

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HISTORICAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER
December 5, 2013**

LEVI LINCOLN CHAMBER – CITY HALL

Commission Members Present: Timothy McCann, Chair
Kevin Provencher, Vice-Chair
Karl Bjork
Andrew Shveda

Commission Members Absent: Erika Dunn

Staff Members Present: Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

Chair McCann called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes from 8/15/2013 and 11/7/2013 meetings.

1. Myra Hiatt Kraft Footbridge Presentation:

Alexandra Jaeger and Courtney Verdel-Ogden, students from WPI, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the history of Red Wood Bridge and Elm Park and their design proposal to restore Red Wood Bridge.

Unfinished Business

2. 100 Institute Road (HC-2013-062): Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Remove & replace existing windows at Kaven Hall with new aluminum clad high performance windows and to re-work windows to incorporate existing AC units in transoms and replace rotting trims

Mr. Mark Donahue representing WPI and the architect Mr. Michael Gorman from the architectural firm that is helping to design the project described that WPI is proposing to replace 128 windows that are old and inefficient. WPI would like install a central HVAC system at Kaven Hall. Currently it relies on window AC units to cool the building.

Mr. Gorman stated that the existing windows were originally painted with lead paint and that the glazing compound contained asbestos. Also, many of the windows are rotting, weather stripping was gone, glass was cracked, some of the windows are not code compliant in terms of tempered glass and traffic.

Chair McCann asked why WPI prefers replacement over repairing the windows.

Mr. Gorman stated that the cost of installation of new windows and the long-term costs of maintaining new windows is much more cost effective than repairing and doing ongoing maintenance of the existing windows. Secondly, the new windows will reduce heat loss by up to 50% in the winter and will lower air conditioning costs in the summer. Mr. Gorman read from a report stating the energy savings that could be expected from new windows could be up to \$380,000 annually.

Mr. Gorman stated that all of the wood interior and trim can remain in-tact as the windows are able to be installed from the exterior.

Commissioner Provencher stated that it is clear that the window material being removed is original but is clearly in poor shape. The cost for repairing the existing windows versus what the cost of replacing the windows with aluminum ones must be acknowledged and it appears that it is twice as expensive to repair the existing windows.

Commissioner Provencher stated that the appropriate information has been presented by the applicant and that an economic hardship can be considered in this case.

Chair McCann stated that the long term maintenance costs of repairing the existing windows could be seen as an economic hardship based on the costs presented.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed repairs are detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed repairs or in-kind replacement of the windows presents an economic hardship based on the cost data presented and that the demolition delay waiver should be approved on these grounds.

The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was approved.

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 3, 2013 and submitted October 10, 2013.

New Business:

3. 16 Stoneland Road (HC-2013-063): Building Demolition Delay Waiver Appropriateness:

Chris Dino presented on behalf of the property owners, Mr. and Mrs. Ngueyn, due to a language barrier. Mr. Dino stated that the property owners are seeking to remove existing two layers of asphalt shingle roofing and replace with architectural singles.

Chair McCann stated that he had visited the property and that the existing roof is not original to the structure and therefore the Commission would not have much to say regarding roof replacement.

Chair McCann asked if any additional work is being proposed for the fascia of the building.

Commissioner Shveda stated that he had reviewed the plans and that he did not see any indication that any historic features of the building would be removed or covered up. It was a simple roof replacement project.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher and seconded by Commissioner Bjork the Commission voted 4-0 to that the proposed project was not detrimental to the historic or architectural resources of the City.

Exhibits: Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 23, 2013 and submitted October 24, 2013.

4. 530 Massasoit Road (HC-2013-064): Building Demolition Delay Waiver:

Ms. Debbie Carey from Mass Audubon acquired a new property that has a historic house and barn structure on it. Ms. Carey stated that the barn needs a new roof and the house porch roof and pillars need repair work. Previously, the applicant came before the Commission to repair the house roof.

The existing barn roof is not original and has asphalt shingles. Ms. Carey stated that they would replace the roof in-kind asphalt shingles. The porch pillars and house roof would also be repaired. Neither the house roof or porch pillars are original.

Chair McCann stated that since the project simply proposes to repair materials that are not original and thus not historic, the Commission is not too concerned with replacing the barn roof and repairing the porch.

Ms. Carey stated that she would like to replace the porch pillars in a similar style to the house across the street which does have original porch pillars.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Shveda, and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed repairs are not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

The motion passed and the Building Demolition Delay Waiver was approved.

Exhibits: Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 23, 2013 and submitted October 24, 2013.

5. 56 Florence Street (HC-2013-065): Building Demolition Delay Waiver:

The applicant property owner, Mr. Leonard Vario and his property manager Ray Barbero is seeking approval to construct a dormer onto the recessed extension at the rear of home and repair front porch with new footings.

Mr. Vario stated that the addition to the back of the house is not visible from the street.

Chair McCann asked if the portion that will have the dormer added on to it was original to the structure.

Mr. Vario stated that he wasn't sure.

Commissioner Provencher stated that from his review of the structure and the pictures provided he felt that it was original. He further stated that the historic value of the structure was the landscape

of the roof. The roof in the rear is lower than the roof out front and this would cause the dormer to be minimally visible from the street.

Commissioner Provencher stated that since the dormer is proposed for the back, it will not impact the sightlines of the structure.

Mr. Vario stated that he is also seeing approval to secure the footings that support the front porch for structural stability and that none of the detail work of the porch would be impacted.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Shveda, and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed repairs are not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Exhibits: Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 23, 2013 and submitted October 24, 2013.

6. 5 Jackson Street (HC-2013-066): Building Demolition Delay Waiver:

The applicant, Mr. Mike Dupont, manager of D&L ventures, is seeking to remove and replace existing slate roof and to remove a replace a window at 5 Jackson Street.

Mr. Dupont stated that his company purchased the property about a year ago and had recently received a community development block grant for affordable housing and would like to restore the house to keep it affordable but also maintain the architectural integrity.

Mr. Dupont stated that the roof is leaking and in disrepair and he needs to repair or replace it. The estimate he received for roof restoration was around \$100,000.

Mr. Dupont stated that to replace the roof with asphalt architectural shingles is estimated to cost approximately \$19,000. Roof replacement with composite slate is estimated to cost \$30,000.

Mr. Dupont stated that the structure has 34 windows. Only two of these windows are original with wood. Many of the windows had been previously replaced with vinyl windows with aluminum storm window exteriors.

Mr. Provencher stated that the Commission would vote on what was to be taken out not what was to be added since this was a demolition delay waiver application.

Mr. Provencher asked how many of the 34 window openings had original sashes.

Mr. Dupont stated that 19 windows had original sashes.

Mr. Dupont stated that from a financial perspective he prefers to replace the existing windows with new black vinyl windows.

Commissioner Provencher stated that the most compelling historic portion of the window is not the sash but the window opening itself with the brick and the detailing and that while this proposal will remove the remaining original window sashes, it will not impact the window openings.

Commissioner Provencher stated that a distinguishing feature of the existing roof is the copper flashing along the edges.

Commissioner Provencher asked Mr. Dupont if he had considered simulating this on the replacement roof.

Mr. Dupont stated that he would be willing to consider this.

Commissioner Shveda stated that the cost of copper would likely be prohibitive but that painted aluminum might be a good alternative to mimic the look.

Commissioner Provencher stated that it appeared to be the sentiment of the Commission that they prefer not to see the copper flashing removed; however, they understand that if the roof is to be replaced, the copper flashing must be removed. The Commission would like to see this feature represented on the replacement roof in some shape or form that keeps with the look of the existing copper flashing.

Commissioner Bjork asked if the Commission should be discussing having the applicant replace the slate with slate.

Commissioner Provencher stated that based on recent applications that have come before the Commission, slate roofs are three times as expensive as asphalt shingle roofs and that this could present an economic hardship to the applicant.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition of the windows is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition of the slate roof is detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the replacement of the slate roof with in-kind materials presents an economic hardship and that the applicant be allowed to replace the roof with asphalt shingles as long as the copper flashings along the hips and ridges of the roof be substituted with a similar material to mimic the appearance of the original copper flashing, that the demolition delay waiver should be approved on these grounds and with these restrictions.

Exhibits: Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 24, 2013 and submitted October 24, 2013.

7. 60 Shrewsbury Street (HC-2013-067): Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Robert Branca and Matt Doyle, owners of the property, proposed to demolish and replace the rear garage structure which is in bad repair.

Mr. Branca also stated that he wishes square off a nook at the back of the building which is currently a nook which attracts trash and people who are often up to no good.

Mr. Branca stated that demolishing this garage would allow him to help reconnect the building which the garage is attached to another building behind it.

Commissioner Provencher stated that this garage structure is an accessory to the main building which was previously the show room for the car dealership that occupied the space for many years. He further stated that this structure had limited historical value.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Shveda, and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated November 3, 2013 and submitted November 6, 2013.

8. 167 Chandler Street (HC-2013-068): Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Mr. Rob Lindgren, the property owner listed the repairs that he is proposing to make. These repairs include:

- (1) Remove rear enclosed porches and asphalt roof (floors 2 & 3) and replace with a new roof above 1st floor
- (2) Remove two rear doors at enclosed porches (floors 2 & 3), reframe openings and replace with two vinyl windows
- (3) Remove side porches & asphalt roof (floors 1 & 2) and replace 1st floor porch with new roof above 1st floor
- (4) Repair front porch, deck, railings and roof
- (5) Remove asphalt siding on entire building and replace with vinyl siding

Mr. Lindgren stated that the front porch is currently patched together with plywood and that it needs a permanent repair. He asked what the Commission prefers to see in terms of repair material.

Chair McCann stated that the Commission cannot compel the applicant to use a specific material on the front porch since it is currently not comprised of original material, but that he recommended pressure treated material for replacement.

Commissioner Provencher stated that he feels the side porch is an original component of the structure but its historical value is up for debate considering how many changes the house has undergone. He stated that he would like to see an attempt made by the applicant to salvage what little original material remains as part of the property.

Commissioner Shveda asked what issues there are with the roof.

Mr. Lindgren stated that it leaks and had some structural issues.

Chair McCann stated that the current asphalt siding is not original and that the proposed vinyl siding would actually be an improvement.

Mr. Lindgren stated that he wouldn't wrap the siding in aluminum.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Bjork, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated October 29, 2013 and submitted November 8, 2013.

9. 102 Elm Street (HC-2013-069): Building Demolition Delay Waiver

Mr. Bernard Thebodo stated that he is seeking to remove half of a second floor porch on the back of the house. He stated that this porch is not original to the house.

Mr. Thebodo stated that the porch is a danger and is not up to code.

Chair McCann stated that based on review, the porch in question is not original to the house and does appear to be rotting. He further stated that it appears to pose a safety hazard in its current condition and needs to be repaired or replaced.

Commissioner Provencher stated that based on his cursory review he didn't feel this porch contributed historical value to the building.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Provencher, and seconded by Commissioner Shveda, the Commission voted 4-0 that the proposed demolition of the porch is not detrimental to the historical or architectural resources of the City.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Building Demolition Delay Waiver Application dated November 12, 2013 and submitted November 12, 2013.

Other Business:

10. 19 McKeon Road – General information discussion

Mr.Scott Veil, from company that owns the building came before the Commission to discuss improvements to the exterior of the building. He requested suggestions since the building is a historic building which the company recently figured out.

Chair McCann stated that they could not say yes or no to specific improvements without an application from the petitioner, but, that the members could provide general suggestions.

Commission members gave overview of BBDW application requirements.

11. Communication Received:

A) Letter from the MHC re: 38 Hancock Hill Drive; dated October 30, 2013 and received November 4, 2013.

Staff will research this matter and report back to Commission members at the next meeting

B) Project Notification Form from Massachusetts Historical Commission re: 14 Burton Court; dated November 5, 2013 and received November 1, 2013.

This notification form has been filed by Staff

C) Project Notification Form from Massachusetts Historical Commission re: 98 Vernon Street; dated November 5, 2013 and received October 21, 2013.

This notification form has been filed by Staff

D) Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission re: 44 Salisbury Street; dated November 18, 2013 and received November 20, 2013.

This notification form has been filed by Staff

E) Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission re: 55 Salisbury Street; dated October 25, 2013 and received November 21, 2013.

Staff will forward a copy of this letter to the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Commissioner Bjork and seconded by Chair McCann, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.