



New Bedford Historical Commission

September 12, 2016 – 6:00 PM - **Minutes**
Room 314, City Hall, 133 William Street New Bedford, MA

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Bill Barr

Secretary and City Planning Staff:

Anne Louro, *Preservation Planner*

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.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the July 11, 2016 public meeting were approved.
An August meeting was not convened

Public Hearings:

ITEM #1 - CASE #2016.17

David Slutz, President, Moby Dick Brewing Company, Inc.

52 Union Street (Map 47, Lot 37)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior Rehabilitation

Kevin Caldwell, Caldwell Architectural Associates, representing the applicant, described the location of the project as well as the existence of several street facing facades including Union, S Water and Commercial Streets. He noted that the proposed renovations would only affect the first story of the building which currently has non-original aluminum panels within the storefront openings. He described the proposed storefront replacement units as having a fixed aluminum grill system, which are better aligned with the original 1920's storefront configuration.

Mr. Caldwell presented a material sample of the aluminum frame storefront divided lite grid system which the manufacturer specifies as “dark anodized bronze”, but presents itself as black in color. He went on to describe the other areas of renovation, including replacement of the corrugated metal canopy, which he followed up by stating may be on hold and perhaps tabled, as the applicant was still considering several options. He did note that the existing canopy brackets will remain, be cleaned, and repainted black.

J. da Silva asked to speak about the canopy as its replacement was submitted as part of the application. The applicant, David Slutz, was in the audience and asked if he could address the question. He stated that earlier in the day a decision had been made to retain and repair the current corrugated metal canopy rather than replace it with new material. Commission members expressed their satisfaction with the new approach, articulating that retention and preservation of historic fabric is preferable to replacement.

In response to J. da Silva, Mr. Caldwell confirmed that the window grid was an applied grid and not a true divided lite system and that the actual lite dimensions would be slightly larger than the presented sample.

Mr. Caldwell noted that the original masonry openings are to remain intact, later infill sections will be retained, and a non-original window opening located on S Water Street will be filled with matching brick. Mr. Caldwell described the new door entries and explained that the existing single doors to the second story will remain.

There was brief discussion regarding the possible future use of a mural on a large expanse of brick façade along S Water Street. A. Louro noted that mural signage has historical precedent within the downtown and if used, would be reviewed as part of the project’s forthcoming signage application.

In response to B. King, Mr. Caldwell confirmed that the existing YMCA signs located at the corner of the building above the canopy would be either removed or relocated, and that the existing YMCA sign located below the canopy, adjacent to the S Water Street entry would remain.

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

Motion carried.

There were no public comments offered or recorded in favor of the petition, nor in opposition to the petition.

MOTION to close the public hearing. Moved by J. Lopes, and seconded by J. da Siva.

Motion carried.

There was brief discussion regarding the tabling or removing of the canopy portion of the application, as the applicant had indicated a new plan was in place to retain and repair the canopy instead. A. Louro advised that with the applicant’s permission, the application be modified to reflect the removal of the canopy replacement. She also noted that the canopy repair would require a different type of Certificate, a Certificate of Non-Applicability, as the proposed canopy repair would not involve a change in materials. The applicant consented to the modification of the original submitted application, and removed the canopy replacement from consideration.

MOTION to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior rehabilitation for 52 Union Street as presented with the condition that the applicant return to the Commission to seek a Certificate of Non-Applicability for the corrugated metal canopy repair. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by J. Lopes.
Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

MOTION to rearrange the Agenda and take Item #3 out of order.
Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by B. King.
Motion carried.

ITEM #3 - CASE #2016.21

John Daley

56-62 N Water Street (Map 53 Lot 175)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Installation of Roof Deck

Mr. Daley explained that he was acting as the agent and representative of the property owner, Mr. John Meldon. He presented the proposed roof deck project explaining the scope to include the replacement of the existing asphalt roof shingle with black three tab asphalt shingles for the entire roof surface, as well as the repair and replacement of deteriorated sections of the gutter, cornice, and a column capital which fell under a Certificate of Non-Applicability which he had recently obtained.

Mr. Daley acknowledged the historical and architectural significance of the building, noting that it is often the focus of heritage walking tours. He also stated that throughout the years the historic fabric of the structure had been patched but not altered, and that the intent was to continue with the repairs and maintenance of the building.

In addition to the current repairs, Mr. Daley described the proposal to construct a roof deck on the east section of the building which is the building addition constructed in 1876. He presented a framing drawing and noted that a structural engineer was also contracted and provided those stamped plans as well.

A. Louro reiterated to the Commission that before them for review was the roof deck proposal only, as the asphalt roof replacement and other repairs mentioned by Mr. Daley were previously authorized by a Certificate of Non-Applicability issued in August.

Mr. Daley stated that the proposed roof deck would not be visible from the front of the building and that many of the buildings within the District have a roof deck, as they are highly desirable due to the water views.

In response to B. King, Mr. Daley stated that the intention was to use the attic space as an office and that currently there were two stairways, a spiral stairway and straight run stairway leading to the attic story. Mr. Daley also claimed that two elevator shafts exist within the addition building.

In response to B. King, Mr. Daley explained that there were two sets of schematic design plans for the roof deck; a smaller design initially submitted, and a later submission of a larger roof deck plan which was preferable to the

property owner.

A. Louro described the differences and details related to the two proposed plans. She also noted that the plans were schematic and not fully progressed architectural plans; lacking in detail and certain dimensional measurements. The plans were also lacking a schedule of materials or specifications related to potential wall siding, trim, doors, gutters, downspouts, roof flashing, and lighting.

J. da Silva stated that there was insufficient detail in the plans to render a decision and J. Lopes sought consensus as to whether the Commission should ask the applicant to further pursue the smaller roof deck plan and return with those details. The Commission members agreed with both J. da Silva and J. Lopes.

Mr. Daley welcomed the direction but noted once again that the property owner preferred the larger roof deck plan. He reiterated that the deck was not very visible from the street, and once again reviewed the proposed dimensions of the larger deck. A. Louro noted that the critical dimension of the deck set-back from the roof edge was missing from the plans, with Mr. Daley acknowledging that fact.

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

Motion carried.

There were no public comments offered or recorded in favor of the petition, nor in opposition to the petition.

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

Motion carried.

J. da Silva voiced her concern for the potential negative impact of the larger roof deck plan on the building. She stated that the building is a “mission essential” structure for the National Park and that the smaller roof deck would have less of an effect on the building’s infrastructure. B. King stated that the roof deck on his building is problematic in relation to water drainage and snow removal, noting that those issues require consideration as standing water and snow have led to building material deterioration. B. King expressed his preference for the smaller roof deck plan and that he opposed the change in roof pitch or railings depicted on the larger plan.

The members reviewed with the Secretary and the Chair the application submittal requirements for approval specific to the proposal. They agreed that they would need information on wall siding, trim, doors, gutter and downspouts, type of roof flashing, and lighting in order to conduct a complete review. The Chair suggested tabling the matter and J. Lopes reiterated his desire to advise the applicant to pursue further detailed plans for the smaller proposal.

MOTION to table the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a roof deck at 56-62 N Water Street in order for the applicant to provide further detail related to lighting, drainage, siding, doors, gutters and other materials, and that the applicant focus on the roof deck schematic design as shown in Plan A1 submitted with the application. Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

ITEM #2 - CASE #2016.18

Jorge Figueiredo

72 N Water Street (Map 53 Lot 68)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior rehabilitation.

The applicant was not in attendance, and with recognition of the project's timeline, the Chair agreed that the Secretary would present the proposal to the Commission. A. Louro noted that the applicant was Mount Vernon Group Architects representing the owner of the property; New Bedford Inc. A. Louro described the general proposed rehabilitation plan for the building to include a restaurant in the lower level, professional offices on the first and second stories and the property owner's office on the third story.

A. Louro indicated that this project had recently been issued a Certificate of Non-Applicability for work that did not require changes in materials, such as window and gutter repair, painting and the installation of an outdoor fountain. She then went on to present the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to include several elements, the first item being the replacement of the main entry door on N Water Street. She described the current door as a double leaf door which was installed as part of the 1978 rehabilitation. The proposed replacement door, based on a historic image, is a single door as presented in the application.

In response to B. King, A. Louro described this entry door as leading to the first floor lobby and that the primary entrance to the first floor office was located on Rodman Street. She noted that the current Rodman Street door was to remain and was currently being repainted.

A. Louro described the cement paver proposed to replace broken and uneven bluestone at the lower courtyard level. A. Louro explained that this location is the universal access entry to the building and that having a level, consistent surface was important. The proposed paver is an architectural paver that is a close color match to the existing bluestone and she recommended its approval.

She described the proposed fencing as based on the accepted style of fence, commonly referred to as the "District Fence", except that the boards would butt, instead of having a gap. This fence would screen the parking lot from the courtyard seating, mechanical systems, and a dumpster area to be located at the southeast corner of the building. The fence will be of varying heights as indicated in the application and painted green to match the building trim.

A. Louro explained that there were several areas of proposed signage and that the existing arched black and goldleaf "Candleworks Building" sign located over the main N Water Street entry was to remain. She stated that all of the proposed signage, except for the proposed ground sign, would be constructed of carved, high density urethane foam, painted black with 22kt goldleaf lettering. She described the proposed bracket sign on N Water Street to be 48" in width by 72" in length. A second existing bracket is also located at the N Water Street entry to the Courtyard, which serves as the main entry to the restaurant. That sign would measure 20" in width by 22" in length. In the courtyard an existing sign above the doorway will be replaced with a similar sign with the same dimensions, as well as a replacement to the existing directory sign adjacent to the entry. She went on to note that an aluminum parking lot sign, measuring 24" by 18", black with white lettering, was proposed and that city code allows a sign at each parking lot entrance.

A. Louro described the existing ground sign located at the intersection of Elm Street and JFK Boulevard as having

white wooden posts, 12' in height and 6' in width, and that the applicant was proposing to replace the existing sign panels to reflect the building's new occupants and uses. The panels would be constructed of medium density overlay board, painted white with black lettering. She noted that the proposed top sign panel is 30 square feet in size, exceeding the City Code which allows 25 square feet, therefore requiring a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. A. Louro did not believe the applicant was aware of the need for a variance and suggested that the applicant may wish to reduce the size of the top panel to comply with City Code. She also advised a change in the signage color to be a black background with white lettering and that the existing sign posts be painted black.

There was discussion that the ground sign should have a black background with goldleaf lettering to be consistent with the rest of the property's signage. A. Louro called attention to the fact that this was an unlit ground sign and that white lettering would read easier than gold.

In response to B. King, A. Louro indicated that the ground sign could not be eliminated by the Commission, as it was an existing sign. She stated that the existing ground sign was increased in height with the Commission's approval in 2010.

There was brief discussion about relocating the sign due to visual clutter at the corner. The discussion then moved to decreasing the size of the sign at which time A. Louro indicated that the Downtown Business Overlay District allows for signage to be up to 25 square feet in area as of right, however the Commission could seek a smaller sign within the District.

A. Louro described the last item as the replacement of the current awning from blue to black with white lettering with the restaurant's name, and that it would be unlit.

Commission members briefly discussed the number of signs and their potentially confusing content related to the name of the building and the restaurant, with the consensus that sign messaging was not within their purview.

A. Louro stated that the Candleworks Building was considered a "priority" building for the District Commission and that the New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park considered it to be a "mission essential" building to the interpretation of the Park. She informed the Commission that the National Park Service commissioned a Historic Structures Report for the property in 2009 that recommends the approach to the building to be preservation versus rehabilitation, and that the Massachusetts Historical Commission holds a Preservation Restriction on the property. She stated that the applicant and property owner were aware of the property's significance and have taken that into consideration with their approach to its reuse.

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

Motion carried.

There were no public comments offered or recorded in favor of the petition, nor in opposition to the petition.

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

Motion carried.

The commission members reviewed the proposed items within the application and determined that a Certificate of

Appropriateness could be issued, but they were not comfortable approving the presented signage without the applicant present to answer questions.

B. King stated that the proposed blade sign on the N Water street façade originally had a smaller sign at that location; and that the proposed sign was too large and had redundant messaging which could be removed, therefore decreasing the sign's size. A. Louro noted that the last sign at that location was 3' by 3' in size. J. da Silva stated that adjacent blade sign at the sidewalk courtyard entrance had the exact wording, reiterating the desire to remove duplicative messaging in an effort to decrease size. The members agreed that a 3' by 3' sign was appropriate on the N Water Street façade and that the courtyard entrance sign as presented without lighting was acceptable.

Members favorably discussed the courtyard signage but voiced concern with regards to the inconsistency of the white lettering on the parking lots signs. There was consensus that the parking lot signage should have gold lettering to be consistent with the facade and blade signage.

In respect to the ground sign, members had several questions and preferred changes to the sign proposal. Reducing the size of the top size component was discussed with B. King suggesting that all of the sign components be equal in size and that the lettering be consistent in the color gold.

There was a proposition that the signage portion of the application be tabled. A. Louro indicated that the signage component of the application could not be separated from the rest of the items without the applicant's approval. D. Henry advised tabling the application due to the applicant's absence and the member's questions related to the proposed signage.

In response to B. King, A. Louro noted that tabling the matter may have an effect on the project's timeline and that a Special Meeting, with 48 hour notice with the City Clerk, could be scheduled. J. da Silva suggested polling member's meeting availability for a Special Meeting resulting with the members' consensus that they were available the following Monday, September 19th.

Motion to table the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior rehabilitation at 72 N Water Street. Moved by B. King and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed on a roll call vote.

Other:

The Chair referenced the Certificates of Non-Applicability, support letters, Section 106 reviews and demolition classifications which had been issued in the last month and sought comments or questions. J. da Silva noted that the work currently taking place at 42 N Water Street, Tia Maria's restaurant, was not listed. A. Louro apologized for the oversight and stated that a modification was made to a Certificate of Non-Applicability previously issued.

B. King stated that a new replacement window had been installed on the north façade at 24-26 N Water Street and that several property owners were painting the exterior. The Chair stated that staff would follow up on the matter.

D. Henry stated that the new fence installed at 66 and 70 N Second Street without a Certificate needs to be

addressed. A. Louro confirmed that the matter had been brought to the attention of the Acting City Planner and that the matter was being reviewed. There was brief discussion regarding the commission's frustration with certain property owner's flouting the Commission's regulations, undermining the integrity of the District and the Commission. D. Henry stated that she would reach out to the Acting City Planner regarding the matter.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by J. Lopes and seconded by J. da Silva. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

NEXT MEETING Monday, October 3, 2016

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro

Secretary to the Historical Commission

Preservation Planner

Approved: 11.07.16