



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Agenda ~

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

Vincent Walsh

Thursday, May 2, 2024

5:30 PM

Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on May 2, 2024 at Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center, 70 Tapley Street, Springfield, MA.

II. Acceptance of Minutes

1. Thursday, April 18, 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

HISTORY:

02/15/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Discussion: No discussion on the matter

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue to next available meeting

Decision: Continued

03/21/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/04/24

Discussion: No discussion on the matter

Public Comment: None

Motion: Continue application to next meeting (04/04)

Decision: Continued

04/04/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/18/24

Petitioner requested additional time for their application prior to the meeting. No further discussion by the Commission.

04/18/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue the matter to the next available meeting (05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

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

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

02/15/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Discussion: No discussion on the matter

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue application to next available meeting

Decision: Continued

03/21/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/04/24

Discussion: The petitioner (Mr. David Gaby) stated that they had consulted with their contractors for this project. They stated that the company informed them that the conduits for the units would be located on the interior of the property, and that all meters for the solar panels would be located next to other electric meters on the exterior side of the property. Commissioner Walsh asked if the petitioner could discuss with the contractors on the relocation of the electric meter to a less visible location. The petitioner stated that they would look into further discussions with the solar company. The petitioner then stated that they could perform landscaping work on the property to cover up the meters, if need be, to which Commissioner Walsh stated that would be a last resort option.

Public Comment: None

Motion: Continue application to next meeting (04/04)

Decision: Continued

04/04/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 04/18/24

Principal Planner, Alvin Allen, informed the Commission that he had received a letter from Mr. David Gaby, the petitioner, requesting a thirty-day extension to the deadline for the matter, and proceeded to show said letter to the Commission. Commissioner Kroll inquired as to why Mr. Gaby needed an extension. Mr. Allen stated that the extension was needed due to the deadline for the Commission to decide on the matter occurring prior to the next meeting date.

04/18/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue the matter to the next available meeting (05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

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.

3. **Petition (ID # 7947)**

208 Belmont Avenue

208 Belmont Avenue: Front porch renovations (floor, columns, railings, lattice)

HISTORY:

03/21/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 04/04/24

Discussion: Ronald Bridges spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Commissioner Walsh asked how the spindles on the front porch would be configured to which Mr. Bridges stated that they would replicate the original porch in design and material. Mr. Bridges stated that the columns of the front porch would be similar in design to the original columns and be made of solid cement. Commissioner Walsh then expressed concern over the circumference of the new posts to which Mr. Bridges stated that the circumference would be a hair slimmer than the original columns. Mr. Bridges added that he had tried to find bigger columns but none could be found. Commissioner Walsh emphasized that the new columns should be larger than what Mr. Bridges was proposing. Mr. Bridges then stated that the porch hand railings would be made of wood and would mimic the previous railings. Commissioner Walsh suggested that the petitioner consider pipe railings but stated that he was fine with the railing style be the same as the previous style. Commissioner Zorzi then asked about the height of the new columns to which Mr. Bridges stated that the columns would be 8 feet tall. Commissioner Kroll asked if the design would be the same as the original columns to which the petitioner stated that they would have the same design as the previous columns. The petitioner stated that he could inquire on getting wider columns. Commissioner Walsh stated that he would be fine with the new columns circumference but that he wished that the columns were larger. The petitioner stated that all other designs and styles of the porch would

match the previous porch. Commissioner Walsh asked if the petitioner would be ok to inquire on larger-sized columns to which the petitioner stated yes.

Public Comment: Harry Seymour spoke in favor of the application; David Gaby spoke in favor of the application.

Motion: To continue application to next meeting (04/04), in order to source wider columns.

Decision: Continued

04/04/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 04/18/24

Principal Planner, Alvin Allen, informed the Commission that he would be receiving a request from the petitioner for a thirty-day extension to the deadline of the application. Commissioner Kroll asked why the item needed an extension to which Mr. Allen stated that the extension was needed due to the deadline for the Commission to decide on the matter occurring prior to the next meeting date.

04/18/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue the matter to the next available meeting (05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

4. Petition (ID # 7950)

134 Buckingham Street

134 Buckingham Street: Replacement windows

HISTORY:

03/21/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 04/04/24

Discussion: The petitioner, Mr. Joe Johnson, stated that he would be replacing all of the first-floor windows but would be returning for projects pertaining to the front door and porch structures of the house. Commissioner Walsh expressed concern over the location of the replacement windows' grids being on the interior of the window. The petitioner indicated that to put the grids on the exterior of the windows would cause great financial hardship. Principal Planner Alvin Allen then showed a picture of the proposed windows. Commissioner Walsh explained to the petitioner that the Commission would need more information pertaining to the size of the windows. The petitioner then explained that the windows would sit directly on the sill and would be black in color. Commissioner Walsh then suggested that the Commission continue the application for the petitioner to explore more options that would involve the window grids to be located on the exterior of the window in a manner that would not cause financial hardship.

Public Comment: Lloyd Creswell spoke in favor of the application

Motion: To continue the application to the next meeting (04/04) for the petitioner to explore more window options.

Decision: Continued

04/04/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 04/18/24

Principal Planner, Alvin Allen, stated to the Commission that the petitioner had informed him that he needed more time to explore other appropriate window models to present to the Commission.

04/18/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: Joe Johnson, owner of the property, spoke on the matter. Mr. Johnson explained that he had contacted multiple contractors and stated that the prices given to install windows with exterior grids would be exorbitant in cost. Mr. Johnson stated that he would then propose the installation of black vinyl windows that did not have grids as a possible alternative replacement option. Commissioner Nardi asked if the storm windows could be kept in place if the new windows were installed to which Mr. Johnson stated no. Mr. Johnson again stated that he would be replacing the windows to be black but with no grids in place. Commissioner Kroll asked which model the windows would be, to which Mr. Johnson stated that he had not chosen a model as of yet. Mr. Johnson asked the Commission what models would be appropriate for the Commission. Principal Planner Alvin Allen then stated that the Commission could not advise Mr. Johnson on what type of window would be appropriate, but that they traditionally advise to choose a darker color window model. Principal Planner Allen then advised that Mr. Johnson utilize the Commission's approved windows list to choose an appropriate model. Commissioner Walsh asked if he could see a historic photo of the property to which one was supplied. Commissioner Walsh commented that the windows in the historic photo shown are not windows but storm windows, and did not reflect the actual windows themselves. Commissioner Walsh then asked how much more it would cost to install windows with exterior grids to which Mr. Johnson stated that it would cost an additional \$80,000. Commissioner Kroll then stated that because Mr. Johnson had not chosen a window replacement model yet that it would make it difficult for the Commission to vote on the matter. Commissioner Kroll then asked if the petitioner would be open to the matter being continued to give Mr. Johnson more time to collect more information. Mr. Johnson then stated that he would be ok if the Commission chose to continue the matter. Principal Planner Allen then asked Mr. Johnson to request a 30-day extension on his application due to there being one more meeting before the application would time out. Mr. Johnson then verbally requested and was given a 30-day extension to the application.

Public Comment: David Gaby spoke in opposition to the application; Jim Boone spoke in opposition to the application

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

5. Petition (ID # 7984)

92 Buckingham Street

92 Buckingham Street: Porch railing modifications, following 1/19/2024 porch renovation approval by SHC.

HISTORY:

04/18/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: Ann Haughton, owner of the property, spoke on the matter. Commissioner Nardi read the proposed work and justification for Ms. Haughton's hardship request to the Commission. Ms. Haughton acknowledged that, although the work done to the railings was not in compliance

with what the Commission approved, the cost to remediate the Commission's concerns would cause extreme financial hardship. Ms. Haughton stated that the cost to rehab the entire front porch was about \$92,000, and added that cost would only increase if the railings were altered to conform with the Commission's original requests. Ms. Haughton stated that, due to this financial hardship, she was petitioning to keep the new rails at the altered height and to leave the top of the railings squared. Ms. Haughton stated that she had originally believed that the original height was being replicated until presented with historic photos of the property. Commissioner Nardi then stated that the previously installed porch railings appeared to be of varying heights to which Ms. Haughton stated that the contractor based the new railing height on a side of the porch that was not equal to the rest of the porch structure. Commissioner Kroll asked to see a copy of the original approval issued by the Commission to which one was presented to the Commission. Commissioner Nardi inquired on the design process for the railings. Ms. Haughton stated that the contractors based their designs off of photos taken of the previously installed porch railings. Commissioner Walsh stated that the contractor did not duplicate the original height of the railings. Ms. Haughton stated that she had thought the contractor would be replicating the original porch structure and that these alterations were not done with her permission. Commissioner Walsh asked what percentage of the porch railing work had been completed already. Ms. Haughton stated that the railings located on the sides of the porches were already installed, and that the railings were fifty percent completed. Commissioner Zorzi stated that the previously installed railings had a channel that the spindles sat on and added that the newly installed spindles did not have a channel installed. Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated to Ms. Haughton that a possible remediation to the porch railings could be a shortening of the already installed railings' heights and installing a black pipe handrail above the railings to comply with code. Ms. Haughton stated that it would be difficult to make any revisions to the railings at this point in the project. Commissioner Walsh stated that the contractor possibly misled Ms. Haughton, and that the new railing height was not what was approved. Commissioner Nardi then stated that the previously installed porch railings were inconsistent in style and were most likely not the original railings of the house. Ms. Haughton then stated that she had thought the pipe handrail would be installed over the railings, and was surprised that the contractor's plans did not call for one, but stated that the pipe handrail was not included in her design requests to the contractor. Commissioner Nardi advised that it might be best to continue the motion and give the petitioner more time to explore possible remediation options. Commissioner Nardi stated that the contractor could reduce the porch railing height by cutting the bottom portion down in size, but that it would not change the height much. Commissioner Nardi then asked what the distance between the railings and the windows was to which the petitioner stated 27 inches. Principal Planner Allen asked if it was possible for Ms. Haughton to speak with the architect who originally designed the porch to create a solution to the matter. Commissioner Nardi added that it would be better for the homeowner to request a continuance on the matter to explore options that would be more appropriate. Principal Planner Allen asked what specifically should be considered to remediate the railing issue to which Commissioner Nardi stated that any new design specifications should address the issues concerning the railing height and the top portion of the railings.

Public Comment: David Gaby spoke in opposition to the application

Motion: To continue the application to the next available meeting
(05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

IV. Public Hearings (New)

1. Petition (ID # 8007)

186 Belmont Avenue

186 Belmont Avenue: Replace rear deck/stairs, wood to Trex composite

2. Petition (ID # 8008)

133 Longhill Street

133 Longhill Street: Replacement roof, slate to asphalt

3. Petition (ID # 8009)

355 Maple Street

355 Maple Street: Installation of solar panels

4. Petition (ID # 8010)

115 Garfield Street

115 Garfield Street: Installation of solar panels

V. Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings

VI. Preservation Agreements

1. Petition (ID # 7985)

94-96 Byers Street

94-96 Byers Street: Replacement windows

HISTORY:

04/18/24

Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 05/02/24

Discussion: Pavlo Yusenko spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Yusenko stated that they would be replacing 12 double hung white windows on the property with white vinyl replacements. Commissioner Nardi asked what was there before to which Mr. Yusenko stated that the new windows would be replacing white wooden models. Commissioner Walsh asked to see the preservation agreement for the property to which a copy was shown to the Commission. Mr. Yusenko stated that the new windows would match vinyl windows that were already installed on the property, and provided a picture of the previously installed vinyl windows to the Commission. Commissioner Kroll questioned the material of the previously installed windows being stated that it appeared as if the windows shown by the petitioner were wooden and not vinyl. Commissioner Walsh asked if the majority of the windows were wood or vinyl to which Mr. Yusenko stated that the majority of the windows were wooden and 5 or 6 were vinyl. Mr. Yusenko added that the new windows would be vinyl and white in color. Commissioner Kroll stated that they needed more information and Commissioner Nardi proposed a site visit to see the property to which the Commission agreed. Commissioner Nardi then proposed a continuance on the matter until the next meeting in order for the Commission to collect additional information.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the application to the next available meeting
(05/02/2024)

Decision: Continued

VII. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission

1. Informational (ID # 8011)

Discussion: Expansion of McKnight Local Historic District

Discussion: Expansion of McKnight Local Historic District

2. Informational (ID # 8012)

Public Speak-Out Session

Public Speak-Out Session