



SPRINGFIELD HISTORICAL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2025

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kevin Coffee (in-person)
Judith Crowell (in-person)
Walter Kroll, Vice Chair (in-person)
Alfonso Nardi, Chair (absent)
Vana Nespor (in-person)
Vincent Walsh (in-person)
Marisa Zorzi (in-person)

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Strniste, Director of Community Planning (in-person)
Kenneth Shea, Second Associate City Solicitor (remote)

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:

Lauren Hirth (30 Spruceland Avenue Representative | in-person)
Marc Prince (280 Washington Street | in-person)
Sam Stonefield (49 Florentine Gardens | in-person)
Alison Stonefield (49 Florentine Gardens | in-person)
Harry Seymour (68 Washington Road | in-person)
Jack Hunter (292 Washington Boulevard | in-person)
Ms. Hunter (292 Washington Boulevard | in-person)
Ziyad Jaraad (102 Thompson Street | in-person)
Ovidia Lopez (47 Westminster Street | in-person)
Rolando Meono (47 Westminster Street | in-person)
Christi Young (30 Westernview Street | in-person)
Jeremy Young (30 Westernview Street | in-person)
Suzanne H Chouljian (77 Adams Street, Quincy, MA | in-person)
William Stonefield (77 Adams Street, Quincy, MA | in-person)
Daniel Diaz (146 Garland Street | in-person)
Unknown Attendee (75 Shephard Drive | in-person)
Kamileh Crocco (24 Mountainview Street | in-person)
Siervo Jimenez (80 Cornell Street | telephone)
Carol Dooney (McCaffery; Downtown Project | remote)
Chantel Croteau (40 Ingersoll Grove Representative | in-person)
Joseph Vasquez (40 Ingersoll Grove Representative | in-person)
Pavel Yusenko (Unknown | in-person)

I. **OPENING REMARKS**

- Acting Chair W. Kroll opened the meeting at 5:30 PM and informed the public of the Commission’s meeting procedures for reviewing applications.

II. **ROLL CALL**

- Acting Chair W. Kroll proceeded with the evening’s roll call:

COMMISSIONER	ATTENDANCE
<i>Chair Alfonso Nardi</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Vice Chair Walter Kroll</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>
<i>Kevin Coffee</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>
<i>Judi Crowell</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>
<i>Vana Nespov</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>
<i>Vincent Walsh</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>
<i>Marisa Zorzi</i>	<i>Present – In-Person</i>

III. **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 4, 2025**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2025	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	ABSENT
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	YAY
KEVIN COFFEE	YAY
JUDI CROWELL	SECONDED - YAY
VANA NESPOR	YAY
VINCENT WALSH	MOTION – YAY
MARISA ZORZI	YAY

- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to accept the Commission’s meeting minutes of December 4, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner J. Crowell. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved unanimously.

IV. **OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY BEFORE THE COMMISSION – LETTER OF SUPPORT – REHABILITATION PROJECT (113 STATE STREET, 1139-1155 MAIN STREET, 1163 MAIN STREET, 11-21 STOCKBRIDGE STREET)**

- Carol Dooney from McCaffery was before the Commission seeking a Letter of Support for their application to the Massachusetts Historical Commission for the purpose of attaining tax credits for their project at 113 State Street, 1139-1155 Main Street, 1163 Main Street, and 11-21 Stockbridge Street.
- C. Dooney advised that they had presented the subject project to the Commission about a month ago, and that they are currently in the process of getting Part 2 approval from the National Parks’ Service – hopefully by April. Once the District is expanded, the entire project will be in the National Register District. McCaffery is now looking for a Letter of Support for their application to the Massachusetts Historical Commission for tax credits.
- C. Dooney provided an overview of the entire project – advising that there will be first-floor commercial storefront and upper-level residential units. The clock on the

Clocktowner building has been restored. The entrance to both buildings will be along Stockbridge Street.

- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to issue a Letter of Support. The motion was seconded by Commissioner M. Zorzi and approved unanimously after no discussion.

V. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – 102 THOMPSON STREET**

MOTION TO CONTINUE TO JANUARY 15, 2026	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>

- Ziyad Jaraad was before the Commission to present the application to the Commission. He had informed Staff Member A. Strniste before the meeting about wanting to be continued to January 15, 2026. Z. Jaraad was able to contact Khalid al Janabi for the purposes of translating over the phone.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll informed Z. Jaraad and K. al Janabi that while the materials are important to the application, understanding what the end product will look like is just as important, that a drawing or sketch can be submitted.
- K. al Janabi informed the Commission that Z. Jaraad had already purchased the materials; Commissioner V. Nespor reinforced the idea that the Commission needs to understand what the end product will look like.
- Commissioner J. Crowell advised that Staff Member A. Strniste will follow-up with K. al Janabi with information of what is required, as well as providing examples they can reference for their application.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi made a motion to continue the hearing to the January 5, 2026 meeting agenda. Commissioner K. Coffee seconded the motion. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved unanimously.

VI. **CONTINUED HEARING – 47 WESTMINSTER STREET**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT DECK PROPOSED AT 47 WESTMINSTER STREET	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- Ronaldo Meono and Ovidia Catalina Lopez-Macario were back before the Commission to present the updated proposed plan. Siervo Jimenez, from 80 Cornell Street, was on the phone to discuss the project on behalf the Petitioners.
- S. Jimenez advised that the plans were updated to conform with the comments made at the last meeting. Acting Chair W. Kroll confirmed that they received the updated plans; Commissioner V. Walsh opined that the plans were acceptable and addressed the concerns of Commission. The proposed reconfigured porch will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Commissioner J. Crowell agreed.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll inquired about the rail tops and spindles; S. Jimenez confirmed that they will look similar to what is existing now.
- With no public comment submitted by those in attendance, Acting Chair W. Kroll acknowledged that the public comment submitted by J. Boone was already read into the record.
- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to accept the application at 47 Westminster Street with the revised plans. The motion was seconded by Commissioner J. Crowell. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – 79 THOMPSON STREET

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE SOLAR PROJECT AT 79 THOMPSON STREET	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>NAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>NAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>SECONDED – NAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>NAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – NAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>NAY</i>

- The Petitioner and/or a representative failed to attend the evening’s hearing. With the application set to expire, Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to accept the application as presented. Commissioner J. Crowell seconded the motion. With no discussion on the motion, it was denied unanimously.

VIII. NEW PUBLIC HEARING – 280 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD

MOTION TO APPROVE THE FENCE AT 280 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>NAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- Marc Prince, the landowner at 280 Washington Boulevard, was before the Commission to present the application relating to the installation of a fence between the side building foundation line and the Pineywood Avenue right-of-way.

- M. Prince informed the Commission that he had been living at the property for 30 years and has struggled to maintain the tree line along Pineywoods Avenue, and that he is seeking to remove the vegetation and install a fence. While he would like to plant new shrubbery, he opined that he would not be at the property long enough to enjoy the new plantings. In observing the surrounding neighborhood, he identified examples where there are fences between the foundation line and the right-of-way. The fence he is proposing is not obtrusive; that the zoning regulations had changed to allow fences in side yards, and now needed approval from the Commission.
- Commissioner V. Walsh advised that he would not have an issue with the fence it was proposed at the foundation line; M. Prince responded that by doing so, the amount of usable yard would be reduced by 12 feet. M. Prince then referred to the underlying guidelines for the District and noted that in some cases, the guidelines allow the Commission to approve fences between the foundation line and public way. M. Prince advised that he was looking to install the fence where the existing trees were located at the sidewalk.
- A discussion about the location of the old fence ensued. Commissioner V. Walsh advised that the local historic districts contain the fence provision to ensure uniformity along the road. Discussion ensued about how far the detached garage is from Pineywoods Avenue.
- Commissioner K. Coffee confirmed with the Petitioner that he was not looking to cede any usable land; M. Prince advised that he was trying to get back the land lost by the lush vegetation. Commissioner V. Walsh opined that he did not see a compelling reason for allowing the fence as proposed. M. Prince asked if he could replace the existing trees; the Commission responded in the affirmative.
- Commissioner J. Crowell opined that she understood M. Prince perspective about wanting privacy and gaining backyard space.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll vocalized concern about setting a precedent should they allow the fence. M. Prince advised that he is not looking to install a fence if required at the foundation line and would like plant instead. He then advised that he would be willing to amend the application so that the Commission could vote to approve the fence if installed along foundation line and that he could later choose how to proceed.
- Jack Hunter, from 292 Washington Boulevard, whom lives across the street from the Petitioner, informed the Commission that he did not mind the fence and wished that the Commission did not make up their mind before hearing from the neighbors.
- Ms. Hunter, also from 292 Washington Boulevard, opined that there were plenty of fences in the neighborhood at the public right-of-way line and that she was in favor of the application.
- Harry Seymour, from 68 Washington Road, advised that he was not against the application, but that he finds bushes more appealing than fences.
- Commissioner V. Walsh advised that part of the Commission's charge is to maintain historic accuracy, which unfortunately conflicts with other aspects of development.
- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to accept the application at 280 Washington Boulevard to install the six-foot wood fence along the foundation line to the garage. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved five (5) to one (1), with Commissioner J. Crowell casting the dissenting vote.

IX. **NEW PUBLIC HEARING – 40 INGERSOLL GROVE**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE SOLAR PROJECT AT 40 INGERSOLL GROVE	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>

- Chantel Croteau and Joseph Vasquez were before the Commission to discuss the solar power project at 40 Ingersoll Grove.
- C. Croteau advised that the panels will be placed on four of the roofs; however, only six of the panels would be visible. The equipment will be placed at the back right side of the building. The conduit will run directly into the attic.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi inquired as to whether the utility meter will be at the front of the building; C. Croteau responded that it could be placed towards the rear of the building if preferrable.
- Commissioner V. Nespore confirmed with the representatives that the electric meter is currently in the basement, and then inquired as to whether the panels on Roof A could be relocated to Roof D. C. Croteau informed the Commission that they could likely get the design team to move the panels to the back driveway side.
- When asked if a new roof would be required, C. Croteau confirmed that initially, a new roof was required, but subsequently discovered that one was not actually needed.
- Commissioner V. Walsh sought clarification as to where the conduit was located; C. Croteau confirmed that the conduit would be located inside, but any outside conduit could be painted to match the surface it is affixed to.
- Harry Seymour, from 68 Washington Road, vocalized his support for the project with the corrections provided.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll read written public comment submitted by Jennifer Rao into the record and advised that all of the concerns raised were addressed.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi made a motion to accept the project with the utility meter moved towards the back of the building and with the panels located on Roof A to be moved to the left side of Roof D. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Walsh. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously. Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that should there be any changes, they need to come back for additional approval.

X. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – 92 MARENGO PARK**

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION TO JANUARY 15, 2026	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>

KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- The Petitioner and/or a representative failed to attend the evening’s hearing. Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the application to the January 15, 2026 meeting agenda. Commissioner J. Crowell seconded the motion. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved unanimously.

XI. NEW PUBLIC HEARING – 30 SPRUCELAND AVENUE

MOTION TO APPROVE THE SOLAR PROJECT AT 30 SPRUCELAND AVENUE	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- Lauren Hirth from 22 Mulberry Street in Worcester, Massachusetts, was before the Commission on behalf of the landowner/Petitioner to discuss the solar project at 30 Spruceland Avenue.
- L. Hirth advised that there would be 32 panels installed on the building’s roof. Commissioner J. Crowell confirmed with L. Hirth that many of the panels can be seen from the street. Commissioner V. Walsh advised that based on the proposal, there would be no way to lessen the impact of the panels.
- Commissioner J. Crowell asked if there was a detached garage on the property; L. Hirth had initially advised no; however, internet resources showed that a detached garage did exist.
- Commissioner V. Walsh inquired as to why there were so many panels proposed; L. Hirth advised that this was the greatest number of panels that could produce the most electricity and still comply with the housing code.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that generally the Commission looks for minimal visibility. Commissioner J. Crowell asked if any of the panels can be put on the garage. L. Hirth advised that she could take the request back to the sales team; that the conduit would need to be trenched.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll asked if the utility meter would be located on the front of the building; L. Hirth responded in the affirmative. Commissioner V. Walsh advised that in the past, some of the equipment could be separated and located to another area of the building.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi confirmed with L. Hirth that the conduit was proposed to be put on the front of the building; Commissioner M. Zorzi opined that the conduit being placed on the back would be better. Commissioner V. Walsh opined that any conduit on the roof would be better in the attic.

- Acting Chair W. Kroll recommended that the hearing be continued. L. Hirth confirmed that the proposed recommended changes included: relocating as many panels from the primary building’s roof onto the garage; moving the shut-off switches and utility equipment as far back on the building as possible; ensuring that the conduit cannot be seen and run in the attic; and any visible conduit being painted to match the surface it is affixed to.
- Commissioner J. Crowell made a motion to continue the hearing to the next meeting agenda – January 15, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor and approved unanimously after no discussion.

XII. NEW PUBLIC HEARING – 49 FLORENTINE GARDENS

MOTION TO APPROVE THE WINDOW PROJECT AT 49 FLORENTINE GARDENS	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- Sam Stonefield, from 336 Reeds Landing, was before the Commission to present the project on his son’s and daughter-in-law’s behalf. The proposed project involved the removal and replacement of the existing wooden windows.
- S. Stonefield informed the Commission that the impetus of the application stemmed from a positive lead test during inspection, which was part of the closing Process – that S. Stonefield and his wife are selling the house to his son and daughter-in-law. S. Stonefield and his wife had lived in the house for 47 years and had received an award from the Springfield Preservation Trust. As they are moving into their retirement years, they moved to Reed’s Landing and are looking to sell the house to his son and daughter-in-law. During the inspection, a vast number of windows and doors tested positive for lead; rather than ignore the problem, his son and daughter-in-law want to address and remove the lead. As a result, 33 windows and 21 doors will need to be de-leaded – an extensive and expensive process. They have contracted Robin Jones, who was referenced by Tom Belton. If approval is attained, they plan to start on January 3, be done by March, and his son and daughter-in-law would move in by April.
- When inquiring as to whether the windows can be de-leaded and restored, S. Stonefield advised that the windows would fall apart during the process. As a result, they are proposing Vinyl Max windows – originally intending a four-over-one grid pattern; however, now proposing a Georgian style grid pattern, to be affixed to the exterior of the window. The diamond style grid pattern was not offered as an option.
- S. Stonefield then informed the Commission that they had discussed the application with the neighbors and that everyone had support the proposal, with letters of support and a petition of support submitted into the record.
- Commissioner V. Walsh opined about the existing windows and the details, specifically inquiring as to the number of windows with the diamond-shaped grids;

S. Stonefield responded that 12-14 windows contain that grid pattern. Commissioner V. Walsh then advised that contractors will often say they are unable to restore the window and that they should be thrown away, and then asked about the conditions of the windows. S. Stonefield responded that the conditions vary; the west side of the house have windows in worst shape due weathering. He then reiterated that de-leading the windows will ruin the windows, specifically the trim of the window.

- Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that the airborne particles or chips are what makes lead paint so dangerous; that the window in its entirety would need to be treated, not just painted over.
- Commissioner K. Coffee advised that the grid pattern was part of the character of the building and that replacing the wooden windows with vinyl windows seems unfortunate, especially on the front side of the building, which is part of the exuberance of the period. Eliminating the windows makes the building a little less special. S. Stonefield agreed and advised that the implications of denying the project would inhibit a young family from moving to Springfield, and at some point, these situations will need to be addressed.
- Commissioner V. Nespor asked if there was any way to retain the diamond grid pattern on the front of the house; in addition to advising that the glass could be kept. S. Stonefield advised that he did not know if they could be kept. Commissioner V. Walsh echoed Commissioner V. Nespor's sentiment about protecting the front windows. He then advised that windows in the past have been de-leaded and suggested restoring them even if just the front windows.
- Alison Stonefield, from 336 Reed's Landing, asked at what price does the Commission require historic features to be maintained, specifically relating to this project. Commissioner V. Walsh advised that the Commission is charged with looking at the historic details of the building; that different requests are made for different projects.
- Kamileh Crocco from 21 Mountainview Street spoke in favor of the application noting that she had three small children and maintenance of these houses are expensive.
- Jack Hunter from 292 Washington Boulevard spoke in support of the application, noting that there were limited options and that allowing the replacement of the windows would bring a young familiar to Springfield.
- The attendee from 36 Westernview Street vocalized support for the project.
- William Stonefield from 77 Adams Street advised that they were committed to being good stewards of the property and hoping to have a safe place for their children to grow up.
- Johanna Hodges spook in favor of the project and echoed the sentiment of those in attendance.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll read the submitted Letters of Support into the record.
- Commissioner V. Nespor inquired about the doors that were mentioned during the hearing; S. Stonefield advised that the doors at issue were interior and that no exterior doors visible from the public way are being altered in any way. Commissioner V. Nespor then confirmed with S. Stonefield that their position is that the windows would disintegrate when de-leaded.

- Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that this was a situation where everyone is right, and that in a Historic District, these decisions are not easy; thus, the Commission makes an effort to explore if compromises can be made.
- Commissioner V. Nespor made a motion to accept the application as presented. Commissioner V. Walsh seconded the motion. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved five (5) to one (1) with Commissioner K. Coffee casting the dissenting vote.

XIII. NEW PUBLIC HEARING – 21 MOUNTAINVIEW STREET

MOTION TO CONTINUE TO THE JANUARY 15, 2026 MEETING	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>YAY</i>

- Pavel Yusenko was before the Commission to present the application to the Commission. Prior to commencing with the hearing, Staff Member A. Strniste provided an overview as to the application history – that the application was the result of two violations that were issued earlier in the fall, noting that approval was never obtained for the window replacement, door replacement, or foundation modifications.
- Commissioner V. Walsh asked if the work had been done without permits from the Building Department and then opined that he would not have approved the windows had they come before the Commission prior to being installed.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi informed the Commission of the differences between the currently installed windows versus what was there previously by comparing and contrasting the different Google Street View images.
- The Commission explored the differences between the existing door and what previously existed.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that there were clear violations with no current plan to make the building compliant or anyone present that was authorized to discuss proposed changes.
- Staff Member A. Strniste advised that he would inquire with the Building Department as to whether any permits were pulled. Commissioner K. Coffee asked what the action plan would be if there were no Building Permits obtained.
- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to continue the application to the January 15, 2026 meeting agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Nespor. Public comment will be taken at the next meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

XIV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW – 22 SALEM STREET

MOTION TO APPROVE THE ROOF VENT PROJECT AT 22 SALEM STREET

CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>

- Daniel Diaz from 146 Garland Street was before the Commission to discuss the proposed roof vent project at 22 Salem Street. Staff Member A. Strniste advised that prior to the meeting, he had learned that there was a Preservation Restriction on the property, which he had included in the evening’s hearing packet.
- D. Diaz advised that he was the project manager for the project – that MassSave recommended a lot of work, including adding ventilation to the attic, which current has no ventilation. The proposal involves installing a ridge vent with matching shingles.
- Commissioner V. Walsh and Commissioner M. Zorzi confirmed that the roof contained existing asphalt shingles. D. Diaz advised that the vent would be the length of entire ridge.
- Harry Seymour from 68 Washington Road vocalized his support for the project.
- Commissioner V. Walsh made a motion to find that there would be no adverse impact caused by the installation of the ridge vent with matching asphalt shingles to cover on the building. The motion was seconded by Commissioner M. Zorzi. With no discussion on the motion, it was approved unanimously.

XV. PRESERVATION OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDINGS – 52 BAY STREET

MOTION TO CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY 5, 2026 MEETING	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	<i>ABSENT</i>
VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL	<i>YAY</i>
KEVIN COFFEE	<i>YAY</i>
JUDI CROWELL	<i>YAY</i>
VANA NESPOR	<i>YAY</i>
VINCENT WALSH	<i>SECONDED – YAY</i>
MARISA ZORZI	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>

- Sam Scoppettone from Wayfinders was before the Commission to present the application relating to demolishing the building at 52 Bay Street.
- S. Scoppettone advised that they were requesting the demolition of 52 Bay Street as part of the City of Homes Initiative. He provided an overview of other similar projects under the program, stating that the goal is to help stabilize and/or rehabilitate properties, or tear down and build anew to sell to first time home buyers. He then cited for code enforcement violations and that the City asked for a special receivership of this particular property to contract and acquire.

- Acting Chair W. Kroll confirmed that the building subject to the application was the rear building – the carriage house. S. Scoppettone informed that the Commission that based on the condition of the building, it is not functionally feasibly to repair it.
- Commissioner K. Coffee asked what the condition of 56 Bay Street was; S. Scoppettone informed that the Commission that he was unaware.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi asked if a structural test on 52 Bay Street was performed; S. Scoppettone advised that he did not believe so.
- Harry Seymour from 68 Washington Road opined that he agreed with Jim Boone’s submitted public comment; however, when he saw the pictures he understood why they were seeking to demolish the building.
- Kira Holmes, representing the Springfield Preservation Trust, vocalized their opposition to the demolition project, informing the Commission that the building was from the 1870’s, and if “we” were to lose the building, it would be lost forever.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll read the submitted written public comment into the record.
- S. Scoppettone advised that they were proposing to demolish a housing unit; however, trying to create a housing unit by renovating the building at 56 Bay Street, which is currently vacant. He also opined that having three units in two buildings on one lot is hard to market, as the arrangement would not be attractive to homeowners. In addition, this would prevent money from going into the neighborhood. S. Scoppettone advised that with enough money, anything can be done. Acting Chair W. Kroll advised that they have seen houses like this be renovated, and that he is working on one that is worse condition than what is shown. There are possibilities to rehabilitate.
- Commissioner J. Crowell advised that she lived across the street from a house that was similar to this one for 10 years and the house is beautiful now – that it can be done.
- Commissioner V. Walsh confirmed with S. Scoppettone that no engineering had been performed. That property is unique. He opined that without any engineering, he has not seen anything that necessitates waiving the nine-month delay period.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi advised that the delay allows time for someone to look into seeing if the building to be restored.
- S. Scoppettone then advised that there were some deadlines that they need to meet in order to attain funding opportunities, and if they are unable to demolish the building, they could potentially lose out on \$400,000 needed for the building at 56 Bay Street. He also advised that they have discussed the project with the Massachusetts Historical Commission.
- Commissioner M. Zorzi made a motion to grant a 60-day extension and continue the hearing to February 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner V. Walsh. A discussion ensued as to what the implications would be if foundation issues were discovered. The motion was approved unanimously.

XVI. **SECTION 106 REVIEW – RAILROAD TRACK ALONG THE CONNECTICUT RIVER AND GRIDIRON STREET, LYMAN STREET, TAYLOR STREET**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMTRAK SECTION 106 SUBMISSION	
CHAIR ALFONSO NARDI	ABSENT

<i>VICE CHAIR WALTER KROLL</i>	<i>YAY</i>
<i>KEVIN COFFEE</i>	<i>YAY</i>
<i>JUDI CROWELL</i>	<i>YAY</i>
<i>VANA NESPOR</i>	<i>MOTION – YAY</i>
<i>VINCENT WALSH</i>	<i>YAY</i>
<i>MARISA ZORZI</i>	<i>YAY</i>

- John Weston and Scott Conti were before the Commission to present the Section 106 Review request relating to improvements along the railroad.
- J. Weston advised that they are seeking to make improvements to accommodate the growth on the rail line. Improvements will be made on the tracks themselves, as well as in the surrounding area. Work to the rail line going both east-to-west and north-to-south will occur. Retaining walls will be constructed east of Armory Street. In addition, restoration will occur at the railyard at Taylor Street and Armory Street. The bridge that traverses Chestnut Street will either be rebuilt or a parallel bridge will be added. The old tower building under the I-91 viaduct will be demolished, as it has not been used in a long time. This building was proposed to be demolished awhile back, but the money was not there to demolish at that time. Mass Historic has advised that the building does not maintain its historic significance anymore.
- Commissioner J. Crowell inquired as to what lines were receiving improvements. J. Weston advised accordingly and informed the Commission that the track will be reconfigured; the change will be fairly minimal; however, the goal is to separate the freight trains from the passenger trains.
- Acting Chair W. Kroll inquired about the Gasoline Alley and the McKnight Neighborhood – specifically inquiring about the work to be performed there. A retaining wall is proposed, which is to be as tall as 20 feet. J. Weston confirmed that the only thing that will likely be seen is the top of the trains. An archeological survey will be performed as the next step to see if there are any significant resources that need to be considered prior to commencing with the project.
- Commissioner V. Nespore made a motion to find that the proposed project, as presented in the submitted materials and during the evening’s meeting, will not be detrimental to the buildings and surrounding area, and that the project will have no adverse impact. With no discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

XVII. *OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY BEFORE THE COMMISSION – ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES*

- Given the time, Staff Member A. Strniste informed the Commission to refer to the Hearing Overview document for the administrative updates.

XVIII. *OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY BEFORE THE COMMISSION – CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION*

- No correspondence was submitted to present to the Commission.

XIX. *OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY BEFORE THE COMMISSION – QUORUM CALL*

- Commissioners V. Walsh will be present remotely at the next meeting. Commissioner V. Nespore will be unavailable. The other attending Commissioners will be present.

I. ***OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY BEFORE THE COMMISSION – PUBLIC SPEAK OUT***

- No members of the public were in attendance to provide public comment.
- Commissioner K. Coffee made a motion to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The Commission adjourned at 8:33 PM.

DRAFT