



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Agenda ~

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

Andrew Strniste
4137876525

Thursday, April 3, 2025

5:30 PM

Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on April 3, 2025 at Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center, 70 Tapley Street, Springfield, MA.

II. Public Hearings (Continued)

1. Petition (ID # 8538)

123 Ingersoll Grove (Garage Door)

123 INGERSOLL GROVE: Replace Wooden Garage Doors

HISTORY:

03/20/25

Historical Commission **CONTINUE VOTE**

Next: 04/03/25

Regina Jenkins, Scott Jenkins, and Brenton Jenkins, all from 123 Ingersoll Grove, were before the Commission to discuss the application - the replacement of a garage door.

R. Jenkins advised that the garage door was a lot of money to replace; after obtaining various quotes, the proposed garage door was \$8,000, whereas repairing the garage door would cost around \$21,000. Chair A. Nardi confirmed that the proposed door would be one single overhead door. R. Jenkins advised that it would be painted maroon.

The Commission confirmed using Google Street View that the garage was visible from the road. R. Jenkins confirmed that the chosen design was selected for security purposes. Commissioner J. Crowell sought clarification about the cost to repair the door versus replacing the door with a single overhead door.

Harry Seymour from 68 Washington Street expressed his support for the project.

Charles Nathan, the previous owner of the property, advised that the existing garage doors are likely to be close to the original doors and that the proposed door seemed to be appropriate. C. Nathan also advised that he experienced difficulty with the existing doors when he lived there, as there a sag in the frame causing the doors to drag.

Another individual advised that he like the proposed door; however, wondered if the glass portion could be larger.

Chair A. Nardi then read submitted public comment letter into the record. R. Jenkins informed the Commission that the current status of the door was not due to neglect, but rather, someone hitting the door. Other design options were explored by the Petitioner; however, they were more modern looking.

Commissioner J. Crowell inquired as to whether the windows could be larger; R. Jenkins advised that they would ask. B. Jenkins advised that he has thought about moving his business to the garage and favored the smaller windows; however, is willing to work with the Commission to find something that is historically appropriate.

Commissioner W. Kroll opined that the door looked modern, but larger windows could help soften the appearance. S. Jenkins expressed concern about the garage door not being repaired for a longer period of time.

Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the hearing to April 13, 2025. The motion was seconded Commissioner W. Kroll. With no discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

2. Petition (ID # 8539)

E S Ingersoll Grove (06925-0025) (Duplex)

E S INGERSOLL GROVE (06925-0025): Construction of a Duplex

HISTORY:

03/20/25

Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/03/25

Regina Jenkins, Scott Jenkins, and Brenton Jenkins, all from 123 Ingersoll Grove, in addition to their architect, Kevin Hadley, were before the Commission to discuss the proposed project - a new duplex at E S Ingersoll Grove.

K. Hadley informed the Commission that the original house burned down, and that the lot has since been empty. He then explained that when designing houses in historic districts, he tries to pick up on the historic details of the neighborhood. K. Hadley advised that he has designed houses in historic districts in Boston and Worcester.

Chair A. Nardi inquired as to the size of the previous building and whether the previous foundation would be used. There is currently nothing on-site; Staff displayed the historical photograph on the screen. Using Google Street View, the Commission viewed a nearby property.

Chair A. Nardi read Pioneer Valley Planning Commission's comments out loud. No comments from the public in attendance were provided. Chair A. Nardi read into the record the written comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Staff Member A. Strniste inform the Commission that his understanding in talking to Planning Director P. Dromey, the City Council's approval was contained to the land use of the property and not the aesthetics of the building. R. Jenkins confirmed that what was provided to the City council was conceptual. K. Hadley opined that the concept submitted to the City Council was not proportionate to what you would expect, as the windows were bigger than what is normally considered acceptable. A discussion ensued about the front porch, specifically that the front porch was undersized for the neighborhood. R. Jenkins advised that an effort was made to match a building abutting the property that had a smaller porch. The Commission advised that the porch relating to that property was likely enclosed. The Commission then reviewed on Google Street View other porches along Ingersoll Grove.

Commissioner J. Crowell inquired as to why different renderings were submitted to the City Council. R. Jenkins advised that the City Council knew that the renderings submitted were conceptual. B. Jenkins confirmed that the plans changed as the project evolved. R. Jenkins added that due to newer regulations, there were more requirements to adhere to that resulted in the project changing. R. Jenkins confirmed that parking would be towards the rear of the building; there was a dingle in the back requiring the building to be further altered.

Commissioner W. Kroll advised that he liked to hear that the Petitioner was willing to consolidate the front door into one door rather than two front doors.

Attorney K. Shea, the City's Legal Counsel that was attending the meeting, advised that the only issue in front of the City Council was the zoning change - to allow the duplex - and that they had not approved the design of the building, as that was reserved to for the Commission. He also advised that the design was not central to the review.

Chair A. Nardi opined that extending the porch would mean that building would not feel so magnified. He then recommended continuing the hearing to incorporate the recommendations discussed.

Commissioner V. Walsh opined that the Petitioners did not seem to have finalized all of the aspects of the application and that additional details were needed.

Commissioner W. Kroll made a motion to continue the hearing to April 3, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner J. Crowell. No further discussion ensued and the motion was approved unanimously.

3. Petition (ID # 8540)

34 Kopernik Street (Duplexes)

34 KOPERNIK STREET: Construction of Duplexes

HISTORY:

03/20/25

Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE

Next: 04/03/25

Matt Campagnari was before the Commission to present the application - the construction of two duplexes in the Immaculate Conception Local Historical District.

M. Campagnari informed the Commission that he received the comments from the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission about the two buildings looking different from one another, and therefore, he altered the design for one of them to have a porch that spanned the entire length of the building.

Staff Member A. Strniste provided that the Historic District differs from a lot of other districts in that it was originally just one parcel prior to the subdivision.

Commissioner W. Kroll inquired about the grid pattern on the convent, which was confirmed to be one over one.

Commissioner V. Walsh informed M. Campagnari that he took issue with the double door, preferring to see only one door.

Chair A. Nardi opened the hearing up to public comment. First Tom Dougal from 115 Primrose Street vocalized that he was against the proposal, as he understood that the property would not be permitted to have any other primary buildings on it; he did opine that the jury was still out on the existing project. A representative from 31 Kopernik advised that he was against the project and had concerns about preserving the neighborhood, noise and disruption of traffic. Gary, Nicole and Sunna Landry all vocalized their opposition to the project. T. Dougal followed up by listing examples where new duplexes have not increased the property value of the area.

Staff Member A. Strniste informed the Commission and public that their jurisdiction was limited to the aesthetics of the building and not the land use of the property.

Commissioner V. Walsh advised that he would still want to ensure that the project would be allowed to ensure that the Commission was not wasting its time. M. Campagnari advised that his deed states that he is allowed to building two duplexes.

Commissioner W. Kroll made a motion to continue the hearing to April 3, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner J. Crowell. Commissioner J. Crowell inquired as to whether

the siding will be vinyl and whether the windows will be dark in color. With no further questions, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. Minutes Approval

1. Thursday, March 20, 2025

IV. Public Hearings (New)

1. **Petition (ID # 8556)**

102 Dartmouth Street (Solar)

102 DARTMOUTH STREET: Installation of Solar Powered Panels

2. **Petition (ID # 8557)**

264 Sumner Avenue (Window)

264 SUMNER AVENUE: Re-establishment of an Historic Window

3. **Petition (ID # 8558)**

200 Florida Street (Mini-Split)

200 FLORIDA STREET: Installation of a Mini-Split HVAC System

4. **Petition (ID # 8559)**

70 Buckingham Street (Planter Boxes & Trellis)

70 BUCKINGHAM STREET: Planter Boxes and Garden Trellis with Gates

5. **Petition (ID # 8560)**

110 Thompson Street (Windows, Roof & Garage)

110 THOMPSON STREET: Replacement Window & Boarded Windows, Roof, and Garage Repairs

6. **Petition (ID # 8561)**

110 Thompson Street (Siding)

110 THOMPSON STREET: Installation of Vinyl Siding

V. CPA-Related Requests (Letters of Support and Determination of Eligibility)

1. **Informational (ID # 8562)**

Buckingham Street & Buckingham Terrace (Fountain & Grounds Restoration)

BUCKINGHAM STREET & BUCKINGHAM TERRACE: Buckingham Fountain and Grounds Restoration

VI. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission

1. Informational (ID # 8563)

July 3, 2025 Meeting

JULY 3, 2025 MEETING

2. Informational (ID # 8568)

Community Preservation Committee Nomination/Appointment

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE NOMINATION/APPOINTMENT

3. Informational (ID # 8564)

Standard Guidelines for Those LHDs Without Specific Guidelines

STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR THOSE LHDs WITHOUT SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

4. Informational (ID # 8565)

Administrative Updates

ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

5. Informational (ID # 8566)

April 17, 2025 Quorum Call

APRIL 17, 2025 QUORUM CALL

6. Informational (ID # 8567)

Public Speak-Out Session

PUBLIC SPEAK-OUT SESSION