

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER  
November 6, 2014**

**LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL**

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

**Commission Members Absent:** None

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

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

9/18/2014 – Upon a motion the Commission voted 7-0 to approve the minutes of 9/18/2014.

10/2/2014 – Upon a motion the Commission voted 4-0-3 to approve the minutes of October 2, 2014.

10/16/2014 – Upon a motion the Commission voted 6-0-1 to approve the minutes of October 16, 2014 with two edits.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**1. 49 Wellington Street (HC-2014-060)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Matheson Corporation  
Present Use: Multi Family Dwelling  
Year Built: circa 1886  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, fka the Main & Wellington Apartment Houses  
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the roof with associated work to the roofing system

Ms. Steele stated that the application had been reviewed with Inspectional Services and the contractor and the roof is a flat roof that cannot be seen from the street so it did not need to come before the Commission.

Upon a motion the Commission voted 7-0 to grant a leave to withdraw for the application.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated September 11, 2014; received September 15, 2014.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **2. 150 Lincoln Street (HC-2014-065)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Queens Ann Condo Association  
Present Use: Condominium Dwelling  
Year Built: circa 1873  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, fka the Howard Holden House  
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the asphalt roof with architectural shingles

Roger Thornberg, from the Condo Association appeared on behalf of the application. He stated that this is for the removal and replacement of the roof shingles.

Chair Provencher asked if any work is proposed on the portion of the flat roof. Mr. Thornberg stated that they will inspect and if anything needs to be replaced they will replace it.

Chair Provencher asked if any work was proposed on edge of the roof. Mr. Thornberg stated that no work was proposed with the exception of aluminum gutters that will be removed but will be put where they were but that work will be done at later time.

Secretary McCann asked what work was proposed for the chimney as the scope of work written by the contractor described reflashing the chimney. Mr. Thornberg stated that he actually doesn't remember ever seeing the chimney.

Chair Provencher stated that the only work described for the chimney is the installation of the lead flashing described in the scope of work and if for any reason something more significant needs to be done to the chimney the applicant would need to come back before the Commission.

Commissioner Bjork asked what type of gutters are on the home currently. Mr. Thornberg stated that they were aluminum.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated September 24, 2014; received October 3, 2014

### **3. 510 Cambridge Street (HC-2014-066)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: College Square Realty

Present Use: Multi Unit Apartment  
Year Built: circa 1869  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, NRIND (National Register Individual Property)  
NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area) and formerly known  
as the Cambridge Street School.  
Petition Purpose: Remove/replace the asphalt roof with architectural shingles

Francisco Argueta from Francisco's Roofing Inc. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that there is damage to the slate and it needs to be replaced.

Secretary McCann asked what portion of the roof was going to be replaced.

Mr. Argueta showed on photos Building #1 which faces McCuen Road where the slate is falling and stated that the owner of the property is concerned because doesn't want his tenants to get hurt by the falling slate.

Vice-Chair Shveda asked if the trim would be replaced in kind. Mr. Argueta stated that it would be something similar or PVC board.

Chair Provencher questioned what the property address was. Mr. Argueta sated he wasn't sure. Vice-Chair Shveda noted that the MACRIS listing shows it as 510 Cambridge Street, Building #1 and #2.

Mr. Argueta stated that some shingles on the dormer are missing on Building #2 that faces Cambridge Street that they will be replaced. Chair Provencher asked if the shingles were made of slate. Mr. Argueta stated that they were slate.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he was concerned with the proposal as this property has very distinctive features and the slate if very prominent and it's what makes the building interesting and he only see one cost estimate from one contractor.

Chair Provencher asked if the \$50,000 was for removal. Mr. Argueta stated that it was. Chair Provencher asked if Mr. Argueta had researched repair. Mr. Argueta stated that he believed it would be twice as much and the homeowner doesn't have that kind of money.

Commissioner Bloom stated that he would like to see more than one quote before the Commission makes a decision.

Chair Provencher stated that the building is over 100 years old and it is clear the roof has failed but Commissioner Bloom had a point that the slate is historically significant and the Commission could look at economic hardship but at this point the applicant has not provided enough information for the Commission to take a vote on economic hardship and suggested that Mr. Argueta may want to consider requesting to continue item until the next meeting.

Mr. Argueta asked if he would need to get another contractor quote. Commissioner Bloom stated that there should be another quote and Commissioner Conroy stated that she would agree with Commissioner Bloom as this is an unique building.

Chair Provencher stated that the application would be stronger with two quotes.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that burden of proof is on the applicant to prove economic hardship so it will be helpful to have the property owner at the next meeting as he would be the one who could answer those questions.

Commissioner Bloom asked if Commission could make recommendations on things to make property safe. Chair Provencher stated that would be matter for Code Enforcement.

Secretary McCann stated that the contractor or the property owner could contact Code Enforcement if they had question relative to safety.

Mr. Rolle stated that it is the property owner's responsibility to make sure property is safe but they could contact Inspectional Services if they had a question.

Secretary McCann stated that the property owner should also explore historical tax credits.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Commissioner Bloom the Commission voted 7-0 to continue the item until November 20, 2014 and to extend the constructive grant deadline until December 6, 2014.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated September 22, 2014; received October 7, 2014.

#### **4. 10 View Street (HC-2014-069)**

Petition:	Building Demolition Delay Waiver
Petitioner:	David Ho
Present Use:	Three Family Residence
Year Built:	circa 1930
Historic Status:	MACRIS-listed, NRDIS (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area) fka Alexander Zdrodowski Three Decker
Petition Purpose:	Remove & replace the asphalt roof with architectural shingles

Franciso Argueta along with the applicant David Ho appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Ho stated that he purchased this property a few months ago and after a storm the shingles started coming off the roof. Mr. Ho stated that the previous owner had replaced half the asphalt but didn't finish the job and now water is leaking in the house.

Chair Provencher stated that it is clear from the images that the roof is at the end of its life span and doesn't see any significant detail around the eaves or rakes.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that it looks like the soffits are already covered in vinyl and it looks the trim was also covered in vinyl.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann, the Commission voted 7-0 that the proposed Building Demolition Delay Waiver is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City. The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver petition was approved.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver dated October 8, 2014; received October 9, 2014.

### **5. 1-3 Ashland Street (HC-2014-067)**

Petition: Certificate of Appropriateness  
Petitioner: Anh Nguyen  
Present Use: Residential/Commercial Building  
Year Built: circa 1872  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, and NRDIS (National Register District), NRMRA (National Register Multiple Resource Area), part of the Crown Hill Local Historic District and fka as Ashland Street Terrace.  
Petition Purpose: Paint front façade

Anh Nguyen appeared on behalf of the application. He stated that his tenant had painted the front stall without permission and he would like to paint the façade a more historical color.

Chair Provencher asked Mr. Nguyen to show on the photos the location to be painted.

Secretary McCann asked Mr. Nguyen if he intended to paint the brick or just the wood. Mr. Nguyen stated that just the wood and pointed out on photos the area.

Chair Provencher asked if the storefront faced the Pleasant Street side. Mr. Nguyen stated that it did.

Chair Provencher asked what color Mr. Nguyen proposed.

Mr. Nguyen showed a photo of an off white he planned for the area.

The Commission discussed the different color options with Mr. Nguyen and the area to be painted.

Chair Provencher stated that the storefronts have changed over the years and most original detail is gone and he did not have a strong feeling as to what color the storefront should be but if there was some consistency with the storefronts already there he would be comfortable voting on item.

Commissioner Bloom stated that the orange color is a detriment but an earth color or beige color would be appropriate.

Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Shveda and seconded by Secretary McCann the Commission voted 7-0 to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the first floor storefront painting using a tan body with an off-white trim along front of Pleasant Street and around the corner of Ashland Street.

Exhibit A: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness; dated October 8, 2014; received October 8, 2014.

## **6. 35 Hamilton Street (HC-2014-068)**

Petition: Building Demolition Delay Waiver  
Petitioner: Diocese of Worcester  
Present Use: Church Rectory  
Year Built: circa 1914  
Historic Status: MACRIS-listed, and fka St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church Complex  
Petition Purpose:

- Replace flat tar/gravel roof with EPDM;
- Replace deteriorated copper roof system with in-kind;
- Demolish non-original storm windows;
- Remove/replace wood trim and windows with PVC and vinyl to match original form;
- Remove/replace wood porch baluster system with wood or PVC system.

Jordan O'Connor, the architect for the project, and Ralph Berthiaume from the parish appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the proposed scope of work would be as follows:

- A. Proposed replacement of flat portion of the tar and gravel roof with new single ply membrane roofing.
- B. Proposed replacement of portions of deteriorated copper roof drainage system with new copper.
- C. Proposed demolition of non-original wood trim with new PVC to match original form.
- D. Replacement of deteriorated wood windows with vinyl windows.
- E. Demolition of existing wood porch baluster system.

The proposed demolition:

- A. The upper flat portion of roof consists of deteriorated tar and gravel roofing. It is proposed to replace this roof system to a singly ply membrane roof material. The location of the roof is relatively hidden from the street view.
- B. It is proposed that deteriorated and damaged portions of the existing copper roof drainage system shall be replaced with new copper. Original collector boxes and brackets will be salvaged for reuse on the project as much as possible.
- C. Non- original exterior storm window systems shall be demolished.

- D. It is proposed that portions of deteriorated wood trim (including dentil work) be replaced with new PVC to match the original shape and painted to blend to match existing similar adjacent conditions.
- E. The existing wood windows are in poor condition. There is a great deal of air infiltration, glazing is single pane and there is some deteriorated wood on the sashes. It is proposed to replace the double hung windows with new vinyl double hung windows that will match the existing 6 over 1 configuration. The existing porch casement windows with transoms are in good condition and will remain. The cost to replace the existing wood windows with new insulated glazed wood windows represent and in their option represents a financial hardship.
- F. The existing porch roof wood baluster system is very badly deteriorated. Much of the exposed wood has split, started to rot and is no longer structurally sound. It is proposed to demolish the three porch roof baluster systems in their entirety. In their opinion to replace with wood or PVC is a financial hardship.

Mr. O'Connor reviewed the window replacement cost analysis:

There are 53 double hung windows that require replacement. Per a quote from Capital Siding Co., Inc. the material cost for a vinyl window replacement with simulated vinyl grid on upper sash is \$550.00 each. The material cost for wood replacement per Pella Architect series is \$1,200.00 each. The true wood windows are well over double cost of the proposed vinyl which will add cost of \$34,450 which in their opinion represents a financial hardship.

For the porch baluster system analysis

Capital siding quote- Total material and installation cost for the three roof baluster system = \$33,000.

Chair Provencher stated that this is a comprehensive proposal and the two important items are the removal and replacement of the windows and the baluster and the Commission understands the energy reason the church is proposing the window replacement.

Secretary McCann stated that just for the record that replacement windows will be an upgrade in energy efficiency over the current windows which in its current state has loss all its ability to be energy efficiency.

Commissioner Bloom asked if non-profits such as churches can access any types of grants.

Secretary McCann stated that he doesn't know.

Mr. O'Connor stated that his company does a fair amount of work for the diocese and there weren't any to his knowledge.

Commissioner Bloom asked what the present color of the windows was and would there be other possible colors. Mr. O'Connor stated that there were other colors and they were considering a more putty color.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that either tan or putty would be a good option.

Chair Provencher asked if there was an option to have a muntin bar on outside and would that be more expensive. Mr. O'Connor stated that there was but it was more expensive.

Commissioner Bloom asked if the baluster would be replaced with PVC or if it will get removed completely and leave nothing there. Mr. O'Connor stated that they are requesting permission to demolish them.

Chair Provencher stated that the applicant had provided cost to reproduce them and it was \$33,000.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated with regard to the baluster that there is always the possibility that it can be put back.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they will try to salvage some of the baluster so the church will know what they look like if there was ever the possibility of putting them back.

Chair Provencher stated that the baluster does have historical and architectural significance and that will need to be noted in the vote and then the Commission could look at economic hardship.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 to approve the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for the following work as the proposed demolition would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester:

- Replacement of flat portion of tar and gravel roof with new single ply membrane roofing;
- Replacement of portions of deteriorated copper roof drainage system with new cooper;
- Demolition of non-original storm windows; and
- Replacement of deteriorated wood trim with new PVC to match original form.

Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 0-7 that the following work would not be detrimental to the architectural or historical resources of the City of Worcester.

- Replacement of deteriorated wood windows with new vinyl windows.
- Demolition of existing wood porch baluster system.

The motion failed and the Historical Commission considered the Building Demolition Delay Waiver with respect to the petitioner's evidence related to undue economic hardship.



Upon a motion by Secretary McCann and seconded by Vice-Chair Shveda the Commission voted 7-0 that the petitioner had demonstrated undue economic hardship and approved the Building Demolition Delay Waiver for

- Replacement of deteriorated wood windows with new vinyl windows.
- Demolition of existing wood porch baluster system.

Exhibit A: Application for Building Demolition Delay Waiver; dated October 8, 2014; received October 9, 2014.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. Communication**

- a. Salter School – Attorney Todd Rodman, Daniel Strow, White Picket Fence, LLC and Barry Ganick the architect for the project appeared on behalf of the item.

Attorney Rodman stated that they are planning to convert this property to residential and just wanted to get some feedback from the Commission on the proposed work.

Mr. Ganick reviewed what work was planned. The Commission provided feedback on the proposal and informed the applicant that this location is not in historical district and the Commission would be reviewing what material would be removed from the structure not necessarily what will be added.

- b. Letter from MacRostie Historic LLC, re: Osgood Bradley Building National Register Form; dated October 15, 2014; received October 15, 2014. – No comment.
- c. Letter from Mass Historic, re: EcoTarium Electric Grid Connection Project; dated October 6, 2014; received October 10, 2014.- No comment.
- d. Letter from Mass Historic, re: Osgood Bradley Building; dated October 14, 2014; received October 17, 2014.- No comment.
- e. Letter from Mass Historic, re: Worcester City Hall (Common Railings); dated October 20, 2014; received October 24, 2014.

Mr. Rolle stated that they have been notified from Mass Historic that the City has worked on the railings and they now comply with ADA guidelines.

- f. 5 Chestnut Street – Gargoyles update.

Mr. Rolle stated he did not have update at this time.

### **2. Update on MHC Call for Survey & Planning Grant applications**

Mr. Rolle stated that the City is looking to apply for the grant and one idea was to evaluate the current ordinance and see how it could be improved and perhaps a study could be done but staff was open to ideas from the Commission.

Commissioner Bjork asked the amount of the grant. Mr. Rolle stated that it is a 50% match from state but he would have to look into what exact amount grant would be for.

Chair Provencher stated the Commission sees a lot of properties on the list that have no historical or little historical value at all and then there are ones who should be on the list but are not. The list is inconsistent and maybe focus study could be done looking at a street or neighborhood each year.

Mr. Rolle stated that one of idea also would be hiring a consultant with the grant money and they could look at the whole ordinance and maybe they could look at the general applicability of the ordinance.

Chair Provencher stated that he knows in other communities the Planning Staff has much greater degree of authority over what applications get to the Commission and Planning staff can make a determination on certain applications.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that in other communities they have a board member and staff meet with applicant prior to meeting to make sure application is well thought out before presented to the full Board. He knows there be questions about open meeting law but he knows some other communities do it.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that he was unaware of where all the properties are. Mr. Rolle stated that there is a map.

Commissioner Bjork asked about creating a new historic district.

Secretary McCann stated that going with Commissioner Bjork's thought maybe instead of new district looking at expanding a district such as Massachusetts or the Montvale Historic District.

Secretary McCann stated that after hearing his other members comments that maybe they should look at redefining what the Commission does, what comes before Commission and what houses should be added to the list and what he would like to see if consultant could be hired to craft a long term plan for historic preservation for the City of Worcester and what that entails.

### **3. Preservation regulations pertaining to Park Lands**

Mr. Rolle stated that with regards to the preservation restriction certain land such as Worcester Common have a preservation restriction and Commission would need to be notified but recent work done was done outside the Common area and other areas in parks only apply to buildings such as the gazebo in Green Hill Park and with regard to the Building Demolition Delay Ordinance there is not a lot of purview under the current ordinance.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated that is why the retaining walls in Elm Park did not come before Commission. Mr. Rolle stated Elm Park is on the MACRIS list but walls would not fall under their purview.

Vice-Chair Shveda stated Preservation Worcester, which he is a member of, had meeting with City Manager and there was discussion that Preservation Worcester should take more of a role in these types of projects.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion the Commission voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.