



New Bedford Historical Commission

November 7, 2016 – 6:01 PM - **Minutes**
Room 314, City Hall, 133 William Street New Bedford, MA

Members Present:

Diana Henry, Chairman

Bill King, Vice Chair

Bill Barr

Janine da Silva

James Lopes

Members Absent:

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. The Chair indicated that B. Barr would serve in the primary historical organization position.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the September 12, 2016 & September 19, 2016 public meetings were both approved as corrected.

Continued Public Hearings:

Motion to take from the table CASE #2016.22 – 18 Johnny Cake Hill (Map 53 Lot 161). Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by B. King.

Motion carried.

ITEM #1 - CASE #2016.22

Old Dartmouth Historical Society AKA Whaling Museum

18 Johnny Cake Hill (Map 53 Lot 161)

Certificate of Appropriateness: HVAC screening.

Michelle Taylor, Vice President, Operations and CFO of the Whaling Museum presented the application accompanied by Tony DiGiantommaso of Page Building Construction Company. Ms. Taylor briefly reviewed the application for HVAC screening which was before the Commission at the previous July meeting and tabled in order for members to review a material sample. Ms. Taylor provided a large sample portion of a pre-formed thermoplastic panel in a batten profile, as well as color chips. Ms. Taylor indicated that the Museum preferred the color "Shadow Gray" as it matched the granite and steel of the adjacent buildings.

B. Barr voiced his dislike of the thermoplastic panel and there was brief discussion as to the preference of using a pre-formed panel versus a built on site brick screening wall, due to the lack of roof penetration, cost considerations, pre-engineered specifications, and warranty. There was discussion regarding the available panel profiles with B. Barr and J. da Silva expressing their desire to utilize the brick style panel in the "Ranchero Red" color, as it would better match the Bourne Building and appear as a roof chimney. Ms. Taylor stated that either the red brick panel or the gray batten panel was agreeable with the Museum.

Members discussed the desire to review a sample of the brick style panel, with Mr. DiGiantommaso stating that it would take approximately a week to order and receive a sample. In order to facilitate the installation of the screening before winter members discussed the prospect of approving the application pending the review of a sample by a sub-committee of the members.

MOTION to open the public hearing. Moved by B. Barr 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 B. King, and seconded by B. Barr.

Motion carried.

There was brief discussion regarding the use of the brick panel design in the "Ranchero Red" color and the desire to construct the motion to allow the approval of the application pending a review of the material sample.

MOTION to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #2016.22 at 18 Johnny Cake Hill for the HVAC screening with the condition that the applicant provide material samples of the brick panel design and the batten design, both in the color "Ranchero Red", to be approved in the field by two commission members and staff.

Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed with B. King dissenting.

Motion to take from the table CASE #2016.21 – 56-62 N Water Street (Map 53 Lot 175). Moved by J. da Silva and seconded by B. King.

Motion carried.

ITEM #2 - CASE #2016.21

John Daley

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

Certificate of Appropriateness: Installation of Roof Deck

Mr. Daley presented a revised plan for a proposed roof deck project which was tabled from the September 12th meeting in order for the applicant to address the Commission's design concerns. Mr. Daley noted that the building was constructed in two parts, and that the proposed deck is located in the "newer" section. He also stated that the property owner is currently making repairs to the gutter system and applying new roofing shingles.

Mr. Daley acknowledged the time that it has taken to redesign the project, expressing his hope that he and the commission could come to an agreement on the proposal. Mr. Daley described the revised deck's dimension as being 10' in depth and 15' in width with a raised roof due to the existing 4/12 roof pitch. Mr. Daley explained that the roof pitch was being raised to a "shed" due to interior head room considerations. Mr. Daley stated that he felt the raising of the roof pitch to a "shed" was a compromise and that it would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Daley described the materials for the roof deck as being rubber, as well as rubber for the "shed" roof. The shed roof would have a gutter, and that in place of the previous railing, the black asphalt shingle roof would be "rolled up" to a 42" height to act as a knee wall. He went on to describe the use of three *Pella* door openings and that the drainage system would consist of a gutter on the "shed" roof, with a drain pipe down through the knee wall into the existing roof gutter.

Mr. Daley completed his presentation stating that he had both an architect and a structural engineer working on the project and has provided revised plans.

B. Barr disagreed with the statement that the project would not be visible, as he thought that there would be several sightlines from which it would be visible. In response to B. Barr asking if the new space was to accommodate residential or an office use, Mr. Daley stated that it was planned for an office space, that it would not be used at night, and would only have emergency type lighting on the exterior.

B. Barr also sought clarification regarding the deck's dimensions, as the revised plan dimensions differed from what Mr. Daley had presented. Commission members discussed several of the differences between the earlier plan and the revised plan. A. Louro indicated that she had provided the members with hard-copy prints of both plans to reference and brought attention to the fact that the initial proposal was for a roof deck only, and that the revised plan proposes a smaller roof deck with an additional 15' X 15' shed dormer.

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

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 B. King and seconded by B. Barr.

Motion carried.

B. King stated that his recollection from the last meeting was that there was not going to be a shed dormer or a knee wall, but they were both in the revised plan. A. Louro noted that the members preferred the knee wall over the initial proposed railing. B. King agreed, stating however that he expected to see a knee wall that was part of the natural slope of the roof. B. King took issue with the way that the proposed knee wall was designed, located at the roof edge, with a fake appearing curved design that does not exist on any other building within the District, and definitely out of character with the existing building.

Examining the proposed plan, B. King suggested that if the dimension of the shed dormer was reduced from the proposed 15' depth to 12' and if the roof deck dimension was reduced from the proposed 12' to 9'; which would eliminate the need for the false curved knee wall and allow adequate head room, and overall the project would not be as conspicuous as to what is being proposed. B. Barr agreed.

J. da Silva stated that she recognized the applicant's exasperation regarding the process, but noted that due to the building's significance it was the Commission's duty to take a cautious approach and proceed in a manner which will result in a project that would be satisfactory to everyone. Mr. Daley reiterated the current building improvement efforts and financial investments taking place, such as the new roof shingles and gutter installation. Mr. Daley stated that in an effort to compromise, he had reduced the width of the deck, but was seeking the roof pitch change due to the challenges of the 4/12 pitch which does not exist on other buildings within the District. He also reiterated that he did not believe the project would be visible and acknowledged the undesirability of a railing, which is why he was proposing a wrapped shingle knee wall, which he felt was not false looking.

B. Barr stated that he was in favor of the roof deck, acknowledging the installation of several roof decks within the District, but would prefer to not see a roof pitch change. He continued, stating that due to the building's importance, attention to the roof line warranted the Commission's scrutiny.

B. King stated that the other decks within the District did not have altered roof lines and reiterated his concern for the curved knee wall and how that false curve would appear on the side elevations of the deck.

D. Henry asked if A. Louro had worked with the architect to articulate the desires of the Commission for the revised design. A. Louro expressed her confusion by stating that she had briefly spoken to the architect that was responsible for the initial plan, but a different architect was used for the revised plan. She did note that subsequent to the September meeting she had emailed the applicant and the property owner's assistant detailing the Commission's specific suggestions for the revised plans and the need for material specifications. Mr. Daley stated that they utilized the second architect due to his ability to meet timeframes, and that he had produced the initial engineered structural drawing which the Department of Inspectional Services required.

There was discussion amongst the members expressing their desire to have the applicant provide the adequate plans and material specifications in order for them to approve the project. D. Henry stated that based on the current revised plans, the Commission would be unable to render an approval, and rather than rendering a denial, suggested that a motion to table may be appropriate to allow Staff to work directly with the applicant's architect.

B. Barr reiterated his feelings that he wanted to be in a position to approve the roof deck, and he agreed that tabling the matter to provide Staff the opportunity to articulate the Commission's requirements directly to the architect may be the best method to achieve success. Mr. Daley consented to tabling the matter until consensus could be reached.

MOTION to table, with applicant's consent, the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a roof deck at 56-62 N Water Street to allow Staff to work with the applicant's identified architect to develop and provide plans and material specifications required for Commission approval. Moved by B. King and seconded by B. Barr.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

ITEM #2 - CASE #2016.23

Jorge Figueiredo

72 N Water Street (Map 53 Lot 68)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior rehabilitation.

Mr. Figueiredo, architect at Mount Vernon Group Architects and Luis DaSilva, General Manager of the property presented the application. Mr. Figueiredo apologized on behalf of the property owner for installing the exterior flood lights without the Commission's approval. He stated that the installation was prompted by security concerns and that the lights, besides lighting the building façade, provided the added benefit of better lighting the surrounding sidewalks, and he was now seeking the Commission's approval for their installation.

B. Barr expressed his pleasure in seeing the building facades lit and appreciated the need for security; however he questioned the use of the chosen LED light fixture and the resulting harsh, cold color and scalloping effect. He asked if the applicant had yet explored options to adjust, reduce, or soften the wattage. Mr. Figueiredo stated that the current light fixture was a "warm" LED light. A. Louro noted that the fixture specification sheet provided in the application indicated that the light fixture color temperature was 5000 Kelvin, which is considered a "cool" light, appearing bluish white. Mr. Figueiredo corrected his statement and in response to B. Barr, indicated that a change would require a replacement of the entire fixture, not just the bulb.

J. da Silva expressed her concern with the chosen light fixture, stating that it detracted from the building and due to its location within the cornice; a recessed or smaller fixture would be preferable. B. Barr called attention to the lack of lighting balance between the upper cornice and the lower building stories. Mr. Figueiredo agreed with that assessment.

Members discussed the exploration of alternate light fixtures which would provide a warmer color, a broader beam spread in an effort to reduce the scalloping effect, as well as the addition of ground lights to achieve an overall balance of light to the entire façade.

Members questioned the use of floodlights within the District with A. Louro responding that the Design Guidelines discourage their use; however the Commission may wish to consider the use of architectural lighting for the Candleworks due to its architectural and historical significance, its gateway location into the District, its nighttime use, and its ability to better contribute to placemaking within the downtown. There was consensus that members

were in favor of architectural lighting, conceding that the current lighting is poorly executed, but that there existed great opportunity to highlight the building with some adjustments.

B. King questioned how ground lights would be utilized, as the building directly abuts the sidewalk on the N Water and Rodman Street facades. B. King also questioned the type of light used at Cork, with A. Louro responding that it may also be LED, but as it was an older fixture, it may be metal halide; however it had a wider spread than the subject lighting.

J. da Silva reiterated her dislike of the current fixture. Mr. DaSilva stated that they had added lenses to the fixture to screen the bulb. Mr. Figueiredo stated that painting the fixtures the color of the building to better camouflage them was an option and that he agreed with the suggestion of using ground lights.

B. Barr expressed his disappointment with having to review a project after the fact, as the Commission may have been able to provide technical advice prior to the purchase and installation of costly fixtures. He acknowledged the financial investment the property owner has made to the property and the desire not to make the owner incur additional costs, however he stated that the lighting as it exists was unacceptable and needed to be changed.

J. da Silva questioned the use of the existing light fixture and inquired if there was any type of research completed prior to its selection. Mr. DaSilva stated that the electrician chose the fixture and asked if they should install additional lights within the cornice in an effort to eliminate the scalloping effect. J. da Silva did not believe that the installation of additional lights was the answer and that a combination of the existing cornice lights with ground lights might achieve a favorable lighting effect.

D. Henry suggested that the Commission may want to consider tabling the matter to allow the applicant to collaborate with Staff in researching an improved lighting method without unnecessarily adding light fixtures that ultimately may be removed.

Mr. Figueiredo agreed to tabling the matter and stated that he would contact the lighting manufacturer to investigate the possibility of switching out the light lenses and would come back before the Commission to present different options.

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.

Prior to tabling the matter, B. Barr wanted to articulate to the applicant the Commission's expectations and reiterate the sentiment that the membership wanted to work with the applicant to achieve a favorable end product. The members also cautioned the applicant to not purchase additional fixtures until a solution and a lighting plan had been determined and approved.

There was discussion regarding the restaurant's planned opening date of November 28th, and the members agreed that the existing lights could and should remain lit while a new lighting plan was being developed. It was also suggested that after consultation with the lighting manufacturer, if it was determined that the fixture lenses could be switched out to a warmer 3000 Kelvin light; the applicant should experiment with one or two of the fixtures in order to review that effect.

J. Lopes suggested that there should be consensus as to what the Commission was seeking and specify the actions Staff should consider while working with the applicant. With further discussion members agreed that Staff and the applicant should explore the changing of the light lenses from 5000 Kelvin to 3000 Kelvin, paint an existing fixture as a sample, explore the use of an alternate type of cornice light fixture, and plan the use of ground lights in an overall lighting plan.

Motion to table, with the applicant's consent, the Certificate of Appropriateness for 72 N Water Street for a period of time as needed in order for the applicant to work with Staff to develop a satisfactory lighting plan. Moved by B. King and seconded by J. da Silva.

Motion passed on a roll call vote.

ITEM #3 - CASE #2016.24

Waterfront Historic Area League (WHALE)

139 Union Street (Map 53 Lot 144)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior Rehabilitation

ITEM #4 - Case #2016.25

Waterfront Historic Area League (WHALE)

141 Union Street (Map 53 Lot 143)

Certificate of Appropriateness: Exterior Rehabilitation

Chair Diana Henry recused herself from the discussion due to a conflict of interest, as Ms. Henry is a member of the WHALE Board of Directors, and indicated that the Vice Chair would chair the matter. Teri Bernert, Executive Director, WHALE and Kathryn Duff, Architect, Studio2Sustain Inc., asked to present the two cases as one, explaining it as a single development project encompassing two adjoining properties. The Vice Chair consented to the request and A. Louro indicated that the Commission could hear the cases together, but would be required to vote on each case separately.

Ms. Duff gave a brief overview of the end uses of the two properties indicating that they were being rehabilitated for the adaptive reuse as a Collaborative Arts Center. The project would include maker space, gallery space, and retail spaces on the first floor, with office and a total of four units of housing located on the upper floors.

Ms. Duff indicated that this project consisted of rehabilitation only, that there would be no new construction or addition of space. She explained the scope of work to include the restoration of the storefronts on both buildings based on physical and historic image evidence. The storefronts would be reconstructed using traditional panels, trim,

bulkheads, sign panels and the use of aluminum clad plate glass windows.

Ms. Duff proposed the use of a composite material, *Boral*, in the place of wood panels and trim in the two storefronts, as well as its use as clapboard siding and for the new brackets in the cornice of 139 Union Street. K. Duff provided primed and painted material samples of the *Boral* material for review. Samples of painted cement fiber board and cedar clapboard were also provided for comparison purposes.

Ms. Duff reviewed the building elevations and described the use of a steel and glass folding door on the Barker's Lane elevation of 139 Union Street. She went on to describe the proposed exterior lighting and its locations on the buildings. Paint colors were described for the clapboards and storefronts, with the use of a blue as a highlight. B. Barr stated that he felt that the green storefront without a blue highlight was preferred and suggested the use of blue as an accent color for the doors. J. DaSilva concurred and the applicants agreed to the color change suggestion. The gray color would be used on the clapboards and on the parged cement wall along Barker's Lane.

There was brief discussion regarding the modern aesthetic of the Barker's Lane elevation of 139 Union Street. T. Bernert explained that façade was the location of the maker space and that it was envisioned that the area would be a vibrant indoor/outdoor space with the use of the folding metal and glass door being open for programming. Because the Barker's Lane façade is a twentieth century addition and due to the lack of photographic evidence, a recreated historic façade would not be appropriate and members agreed that the restoration of the cement parging was acceptable.

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

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.

B. Barr and J. da Silva questioned the proposed light fixture and asked the applicant to rethink it and seek a more period appropriate fixture. They expressed their liking of the bronze finish, but a better match to the building's restoration, perhaps something more akin to a lantern. The applicant agreed to seek another light sample. Members expressed their favorability towards the *Boral* product; however J. da Silva expressed her concern for the product's track record and reliability and requested a list of District Commissions who may have used *Boral*. K. Duff stated that it is a relatively new product, but would seek to find examples of its use in a historic setting.

Members discussed approving the projects dependent on the research regarding the *Boral* material. A. Louro stated that generally District Commissions were moving towards allowing the use of composite materials, particularly where the material meets the ground where deterioration is widespread. She also noted that the proposed use of the material would not be replacing original historic fabric; as both the storefronts and the clapboard siding are composed of 20th century materials.

Motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior rehabilitation of 139 Union Street. Moved by

B. Barr and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed with J. da Silva dissenting.

Motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior rehabilitation of 141 Union Street allowing Staff approval for the exterior light fixtures. Moved by B. Barr and seconded by J. Lopes.

Motion passed with J. da Silva dissenting.

Chair Diana Henry rejoined the members at this time.

Other:

The Chair referenced the Certificates of Non-Applicability, support letters, Section 106 reviews, demolition classifications and other communications which had been issued in the last month and sought comments or questions. J. da Silva noted that work was currently taking place at the Sundial Building. B. Barr sought information regarding the previously discussed violation and penalty policy with A. Louro stating that ordinance language had been provided to the City Solicitor for review and that matter was moving forward.

A. Louro briefed the members on the favorable neighborhood acceptance of the proposed Local Historic District expansions and provided members with the 2017 meeting schedule.

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 8:10 p.m.

NEXT MEETING Monday, December 5, 2016

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro

Secretary to the Historical Commission

Preservation Planner

Approved: 12.05.16