

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

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2007
CHASE BUILDING, 44 FRONT STREET, WORCESTER
SUITE 300 – CONFERENCE ROOM**

Commission Members Present: Thomas Constantine, Vice- Chair
Michael Theerman
James Crowley
Janet Merrill

Staff Present: Edgar Luna, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services
Ruth Gentile, Division of Planning and Regulatory Services

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Constantine called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by James Crowley and seconded by Michael Theerman, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the approval the minutes from the August 9, 2007 and August 23, 2007 meeting until September 27, 2007

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. 80 Fairhaven Road (HC-07-28) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Anne Marie Incutto, owner and petitioner, and Chad L. Bergeron presented the petition. Ms. Incutto stated that she was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on site: (a) repair the three front decks utilizing 1” x 4” fir-wood decking, (b) remove and replace the front steps utilizing new pressure-treated framing and raising boards, (c) remove and replace the front railings utilizing a similar design and the following materials: “Trex” 2” x 4” rails, 4” x 4” posts, and 2” x 24” balusters, (d) construct a new 12” baluster and rail system to be installed from post to post on top of the three porches utilizing “Trex” 2” x 4” rails and 2” x 2” balusters. Ms. Incutto also stated that over the years, many of the original architectural features

of the building, such as the wood clapboard with wood shingle bands between stories and the Tuscan columns, were removed and replaced with vinyl siding and square columns due to wear and deterioration. In addition, Ms. Incutto stated that the proposed repairs were required to meet current Code standards. Mr. Bergeron stated that the installation of the 2" x 4" rails and 2" x 2" balusters on top of knee-walls on the three (3) front-porches was being proposed in order to meet Code standards, and minimize insurance liability. Commissioner Theerman stated that while he supported the efforts of the petitioner to comply with Code standards, he expressed concern that the proposed additions would further erode the originality of the structure and negatively impact the exterior architectural significance of the building. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, the Commission found that the applicant had an undue economic hardship; therefore, it voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver based on hardship.

2. 43, 45 & 49 Belmont Street (HC-07-29) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:

Reverend Edward Ryan and Michael O'Rourke presented the petition. Mr. O'Rourke stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on the exterior of the church: (a) remove the brick chimney located on the northerly-side, and close the respective opening on the roof with slate and (b), install an exterior new stainless steel flue-vent on the easterly-side of the church. Mr. O'Rourke also stated that the bricks on the four (4) sides of the chimney walls are loose and have deteriorated from natural wear, and indicated that the chimney is currently leaning precariously towards the easterly side, which causes concern for the safety of the parishioners who attend daily masses and park their vehicles under it. In addition, Mr. O'Rourke stated that while the church leaders had carefully considered repairing the chimney as their first option, labor-cost and material-estimates compelled them to consider installing an exterior flue-vent instead. Commissioner Theerman asked Mr. O'Rourke to inform the Commission of the cost-estimate of repairing the chimney versus installing the flue-vent. Mr. O'Rourke stated that repairing the chimney in its current location would have a total cost of \$35,000.00, while installing the exterior flue-vent and closing the roof opening with slate would have a total cost of \$20,000.00. Commissioner Theerman expressed concern that the proposed stainless steel flue-vent would negatively impact the exterior appearance of the Victorian-Gothic architecture of the church, especially due to the fact that the proposed location for the flue-vent could be seen from Belmont Street. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, the Commission found that the applicant had an undue economic hardship; therefore, it voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver based on hardship.

- 3. 34 William Street (HC-07-30) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Eileen P. Milton, owner of the property and petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Milton stated that she was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to remove and replace the exterior stairway on the westerly-side to provide access to all three (3) stories. Ms. Milton also stated that the current stairway is not original to the period of the house, does not reach the third-floor, was poorly constructed, and has deteriorated beyond repair. In addition, Ms. Milton stated that she was planning to utilize wooden spindles in a style that is appropriate to the period of the house, and would be built according to current code standards. John Zeugner, an abutter, stated that while he did not oppose the proposed project, he requested clarification regarding the location of the stairway. Ms. Milton stated that the proposed project involved removing and replacing the stairway in the same location. Mr. Luna stated that he had informed Ms. Milton that the proposed landing of the stairway should not encroach into the side yard setback as such encroachment may require a Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Crowley, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.
- 4. 24 William Street (HC-07-31) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Craig Orn, representative for the petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Orn stated that he was seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following repair work on the structure located on site: (a) remove and replace burned sill and trim work, up to 20 linear feet, (b) remove and replace clapboard, up to 200 square feet, (c) repair and restructure the deck with pressure-treated wood, (d) remove and replace the deteriorated trim on the eaves and soffits on the third floor, (e) repair the exterior doors located on the common areas, removing the slate roof on the Mansard-roof and gable areas, and replace it with synthetic architectural shingles, and (h) install EPDM roofing on all flat roofs, (f) create a new access/egress on the third-floor, which would include the following: framing a new dormer on the gable roof for landing, building a new stairway to be connected to the existing second-floor stairway, and installing a fire-rated entry door with entry lockset and deadbolt, (g) removing the slate roof on the Mansard-roof and gable areas, and replace it with synthetic architectural shingles, and (h) install EPDM roofing on all flat roofs. Mr. Orn also indicated that the residential structure had incurred substantial damaged as a result of a recent fire, especially, the upper section of the building. He further indicated that the main objective of proposed project was to restore the building as closely as possible to its original appearance and indicated that all efforts would be made to repair and reuse original architectural features. In addition, he indicated that the three (3) damaged windows would be rebuilt in the same style, utilizing the same materials, and of the same size as the original windows in place. Commissioner Merrill asked if the remaining windows were in good condition. Mr. Orn stated that all windows, except for the three (3) windows previously indicated, were in good condition and would remain in place. Vice-Chair Constantine stated that proposed restoration project seemed appropriate and comprehensive, except for the proposed removal of the slate

roofing. He also indicated that the slate-roof was a significant architectural feature of the building and indicated that the proposed replacement with synthetic architectural shingles would negatively impact the overall exterior appearance of the structure. Commissioner Crowley asked Mr. Orn if the petitioner had considered restoring the slate roof instead of just replacing it with architectural shingles. Mr. Orn stated that the petitioner had considered restoring the slate roof; however, he indicated that such restoration would be significantly more expensive than replacing it with synthetic shingles, especially in view of the fact that the roof-structure supporting the slate was severely damaged during the fire. Commissioner Crowley asked Mr. Orn if the petitioner may consider repairing and retaining the slate-roof in the front and in the sides of the building, and utilize synthetic architectural shingles in the back section of the roof. Mr. Orn stated that the petitioner would accept repairing and retaining the slate-roof in the front and in the sides of the building, and utilizing synthetic architectural shingles in the back section of the roof. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver with the following conditions:

- **The petitioner will repair and retain the slate roof in the front section of the Mansard roof, including the gable areas.**
- **The petitioner will repair and retain the slate roof located on the left-side and right-side of the Mansard roof, including the gable areas.**
- **The petitioner will restore the porch and pipe railings located in the front of the building to its original condition and color.**

5. **23 Dix Street (HC-07-32) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Kenneth Davis and Armand Belanger, owners and petitioners, presented the petition. Mr. Belanger stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work to the building located on site: (a) remove and replace all windows on the third floor, (b) repair damaged siding areas with wood siding, (c) repair the front door and (d), install energy-efficient heating unit vents and bathroom vents on the easterly side of the dwelling structure. Mr. Belanger also stated that although most of the exterior architectural features of the building had been removed over the years, they were proposing to repair the siding damaged areas with the same materials and color. In addition, Mr. Belanger stated that the proposed windows were similar in style to the windows currently in place. Mr. Davis stated that the front-door will be replaced with an energy-efficient door, in a style that is appropriate to the building, and indicated that the two (2) side lights would be replaced. In addition, Mr. Davis stated that they were proposing to install energy-efficient heating unit vents and bathroom vents on the left side of the building, which will be painted the same color as the house. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be

detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Crowley, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

- 6. 7 Woodford Street (HC-07-33) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** David Dunham and Lisa Haddad Dunham presented the petition. Mr. Dunham stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay waiver to remove and replace the roof of the building located on site due to its advanced state of deterioration. He also stated that the roof was not original to the period of the house, as it was made of synthetic materials. In addition, Mr. Dunham stated that while the proposed roof was synthetic architectural shingles, the color and texture selected closely resemble slate tiles, which would have been the appropriate roofing material the period of the house. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Merrill and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.
- 7. 28 Adams Street (HC-07-34) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Christina , Pasquale Buonopane and Robert Albanese presented the Plan. Ms. Crawford stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on the school building located on site: (a) repair existing exterior retaining walls where needed, (b) lower the sills of existing windows in selected areas of the first floor, (c) install new window wells on selected windows in the former classrooms on the first floor, (d) remove all existing wood-windows, and replace them with aluminum-windows to match the existing mullion patterns, (e) remove all existing ball protection screens at windows, (f) install 2 south-facing dormers, 1 east-facing dormer, and 3 skylights on the roof, (g) close the Adams Street entrance with brick masonry to match existing masonry and (h), install a new window within the existing masonry arch. Ms. also stated that proposed project included sealing off the former front door with brick to match the existing brick, placing a stone band to match the existing stone band, installing a new arched window and adding a granite planter created from existing granite stairs. In addition, Ms. stated that the petitioners requested salvaging and repairing as many architectural elements from the former school as possible to be reused in the new project. Commissioner Theerman asked Ms. Crawford to inform the Commission what type of windows was proposed for the project. Ms. Crawford stated that the petitioners were proposing to install new single-hung aluminum windows, which will be adapted and matched to fit the existing openings throughout the building. In addition, Ms. Crawford stated the number and size difference of the existing windows presented the most difficult challenges of the proposed project. Mr. Theerman asked Ms. Crawford if the petitioner had considered installing true-divided windows instead of simulated-divided windows. Mr. Pasquale stated that true-divided windows would be significantly more expensive than simulated-divided windows, but indicated that he did not have at hand the price difference. Therefore, Mr. Pasquale asked the Commission to continue the approval of the proposed windows until September 27, 2007 to allow him additional time to

research the price differences. In addition, Mr. Pasquale asked the Commission to approve the remaining proposed repairs. Upon a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Merrill, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the hearing regarding the proposed windows until September 27, 2007.

The Commission expressed its desire that the main door at the west elevation on Adams Street be retained and made inoperable and the steps and walkway to the City sidewalk be removed and grass planted in the area. Upon reviewing the petition submitted for: (a) repairing the existing exterior retaining walls where needed, (b) lowering the sills of existing windows in selected areas of the first floor, (c) installing new window wells on selected windows in the former classrooms on the first floor, (d) removing all existing ball protection screens at windows, (e) installing two (2) south-facing dormers, one (1) east-facing dormer, and three (3) skylights on the roof, (f) closing the Adams Street entrance with brick masonry to match existing masonry and (g), installing a new window within the existing masonry arch, and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Crowley, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.

- 8. 13 Dartmouth Street (HC-07-35) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Christina , Pasquale Buonopane and Robert Albanese presented the Plan. Ms. Crowford stated that they were seeking a Building Demolition Delay Waiver to do the following work on the school building located on site: (a) re-open original masonry window openings, (b) install new aluminum windows to match the original openings, (c) remove all existing ball protection screens at windows, (d) lower the window sills and install window wells at the south-east corner of the building, and (e), install 4 north-facing dormers, and 1 north-facing skylight on the roof. Ms. Crowford also stated that since all windows on site were replaced recently and were in excellent condition, the proposed project did not include replacing them. She further indicated that the proposed four (4) new windows would be matched to the existing windows. Upon reviewing the petition submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission found that the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. Therefore, on a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Crowley, it was voted 4-0 to grant the Building Demolition Delay Waiver.
- 9. Local Historic District Study Committee Discussion/Update:** Mr. Luna informed the Commission that due to staff shortages and an increase in work responsibilities, staff would not have time to prepare for the public meeting previously scheduled for September 20, 2007 to address the possible expansion of the Montvale Local Historic District. Mr. Luna also informed the Commission that the Law Department had issued an opinion regarding the question posed by the Commission as to whether the parcels that comprise One Montvale Road were owned in common ownership with the portion of One Montvale Road that is within the Montvale Local Historic District.

Mr. Luna further indicated that in the memorandum issued by Michael Traynor, Deputy City Solicitor, he stated that both parcels (the front and the back parcel), were included in the deed to Anne M. Lyell, trustee of the One Montvale Road Realty Trust, the current owner. Such conveyance occurred on May 24, 1995; the grantor was Anne M. Lyell. Ms. Lyell's deed, which also includes both parcels, derived from Rosslyn A. Lyell and that conveyance took place on July 1, 1974. Therefore, he concluded that at the time of the District's creation on April 27, 1993, according to the aforementioned deeds, the subject parcels were under common ownership. Bruce Bunkie, from the Montvale Local Historic District, requested that the public meeting to consider expansion of the District be held as soon as possible, as several residents had expressed interest in addressing this matter. Commissioner Theerman stated that the meeting notification should be sent to all residents of the Montvale Historic District, as well as the following addresses: 72, 78, 80, 84, 88, and 90 Park Avenue; 1 and 3 Waconah Road; 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 15 Otsego Road; 2, 6, and 10 Forest Street; and 4, 6, and 8 Fenimore Road. Upon a motion by Commissioner Theerman and seconded by Commissioner Merrill, the Commission voted 4-0 to hold a public meeting on Thursday, October 18, 2007 discuss the possible expansion of the Montvale Local Historic District.

Vice-Chair Constantine adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.