



New Bedford Historical Commission

June 6, 2016 – 6:00 PM - **Minutes**

Room 314, City Hall, 133 William Street New Bedford, MA

Members Present:

Diana Henry, Chairman
Bill King, Vice Chair
Keri Cox
Janine da Silva
James Lopes

Members Absent:

Bill Barr

Secretary:

Anne Louro

Call to Order:

D. Henry called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

Roll Call:

A formal roll call was conducted confirming a quorum of the members present as stated above. The Chair indicated that K. Cox would serve in one of the primary historical organization positions.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION to accept and approve the minutes of the May 2, 2016 meeting with corrections.

Moved by J. Lopes and seconded by B. King.

Motion carried.

Executive Session:

MOTION to enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing potential litigation with the intention to return to the public session. Moved by J. Lopes and seconded by B. King.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

The Historical Commission convened in Executive Session at 6:05 PM.

The Historical Commission reconvened in Public Session at 6:40 PM.

Consideration of Matters Discussed in Executive Session:

MOTION to rescind the approval of the motion for the proposed sign on the west façade of 25 Elm Street which approval occurred at the New Bedford Historical Commission meeting on May 2, 2016 and to modify the Certificate of Appropriateness #2016.06 issued on May 9, 2016 to delete all language in the “NOTE” section appearing after the words “determined to be duplicative.” Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by Keri Cox.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

Public Hearings:

MOTION to rearrange the Agenda to review 51 Elm Street. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by K. Cox.

Motion carried.

1. 51 Elm Street- Elm Street Garage (Map 53, Lot 19) Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior Rehabilitation & Signage.

Jorge Figueiredo of Mount Vernon Group Architects, and Mark Champagne of City of New Bedford Department of Facilities and Fleet Management, presented the plan for the rehabilitation of 51 Elm Street.

The applicants presented elevations and conceptual drawings of the east and south facades of the structure. They submitted sample materials for the stair/elevator tower façade covering, which included cast stone to be located in the area below the canopy and aluminum panel in a “Copper Penny” color for the wall surface above the canopy. Mr. Figueiredo noted that there is planned to be logo signage on the upmost section of the tower structure, which is depicted in Mount Vernon Group’s drawings as a “whale’s tale”, however the design of the logo has not yet been identified or determined by the City.

A second sign location is planned on the east façade of the parking structure, but the associated logos and specifications of that signage has also not yet been finalized; therefore the depicted east façade signage in the presented drawings is meant to be a “placeholder” according to Mr. Figueiredo.

Mr. Figueiredo explained the various lighting applications to be used on the facades, which include new LED up/down lighting on the columns and color changing wall wash lighting to be mounted low on the walls, as well as the possibility of utilizing colored LED tube lighting attached to the first level railings, noting that the use of that particular feature had not yet been finalized.

Mr. Figueiredo presented the use of new illuminated parking symbol signs and members sought clarification regarding their location and to whether the west and north facades of the structure were receiving the same lighting applications. Mr. Figueiredo clarified that the LED up/down lighting on the columns will be located on the south and west facades, with security lighting on the north façade, and that the color-changing wall-washers would be located on the south, Elm Street façade only. There was a question regarding the exact mounting location of the wall-washers due to potential vandalism concerns. Mr. Figueiredo stated that the mounting location had not yet been determined, however if they are mounted low, an aluminum shroud would be fabricated to protect them from potential damage. A. Louro asked about the sidewalk trees adjacent to the building on Elm Street, and Mr. Figueiredo stated that they were to remain.

Mr. Champagne stated that the façade improvements were a portion of a larger scale rehabilitation that included structural stabilization and mechanical upgrades in an effort to improve the aesthetics and security of this important destination facility.

Discussion focused on the number of universal parking symbol signs and their locations. Mr. Figueiredo clarified that there are currently two “P” signs on the east façade of the structure and that they are adding two additional “P” signs. J. da Silva voiced concern over the location of the LED rope lighting on the first level openings due to its low height and potential for vandalism.

MOTION to open the public hearing. Moved by B. King and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion carried.

Public comments in favor: None

Public comments recorded in favor: None

Public comments not in favor: None.

Public comments recorded not in favor: None

MOTION to close the public hearing. Moved by B. King seconded by K. Cox.

Motion carried.

J. Lopes asked again about the amount of parking symbols and the concern regarding visual clutter along Elm Street, and the proximity of historic buildings at North Second and Elm Streets. The lettering on the canopy came into question and whether it was repetitive. There was discussion regarding the current lack of signage orienting visitors to the parking facility and that the addition of the parking signs, particularly those situated on the upper east façade were necessary. J. Lopes suggested eliminating the “P” symbol adjacent to the garage pedestrian entry on the first level, as well as removing the lettering on the canopy. Mr. Lopes confirmed the need for a parking symbol on the east façade, but suggested the use of one, versus two, by centering it on the middle of the garage’s east façade; all in an effort to eliminate visual clutter. B. King asked if there were plans to place parking signage on the west façade. The applicants did not believe west façade signage was necessary due to lack of visibility.

The Chair clarified the items that were before the Commission for approval and noted that the proposed tower logo, east façade signage, awning lettering and parking signage would require further detail to warrant approval. There was brief discussion regarding the need for pedestrian orientation and whether the Traffic Commission Office would require signage. Mr. Champagne noted that the Traffic Commission would remain housed at the facility, that all parking related functions would be automated on site and that there were no current plans for exterior signage for the Traffic Commission Office.

The Chair noted that there were façade samples and lighting specifications submitted as part of the application, and asked if the applicant had specifications for the parking directional signs, and whether they were all the same size. Mr. Figueiredo stated that they varied in size and that he did not have the specifications, but could provide them as necessary. The Chair expressed a desire to have the submitted items voted separately by subject area and the members agreed.

MOTION to approve the façade materials and colors as submitted and grant the Certificate of Appropriateness. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by B. King
Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

MOTION to approve the lighting as proposed in the application and grant the Certificate of Appropriateness. Moved by K. Cox and seconded by J. Lopes.
Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

MOTION to table the review of the signage portion of the application until the July 11, 2016 meeting. Moved by B. King and seconded by J. da Silva.
Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

2. 46-48 Union Street (Map 47 Lot 240)
Certificate of Appropriateness: New Signage.

A. Louro presented the application on behalf of applicant who was unable to attend the meeting. A. Louro noted that the sign was associated with a new small business which had recently moved into the building. A. Louro stated the building has two first floor business spaces with a shared Union Street entrance. A law business is located on the east side of the storefront with an affiliated a double sided blade sign situated above the shared entrance. A. Louro explained that the plan was to relocate the law sign to be affixed above the east storefront window and for the new sign to be affixed above the west storefront window. The sign is double sided molded PVC with a black bracket, and was originally proposed to be 6' X 4' in size. A. Louro recommended to the applicant and sign designer that a 2' X 4' sign would be more appropriate in that location.

Members briefly discussed the sign material and A. Louro indicated that the sign company has manufactured several signs within the District and that the sign was not going to be illuminated.

MOTION to open the public hearing. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by K. Cox.

Motion carried.

Public comments in favor: None

Public comments recorded in favor: None

Public comments not in favor: None

Public comments recorded not in favor: None

MOTION to close the public hearing. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by K. Cox.

Motion carried.

There was no member discussion regarding the sign proposal.

MOTION to approve the sign as submitted and grant the Certificate of Appropriateness for 46-48 Union Street. Moved by B. King and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

3. 66 N Second Street (Map 53 Lot 258) Modification of Certificate of Appropriateness: Gutter Replacement.

A. Louro presented the modification to the members, explaining that the original Certificate # 2015.05 had specified that the wood gutters were to be replaced in kind; however the contractor replaced the deteriorated wood gutters with aluminum in an effort to reduce cost and to address long-term maintenance concerns. She noted that the wood gutters were not original to the building and that the aluminum gutter profile and installation on the fascia and cornice boards was appropriate. Members agreed that the aluminum gutters were fine in this installation; however they voiced concern regarding the property owner's possible intent to mislead the Commission during the initial application proceeding, as this was the second instance of an unapproved change for this particular certificate. They also voiced frustration as to why the change, when it arose, was not brought to the attention of the Commission, which is the property owner's responsibility.

Motion to modify the Certificate of Appropriateness #2015.05 to reflect the change from wood gutters to aluminum gutters. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed 3 to 1 on a roll call vote.

J. da Silva yes

K. Cox yes

J. Lopes yes

B. King no

Other:

- **Non- Historic Demolition Classification**
A. Louro updated the Commission on a recent demolition request of a circa 1924 concrete block garage located at 21 Margin Street, which was deemed to be non-historic by the Preservation Planner, who is the designee for the historical commission on these matters.
- **Communication from Commissioner of Inspectional Services**
A. Louro updated the Commission on a Board of Survey that was performed at 45 Nelson Street, finding the structure to be a health and safety hazard, and requiring immediate demolition.
- **Communication from Corey Pacheco**
The Chair informed the members that Historical Commission member Corey Pacheco had tendered his resignation effective May 5, 2016 due to time constraints.
- **Letter to Massachusetts Historical Commission in support of a Survey & Planning Grant.**
A. Louro informed members that the Department of Planning, Housing & Community Development had recently submitted a grant application to fund gravestone conservation at Rural Cemetery and a conservation workshop. A letter of support for the grant was provided from the Commission.
- **Letter to Massachusetts Historical Commission regarding ADA Consultation for 226 Ash Street.** A. Louro informed members that ADA accessibility for historic structures has an appeal process to the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board, of which the local historical commission is a consulting party. The Ash Street Jail at 226 Ash Street is planning a water conservation project which triggered ADA compliance, which is difficult to meet due to the building's design; therefore it was seeking a variance. The Commission submitted comments to the Massachusetts Historical Commission in support of the variance due in part to the Sheriff's Department ability to provide ADA program accessibility to both its inmates and visitors within the current parameters of its properties and programs, and that the alterations required to provide universal accessibility to the public entrance on Ash Street would adversely affect the historic exterior of the building while not resolving the issue of additional barriers within the interior of the building.
- **66 N Second Street Parking**
Bill King voiced his concern that the rehabilitation of 66 N Second Street resulted in the removal of a granite post and that there is currently automobile parking in the front of the building, where the post was located. J. da Silva noted that when the post was removed she sought clarification from the property owner, who stated that it would be reinstalled once the site construction was complete. A. Louro stated that zoning does not allow parking in the "front yard" and that she could have the Commissioner of Inspectional Services address this issue. The Commission asked Staff to send correspondence to the property owner seeking to have the granite post reinstalled and to ask the Commissioner of Inspectional Services to send notice regarding the zoning violation.
- **70 N Second Street Violation**
Members sought an update on the status of the violation which was to be remedied by substituting the ball finials with granite pyramidal caps. A. Louro stated that the property owner's assistant, Marie Pepin, had emailed her and made her aware that the property owner was having the stone cutter modify the granite pyramidal cap in an effort to have it better

match the existing granite post. A. Louro reminded members that there was a modification to the original certificate to allow for the substitution of a granite pyramidal cap and that the Commission did not ask for the ball finials to be removed at that time due to harsh weather concerns. The members conceded that weather is no longer a concern and that the ball finials can be removed while the pyramidal cap is being readied. Members asked that Staff send correspondence to the applicant regarding this matter.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by J. da Silva and seconded by B. King. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

NEXT MEETING Monday, June 6, 2016

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro

Secretary to the Historical Commission

Approved: 07.11.16