone the item to the February 23, 2017 meeting and to extend the BDDW Construction Grant Deadline to February 26, 2017.

2. 272 Highland Street - HC-2016-080

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Melinda Pham  
Present Use: Single family residence  
Year Built: 1890  
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register Individual (NRIP), National Register (MRA), fka E.S. Pierce House

Petition Purpose:  
- Remove and replace windows  
- Repair to siding  
- Close first floor window on left north side home  
- Eliminate the chimney right south side of home

The Petitioner was not available and requested a continuance.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Wamback, the Commission voted to postpone the item to the February 23, 2017 meeting and to extend the BDDW Construction Grant Deadline to February 26, 2017.

3. 570 Pleasant Street - HC-2017-001

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Josue Rosa  
Present Use: Three Family Residence  
Year Built: 1912  
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register Individual (NRIP), National Register (MRA), fka Helen Three Decker

Petition Purpose:  
- Demolition of the Building

Jose Rosa appeared on behalf of the application.

This item had been continued from January 19, 2017 to allow for the Petitioner to meet with the IRT Committee to explore alternative options. Mr. Rosa stated that the meeting went well, but that he still desires to just take the building down.

Chair Shveda asked about the possibility of his wellness center being housed in this building, but Mr. Rosa stated that it’s too expensive.

Chair Shveda confirmed that Mr. Rosa understood how the Demolition Delay Waiver works and stated he doesn’t have any more questions. Mr. Rosa stated that he wants to expand his business and that the
building is too far gone to repurpose. He said it hasn’t been maintained, that he had already spent a lot on the purchase and the work to restore it would be too costly. Mr. Rosa claimed that there are extensive structural issues and that in order to use it as a wellness center it would be too expensive to bring it up to code, specifically regarding the installation of a sprinkler system.

Chair Shveda informed Mr. Rosa that the Commission would vote, unless he had additional information to present. Mr. Rosa stated that he’s a small business and that it would be an economic hardship to restore the building. He stated that the reason he purchased it was so that another buyer wouldn’t acquire it and create a negative impact on his neighboring property.

Chair Shveda asked about the possibility of someone buying it and restoring it. Mr. Rosa stated that it’s too far gone, that he spent $200,000 to acquire it and it would cost almost half a million to restore it.

Commissioner Conroy inquired about the availability of any structural reports. Mr. Rosa stated that he had his contactor, Sam Rosario check it out; then repeated the need to bring the whole building to code.

Chair Shveda asked about the option of keeping it as residential use. Mr. Rosa repeated that it’s too far gone for that use too, because no upgrades have been done. Commissioner Conroy asked when the last tenants left. Mr. Rosa stated it’s been vacant for over two years.

Chair Shveda continued his explanation of the process. Mr. Rosa understood that there would be a 12 month hold on the demolition if the waiver did not pass, and stated that he was disappointed because his goal is to create a positive environment. He said he has good intentions and that his other properties are well maintained.

Chair Shveda stated he still believed there are other options, mainly restoration. He pointed out that Mr. Rosa bought the property with the sole purpose of tearing it down. He also noted the importance of the building along that particular stretch of houses, stating that he doesn’t want to see a parking lot there. Mr. Rosa replied that his intent is to enhance the neighborhood and believes he’s done so with his existing neighboring business, but that he doesn’t have the resources to do it again.

Commissioner Conroy voiced her concern about the lack of proof that the condition of the building warrants demolition as the only option. Mr. Rosa stated that his intention upon purchase was to renovate, but that it’s too far gone.

Mr. Rosa stated that he acquired the property for $200,000 and does not have the money to put into it for renovations. He also stated that he estimated the cost of demolition to be approximately $40,000.

Chair Shveda confirmed that Mr. Rosa stated he had invested $3 million into his salon, the neighboring property, but asked why he’s not willing to put $500,000 into this house. Mr. Rosa now stated that it will cost more than that, and that he doesn’t want to get more into debt at this point in his life. He stated that it’s not going to be an open parking lot; that he just wants to take the building down and landscape the lot.
Chair Shveda voiced concern about applications like this that present no clear plan following demolition. Mr. Rosa countered that he has a history of improving the neighborhood. Commissioner Conroy reinforced this concern about a lack of plan.

Commissioner Wamback questioned the logic in putting money into removing a building and landscaping and thereby creating a parcel that will not generate any income, versus investing the same money in the building and gathering rent. Mr. Rosa claimed he looked at all those options and it would take him too long to recover the money.

Susan Ceccacci from Preservation Worcester stated that she feels this house is an important contribution to this street and in general it’s wise to preserve a building rather than to demolish it and leave a vacant lot with no plans for the future. The house is important to the character of the development of the neighborhood. Preservation Worcester is opposed to allowing this demolition.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Kurtz and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 0-4 that the proposed demolition of the building was not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to deny the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.

Chair Shveda stated that the waiver was denied and that the delay period will extend one year from the date of filing. The commission does have the ability to shorten the period should the applicant reappear with new information regarding plans for the property.

Mr. Rolle reminded the Commission that they can take a vote on the matter of economic hardship, if the applicant wanted to provide additional information to support that argument.

Regarding economic hardship, Mr. Rosa stated that the restrictions aren’t fair to a small business. That his goal is to enhance the neighborhood and that the current regulations make that difficult.

Commissioner Conroy stated that she may be open to entertaining an economic hardship argument if more information was presented. For example, a report stating the current conditions and a cost estimate for repairs. Mr. Rosa repeated the need to sprinklers and that there’s just too much to do. Chair Shveda questioned the need to a full gut and rehab. Commissioner Wamback also stated he’d like to see more detailed information to support an economic hardship argument.

As Mr. Rosa was interested in pursuing this option, Chair Shveda requested a detailed estimate of costs to make the building safe per Worcester Inspectonal Services, as well as a relatively detailed breakout of the cost of full renovation to make it habitable for rent. Commissioner Conroy also requested photos showing structural issues and the interior. Mr. Rosa agreed to have the Commission members schedule a site visit prior to the next hearing.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the economic hardship discussion for 570 Pleasant Street to the March 23 Commission meeting and extend the BDDW Construction Grant Deadline to March 26.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application received December 16, 2016 and dated December 12, 2016.
New Business

Item (e) under Communications, 2017-2018 Meeting schedule, was taken out of order.

Upon a motion by Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the amended 2017-2018 meeting schedule.

4. 120 Austin Street - HC-2017-006

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: F&M Properties
Present Use: Two Family Residence
Year Built: 1857
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, part of Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose:
   • Remove and replace windows
   • Replace damaged fascia

Todd and Pat Rainey from Bill’s Roofing appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Shveda confirmed that the windows and fascia being replaced are not original to the building. As this property is within the Crown Hill Historic District, in addition to a Demolition Delay Waiver, the Commission needs to vote on a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Rainey stated that the windows and fascia will match the existing in color and material. Chair Shveda noted that the house contained little to no historic material, and that the proposed work did not appear to have a negative effect on the district.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Kurtz and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition was not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Kurtz and seconded by Commissioner Conroy the Commission voted 5-0 that the changes proposed to 120 Austin Street are appropriate for the Crown Hill Local District and approved the Certificate of Appropriateness.


5. 22 Gage Street - HC-2017-005

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Michael Miller
Present Use: Multi Unit Apartment
Year Built: 1890
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed
Petition Purpose:
- Remove and replace roof
- Replace vinyl windows with vinyl windows
- Repair and replace damaged siding

Jeff Riscucci appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Riscucci stated that the damage to be repaired was due to a fire, and he confirmed that the current windows are vinyl and are being replaced in kind.

Chair Shveda noted that this is not in a historic district, that the replacement is like for like, replacing non-historic material, and that the overall look and form of the building will not be changed.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition was not detrimental to the historic and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


6. 2 Washington Street (Union Station) - HC-2017-014

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Worcester Redevelopment Authority
Present Use: Train Station
Year Built: 1900
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register Individual Property (NRIP), National Register (MRA), Preservation Restriction

Petition Purpose:
- Installation of automated lighting controls
- Repair interior public spaces
- Refinishing the interior passenger elevators
- Replace the wheelchair lift with ADA compliance ramp in the corridor off Harding Street
- Upgrading basement and second floor public restrooms

Steve Van Dyke, Azim Rawji, Mark Suponti, and Jeanette Tozer appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Shveda confirmed the outline of work to be performed and requested a brief overview by the petitioners. Ms. Tozer noted that funds for this project are being sought through the Federal Transit Administration and part of that application is completing the Section 106 process, so a letter of support from the Commission is requested as part of the due diligence.

Mr. Rawji stated that there are currently no automated lighting controls present, so they are left on all the time. In order to have a more efficient building, automated controls are being proposed.
Interior painting applies to most of the interior public spaces. The paint is in fair condition, so this work is being proposed as preventative maintenance. Chair Shveda asked if the preparation work is different for a surface that is failing versus one that is in good condition. Mr. Van Dyke stated that yes; there is less effort to complete the work now. Chair Shveda asked whether it is also less destructive to the underlying material. Mr. Van Dyke agreed and said it’s less expensive as well.

Mr. Van Dyke continued, stating that the elevators see a lot of use and wear. The interiors of the cabs are metals panels that have a clear lacquer applied. The refinishing process involves sanding and re-lacquering, which takes the elevator out of service for an extended period. The proposed solution is to produce a second set of panels that can be swapped out when the panels need refinishing.

Mr. Van Dyke stated that the Harding Street entrance is at a lower grade and currently has a wheelchair lift. The lift, due to being unmanned and unreliable, does not adequately provide handicap accessibility. The proposal is to remove the lift and construct a ramp over a portion of the stairs, in material that will be visually consistent with other portions of the building. Chair Shveda asked if the stairs would be elongated to match the ramp. Mr. Van Dyke responded that there is a set of doors to a mechanical room that prevent regrading the stairs or moving the ramp to the current position of the lift.

Mr. Van Dyke discussed the damaged terrazzo baseboard in the bathrooms. This will be removed in full and stockpiled for future repairs in more visible locations, and the bathrooms would receive all new base that will match the existing terrazzo as closely as possible.

*Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Wamback, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.*

*Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Wamback, the Commission voted 5-0 that the work proposed at Union Station is appropriate for the Preservation Restriction.*

Item (a) under Communications, Request for Letter of Support, was taken out of order.

*Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve issue a Letter of Support for the Worcester Development Authority’s proposal for capital improvements at Union Station, to be sent to the Federal Transit Administration.*


7. **35 Cambridge Street - HC-2017-008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition:</th>
<th>Building Demolition Delay Waiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner:</td>
<td>Westview LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use:</td>
<td>Multi Unit apartment building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built:</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Status:</td>
<td>MACRIS Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Purpose:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Remove and replace deck stairs
• Remove old siding and paint with like materials
• Remove and replace roof shingles

Phil Moore and Walter Palowski appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Moore stated that the deck is in the rear of the house and is a safety issue. Chair Shveda asked whether the porch is visible from any streets. Mr. Moore stated that it’s partially visible from Haynes Street.

Commissioner Conroy provided a c1920 photograph showing a 2-story porch across the rear of the house, and Chair Shveda noted that some of the current framing members appeared to date to that photo. Mr. Moore stated that it will be replaced to match, and to bring it to code. The roof will be temporarily supported then the deck underneath it will be rebuilt.

The applicants clarified that Item 1 (replace the rear decks) applies to the older (blue) house, and Items 2 & 3 (repair/replace siding, and roof shingles) apply to the newer (tan) house. Mr. Palowski stated the property used to be two separate street addresses that were merged in the 1980s.

Mr. Moore also mentioned replacing windows on the tan house. This item was not included in the application and was therefore not advertised. Ms. Steele noted that the applicant would need to reappear for this item. As a firm date of construction for this building was not known, Mr. Rolle suggested that staff research the property and if it was built after 1967 then it would not need additional approval.

Chair Shveda commented that, though the deck did appear to be a historic feature, it has been modified and that exposed wood decks do have a specified lifetime. He also noted that the proposed design is respectable, paying homage to the original.

The vote will cover both structures, except for the proposed window replacement to the tan house. This item will be pending discovery regarding the building’s age.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Wamback and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


8. 37 Fruit Street - HC-2017-011

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Hampton Properties LLC
Present Use: Mixed Used Building
Year Built: 1884
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register District (NRD), National Register (MRA) fka Francis M. Lincoln House
Petition Purpose:
- Repair and replace roof
- Remove and replace windows
- Add additional egress from third floor

Russell Haimes appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Haimes reviewed the building’s renovation history provided by the previous owner. He outlined his proposal and estimates for repairing the slate roof versus replacing it with slate-look composite tiles with copper valleys and caps. He stated the replacement would be approximately $25,000 less than slate repair.

On 59 William, the roof is asphalt, and the entire building had previously been heavily modified. He proposed to replace the roof in kind.

Mr. Haimes stated that some of the windows on 37 Fruit are unique or are protected from weather by porches, and will be retained. He stated that the others are too damaged and will be replaced with vinyl windows in a darker color with the grid pattern to match the existing. Chair Shveda asked how many of the originals will be replaced. Mr. Haimes was not sure, but said that maybe four of the originals would be retained.

Commissioner Conroy asked if the windows in 59 Williams are original. Mr. Haimes replied no, they are a mix of replacements.

Regarding the proposed third floor egress, Mr. Haimes explained that the interior stair case is already present, opening to a porch via window, but that the current configuration is inadequate. The proposal would be to replace the window with a door and add a staircase toward the rear to the ground.

Chair Shveda noted that he’s inclined to grant a bit more latitude to this applicant as he has previously proven himself in terms of quality and attention to detail. He also acknowledged that wooden windows can be repaired, but that it involves additional cost and labor, and unfortunately the lack of storms likely hastened the deterioration. He confirmed that the sashes, weights, and stops will be removed and the cavities insulated. Mr. Haimes stated they’d be replaced by Harvey brand windows, and the exterior of both houses will be painted.

Chair Shveda asked what the budget is for this project. Mr. Haimes stated that just for 37 Fruit, it is approximately $300,000, which includes interior renovation. He also stated that the house will be insulated from the interior with blown insulation.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Wamback and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition of 37 Fruit Street and 59 Williams Street is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.

9. **61 Cedar Street - HC-2017-010**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Hampton Properties LLC  
Present Use: Multi Unit Residence  
Year Built: 1892  
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register District (NRD), National Register (MRA)  
Petition Purpose:  
- Remove and replace roof  
- Remove and replace windows  
- Demolish detached garage

Russell Haimes appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Haimes presented examples of previous projects as an example of the windows proposed for the property. He stated that likely due to structural settling, many of the windows are out of square resulting in them not closing properly.

Chair Shveda confirmed that the roof is asphalt and will be replaced in kind, and asked about the removal of the garage. Mr. Haimes stated that he needs the additional driveway space for parking as there are eight units in the house. Chair Shveda asked whether the garage is original to the house. He speculated it dates to the 1920s with the increase in automobile ownership. Regardless of whether it’s original, its removal needs to be considered. Mr. Haimes stated that its removal would allow for four additional spaces; that its position does not allow for adequate snow removal or maximum use of the driveway. Discussion continued about the presence of similar garages in the neighborhood, and the structure’s historic significance in the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Haimes noted that he’s not required to provide any parking spaces, but would like to for the convenience of his tenants.

Regarding the second egress in process, Mr. Haimes stated that when he purchased the property there was a ladder tacked to the side of the house from the third floor to a roof below. The third floor was identified as a life and safety issue as there is no additional egress. This has already involved replacing the original window, and reroofing the shingles below.

*Upon a motion by Commissioner Wamback and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.*


10. **56 Water Street - HC-2017-012**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Baystate Investment Fund  
Present Use: Commercial Building
Year Built: 1936
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, fka Bob’s filling station
Petition Purpose:
  • Remove and replace windows

Ed Murphy appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Shveda noted that this is a former filling station, one of the few left in the city, and asked what the proposed use would be. Mr. Murphy stated it would be a cupcake bakery; that the overhead doors would remain, that many of the windows were boarded over and were found when demolition of the ceilings began. He stated that he also renovated the building at 50 Water Street, and would like to use the same Anderson 400 series window on this location as well as 56 Water Street for continuity.

Mr. Murphy continued that as part of their redevelopment of 56 Water Street, parking was needed so they purchased this lot and worked it into the plan.

Chair Shveda commented that though the windows have aesthetic value as part of the industrial history, he acknowledged issues of energy and the deteriorated condition of some of them. Mr. Murphy stated that the replacement windows would have a similar grid pattern to the existing units.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


11. 64 Water Street - HC-2017-013

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Baystate Investment Fund
Present Use: Commercial Building
Year Built: 1912
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, fka Mendel Block Building
Petition Purpose:
  • Demolish Harding Street store fronts
  • Remove and replace four bay windows

Ed Murphy appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Murphy stated that the bay windows have been exposed to the elements and are rotting. There are currently two window openings in each bay, on each floor, but no windows. The proposal is to rebuild the bays and add a third window to the center of each bay. He stated that the current bay framing is not securely attached to the building and wood rot is exacerbating the condition.
Regarding the storefronts, Mr. Murphy stated that the Water Street elevation storefronts were updated in the last 10 years or so, and that this phase will consist of creating usable storefronts on Harding Street. The current condition consists of patched in doors and brick. The applicant intends to retain the center entrance, but stated that a glass door will be required due to it being a high traffic area.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Kurtz and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


12. 38 May Street - HC-2017-004

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Frank McReynolds
Present Use: Multiple Structures
Year Built: 1888
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register District (NRD), National Multiple Resource Area (MRA), fka C.C. Whitcomb House

Petition Purpose:
- Work to porch, deck, steps and balconies
- Work on windows and replacement of some windows
- Replacement of bulkhead
- Work on siding
- Work on foundation
- Installation of handrail

Frank McReynolds appeared on behalf of the application.

Chair Shveda reviewed the scope of proposed work, summarizing that the majority of work appeared to be maintenance and upkeep, which the Commission has no issue with. He noted, however, that in repairing mortar to try to match the new as closely as possible to the existing. He encouraged Mr. McReynolds to make sure his mason followed through on this.

Regarding the proposed porch repairs, Chair Shveda asked about the plan for the missing porch posts. Mr. McReynolds stated that his contractor can duplicate the turned post to match the existing ones. He noted that the items involving the porch are more of a safety concern, while some other items are standard upkeep and repair. Chair Shveda inquired about the missing balusters as well. Mr. McReynolds stated that he’d like to keep it the same and that his contractor believes he can find duplicates.

Discussion about the exterior, decorative window on the porch raised the question about whether code would require its removal. Mr. McReynolds’ building report recommended the removal of the window for safety reasons, but Chair Shveda did not think it was necessary as it’s not within 30 inches of a
door. He did, however, question the height of the handrail and noted that sometimes, repairs versus replacement may allow for the retention of the existing height.

Regarding the note in the report about the chimney condition, Mr. McReynolds stated that some bricks have fallen and the mortar is crumbling and that it will be fixed.

Returning to the decorative window on the porch, Chair Shveda stated he would like to see the window retained. He did not believe it was a code issue, but more of a personal preference, and encouraged Mr. McReynolds to speak with the code official about this. He followed up, stating that for the sake of this demolition delay that this window is not part of the ruling.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Wamback, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition, with the exception of the decorative glass window on the front porch, is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


13. 22 Newbury Street - HC-2017-009

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver & Certificate of Appropriateness
Petitioner: City of Worcester
Present Use: Vacant Lot
Historic Status: Crown Hill Local Historic District
Petition Purpose:
- Replace chain link fence
- Fix crumbling retaining walls and concrete circular walkway
- Grading of area and installation of water spigot
- Installation of garden beds, seating areas and landscaping

The Petitioner was not available and requested a continuance.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Conroy and seconded by Commissioner Wamback, the Commission voted to postpone the item to the February 23, 2017 meeting and to extend the Construction Grant Deadline and the Certificate of Appropriateness deadline to February 26, 2017.


14. 21-24 Hospital Street - HC-2017-007

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner: Commonwealth of MA, DCAMM
Present Use: Former Hospital Buildings
Year Built: 1920
Historic Status: MACRIS Listed, National Register District (NRD), National Register (MRA) fka Worcester State Hospital

Petition Purpose:
- Demolition of four cottages on southeastern portion of site
- Redevelopment of Hale building

Julie Holstrom and Roberta Bryan appeared on behalf of the application.

Ms. Holstrom clarified that this phase entails the demolition of the four cottages; the Hale building is currently mothballed and will be examined for reuse at a later date. The properties are currently owned by the Commonwealth, and the WBDC is in the process of negotiating a land disposition agreement so that the land, which is 44 acres and includes the cottages, the Hale building, community health link and department of developmental services, will be conveyed to them.

Chair Shveda reviewed the project, stating that according to the application three of the four buildings are unheated and in poor condition. Ms. Holstrom confirmed, stating that one building is still partially occupied by the security company that manages the other state owned properties there. With the land conveyance, that security office would be relocated.

Chair Shveda inquired about the history of the cottages, when they were built. Ms. Holstrom stated she believed they were constructed in the 1920s, as the hospital grew. Chair Shveda asked if the reason for the proposed demolition was so that the site could be redeveloped into a biomedical facility. Ms. Holstrom confirmed, stating that the plan is to site a 100,000 square foot bio manufacturing facility there.

Chair Shveda noted DCAMM’s history of working well with the Commission and Preservation Worcester in the creation of the clock tower monument. He noted the charm of the cottages and their connection to the hospital campus, but acknowledged that it has changed significantly. He noted the present use of the site, and the fact that the Hale building is being actively mothballed for potential reuse. Commissioner Conroy noted the letter of support from Preservation Worcester. (Item g under Communications) Ms. Holstrom stated that they had completed a site visit with members of Preservation Worcester and agreed to properly document the cottages prior to any demolition activity.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Wamback and seconded by Commissioner Kurtz, the Commission voted 5-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical and architectural resources of the city and voted to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver application.


Communications


b. Communication from Division of Capital Asset and Maintenance re: Worcester State Hospital, dated January 9, 2017 and received January 13, 2017.
c. Communication from Division and Capital Asset and Maintenance re: Former Worcester State Hospital dated, January 10, 2017 and received January 10, 2017.


Upon a motion by Chair Shveda and seconded by Commissioner Conroy the Commission voted 5-0 to issue a Letter of Support.

e. 2017-2018 Meeting schedule.


Adjournment

Upon a motion the Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.