



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Vincent Walsh

Thursday, June 6, 2024

5:30 PM

Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on June 6, 2024 at Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center, 70 Tapley Street, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Vincent Walsh	Chair, RAPV Representative	Present	
Alfonso Nardi	Vice-Chair	Present	
Judith Crowell	CPC Representative	Present	
Walter Kroll		Present	
Marisa Zorzi		Present	
Vana Nespor		Present	

II. Acceptance of Minutes

1. Thursday, May 16, 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

03/21/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/04/24

04/04/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/18/24

04/18/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 05/02/24

05/02/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 05/16/24

05/16/24 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 06/06/24

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal planner Alvin Allen stated to the Commission that the petitioners had requested a 30-day extension to their application and for the matter to be continued.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the application to the next available meeting (06/20/2024)

Decision: Continued

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 6/20/2024 5:30 PM
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor	

IV. Public Hearings (New)

1. Petition (ID # 8027)

66 Dartmouth Street

66 Dartmouth Street: Installation of solar panels

HISTORY:

05/16/24 Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/06/24

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Alex Legler of Trinity Solar spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Legler stated that Trinity Solar would be installing solar panels to the right and rear portions of the house. Mr. Legler stated that the conduits for the panels would be hidden underneath the roof, except for the portion of the conduit that was near the electric meter for the panels. Mr. Legler stated that any visible conduits would be painted to match the exterior color of the house. Commissioner Nardi asked what color the panels would be to which Mr. Legler stated that they were to be black. Mr. Legler then stated that the proposed solar unit's meter would be located on the western facade of the home next to an existing meter.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the application for Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulation that all external conduits be painted to match the exterior color of the house and for the meter to be located on the western facade of the home next to an existing meter.

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

2. Petition (ID # 8031)

213 Pine Street

213 Pine Street: Construction of two new duplexes

HISTORY:**05/16/24****Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE****Next: 06/06/24****COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: Victoria Vikhrev spoke on the matter. Ms. Vikhrev stated that she had made revisions to her plans for proposed duplexes since she was last in front of the Commission, and a rendition of the revised plans were then shown to the Commission. Ms. Vikhrev stated that the new plans called for the separation of the windows located in the front of the house, and for a singular door at the front of the house versus the two doorways that were originally proposed. In addition, Ms. Vikhrev stated that the style of the siding of the house would change but that the material would still be vinyl. Ms. Vikhrev went on to state that the new pattern would include a shake-style pattern on the third-floor of the front of the house, and clapboard siding along the second and first floor portions of the house. Commissioner Walsh then asked about the material and style used for the front porch railings of the house. Ms. Vikhrev stated that the railings would be white vinyl with the balustrades sitting in between the top and bottom railings. Ms. Vikhrev then added that the decking and stairs of the front porch would be AZEK tongue and groove style flooring and that the stair railing would match the style and design of the porch railing. Ms. Vikhrev then provided samples of the proposed siding to the Commission. Commissioner Kroll then asked about the color of the railings to which Ms. Vikhrev stated that the proposed railings would be white. Commissioner Walsh stated that standard white vinyl railings would not be acceptable models, and that he would like to see a more appropriate model that included features such as a more curved top to them. Commissioner Walsh then stated that everything aside from the railings and the siding material appeared to be acceptable. Commissioner Walsh also stated that the lattice would need to be framed and would need to be wrapped around the side of the front porch as well. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the Commission vote on all aspects of the matter with the exception of the railings which would be continued to the next meeting. Commissioner Nardi then stated that the petitioner might need to return to the Commission if Code Enforcement required the installation of a third-floor vent.

Public Comments: Harry Seymour spoke in favor of the application

Motion: To approve the application for Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulation that front porch flooring be perpendicular to the face of the building, railings be designed according to the sketch given to the Commission and that the front porch vinyl lattice be framed.

Decision: Denied

Reason for denial: Commission was not in favor of vinyl siding and would prefer an alternative siding material.

RESULT:	FAILED [3 TO 3]
AYES:	Vincent Walsh, Alfonso Nardi, Vana Nespor
NAYS:	Judith Crowell, Walter Kroll, Marisa Zorzi

3. Petition (ID # 8032)

55 Emery Street

55 Emery Street: Replacement of storefront windows, re-installation of canopy, infill doors/doorways for security purposes (remediation of stop work order, 3/26/2024), and remediation of unauthorized exterior window color (grey to white).

HISTORY:

05/16/24 Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/06/24

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: David Borstein and Shannon Dodge spoke on the matter. Commissioner Walsh stated that the proposed window color should not remain white. Commissioner Walsh also stated that he had no issues with proposed installation of the canopy. Commissioner Walsh stated that the blocking of windows and doorways needed to be addressed tonight. Commissioner Walsh stated that the blocking of windows that are not visible from the public way could be blocked if need be. Mr. Dodge proposed that three covered windows, visible from the public way, could be replaced with faux windows to allow for more usable interior space. Commissioner Walsh stated that the faux windows would be acceptable, and also that the storefront windows proposed could be added as long as they matched the already installed models on the building. Mr. Dodge stated that two solutions regarding the doorways could be the bricking of doorways and the addition of a faux door over the brick, or the installation of gates to the doorways on the property. Commissioner Walsh stated that the faux door option would be better if it matched the design and style of what was there previously. Commissioner Nespor asked if the proposed gates could be models that appeared able to be opened but could not in fact be opened. Mr. Dodge stated that they were not looking at that as an option. Mr. Dodge also stated that the gate could go up about a foot off of the sidewalk if that would be more aesthetically pleasing. Commissioner Walsh stated that might not be an acceptable option. Principal Planner Alvin Allen asked Mr. Dodge to clarify that the brick door openings would mimic the design and style of the original doorways, and if the faux doors would be set back in those bricked in openings. Mr. Dodge stated yes to Planner Allen's question and added that the faux doors could be models based on doors from the similar period. Mr. Dodge then stated that the proposed storefront windows would mimic what is currently installed on the property, and that the proposed non-storefront windows would match the styles and designs of the other already installed non-storefront windows. Commissioner Walsh then stated that the proposals for the storefront windows, canopy and bricked over doorways and windows would be acceptable. Commissioner Walsh stated that the color of the non-storefront windows would need to be changed, and that the white color that was currently on the windows was not acceptable. Mr. Dodge stated that the white window color was judged to

be the more appealing models to them, but stated that they could paint them a different color if need be. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the window color matter be continued, and that all other matters concerning this item could be voted on tonight. Commissioner Walsh also recommended that the petitioners return within six months to propose designs of permanent coverings of the doorways, but that temporary coverings could be installed in the meantime. Commissioner Nespor asked if the color of the building could be changed, and thereby make darker colored windows more appealing to which Mr. Dodge stated that option would be too costly for them.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a new canopy where the original one existed, temporary infill of doorways (with the stipulation that the petitioners return within 6 months to propose a permanent solution), the installation of storefront windows to the East Columbus façade, and to reinstall nine windows (three faux windows, six real windows) to the East Columbus façade. To Continue the matter of the window color matter to the next meeting and extend the deadline of the application by 60-days.

Decision: Application for storefront windows, non-storefront windows, doorways and canopy **approved**; Application for window color **continued** to next meeting (06/20/2024)

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

4. Petition (ID # 8067)

37 Avon Place

37 Avon Place: Installation of front yard fence

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh recommended that the application be accepted as the fence did not appear to be overly obtrusive, due to the installation of similar models in the neighborhood and aligning with a similar fence on the adjacent property.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve a Certificate of Hardship for the previously installed fence to remain at its current location

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

5. Petition (ID # 8068)

134 Buckingham Street

134 Buckingham Street: Installation of side yard fence**COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: Samira Fernandes spoke on the matter. Ms. Fernandes stated that the proposed fence would be replacing a previously installed fence, and that the path of the fence would be along the western, eastern and southern lot lines of the property. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the new fence should match the previously installed fence that was located on the eastern lot line of the house. Ms. Fernandes then stated that the new fence would match the previous fence. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the application be changed, and be one of appropriateness as the matter would involve the installation of a fence in areas where there was previously a fence.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness

Decision: Approved

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

6. Petition (ID # 8069)

144 Buckingham Street

144 Buckingham Street: Replacement windows**COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: Linda Wallace spoke on the matter. Ms. Wallace stated that the original first and third floor windows of the house were badly damaged, and were in need of replacement. Ms. Wallace stated that it would cost too much for the original windows to be repaired and stated that the original windows were energy inefficient. Commissioner Walsh asked if the window company could duplicate the design of the original windows. Ms. Wallace stated that the proposed windows did not have any grids on them. Ms. Wallace then stated that the proposed windows would be white vinyl to match the color of the previously installed windows. Commissioner Walsh then asked how many windows would be replaced. Ms. Wallace stated that she would be replacing 28 windows in total. Commissioner Nardi advised Ms. Wallace that one possible window option could involve models that are of a darker exterior

color, and that included grids that matched the design of the original windows but added that might change the cost of the windows. Commissioner Walsh added that if/when the non-original window models that had been previously installed needed to be replaced, the new models should replicate the original windows in design and style. Commissioner Kroll asked if Ms. Wallace had utilized the Commission's pre-approved window list to which Ms. Wallace stated she had not. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the matter be continued so that a new model that is more appropriate could be chosen.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting date (06/20/2024)

Decision: Continued

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 6/20/2024 5:30 PM
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor	

7. Petition (ID # 8070)

43 Ingersol Grove

43 Ingersol Grove: Replacement windows, repair trim boards and cedar shakes

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen informed the Commission that the petitioner had notified staff that they would be withdrawing their application.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Withdrawn by Applicant

RESULT:	WITHDRAWN
----------------	------------------

8. Petition (ID # 8071)

29 George Street

29 George Street: Replacement windows and rear porch renovations

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Jada Miller spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Ms. Miller stated that the spindles located in the rear of the property had already been installed and added that the new spindles matched the previous spindles that were

installed on the rear porch in design and material. Ms. Miller added that the two new windows will be located on the second and third floors of the house and will replicate the design of the original windows. Commissioner Walsh asked if Ms. Miller had more information regarding the specifications, and images of the proposed new windows. Ms. Miller stated that she could obtain that information but did not have it with her presently. Commissioner Walsh stated that, while the spindles were acceptable, he advised that the matter be continued until more information regarding the proposed windows could be gathered.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the application to the next available meeting date (06/20/2024)

Decision: Continued

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

V. Environmental Reviews

1. Petition (ID # 8072)

134 Catharine Street

134 Catharine Street: Several exterior renovations

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: William Brock spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Brock stated that the front and side porches of the house were to be repaired, and that new tongue and groove flooring would be installed. Mr. Brock also stated that the proposed window replacements were to be wooden windows with an aluminum wrap. Mr. Brock then stated that entry-way doors would be replaced to match the original doors. Mr. Brock added that the rear hatchway was to be replaced with a new model and would be located in a non-visible location. Mr. Brock stated that all lattice was to be replaced with matching models. Mr. Brock then stated that the proposed wooden clapboard siding installation might be too expensive to install, and asked the Commission if the repair of the aluminum siding might be more acceptable. Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that planning staff would consult the department's historic consultant for guidance, but that everything except for the siding could be voted on.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To issue a "No adverse impact" decision with the exception of the siding; To continue the siding mater to the next available meeting date (06/20/2024)

Decision: **No adverse impact**, siding matter **continued**

RESULT: **APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
AYES: Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

VI. Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings

1. Petition (ID # 8073)

46 Wilton Street

46 Wilton Street: Demolish single family home

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Commissioner Nardi reported the findings of a site visit to the property by a select group of Commission members. Commissioner Nardi stated that upon visiting the property, he believed that there was no historical significance to the building itself, or any effect to the historical character of the neighborhood by the building's demolition.

Public Comments: A letter from Mr. Ross and Mrs. Zilpha Murray, supporting the demolition of the building, was read into the public record, which also included signatures of several neighbors also located on Wilton Street.

Motion: To grant an exemption from the nine-month demo delay ordinance

Decision: Exemption granted

RESULT: **APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
AYES: Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

VII. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission

1. Informational (ID # 8033)

101 State Street (Section 106 Review)

101 State Street (Section 106 Review): Antenna installation

HISTORY:

05/16/24 Historical Commission COMMITTEE

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen informed the Commission that the representatives for the project were unable to attend.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Continued

2. Informational (ID # 8074)

263 Alden Street

263 Alden Street (Section 106 Review): Install one antenna tower

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the representatives for the project were unable to attend tonight's meeting, but suggested that the Commission could issue a decision of no comment due to the lack of historic significance in the affected area.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Commission took a stance of no comment on the matter

3. Informational (ID # 8091)

90 Fairfield Street

90 Fairfield Street (Non-Applicability): Several exterior repairs

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Andrea Anderson spoke on the matter. Ms. Anderson stated that she would be renovating the front porch to match the original design and material of the porch. Commissioner Walsh then asked Ms. Anderson if any material or design would alter from what was originally on the porch to which Ms. Anderson stated no.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To issue a Certificate of Non-Applicability

Decision: Approved

RESULT: RECEIVED THE REPORT-PASSED

4. Informational (ID # 8075)

Public Speak-Out Session

Public Speak-Out Session**COMMENTS - Current Meeting:**

Discussion: Harry Seymour spoke to raise concerns about the height restrictions of balustrades on second-floor porches versus a first-floor porch in historic districts. Mr. Seymour was advised to go to the building department for guidance on the matter.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: None