



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Vincent Walsh

Thursday, August 15, 2024

5:30 PM

Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on August 15, 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, August 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

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

05/02/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 05/16/24

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the petitioner had informed him that they would not be in attendance for the meeting and had requested a continuance of their application. Commissioner Walsh asked Principal Planner Allen if there was a limit on the number of times applicants could request an extension. Principal Planner Allen stated that there was not a limit to the number of extensions they could request.

Public Comment: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (05/16/2024)

Decision: Continued

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

Discussion: Commissioner Nardi asked if the application had enough time left, with regards to its deadline, before the Commission had to make a decision. Principal Planner Alvin Allen and Planning Intern Evan Mastroianni informed Commissioner Nardi that the application had two more meetings left before its deadline.

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue to next available meeting (06/06/2024)

Decision: Continued

06/06/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/20/24

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

06/20/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 07/18/24

Discussion: Commissioner Walsh asked planning staff how much time was left on the application. Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the application deadline was July 24th.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the application to the next available meeting (07/18/2024)

Decision: Continued

07/18/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE**
Next: 08/01/24

Discussion: None
Public Comments: None
Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting 8/1/2024
Decision: Continued

08/01/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE**
Next: 08/15/24

Discussion: None
Public Comments: None
Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (08/15/2024)
Decision: Continued

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to next available meeting (09/05/2024)

Decision: Continued

RESULT: CONTINUE

Next: 9/5/2024 5:30 PM

2. Petition (ID # 8169)

34 Westernview Street

34 Westernview Street: Replace roof shingles, slate to asphalt

HISTORY:

08/01/24 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 08/15/24

Discussion: Zack, of Venture Solar, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. Zack stated that due to the lack of structural support for the previously approved solar panel installation to the house, they would be seeking to replace the slate roof with a proposed architectural shingle model. Commissioner Nespor asked if the proposed roof replacement was just for the sections of the roof that would contain solar panels. Zack stated that the proposed roofing replacement was for the entire roof of the house. Commissioner Walsh stated that he would like to know more about the condition of the existing slate roof. and stated that the presented pictures did not give enough information on what the roof's current state was. Commissioner Kroll advised that it might be best for members of the Commission to conduct a site visit to the property to properly assess, and understand the current state of the roof. Commissioner Walsh agreed with Commissioner Kroll and recommended that a motion be made to continue the matter to allow for a site visit to be conducted.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (08/15/2024)

Decisions: Continued

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: A petitioner, Julianne Chu, spoke on behalf of the property owner. Commissioner Walsh asked Ms. Chu if she had any idea when the slate roof was removed and replaced with an asphalt roof. Ms. Chu could not give an answer as to when the asphalt roof was installed. Commissioner Walsh then asked Ms. Chu if the solar panel company had given her any information regarding the asphalt roof installation. Ms. Chu stated that they had not and stated that she was filling in for the person who was meant to come before the Commission. Ms. Chu then stated that the individual who was supposed to come before the Commission had informed her that there had been a miscommunication regarding the installation of the roof. Commissioner Walsh then stated to Ms. Chu that the individual who was previously before the Commission as a representative for the property owner at the last Historical Commission meeting had, in Commissioner Walsh's opinion, misled the Commission. Commissioner Walsh stated that the individual did not disclose to the Commission that the slate roof had been removed and replaced, and presented photos to the Commission from a recent site visit conducted by Commission members showing the newly installed asphalt roof. Commissioner Walsh then stated that he wished that the solar company had sent a representative with more knowledge of the project. Commissioner Walsh then requested of the Commission to give feedback on the appropriateness of the recently installed roof. Commissioner Walsh commented that the placement of the solar panel conduits was inappropriate, and was in fact installed in a manner that was not allowed on the approval certificate that they had received from the Commission. Commissioner Walsh then stated that he would have likely approved the change of roofing material had they come before Commission before installing the new roof. Commissioner Nardi asked if there were any other photos of the newly installed roof to which staff presented such photos to the Commission. Commissioner Nardi commented that it appeared as though the roof was improperly installed. Principal Planner Alvin Allen added that staff was in the process of issuing a stop work order for the improper solar installation. Commissioner Nespor asked if the Commission could include a decision that recognized the apparent improper installation of gutters. Commissioner Walsh stated that the Commission could only decide on what was on the meeting agenda and added that gutters were not part of the item and thus could not be part of the motion. Commissioner Nespor then asked if there was any recourse that could be done regarding the matter to which Principal Planner Allen stated that a stop work order for the solar panel installation was in the process of being issued. Commissioner Kroll then added that regardless of whether the new roof is appropriate, the Commission should not assume that it is appropriate as they were never given the opportunity to see the state of the original slate roof. Commissioner Nardi then stated that part of the appropriateness of the roof was the manner in which it was installed as well to which Commissioner Nardi stated that the newly installed roof does not meet those standards. Commissioner Walsh added that because the roof was the last slate roof left in the neighborhood, it was even more vital that the Commission had decided on the asphalt roof installation before it was completed. Commissioner Walsh then asked if the representative knew the type of asphalt shingle that was installed to which Ms. Chu stated she did not know. Commissioner Walsh then asked staff what could be done by the Commission to respond to the improper roof installation. Principal Planner Alvin Allen then added that the Commission could issue the stop work order for the roof installation if it was denied by the Commission tonight.

Public Comments: Harry Seymour spoke in opposition to the application, Steve Jablonski spoke in opposition to the application.

Motion: To approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness

Decision: Denied (Not enough information provided to address concerns of the Commission)

RESULT:	FAILED [1 TO 5]
AYES:	Vincent Walsh
NAYS:	Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor

IV. Public Hearings (New)

1. Petition (ID # 8185)

80 Fairfield Street

80 Fairfield Street: Install handicap access ramp to rear of property

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Jessica and Erik Sunny (homeowners) spoke on behalf of the matter. Mrs. Sunny stated that her sister and husband were moving into their property and required a handicap ramp to be installed onto the property and presented photos and drawings of the proposed ramp to the Commission. Commissioner Crowell asked how long the ramp would be installed for to which they stated that it would be installed for a year or two. Commissioner Nardi commented that the pitch of the ramp might need to be adjusted to allow for better use of the ramp.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the application for a Certificate of Hardship (will be uninstalled when use of ramp is no longer needed)

Decision: Approved

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

2. Petition (ID # 8186)

83-85 Thompson Street

83-85 Thompson Street: Removal and restoration of front porch (1st floor only)

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Eduardo Pichardo spoke on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Pichardo stated that he would be performing repair work on the front porch columns and front porch trim of the property using the same materials, and designs as the original front porch columns and trim. Mr. Pichardo then stated that he was proposing to replace the existing front porch flooring, and front porch stairs with composite tongue and groove flooring and composite stairs and presented photos of the proposed composite material to the Commission. Commissioner Walsh asked Mr. Pichardo if the new flooring would match the design of the original front porch flooring to which Mr. Pichardo stated yes. Commissioner Walsh then asked if the black metal pipe handrail on the front porch stairs would remain

in place to which Mr. Pichardo stated yes. Commissioner Kroll commented that the picture of the proposed composite material did not appear to be one of the exact model or type that would be used on the front porch. Mr. Pichardo stated that his intention was to seek out and choose a model based on the Commission's decision/recommendation. Commissioner Walsh commented that there was not enough information present on the proposed replacement flooring materials for the Commission to make a decision and recommended that the Commission continue the matter to allow for more information on a replacement model to be gathered. Mr. Pichardo then asked Commissioner Walsh if he could replace the flooring and stairs to models that were of the same design and material rather than using the originally proposed composite flooring. Staff informed Mr. Pichardo that as long as the design and material of the flooring and stairs did not change that the Commission could issue a certificate of non-applicability. Mr. Pichardo agreed that he would not change any designs or materials of the front porch and changed his application to one of non-applicability.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To approve the application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability

Decision: Approved

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

3. **Petition (ID # 8187)**

49 Chestnut Street (MOFA)

49 Chestnut Street (Museum of Fine Arts): Remove windows and infill with limestone

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Steve Jablonski and Sean Mullet spoke on behalf of the matter. Mr. Jablonski informed the Commission that they were proposing to replace the southern façade windows on the buildings with limestone infills, and presented a rendering of the proposed work to the Commission. Mr. Jablonski stated that they would be removing the existing windows and covering them with limestone due to concerns of practicality, and stated that covering of the windows with limestone was the most appropriate/cost effective option. Mr. Mullett also stated that the proposed wall installation would better preserve the art, and would not dramatically change the look of the building. Commissioner Kroll stated that it was difficult for him to visualize what the new walls would look like to which a picture of a section of the museum with no windows was presented. Commissioner Nespor stated that the proposed replacement of the windows with limestone seemed very drastic, and asked Mr. Mullett and Mr. Jablonski if they had considered installing murals modeled after the windows to which Mr. Jablonski said that was not an option for them at this time. Mr. Jablonski emphasized that the limestone infill option was the most cost-effective measure, but one that would also, in his opinion not detract from the historical character of the building. Commissioner Nespor asked Mr. Mullett and Mr. Jablonski if they considered replacing the windows with other resourced and similarly designed windows that could serve as faux windows. Mr. Mullett stated that was not considered due to, in the Museum's opinion, the high cost associated with such a project. Commissioner Nespor asked if the windowsills would remain in place on the façade to which Mr. Mullett stated yes. Commissioner Walsh asked if the petitioners could produce a rendering of the proposed walled over design to which the petitioners stated that

they were not able to send one over in time. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the Commission continue the matter to have the petitioners produce more information, and explore other options for the northern and southern façade windows.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (09/05/2024)

Decision: Continued

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 9/5/2024 5:30 PM
AYES:	Walsh, Nardi, Crowell, Kroll, Zorzi, Nespor	

V. Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings

VI. 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**

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen stated that the Verizon Wireless is requesting a Section 106 Review for the installation of antennas to the property. Principal Planner Allen also stated that, due to its prominent location and historical significance, staff had attempted to contact the project managers, but had not heard back from them as of yet. Principal Planner Allen then presented design plans for the proposed antennas on the property, and stated that there were already antennas on the property and that this project would be made as an addition to those already installed antennas. Commissioner Kroll stated that it would be best for a representative of the project to come, and give more detail on the proposed installation. Commissioner Nardi agreed and advised that the Commission move to continue the matter until a representative can be found to speak on the matter.

Public Comments: None

Motion: Continue to next available meeting (06/06/2024)

Decision: Continued

06/06/24 **Historical Commission**

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

06/20/24

Historical Commission

Discussion: City Planning staff informed the Commission that the project manager was unable to obtain permission to speak on the project, and therefore could not attend the Commission meeting. Commissioner Walsh recommended that the matter be continued to give the project manager more time to obtain a letter of authorization from the property owner.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (07/18/2024)

Decision: Continued

07/18/24

Historical Commission

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Continued

08/01/24

Historical Commission

Discussion: Planning Intern Evan Mastroianni informed the Commission that the project manager had not yet obtained a letter of authorization from the property owner, and would not be able to come before the Commission tonight. Commissioner Walsh then recommended that the Commission continue the matter until the next available meeting, and allow time for the project manager to obtain a letter of authorization from the property owner.

Public Comments: None

Motion: To continue the matter to the next available meeting (08/15/2024)

Decision: Continued

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: Principal Planner Alvin Allen informed the Commission that the petitioner has asked for the item to be removed as they have been unable to obtain a letter from the property owner to petition on their behalf.

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: Request withdrawn

2. Informational (ID # 8188)

Public Speak-Out Session

Public Speak-Out Session

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

Discussion: None

Public Comments: None

Motion: None

Decision: None