



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Vincent Walsh

Thursday, February 15, 2024

5:30 PM

City Hall -- Room 205

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on February 15, 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	Absent	
Judith Crowell	CPC Representative	Present	
Bryan Mcfarland	Spfld Preservation Trust Representative	Remote	
Walter Kroll		Present	
Vincent Calcasola	Alternate	Absent	

II. Acceptance of Minutes

1. Thursday, February 01, 2024

III. Public Hearings (Continued)

1. Petition (ID # 7901)

91-97 Chestnut Street

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

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: No discussion on the matter

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue to next available meeting

Decision: Continued

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

2. Petition (ID # 7818)

194 Sumner Avenue

194 Sumner Avenue: Replacement of tile roof with asphalt shingles**COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh stated that there would only be one meeting left until the deadline for the application and suggested that they make a motion to deny the application today, but have the petitioner come back with another application in order to allow the petitioner more time to gather information for the application. Principal Planner Alvin Allen then stated that the Commission could attach a stipulation to the motion stating that the petitioner may return to the Commission with the same application if denied.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the certificate of hardship with condition that applicant can reapply for same matters if denied

Decision: Denied

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

3. 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**

02/01/24 Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**

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

Principal Planner Alvin Allen explained to the Commission that the petitioner was unable to attend so items 3-8 as well as the environmental review for 111-113 Bay Street cannot be heard. Mr. Allen also informed the Commission that the applications need to clear additional approvals with Zoning Department before returning before the Commission at next meeting (02/01) Mr. Allen will follow-up with Zoning to confirm signs meet zoning ordinances.

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: No discussion on the matter

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue application to next available meeting

Decision: Continued

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

IV. Public Hearings (New)

1. Petition (ID # 7895)

34 Kopernick Street

34 Kopernick Street: Several exterior renovations

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: The petitioners stated that they had found a tenant to occupy the structure and indicated that it would be a housing program. The petitioners also stated that in order to comply with fire code

regulations, which require they have to build new exits and entrances for the structure. The petitioners stated that they are proposing to build an egress that would cover two front windows on the property to comply with the fire code regulations of the City. The petitioners stated that they had two design plans to propose for the Commission's approval of one proposal. The petitioners stated that the first version had unnecessary features and that the second version would eliminate those features, and added that either version of the staircase would involve installing the covered egress over the original windows to accommodate the new staircase area. The petitioner stated that this would be done in a similar fashion to the Indian Orchard fire station on Page Boulevard. Commissioner Walsh asked how far out the staircase would come past the original walls to which the petitioners answered 7 feet. Commissioner Walsh then asked Principal Planner Alvin Allen for what historic restrictions were on the property to which Mr. Allen presented such guidelines to the Commission on the computer screen of the meeting room. Commissioner Walsh asked if the petitioners could save the original fire escapes of the property to which the

petitioners said no. Commissioner Kroll then asked what the outside facade would look like to which the petitioners stated that the enclosure for the staircase would be covered by clapboard siding. The petitioners reiterated that they would not be modifying the existing structure just adding on to the structure and renovating it. Commissioner Walsh then asked if the Springfield Diocese was ok with this proposal to which the petitioners stated yes. Commissioner Walsh then asked what would be done to the back of the property to which the petitioners state that it would be the same enclosed stair design as will be installed on the front and will include a handicap ramp. Commissioner Walsh then asked if there was a rendering of the work proposed for the back of the property to which the petitioners stated no. Commissioner Walsh asked if the rendering was ok with the other Commissioners to which Commissioner Kroll stated that the rendering that did not the windows would be better. Commissioner Walsh then stated it would be better to have a design that would allow for the historic character of the building to be maintained. Commissioner Kroll then asked what type of windows would be installed to which the petitioners stated they would be Harvey Classic windows. Mr. Allen stated that the Commission could include a stipulation to the certificate that the petitioners would design the structure based on the second version of the design if it was approved.

Public Comments: David Gaby, of 1105 Worthington Street, spoke in favor of the application. Harry Seymour, of 68 Washington Road, spoke in favor of the application.

Motion: Approval of application for certificate of appropriateness with the stipulation that the second design of the structure will be selected

Decision: Approved

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

2. Petition (ID # 7896)

80 Cornell Street

80 Cornell Street: Erect two car garage

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: The petitioner stated that the main changes for the new garage proposal would be to a revised elevation of the garage roof that better fit the local historic district's character, and that it would also

include a coppola atop the roof with gables along the front of the overhang of the garage. Commissioner Kroll then asked what the materials of the structure would be to which the petitioner stated that the siding was originally going to be stucco, but now the garage would be made of LP siding of a tan color. The gables at the front of the garage made of cedar shakes and the windows of the garage

door would be one of the pre-approved windows from the Commission. The petitioner stated that the model number for the window was located on the application. The petitioner then stated that the siding would resemble wooden clapboard siding but that the material was more of a vinyl type. Commissioner Walsh stated that this application was a good effort to make the new garage more in line with the style of the historic district regardless of the non-historic nature of the materials used. Commissioner Kroll then asked that the application be approved with a stipulation that the Coppola not be installed on the roof.

Public Comments: David Gaby, of 1105 Worthington Street, spoke in opposition. Jim Boone spoke in favor of the application (by letter).

Motion: Approval for the application for certificate of appropriateness with the stipulation that the garage will not include the Coppola as previously proposed

Decision: Approved

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

3. Petition (ID # 7897)

80 Cornell Street

80 Cornell Street: Installation of solar panels

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Crowell asked the petitioners what had changed from their original design proposal for the solar panels that they had come to the Commission seeking approval for. The petitioner stated that the only thing that was changing would be that the main house would have to include more solar panels as the new garage that they were building would not be able to hold solar panels. The petitioner then stated that in order to get the maximum amount of power from solar panels that he had to put additional panels at the front of the house. The petitioner stated that he had additional photos to present to which Principal Planner Alvin Allen presented such images to the Commission. The petitioner stated that the solar panels would be located predominantly on the front and sides of the house. Commissioner Walsh then stated that they would not be able to accept the installation of solar panels to the front porch of the house as it would go against the historic guidelines for solar panels set by the Commission. The petitioner then stated that this would be the only design that he could use to install solar panels as the garage would not be able to support solar panels. The Commission asked the petitioner if he could utilize the shed located in the rear of the house to store the panels to which the petitioner said no. Commissioner Walsh then asked if some panels could be removed from the original design to which the petitioner stated no. Commissioner Crowell asked what the other proposed design was to which an

image was provided by Mr. Allen. Commissioner Kroll then asked if any trees could be cut down to allow for more sunlight to which the petitioner stated no. Commissioner Walsh reiterated that the guidelines would not allow for the current design proposed. Commissioner Walsh asked why there were so many panels proposed to which the petitioner stated that the high number of panels was due to the contractor's estimate of what would allow for the maximum amount of power to be drawn. Commissioner Walsh stated that the picture in the application did little to explain what other locations the panels could be located. The petitioner stated that there would be five panels located at the front in response to a question by Commissioner Walsh on the number of panels located on the front porch. Commissioner Kroll stated that the reason for the design proposed was because the contractors were attempting to get the maximum amount of energy and thus did not factor in the historic guidelines for solar panels. Commissioner Walsh then asked where the conduits and meters would be located to which the petitioner stated that they would be along the side of the property towards the rear of the house. Commissioner Walsh stated that the way the application is worded would make it difficult for them to approve the application and that it would be better to continue the application. Commissioner Walsh said that this would give the petitioner time to come back with more detail and redesigned proposals. Commissioner Kroll then stated that the contractors should be able to make a revision to their original design at no cost. Commissioner Walsh then stated that any new design should make more of an attempt to have the panels be in a less visible location.

Public Comments: David Gaby spoke in opposition to the application.

Motion: Continue to next available meeting

Decision: Continued

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

HISTORY:

02/01/24 Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**

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

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: The petitioner stated that, after talking with the homeowner, he would desire to rebuild on the potential demolition site and build a house that would be similar to the styles of the houses located in the McKnight historic district. Commissioner Walsh stated that, after a site visit to the property, the damage inside the property was worse than what appeared on the outside. Commissioner Walsh stated that he wanted to have a structural engineer come to the property but the contractor could not find one before the Commission met. Commissioner Walsh then stated that the Commission had no control over the design of a new structure on the property as it is not located in a local historic district. The petitioner then stated that the homeowner desired to rebuild on the property in a fashion that would better suit the national register district. The petitioner produced two quotes to the Commission to reflect the cost of rebuilding on the property as well as the cost to renovate the existing house. The total to renovate the house came to \$541,000 and the cost to rebuild on the property would be \$409,000 including the demolition of the existing house. Commissioner Walsh stated that the damage to the house had extended to the top two floors of the property and that even if they voted no on the matter that the property would still be demolished in 9 months. Commissioner Walsh then reiterated to the public that comments could only be those that directly address the matters on the agenda.

Public Comments: Chuck Holmes spoke in opposition to the application (by letter). Residents of the McKnight neighborhood spoke in opposition to the application (by letter). David Gaby spoke in opposition to the application (by letter).

Motion: To waive the demolition delay ordinance for the property

Decision: Denied

RESULT:	FAILED [2 TO 2]
AYES:	Vincent Walsh, Judith Crowell
NAYS:	Bryan Mcfarland, Walter Kroll
ABSENT:	Alfonso Nardi, Vincent Calcasola

VI. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission

1. Informational (ID # 7900)

CPC Historic Home Restoration Program

Discussion: Community Preservation Committee Historic Home Restoration Program - Review of Non-Applicability Applications

a) **79 Bowdoin Street:** Repair or replacement of windows, doors, and trim to carriage house

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that Shannon Walsh was the consultant for this project as it is a Community Preservation Committee grant awarded project in response to a question from Commissioner Walsh. Commissioner Crowell then stated that she could not vote on this issue due to it being a conflict of interest to which Mr. Allen stated that the Commission did not need a quorum to approve the non-applicability application. Commissioner Kroll then asked to see a more detailed version of the scope of work to which Mr. Allen provided the scope of work for the project to the Commission. Commissioner Walsh then asked if anything proposed would be an alteration in material or design, which the petitioner stated no on their application. Mr. Allen stated that the property owner had to renovate in a manner that would match the original shed in design, style, material and color as a stipulation of the Community Preservation Act program.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Approved for certificate of Non-Applicability by the chair

2. Informational (ID # 7898)

CPA Historic Determinations / Project Reviews

Discussion: Community Preservation Act Historic Determinations / Project Reviews

a) **178-184 Maple Street:** Request of CPA funds for restoration of deteriorated row houses

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: The petitioners stated that they would be completely renovating the property and that currently there was one tenant located on the second floor of 178 Maple Street. The petitioners stated that they plan on renovating the row houses to be residential apartments. Commissioner Walsh then asked which houses were owned by the petitioner to which the petitioners indicated that they owned 178-184 Maple Street. The petitioners stated that they are currently doing clean-up work on the property, but that much of their timeline was contingent on the awarding of Community Preservation Act funds as well as if the city would sell them the two adjacent row houses. Commissioner Walsh then asked what the petitioners needed from the Commission to which the petitioners stated that they were seeking a letter of support in order to seek CPA funds. Commissioner Kroll then asked when the letter would be required to which the petitioners stated that the deadline for submission was the 29th of February.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To designate property as historically significant / letter of support issued by commission

Decision: Approved/Issued

RESULT: RECEIVED THE REPORT-PASSED

3. Informational (ID # 7899)

Discussion: SHC Meetings Relocation

Discussion: Relocation of Historical Commission meetings from City Hall to 70 Tapley Street

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh stated that he did not mind moving to 70 Tapley Street but would defer to the other Commissioners on their opinions on the matter. Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the need to move to 70 Tapley Street was due to the internet and audio connectivity issues that have persisted with meetings in Room 205 at City Hall as well as the lack of parking at City Hall during particular events at either the MassMutual Center or Symphony Hall.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the change of location for Historical Commission meetings upon the first meeting in April of 2024.

Decision: Approved

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

4. Informational (ID # 7565)

Public Speak-Out Session

Public Speak-Out Session

HISTORY:

01/18/24 Historical Commission

Petitioners for the closed matter regarding 83 Buckingham Street came forward and asked the commission if their application would be heard. Commissioner Walsh then responded saying that their matter had already been closed. The petitioners responded by saying that they had not received any notice of a decision on this matter. Planner Alvin Allen then informed the portioners that their matter had been accepted by default as a decision on the matter had not been made by the commission within the 60-day deadline to do so. Commissioner Walsh recommended to the petitioners that, though approved, the petitioners should ensure that the work done to the house adhere to the historic guidelines of the neighborhood and that if there

were any changes that were not in the original application that they were required to come before the commission for approval of those changes.

02/01/24

Historical Commission

Discussion: David Gaby of 1105 Worthington Street spoke on the importance of preserving historic structures and of their future endeavors to expand the McKnight Local Historic District to better preserve the historic characters of the city's neighbors. Harry Seymour of 68 Washington Road spoke to raise the names of potential candidates for consideration of appointment to the Historical Commission and of a project to raise awareness to the patching of sidewalks with asphalt.

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: David Gaby rose to raise concerns over the permitting of technological additions to historic homes and the need for an alteration of the ordinances guiding the installation of solar panels in local historic districts. Commissioner Walsh stated that these were legitimate issues but that the Commission could not direct individuals as to what would be a proper appliance for their homes. Mr. Gaby also presented interest in creating a study commission to study the creation of a single building historic district for 69-71 Princeton Street.