

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

**March 11, 2010
LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL**

Commission Members Present: Peter Schneider, Chair
Thomas Constantine
Timothy McCann
James Crowley
Michael Theerman
Janet Merrill

Staff Present: Edgar Luna, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schneider called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

CONTINUANCES – WITHDRAWALS:

- 1. 20 Whitman Road (HC-2010-005) – Certificate of Appropriateness and Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Mr. Luna informed the Commission that the petitioner, Jeanice Sherman, requested a continuation of the hearing to March 25, 2010. Upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the hearing for the Certificate of Appropriateness to March 25, 2010.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- 1. 18 Woodford Street (HC-2010-004) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Dang Quach, owner and petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Quach stated that he was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to implement the following changes to the residential building on site: (a) replace 45 existing windows with new vinyl windows with similar grids, (b) remove existing storm windows, (c) repaint window trim with the same color, (d) repair/replace a section of wood siding and repaint with same color, (e) repair cracked/damaged stucco siding, (f) repaint front and back door, (g) replace house and garage roof with like materials (architectural shingles), (h) repair/replace section of front and side porch with like materials and repaint, (i) repair chimney, (j) repair/replace gutters and down spout as needed. Mr. Quach stated that he was planning to restore the property in order preserve its historic significance while making it financially profitable. He indicated that his main concern was the removal and replacement of the windows because they were not energy-efficient. Chair Schneider asked Mr. Quach to describe the

condition of the wooden windows. Mr. Quach stated that the wood in the windows had rotted and indicated that while it may be possible to repair, it would be extremely costly and not financially profitable. Chair Schneider asked Mr. Quach if he had considered restoring the windows instead of replacing them. Mr. Quach responded that he consulted four (4) contractors on this matter but indicated that all four advocated replacing the windows instead. Chair Schneider stated that several window restoration alternatives existed, and indicated that such alternatives were energy efficient and less costly. He stated that one such method included removing the counterweights and replacing them with a spring mechanism that would allow opening/closing of the window, which would allow filling the empty chamber with synthetic foam to increase insulation. Commissioner Theerman asked the petitioner if he had submitted written estimates from window treatment professionals indicating cost differences between restoring windows, versus window replacement. Mr. Quach stated that his application included a cost estimate which indicated that the cost of replacing the windows with vinyl windows was \$250.00 versus \$450.00 for the restoration of the windows in place. Commissioner Theerman stated that in his opinion, the information submitted in the application did not meet the criteria for an accurate cost estimate as it had not been signed by a window treatment expert. He further indicated that in order to render a vote on this matter, the petitioner would need to submit a written and signed cost estimate from such professionals. Chair Schneider stated that in his opinion, the most important windows of the house were the windows located in the front. Mr. Quach stated that he was proposing to replace the windows but indicated that he would keep the existing window trim, and added that the new windows would be painted the same color as the windows currently in place. He also indicated the stained glass window located on the second level of the house would remain in place. Commissioner Theerman stated that he was in favor of approving all repairs proposed, except the items related to the windows. Commissioner Crowley stated that he concurred with Commissioner Theerman. Commissioner Theerman asked Mr. Quach what he would do if the window replacement was denied. Mr. Quach stated that he was a real estate investor; therefore, if the window replacement was denied, he would sell the property without making any restorations, as it would not be profitable for him to invest in a partial restoration of the house. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the following proposed work would not be detrimental: (k) repair/replace section of wood siding and repaint with same color, (l) repair cracked/damaged stucco siding, (m) repaint front and back door, (n) replace house and garage roof with like materials (architectural shingles), (o) repair/replace section of front and side porch with like materials and repaint, (p) repair chimney, (q) repair/replace gutters and down spout as needed, of the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester; therefore the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for these items was approved. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 1-5 (Commissioner Constantine voting yes) that the proposed replacement of 45 existing windows with new vinyl windows with similar grids, and the removal of existing storm windows would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester. The motion failed, and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for those two items was not granted. The Commission then considered whether the petitioner had demonstrated undue

economic hardship. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 1-5 (Commissioner Constantine voting yes) that the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship and approved the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project based on the economic hardship. The motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not granted.

- 2. 52 Millbury Street (HC-2010-006) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Deriusz Gago, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Gago stated that he was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to implement the following changes to the building on site: (a) remove the existing façade and install 8 vinyl windows with aluminum trim, (b) install two (2) front doors, (c) remove and replace the existing fascia and (d), install a 3.5 foot brick wall under the proposed windows. Mr. Gago stated that the original exterior architectural features of this building were removed several years ago, and indicated that the current features are in an advance state of disrepair and decay. In addition, he indicated that the exterior features proposed will blend harmoniously with other buildings on Millbury Street that still retain their original features, and enhance the neighborhood. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, and upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the changes proposed would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester; therefore, the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.
- 3. 3 Stoneland Road (HC-2010-007) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** John Boyce, representative for Sophia Tsoikas, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Boyce stated that the petitioner was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to implement the following changes to the building on site: (a) reconstruct masonry chimneys, (b) replace asphalt shingles with architectural shingles, (c) install vinyl siding and trim, (d) repair the porch, (e) replace wooden railings system with vinyl railing system, (f) replace existing wooden storms with aluminum combination storm and screen door. Mr. Boyce stated that the petitioner recently inherited the property from an elderly relative who was not able financially to address the advanced state of disrepair and decay of the building. He also indicated that according to the petitioner, the last maintenance work performed on the house was the replacement of the roof, which took place during the early 70's. Chair Schneider stated that in his opinion, several of the exterior architectural features the petitioner was proposing to remove and replace appeared to be original to the house, such as the window pediments and gables; therefore, he indicated that he would prefer that the petitioner consider restoring these features and not replacing them. Mr. Boyce stated that most of the exterior wooden architectural features were in an advanced state of disrepair, and indicated that the petitioner was a senior citizen with limited income and would not be able to afford restoring these features. He also indicated that the restoration cost for each window would be \$450.00 versus the installation cost of \$250.00 per each new vinyl window. Commissioner Crowley expressed concern with the proposed installation of vinyl siding and trim. Commissioner Constantine expressed his support for the restoration plan as proposed. Commissioner Theerman expressed concern with the proposed removal of the wooden railings and proposed installation of vinyl siding. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted

1-5 (Commissioner Constantine voting yes) that the proposed (a) reconstruction of the masonry chimneys, (b) the replacement of asphalt shingles with architectural shingles, (c) the installation of vinyl siding and trim (d) the repair of the porch, (e) the replacement of the wooden railing system with vinyl railing system, (f) the replacement of the existing wooden storm doors with aluminum combination storm and screen door would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester; therefore, the motion failed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was not granted. The Commission then considered whether the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship and approved the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project based on the economic hardship.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 4. 127 Austin Street (HC-2010-008) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Todd Rainey and Patricia Kapulka, representatives for Michael Razzo, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Rainey stated that the petitioner was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to install vinyl siding over the existing wood siding. Commissioner Schneider asked Mr. Rainey to inform the Commission why the petitioner was proposing to install vinyl siding over the existing wooden siding. Mr. Rainey stated that the wooden siding was old and provided deficient insulation, while the installation of the vinyl siding would improve insulation. Chair Schneider stated that in his opinion, the wooden siding appeared to be in good condition, and asked if the petitioner had considered sanding and painting the wooden siding instead of adding a new layer of vinyl siding which would have a negative impact on this historically significant structure. Mr. Rainey stated that the siding in place had lead paint which would be too costly to remove. Chair Schneider stated that the City had a lead removal program administered by Neighborhood and Housing Development Division. Mr. Rainey also indicated that the windows on site would need to be replaced due to the wood frame being in poor condition. Chair Schneider reminded Mr. Rainey that the Building Demolition Delay Waiver submitted did not include the removal and replacement of windows; therefore the Commission could not consider it, and added that such removal and replacement would require a new petition. Mr. Rainey stated that he would like to consult with the petitioner regarding these matters; therefore, he requested continuation of the hearing to March 25, 2010. Upon a motion by Commissioner Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Theerman, the Commission voted 6-0 to continue the hearing for the Building Demolition Delay Waiver to March 25, 2010 to allow the petitioner additional time to consult with the petitioner regarding these matters.
- 5. 2-4 Kansas Street (HC-2010-009) Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Ernest Porter, petitioner, presented the petition. Mr. Porter stated that he was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to remove and replace an overhead door located on the southerly side of the building from 8' x 10' to 14" x 12". Commissioner Crowley stated that the proposed door would be an improvement to the building. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, and upon a motion by Commissioner

Crowley and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed change would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester; therefore, the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.

6. **24 Gage Street (HC-2010-010) – Building Demolition Delay Waiver:** Tatyana Shcherban and John Drazack representative for Hatarbut Investment, petitioner, presented the petition. Ms. Shcherban stated that the petitioner was seeking Building Demolition Delay Waiver approval to implement the following changes to the building on site: (a) remove and replace seven (7) vinyl windows with vinyl windows, (b) replace one exterior door on the right side of the building, (c) cover the interior of the porch with T1-11 material, and (d), install metal flashing on windows and porch. Ms. Shcherban stated that she was surprised to find out that this building was listed in the MACRIS list, as all of the exterior architectural features had been removed. Upon reviewing the request submitted and the evidence provided, and upon a motion by Commissioner McCann and seconded by Commissioner Constantine, the Worcester Historical Commission voted 6-0 that the proposed changes would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester; therefore, the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for this project was approved.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. **Crown Hill Local Historic District Update:** Mr. Luna informed the Commission that Mr. Neil Larson had successfully completed phase I and II of the project, and was currently in the process of researching the historical data of the sites and structures selected for possible inclusion in the final Crown Hill neighborhood list of architecturally significant buildings.
2. **Adjournment:** Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM.