



Historical Commission

Special

~ Agenda ~

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

Andrew Strniste
4137876525

Thursday, June 26, 2025

5:30 PM

Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center

I. Call to Order

5:30 PM Meeting called to order on June 26, 2025 at Richard Neal Municipal Operations Center, 70 Tapley Street, Springfield, MA.

II. Minutes Approval

1. Thursday, June 05, 2025
2. Monday, June 16, 2025

III. CPC Historic Home Restoration Grants

1. Petition (ID # 8710)

145 Harvard Street: Exterior Restorations

145 HARVARD STREET: Exterior Restorations

HISTORY:

06/05/25 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE
Next: 06/26/25

The landowner(s), nor a representative, failed to attend the evening's meeting. Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the agenda item to the June 26, 2025 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Crowell. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

IV. Public Hearings (Continued)

1. Petition (ID # 8600)

23 Spruceland Avenue (Replace Brick Steps)

23 SPRUCELAND AVENUE: Replace of Existing Brick Steps

HISTORY:

05/01/25 Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE
Next: 05/15/25

Staff informed the Commission that the Petitioner was out of the country and unavailable to attend the evening's meeting, thus requesting a continuance to the next meeting agenda. Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the hearing to May 15, 2025. The

motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

05/15/25 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/05/25

Michelle Koch, the landowner of 23 Spruceland Avenue, was before the Commission to present the proposed project.

M. Koch informed the Commission that she would like to remove the end caps, but keep and repurpose as much brick as possible, and then place a blue stone atop as the step. She then informed the Commission that other houses in the area do not have end caps and provided examples of both wood and concrete caps.

The Commission compared the proposal to what had previously existed in the 1939 photograph.

Clarification was sought by Commissioners V. Walsh and W. Kroll about M. Koch's desire to keep the end caps. While M. Koch would love to keep the end caps, she advised that she would likely not be able to afford the cost to repair them, and is therefore, proposing to eliminating the caps and using bluestone tread.

Commissioner V. Walsh advised that should M. Koch dismantle and rebuild the front steps to the same design and material, then the application would qualify as a Certificate of Non-Applicability; however, because of the elimination of the end caps, the Commission needs to review the application. Commissioner V. Walsh then informed M. Koch that he would not approve a black railing similar to what is currently existing, and then opined that he would prefer the end caps to be kept and rebuilt.

The Commission determined that additional information is needed, including a more defined scope of work.

Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the hearing to the June 5, 2025 meeting agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner M. Zorzi. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

06/05/25 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/26/25

Staff Member A. Strniste informed the Commission that the Petitioner had requested a 45-day extension and also requested that the hearing be continued to the Commission's June 26, 2025 special meeting. Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to approved the 45-day extension request and to continue the hearing to the Commission's June 26, 2025 special meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved unanimously.

2. Petition (ID # 8703)

93 Clarendon Street (Porch Renovations SWO)

93 CLARENDON STREET: Porch Renovations (Response to Building Department Stop Work Order)

HISTORY:

06/05/25 **Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE**
Next: 06/26/25

Jeffrey Scavron, from 245 St. James Avenue, was before the Commission on behalf of the landowner to present the application relating to the replacement of a wooden porch with vinyl features and trex decking.

J. Scavron informed the Commission that the owner of the property was elderly with a day care. The porch was deteriorating and a relative had performed the renovation work - both of whom were unaware approval from the Commission was needed. The landowner chose the best option available - vinyl and trex decking - result in a \$5,000 savings.

Chair A. Nardi asked if the contractor was licensed; J. Scavron was uncertain.

Staff Member A. Strniste informed that the Commission that a building permit was not obtained; that this application precipitated from a Stop-Work-Order by the Building Department.

When viewing the porch that had been replaced using Google Street View, Commissioner V. Walsh advised that what previously existed was not the original railing. Clarification relating to handicapped children was discussed. Commissioner V. Walsh then informed J. Scavron that had the landowner first pursued approval, then Commission could have afforded some flexibility; then advised that the installed floor decking was not going in the correct direction.

Commissioner V. Walsh then opined that he was happy that the posted was kept; while the hardship may not be legitimate, he was unsure where to draw the line for those who complete projects without a permit. Had the railing that was installed been presented, he would not vote to approve the railing; though, the lattice may be okay.

A discussion about the porch decking ensued.

During public comment, J. Boone from 97 Florida Street opined that the replacement porch was looked aesthetically better; however, it was still vinyl, and then advised that landowners need to be held accountable for projects completed without the proper approvals. Ultimately, the landowner had replaced something that was really bad with something not as bad. J. Scavron confirmed that a fine had been issued and paid.

Harry Seymour from 68 Washington Road supported the project, but recommended that the satellite dish be removed. Deborah Novak from 102 Magnolia Terrace opined that what was constructed looked better than was previously there.

Attorney Robert Shewchuk, who represents the City of Springfield, cautioned the Commission as to how the basis they are approving the Hardship Certificate application. Commissioner V. Walsh read the Hardship standard out loud. Attorney R. Shewchuk advised the Commission to be very specific should they approve the application.

Commissioner V. Walsh listed the following reasons as to why the application could be satisfy the hardship standard: the physical conditions of the original porch was in poor condition and was worse from an historic standard point than what was installed; the original porch was not the original porch; and that the original porch posed a safety risk for the children.

A discussion ensued as whether a Building Permit application had been filed with the Building Permit. Chair A. Nardi opined that copies of the Guidelines should be delivered to the contractor.

Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the hearing to the next meeting agenda - June 26, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor. Staff Member A. Strniste confirmed that there are two meetings left to hear the application within the 60-day review period. July 18, 2025 is the last day to review the application. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

3. Petition (ID # 8704)

WS Buckingham Street (02042-0039) (Single-Family Dwelling)

WS BUCKINGHAM STREET (02042-0039): Construction of a Single-Family Dwelling

HISTORY:**06/05/25****Historical Commission CONTINUE VOTE****Next: 06/26/25**

Joseph Ruggeri was before the Commission to present the proposed project at WS Buckingham Street relating to a single-family dwelling.

J. Ruggeri advised the proposed single-family will have Hardie Board siding and follow the design of the McKnight neighborhood. Commissioner V. Walsh confirmed that the previous building was a single-family dwelling. A brief discussion regarding an existing tree on the property ensued.

A separate discussion ensued about the orientation of the building and which direction was the front. Chair A. Nardi requested a site plan and observed that the proposed site location, as presented, set behind the front building line of the adjacent properties.

Commissioner V. Walsh advised that shakes on the garage portion of the building was uncommon, that he had concerns about the corner boards, advised that the applicant should ensure that the front porch is functional, that the front porch itself of a historic building does not typically sit that close to the ground, that the front porch would typically have a railing, the front door was not historically appropriate, the faux stone was not really historic, and that the garage being in front is not normally present (though understood why the garage was situated there).

Commissioner J. Crowell opined that the building should look like those in the neighborhood and also be consistent with the neighborhood.

Chair A. Nardi informed the representative that the elevation of the back entry door and front entry door did not align when looking at the elevations of the porches and number of steps. Commissioner V. Walsh advised that typically the foundation of a historic building sits higher.

During public comment, Jim Boone from 97 Florida Street advised that the McKnight brothers had deliberately anticipated setbacks when designing the area in the 1870s and 1880s and finds that the garage in the front of the building to be inappropriate. Commissioner V. Walsh then read J. Boone's and Jennifer Rao's written public comment into the record. Kevin Hadley from 190 Buckingham Street, opined that the project was not close to what was there previously and that a more thorough design would be appropriated. Harry Seymour from 68 Washington Road expressed his disapproval for the proposal and reinforced his position for new construction guidelines.

Commissioner V. Walsh opined that he could not vote in favor of the submitted proposal and suggested that the hearing be continued. Chair A. Nardi advised that the applicant should come back with updated plans.

Commissioner V. Nespor made a motion to continue the hearing to the next available meeting date - June 26, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner J. Crowell, and with no other discussion, approved unanimously.

V. Public Hearings (New)

1. Petition (ID # 8751)

SS Parker Street (21 Parker Street | 09510-1978) (Windows)

SS PARKER STREET (21 PARKER STREET | 09510-1978): Replacement of Windows

2. Petition (ID # 8752)

105-107 Buckingham Street (Solar)

105-107 BUCKINGHAM STREET: Solar Powered Panels

3. Petition (ID # 8753)

200 Florida Street (Roof)

200 FLORIDA STREET: Roof Renovations

4. Petition (ID # 8754)

165 Central Street (Aka 1 Ames Hill Drive | 02560-0204) (Fencing)

165 CENTRAL STREET (A.K.A. 1 AMES HILL DRIVE | 02560-0204): Fencing

VI. Other Matters Properly Before the Commission**1. Informational (ID # 8755)**

60 Byers Street: Project Overview of Future Project

60 BYERS STREET: Project Overview of Future Project

2. Informational (ID # 8756)

Administrative Updates

ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

3. Informational (ID # 8757)

July 17, 2025 Quorum Call

JULY 17, 2025 QUORUM CALL

4. Informational (ID # 8758)

Public Speak-Out Session

PUBLIC SPEAK-OUT SESSION