



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Minutes ~

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103
<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Vincent Walsh

Thursday, February 1, 2024

5:30 PM

City Hall -- Room 205

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on February 1, 2024 at City Hall -- Room 205, 36 Court Street, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Vincent Walsh	Chair, RAPV Representative	Present	
Alfonso Nardi	Vice-Chair	Present	
Judith Crowell	CPC Representative	Present	
Bryan Mcfarland	Spfld Preservation Trust Representative	Remote	
Walter Kroll	Alternate	Remote	
Vincent Calcasola	Alternate	Absent	

II. Acceptance of Minutes

1. Thursday, January 18, 2024

III. Public Hearings (Continued)

1. Petition (ID # 7810)

91-97 Chestnut Street

91-97 Chestnut Street: Installation of murals to either side of building

HISTORY:

01/18/24

Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

	Discussion	No discussion
	Public Comments	No comments
	Motion	Continue to next available meeting
	Decision	<i>Continued to next available meeting</i>

RESULT: **CONTINUE VOTE [5 TO 0]**

AYES: Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll

ABSENT: Vincent Calcasola

2. Petition (ID # 7838)

194 Sumner Avenue

194 Sumner Avenue: Replacement of tile roof with asphalt shingles

HISTORY:**01/18/24****Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE****COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

	Discussion	No discussion
	Public Comments	No comments
	Motion	Continue to next available meeting
	Decision	<i>Continue to next available meeting and given 30-day extension</i>

RESULT: CONTINUE VOTE [5 TO 0]**AYES:** Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll**ABSENT:** Vincent Calcasola**IV. Public Hearings (New)****1. Petition (ID # 7840)**

1030 Worthington Street

1030 Worthington Street: Roof replacement, solar installation, and interpretive signage**HISTORY:****01/18/24****Historical Commission LAY ON TABLE****COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: The petitioner stated that the original roof was removed and replaced with a black rubber roof. The petitioner stated that the replacement roof will be a black plastic standing seem model but with no change to the pitch of the roof and solar panels to go in between the seams of the roof. Commissioner Walsh asked if it was possible to add solar panels to the upper roof but the petitioner stated that the standing seem replacement roof for the lower roof would be preferable for solar panels. Commissioner Nardi stated that the porch roof would be similar to the original roof and that the integrated solar panels would be the best fit for that house. Commissioner Nardi asked if the only thing to be approved would be the roof system with the intention of adding solar to them in the future to which the petitioner said yes. Commissioner Crowell questioned the need to approve solar installation without the installation of conduit units to which Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that they could make that a stipulation of the acceptance of the application. Commissioner Nardi then advised that the petitioners get the conduit matter sorted before installing solar panels. Commissioner Crowell then asked if the stipulation state that the petitioner return if conduits are visible to which Commissioner Nardi stated that the stipulation covers that matter.

Public Comments: Pedro and Elizabeth Arroyo spoke in favor of the petition, Frances Gagnon of 1120 Worthington Street spoke in favor of the petition (by letter).

Motion: Accept application for appropriateness with stipulation that petitioner return for approval of conduits, meters and all other equipment associated with the solar units

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

2. Petition (ID # 7841)

1105 Worthington Street

1105 Worthington Street: Roof replacement, solar installation, and interpretive signage**HISTORY:****01/18/24** **Historical Commission LAY ON TABLE****COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: The petitioner stated that they would be replacing the lower roof located in the rear of the property with luma roofing resembling a cast slate model. The petitioner stated that the roof would have a blue tint color in response to a question by Commissioner Walsh pertaining to the color of the roof. Commissioner Nardi then asked if this application would have the same stipulation for the conduit as 1030 Worthington Street. Commissioner Walsh then asked to see a rendering of where the conduit could be located for the house to which the petitioner stated that the electric meter for the panels would be located on the side of the house in a visible location. Commissioner Walsh then stated that he liked both images but stated that he would prefer a continuation to present a more complete picture of the plan. Mr.Gaby then stated that he would need a 30-day extension on his deadline in order to gather the required materials.

Public Comments: Roberta Walker Kilkenny of 1104 Worthington Street spoke in opposition to the application (by letter).

Motion: Continue to next available meeting

Decision: Continued to next available meeting and granted 30-day extension

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

3. Petition (ID # 7839)

190 Bowdoin Street

190 Bowdoin Street: Solar installation**HISTORY:****01/18/24** **Historical Commission LAY ON TABLE****COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: The petitioner stated that the construction of the house was approved already by the commission but that the solar installation was not. The petitioner stated that the majority of the solar installation would be on the north side of the property. Commissioner Walsh stated that he would like a more complete plan including the location of the meter. Commissioner Walsh was then told by the petitioner that he had been approved for the design of the house but that he would need to come back for the roof surface. Commissioner Walsh then said he would still need to come back for approval of any meter and outside equipment installation. Commissioner Kroll then questioned why they

were approving solar panels before the house was actually built to which Commissioner Walsh reiterated that the roof would be composed of solar panels. Commissioner Nardi then stated that the chimney heights on the rendering shown by the petitioner did not look up to code to which the petitioner stated that the chimney structure would not be built until being cleared by the building department.

Public Comments: Charlie Knight of 32 Byers Street spoke in favor of the application.

Motion: Accept application for appropriateness with condition that petitioner returns for approval of any external conduit and outdoor equipment.

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

4. **Petition (ID # 7851)**

34 Ingersoll Grove

34 Ingersoll Grove: Addition of metal handrails to porch steps

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen had asked whether or not the petitioner had talked about the options for the handrail to which the petitioner stated that they had not, and wanted to wait until approval was given by the commission. The petitioner then stated that the railing would be coming down the front steps so that their mother could safely enter and exit the house. Commissioner Walsh then stated that the application was only for the railing and that the wrought iron with baluster model would be the most appropriate model, but that any of the options she had chosen would be good. Commissioner Nardi stated that the wrought iron model would be the best one as it would be closer to the code requirements for a 3-step porch.

Public Comments: Edward Zukerman of 28 Ingersoll Grove spoke in favor of the application (by letter); David Gaby of 1105 Worthington Street spoke in favor of the application Tommy Abington spoke in favor of the application

Motion: Accept application for appropriateness to install handrails

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

5. **Petition (ID # 7852)**

64 Thompson Street

64 Thompson Street: Replacement of front porch railing

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh stated that this application was interesting as the previous porch railing was an alteration to what the original railing was and stated that, under Commission

guidelines, if it was code compliant it did not need to be a replication of the original model. Commissioner Walsh stated that the only thing they would have advised would be that the railing be lowered to historic height but stated that the petitioner could replace it to match the previous handrail height rather than the original model. Commissioner Walsh then asked if he would be willing to lower it to its original version even though he did not have to because the railing did exist at the level it is at presently after the original version to which the petitioner said he would look into it in the future. Commissioner Walsh stated that the railing would fit into the appropriateness guidelines. Commissioner Nardi then asked how the current railing was appropriate and asked what the replacement model was. Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the new railing was the same height as the previous model but not the same design of the previous model. Commissioner Walsh stated that he would have preferred the petitioners to have come before them to make the railing closer to the original model. Commissioner Nardi then asked how much of the new railing was completed to which the petitioner stated that the whole porch had been completed. Commissioner Walsh then stated that they have a right to replace what is currently there regardless of it matching the original version. Commissioner Walsh then asked Attorney Robert Shewchuk if that assumption was correct to which attorney Shewchuk stated yes. The petitioner stated that in the future he would look at lowering the railing to the original height. Commissioner Nardi then stated that it was reasonable to be able to lower the railing of the porch. Commissioner Walsh stated that it would be acceptable to accept the application but that based on public commentary that this would qualify as a hardship application versus an appropriateness application. Commissioner Walsh then asked that the application be changed to one of hardship to which the petitioner did change it to hardship.

Public Comments: David Gaby of 1105 Worthington Street spoke in favor of the application; Charlie Knight of 32 Byers Street spoke in favor of the application; Jim Boone of 97 Florida Street spoke in opposition to the application (by letter).

Motion: Accept hardship application

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

V. Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings

1. Petition (ID # 7853)

69-71 Princeton Street

69-71 Princeton Street: Demolition of residential home due to fire damage

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh asked if the house was in a local historic district to which the petitioner stated no but Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the house ,being at least 75 years old, was under the purview of the commission to decide on the lifting of a demo delay for the house. The petitioner then stated that there was no plan to maintain the same foundation for a potential new house on the property, and that the house and foundation would be demolished to answer a question on what would be demolished and if it would maintain the same footprint of the original house by Commissioner Nardi. Commissioner Walsh then asked if the petitioner had looked at any options to preserve

the building to which the petitioner stated that it was not feasible financially to rehab the original house and that it would be cheaper to demolish the building, and stated that it would cost \$500,000 to rebuild the house in response to Commissioner Walsh's question on how much it would cost to rebuild. Commissioner Walsh then asked Principal Planner Alvin Allen if the Commission controlled the exterior design of the new house built to which Planner Allen said no as it is outside of a local district. Commissioner Walsh then asked what the biggest cost outside of asbestos removal that was stated by the petitioner would be to rehab the house to which the petitioner stated that the third and second floor would be the most difficult elements to rehab. Commissioner Walsh disagreed with the assertion by the petitioner that the second floor was beyond saving. Commissioner Crowell stated that there were instances where buildings damaged by fire were saved but then commissioner Walsh stated that it was tough to determine which houses could be saved and which could not be saved and asked the petitioner if he could breakdown the cost of a potential rehab. The petitioner stated that the asbestos removal would cost the and the structure needing to be supported to help rebuild a new foundation would be costly as well. Commissioner Walsh then stated that he wished the petitioner had come with more complete breakdowns of the cost to rehab the house to better inform the commission's decision. Commissioner Nardi then agreed with the petitioner's assertion of a \$500,000 cost for rehabilitation of the house. The petitioner then stated that the use of the land would be the same as the previous house. Principal Planner Allen then stated that he believed the city would allow them to build a 2-family structure on the same foundation within 2 years but after that it would have to conform to the single-family zoning of the area but was not sure on the if that policy was in fact the case. The petitioner then stated that the price of demolition would be \$50,000. Commissioner Nardi then stated that due to the great distance between the local district and the house that the demo should be allowed. Commissioner Nardi added that a single-family house would be an appropriate replacement. Commissioner Walsh then stated that the petitioners should explore ways in which to rehabilitate the house. The petitioner stated that the asbestos abatement cost would cause the project to be too costly to rehab. Commissioner Walsh stated that due to the commission's lack of control over the design of a new house and/or rehabilitation of the original house that they should try to continue the item to get more information on the project before lifting the delay. Commissioner Nardi stated that all of the information needed to make the decision involved structural plans being presented by the petitioner as well as plans for what the new structure would look like to better inform the decision of the commission. Planner Allen stated that the petitioner should do a 30-day extension which commissioner Walsh agreed and asked if the petitioner would be open to that to which the petitioner stated yes.

Public Comments: Charlie Holmes of 59 Carew Street, Kenneth Spence of 1105 Worthington Street, Kim Rivers of 75 Pamona Street, Tyreed Olivo of 104 Roy Street, Annette Rodriguez of 52 Freemont Street, Candy Pink of 43 Blunt Road, Tonique Smith of 107 Robert Dyer Circle, Zaburah Scott of 68 Federal Street, Mark Laport of 95 Yale Street, David Gaby and Stephen Gray of the McKnight Community Development Corporation, Charles Knight of the American Institute of Historic Preservation, Inc, Marion Bradley of 108 Yale Street, Sheldon Gaynor of 108 Yale Street, Maria Spruell of 108 Yale Street, Mary Gowman of 114 Yale Street, Gregory Freeman of 119 Wilbraham Avenue and Jennifer Rao of 29 Ingersoll Grove spoke in opposition to the application.

Motion: To continue to next available meeting

Decision: Given 30-day extension and continued to next available meeting

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [5 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Mcfarland, Kroll
ABSENT:	Vincent Calcasola

VI. Environmental Reviews

1. Petition (ID # 7854)

37 Elm Street

37 Elm Street: Installation of new fencing

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioners Walsh and Crowell stated that they had no comment on the matter. Commissioner Nardi asked what had happened to the original fence on the left portion of the front of the property to which the petitioner stated that they put plywood over the fence to protect it from damage. The petitioner stated they would be willing to accept a stipulation of having a removable fence installed to which Commissioner Walsh stated that that was not necessary under the stipulations associated with an environmental review.

Public Comments: Darold McDonald representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts spoke in support of the application, David Gaby of 1105 Worthington Street spoke in favor of the application

Motion: No adverse impact to the north facade of the building

Decision: No adverse impact to the north facade of the building

RESULT:	APPROVED [4 TO 0]
AYES:	Vincent Walsh, Alfonso Nardi, Judith Crowell, Bryan Mcfarland
ABSENT:	Walter Kroll, Vincent Calcasola

VII. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission

1. Informational (ID # 7565)

Public Speak-Out Session

Public Speak-Out Session

HISTORY:

01/18/24 **Historical Commission**