



Historical Commission

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Alvin Allen
(413) 787-6020

Thursday, June 15, 2017

6:30 PM

City Hall--Room 220

I. Call to Order

6:30 PM Meeting called to order on June 15, 2017 at City Hall--Room 220, 36 Court Street, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Thomas Belton		Present	
Benjamin Murphy		Present	
Steve Shultis		Present	
Vincent Walsh		Absent	
Victoria Rowe		Absent	
Alphonse Nardi		Present	
Shannon Walsh		Present	

II. Acceptance of Minutes

. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

1) Meeting Minutes: May 18, 2017

BOARD VOTE

Voting for: Belton, Murphy, Nardi, Shultis, S. Walsh

Voting against: None

Abstaining: None

2) Meeting Minutes: June 1, 2017

BOARD VOTE

Voting for: Belton, Nardi, Shultis, S. Walsh

Voting against: None

Abstaining: Murphy

III. Tabled Items

1. Petition (ID # 4019)

129 Westminster Street

129 Westminster Street: Replacement windows

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

) **129 Westminster Street:** Replacement windows.

PROPOSERS

No one was present to speak in favor of this petition.

OPPOSERS

No one was present to speak in opposition to this petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Commissioner Murphy explained that the matter was on the agenda in error as the Commission voted to against the petition at their previous meeting, June 1, 2017.

BOARD VOTE

As the matter was posted to the agenda in error, no vote was taken.

IV. Public Hearings

1. Petition (ID # 4080)

Apremont Triangle LHD

Apremont Triangle LHD: Proposed creation of a new local historic district.

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

1) **Apremont Triangle LHD:** Proposed creation of new local historic district

PROPOSERS

William Devlin, of 235 State Street, Springfield, addressed the Commission. Mr. Devlin explained that he came back to the City of Springfield in the early 1980's and worked in the Apremont Triangle area for about 3-4 years. He also stated that he still visits various offices and businesses in the area and he has always been very impressed with the architecture in the area. He further explained that the area was one of Springfield's first automobile districts in the 1920's. He also stated that there have been very unfortunate renovations done to some of the buildings, including the Tarbell-Waters Building, which previously had an all glass with bronze frames storefront, which was an auto dealership but had transitioned to an auto parts store by the time he was working in the area. He also explained that the building was later renovated to accommodate office space replacing the bronze framed windows using yellow brick to match the rest of the building. He added that this was probably the worst renovation he witnessed at the Apremont Triangle.

OPPOSERS

No one was present to speak in opposition to this petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Commissioner Nardi commended the report for being well written.

Commissioner Shultis agreed with Commissioner Nardi and further stated that he had lived in the neighborhood and appreciated the collection of buildings that were being included in the proposed district and he believes this is an area worthy of protection.

Commissioner Murphy stated that he felt the proposed district is a no-brainer as the collection of buildings were all built within a fifteen year timeframe and were a great example of early twentieth century architecture.

Commissioner S. Walsh made a motion to accept the preliminary report for the Apremont Triangle Local Historic District; seconded by Commissioner Nardi.

BOARD VOTE

Moved and seconded to accept the preliminary report for the Apremont Triangle Local Historic District. Final report to be sent to City Council for a vote to include the proposed district into the City Ordinance.

Voting for: Belton, Murphy, Nardi, Shultis, S. Walsh

Voting against: None

Abstaining: None

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 0]
MOVER:	Shannon Walsh
SECONDER:	Alphonse Nardi
AYES:	Belton, Murphy, Shultis, Nardi, Walsh
ABSENT:	Vincent Walsh, Victoria Rowe

2. Petition (ID # 4081)

43 Maplewood Terrace

43 Maplewood Terrace: Replacement roof shingles, slate to asphalt.

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

2) **43 Maplewood Terrace:** Replacement roof shingles, slate to asphalt

PROPOSERS

Frank & Carla Grimaldi, of 43 Maplewood Terrace, Springfield, addressed the Commission. Mr. Grimaldi stated that he has a slate roof that is in much disarray. He then explained that he sought a company out of Agawam, MA, to inspect and repair the roof and the company stated that the roof should be replaced not repaired because there is severe damage and massive amounts of slate missing. Additionally, he explained that he recently purchased the home and is simply looking to restore it to a habitable condition.

He added that the cost of the roof repair would be approximately \$115,000. Further, he stated that it is his request to replace the slate with asphalt shingles, which would cost him approximately \$26,000 by a local Springfield roofing company.

Commissioner Murphy questioned if the company that gave him the quote specialized in slate repair, which Mr. Grimaldi responded that the company, Mahan, indeed specialized in slate repair.

Mrs. Grimaldi added that there was water damage in the ceilings and walls of the home.

Mr. Grimaldi stated that the \$115,000 quoted to repair the roof is almost half of what they paid to purchase the home. Further, he stated that he had a sample of the asphalt shingles he is looking to use if the Commission would like to review the product.

Mr. Charles Ryan, of 55 Maplewood Terrace, Springfield, stated that he is the neighbor of the petitioner. He stated that he just met his new neighbors several days ago and had welcomed them to the neighborhood. He explained that he received a meeting notice in the mail and discussed the matter with his neighbors and promised to speak in favor of the work they are attempting undertake. Additionally, he explained that he has neighbored the home for about 40 years and has lived in the Forest Park neighborhood for about 70 years. He then explained that the subject home needs plenty of attention but the last thing it needs is a slate roof at about \$100,000 cost difference than the cost of asphalt. Further, he explained that roofs are for protecting people and back in the day slate made sense for people who could afford it but today, the cost is just too prohibitive. In conclusion, he stated that he is privileged to speak on behalf of former Springfield residents that are returning back to the City and he welcomes them to the neighborhood.

OPPONENTS

No one was present to speak in opposition to this petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Commissioner Murphy stated that during his tenure on the Commission, as long as petitioners demonstrate a need for replacement of their roof, the Commission has not denied a slate roof replacement to asphalt.

Commissioner Nardi stated that the asphalt shingle product that has been presented looks nice and it is a product that is used on a lot of modern homes. He then questioned if the homeowners looked at any other roofing products such as GAF, which is manufactured by SlateLine, which is a slate like looking material. He stated that the GAF material is a little heavier and a little more expensive than what they are proposing. Mr. Grimaldi stated he would check with his roofer and research the product.

Commissioner Murphy explained to the homeowners that the Commission does not control color but he encourages them to try and match the existing color.

Commissioner S. Walsh made a motion, under the category of hardship, to approve the replacement of the slate roof with asphalt shingles; seconded by Commissioner Shultis.

BOARD VOTE

Moved and seconded to allow a Certificate of Hardship for the replacement of the slate roof with asphalt shingles.

Voting for: Belton, Murphy, Nardi, Shultis, S. Walsh

Voting against: None

Abstaining: None

3. Petition (ID # 4082)

139 Westminster Street

139 Westminster Street: Replacement front & side porch spindles.

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

3) **139 Westminster Street:** Replacement front and side porch spindles

PROPONENTS

Ms. Aleethea Francis, of 139 Westminster Street, Springfield, Mr. Winston Francis, of 16 Albemarle Street, Springfield, and Mr. Mark Carrington, of (street number inaudible) Eastern Avenue, Springfield, addressed the Commission.

*The petitioners submitted a letter to the Commission, which Commissioner Murphy read out loud to the audience. The letter stated the following: This is a list of work being requested to be done at 139 Westminster Street. Balustrades on front porch, would like to change or add spacing between to meet minimum spacing requirements. Front of roof is slate and rear is asphalt shingled. Due to age and cost, we are looking to remove the remainder of the slate and replace with asphalt shingles. Windows on second floor are all vinyl and are very drafty. First floor windows are a mix of wood and vinyl and are loose and drafty and we would like to change them to dark colored vinyl. Front porch guard rails are too low, would like to use black pipe iron rail to bring up to standard height. Sincerely, Aleethea Francis.

Commissioner Murphy explained that because only the spindles are on the application, that is all the Commission can hear. He further explained that because it is a public hearing, public notice was sent out, only referring to the spindles, and the Commission can only hear the items listed on the public notice.

Commissioner Murphy asked the petitioners to share with the Commission what the Code Enforcement issues are with the subject property.

Mr. Francis stated that they received a letter from Code Enforcement stating that the spindles were too far apart. Additionally, he stated that his daughter and her child are

slated to move into the house. He then questioned the Commission if he could use a different style spindle that he has found on other homes in the district to fill the gaps. He then stated that when he purchased the home, there was nothing on the side porch but plywood.

Commissioner Murphy asked the petitioner to take one matter at a time and start with the side porch.

Mr. Carrington stated that he is an architectural designer and builder in Springfield. He added that he has done work for Mr. Francis in the past and he is familiar with Springfield building code. Additionally, he stated that he spoke with a building inspector to get a better idea of what needed to be resolved. He then explained that the original spindles on the side porch had been replaced by a previous owner using plywood. He then added that he is proposing to remove the plywood and use a different but period appropriate spindle on the side porch, while trying to replicate the existing spindles as close as possible on the front porch as only a few spindles are missing on the front porch.

Commissioner Murphy questioned with the proposed new spindles, what the height of the side porch railing would be, which Mr. Carrington replied that the building code calls for 42 inches.

Commissioner Shultis recommended that the petitioner restore the railings and spindles to their original historic height and add a black pipe rail over the top to bring the railing to the building code height. He added that the black pipe rail really disappears visually and maintains something close to the original architecture.

Mr. Carrington clarified that the 42 inch height requirement was for the second floor and that the first floor only requires 36 inches per building code.

Commissioner Murphy questioned the height of the original rail, which Mr. Carrington stated that it was over 36 inches. Commissioner Murphy then stated that railing height on the first floor porches shouldn't be an issue then, which Mr. Carrington replied that this is true.

Commissioner Murphy questioned if Mr. Carrington could replicate the architectural design of the front porch railings on the side porch, which Mr. Carrington replied that he would try and match it as close as possible.

Commissioner Murphy questioned what the plan would be for the front porch if they are unable to salvage enough of the original spindles on the front porch, which Mr. Francis explained that another home within the district came up with a solution that he would like to try and replicate.

*Mr. Francis submitted a visual display to the Commission to verify what he was

referring to in regards to the other home in the district's solution.

Commissioner Shultis suggested using as many of the original spindles on the front and as the porch bends around, begin filling in the gaps with a similar spindle to what was used in the visual display.

Commissioner Murphy commented that the second floor front porch appears to be missing quite a bit of spindles as well, which Mr. Carrington responded that there are five missing spindles.

Mr. Roger Manahan, of 142 Westminster Street, addressed the Commission. Mr. Manahan stated that he was also representing the homeowner of 132 Westminster Street, who could not attend the meeting. He stated that he believes the plan is a very good one. Additionally, he stated that the new homeowners of the subject property are looking to restore a home that was stripped down and dilapidated. He then stated that he and neighbors are very enthused by the efforts of the new homeowner. He then explained that it was his belief that the historic district rendered building code invalid and that the original designs of the homes were the standards. Further, he explained that many of the missing spindles came from the previous tenant's kid who just kicked a lot of them out and the tenant simply threw them out.

Commissioner Murphy explained that the historic district standard for front porch railing height trumped the sanitary code; however, the homeowner has the option to raise the railing height and typically the Commission will allow a pipe rail.

Mr. Francis explained that he received a letter from Code Enforcement requiring them to raise their porch railing height, on the first floor, to the building code within 30 days.

Commissioner Murphy stated that he had spoken with City attorneys on the topic of railing heights and it was interpreted that railing heights are not subject to building code standards; however, many inspectors either don't know or don't realize that historic districts are different. He further stated that the petitioner can seek to raise the railing height with permissions from the Commission; however, he is not required to raise his railing height.

OPPONENTS

No one was present to speak in opposition to this petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Commissioner Nardi stated that he did not understand the actual request. He questioned if the petition was to replace the spindles only.

Commissioner Murphy stated the petition could be broken down into two separate matters. The first matter being, replacing the plywood from the side porch and installing

railings similar in design and height to front porch, with modern spindles. The second matter being, applying repaired spindles to the front porch to fill in as many gaps as possible, then using slightly different spindles on the sides of the front porch.

Commissioner Nardi commented that the petitioner could find spindles on Ebay for a pretty low price but the petitioner would have to do an extensive search to find a similar design.

Commissioner Shultis made a motion, under the category of hardship, to approve the replacement of plywood on side porch with spindles at the same height as the front porch, including the installation of a bottom rail and to be painted. Restore to the degree possible, as many of the original spindles to the front area of the front porch. Given a limited availability of the original spindles, alternate the original spindles with square spindles on the side of the front porch, also at the height of the original spindles and to be painted, seconded by Commissioner S. Walsh.

Commissioner S. Walsh questioned if they should apply a pipe rail to the motion just in case the homeowner should want to apply one, which Mr. Francis stated he only requested one because of the letter from Code Enforcement; however, that was not a part of his plan of action.

BOARD VOTE

Moved and seconded to allow a Certificate of Hardship for the replacement of plywood on side porch with spindles at the same height as the front porch, including the installation of a bottom rail and to be painted. Restore to the degree possible, as many of the original spindles to the front area of the front porch. Given a limited availability of the original spindles, alternate the original spindles with square spindles on the side of the front porch, also at the height of the original spindles and to be painted.

Voting for: Belton, Murphy, Nardi, Shultis, S. Walsh

Voting against: None

Abstaining: None

V. Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings

1. Informational (ID # 3902)

Discussion: Certified Local Government

Discussion: Certified Local Government

2. Informational (ID # 3879)

Discussion: Community Outreach

Community Outreach

3. Informational (ID # 3878)

Discussion: Outdoor Mechanical Equipment Guidelines
Outdoor Mechanical Equipment Guidelines

4. Informational (ID # 3793)

Discussion
Creation of and single building LHD's

5. Informational (ID # 3795)

Preservation Restriction
Former fire stations (Sumner, Page, Oakland)

6. Informational (ID # 3796)

Noncompliance
3 Sumner Avenue & 79 Thompson Street

7. Informational (ID # 3798)

Public Speak-Out Session
Public Speak-Out Session