

MINUTES

**State Historic Preservation Review Board
Friday, September 17, 2021 9:30 a.m.
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams (Recorded)**

Present: Dr. Bucki (via phone) Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards (Chair, via phone), Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan (via phone), Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders (via phone), Mr. Wigren

Absent: Mr. Barlow

Staff: Jenny Scofield (presenting), Todd Levine (presenting); Jonathan Kinney, Jane Schneider, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

Guests (by Agenda Item):

IV.A.1 Aaron Borngraber (City of Hartford), Nina Caruso (Crosskey Architects), Mary Falvey (Hartford Preservation Alliance), David Goslin (Crosskey Architects), Kim Smith (MHA), Roysin Younkin (MHA)

IV.A.2 Heidi Hoeller (author/owner)

IV.B.1 Sandra Berinstein (Cemetery Committee), Aaron Borngraber (City of Hartford), Mary Falvey (Hartford Preservation Alliance), Aaron Gill (Frog Hollow NRZ), Rhodée Gine (Frog Hollow NRZ), Mathew Hoberman (Butler, Norris & Gold), Daniel Kelman, Marcus Ordonez (Frog Hollow NRZ), Calvin Parker (resident), Kerri Provost, Elizabeth Rose (Jewish Historical Society of Greater Hartford), Dr. Elissa Sampson (Cornell University lecturer/urban geographer), Carey Shea (Friends of Zion Hill Cemetery)

I. Call to Order

Ms. Scofield confirmed that a quorum of Board members was present. Mr. Edwards called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. The Board discussed the order of items on the agenda.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Ms. Scofield provided the digital meeting procedures and announced that the meeting will be recorded. She requested that each person wishing to speak state their name and affiliation before giving comments. Ms. Scofield acknowledged guests in attendance. Guests introduced themselves.

III. Approval of the June 18, 2021 meeting minutes

Mr. Edwards requested comments on the June minutes. No comments were heard.

A motion was made by Dr. Feder, second by Mr. Wigren to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2021 meeting (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-1).

Board members voting yes: Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

Board members abstaining: Dr. Bucki

IV. Action Items

A. Completed National Register Nominations

All registration forms are subject to changes made by the State Historic Preservation Review Board (SRB) and by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) staff.

1. Hartford Special Machinery Complex, Hartford (Criterion A, local level)

Ms. Scofield summarized that property is an industrial complex that dates from 1915 to 1942. It includes a connected mill building, guard house, and the Stanley P. Rockwell factory across street at 296 Homestead Ave. Staff recommends the property for listing under Criterion A for Industry. The project revealed a niche industry in Hartford in the early twentieth century. Hartford Special Machinery and Stanley P. Rockwell offered specialized services that supported other local industry. Hartford Special Machinery did machinery design development, production of machinery, and design of machine tools/parts and had flexibility to shift production. The Rockwell company was a heat treating and metallurgical analysis specialist. They were in a building that Hartford Special Machinery owned for expansion and Hartford Special Machinery constructed the building for them.

The owner of the Hartford Special Machinery complex initiated the nomination. Notice of meeting was sent to owners of both parcels, the City of Hartford, and the Hartford Preservation Alliance, 30 days before meeting. The CLG process has been initiated. The nomination was posted on the SHPO website during noticing period. Roysin Younkin and Kim Smith of MacroStie Historic Advisors attended the meeting to represent the nomination. Members of Crosskey architects and a member of the City planning staff are also present. No letters were received in response to the notice.

Mr. Edwards invited the public to comment.

Aaron Borngrober introduced himself as a senior planner with the City of Hartford. The CLG support letters are in progress. The Commission recommended support for the listing at their August meeting.

Mr. Edwards invited comments from the SRB.

Dr. Bucki noted that she found the nomination fascinating. She expressed concern that there is nothing special about the Hartford Special Machinery company; it is representative of so many other machine builders of the era. She noted that her specialty is Bridgeport, which claims the lead on this machine building. She asked to hear from the owners or consultant about what makes this stand out. The nomination should highlight the fact that there is an explosion of special machines in order to carry out the scientific management plans that many manufactures of wartime equipment had. For that you needed to have a group of special machine shops in order to service the main production factories. That would explain the multitude of different kinds of machinery

that this company produced. It was part of an industrial progression that had its apex around 1915. Mention scientific management and Taylorism; reframe the nomination to highlight this company as an exemplar of scientific management. Highlight the special nature of the industry of the time.

Dr. Bucki noted that this is still a very intact complex that does need to be preserved.

Mr. Wigren stated that this is an interesting case of a company spinning off or supporting a separate company that would act in an interconnected way.

Mr. Edwards requested that the description of architecture be tightened up to remove repetitive references used for the same building type or fenestration. Make the narrative less verbose.

Mr. Edwards referenced the mention of the Reverend Francis Goodwin house in the nomination. The reason his residence was located on the opposite side of the railroad is because all of the land over to the [present] University of Hartford belonged to his grandfather Junior Spencer Morgan. It was inherited by Goodwin's mother who had a large house built at the other end of Woodland Street at the corner of Asylum Ave. Reverend Francis Goodwin was a supporter of art and architecture. It is possible Goodwin decided to sell land after his grandfather had died.

Mr. Herzan stated that the nomination was well-researched and polished. He appreciates the thorough level of research that the consultants did on the history.

Ms. Roysin Younken introduced herself as part of the consulting team for the nomination. She noted that she will address the issues raised. This is an intact complex in an area with a lot of industrial loss. She stated that while each individual complex may not be architecturally special, the loss of others elevates their integrity. The retention of Stanley Rockwell across the street, which had such an intimate connection with Hartford Special Machinery boosts the significance. It was also a long-serving special machinery complex that lasted longer than others in the city and did support other industries. She will work to reframe the conversation around significance.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. McMillan to recommend the Hartford Special Machinery Complex for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).

Board members voting yes: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

2. Dr. Henry M. Knight House, Salisbury (Criteria A, B, C, state level)

Ms. Scofield summarized that the property includes a house built in 1853 and updated around 1890. The property also includes a c. 1910 outbuilding and hitching post that are counted resources. The property has complicated layers of history; the owner and author of the property, Heidi Hoeller worked through that with SHPO staff. It is recommended eligible at the state level under Criteria A, B, and C. Under Criterion B, it was the home of Dr. Henry M. Knight who founded an institution for intellectually and developmentally disabled children in this home in 1858, then at the adjacent school (not extant). The categories recognized under Criterion B are Social History and Health/Medicine. Additional social history is recognized under Criterion A. The property represents a juxtaposition between progressiveness in breaking from societal norms vs. upholding social norms. Charlotte Mars (sister of James) lived here as free person, but as a domestic helper. Knight's son Dr. George H. Knight also lived in the house and engaged in similar study but had a more controversial role in his idea of appropriate treatment of the mentally disabled. The property is recommended eligible for architecture for the expression of the Stick Style and Kate Brannon Knight's role in bringing ideas back from the world's fairs to this rural community. The period of significance is 1853 when the house was built through 1913 when the CT School for Imbeciles was transferred back to state ownership. Ms. Scofield noted that the terminology used throughout the nomination in reference to disabled people is the terminology of the time period; the definitions for each term are explained in the footnotes.

The owner initiated the nomination to recognize the history and be a good steward of the property. Notice of the meeting was sent to owners, Town of Salisbury First Selectman (Curtis Rand), town historian, and Historic District Commission, 30 days before meeting. Nomination also posted on our website during noticing period. A CLG response was received in favor from the First Selectman and the rest of the response is in process.

Mr. Edwards invited Ms. Hoeller to comment.

Dr. Hoeller clarified that Kate Brannon Knight was the wife of Dr. George Knight. She stated that she and her husband are excited to present the property for National Register listing. They love history and want to protect the house. They moved to this area because they found out the house was related to the CT School for Imbeciles and not yet listed on the National Register. For the past two years she has conducted research on the Knight family and items in the house. Dr. Knight appreciates any comments from the SRB.

Mr. Edwards invited comments from the SRB.

Ms. Saunders asked if there are any sketches or photos of the house before it was transformed into the Stick Style. Dr. Hoeller responded that she has only one photo from the Salisbury Association. She has found two historic sketches in books, but the front of the house is shrouded by trees and not clear. She did not find anything that revealed what the style of the house was before its conversion.

Mr. Herzan stated that the description of the house was thorough but asked for floor plans for to make the narrative easier to follow. He suggested adding a paragraph under Criterion C for architecture to summarize the architectural significance more concisely. There is no discussion of

the Stick Style as a period. Provide some context for Victorian styles/architectural period of the building. The plumbing gets more attention than the public spaces. He suggested Vincent Scully's book, *The Shingle Style: Architectural Theory and Design from Richardson to the Origins of Wright* (1955, Revised 1971) as a reference for the style. Mr. Herzan requested more photos of the main interior spaces. He noted that the Board is grateful that the owner is pursuing listing of the building. Mr. Herzan also suggested editing for grammatical inconsistencies.

Mr. Edwards added to Mr. Herzan's observations. He noted that many simple wood-frame houses of the 1850s and 1860s had a facelift in the 1890s. It was the influence of the popularity of the Stick Style highlighted by the Palliser Brothers of Bridgeport. There were elaborate country villas built in the later Stick Style. Mrs. Knight was likely looking at what other people from outside of Lakeville were building in town. The Scully work is focused more on the individual buildings that begin with the aesthetic movement in the United States and inspired the more populist Stick Style which this represents. Recognize this as more fashionable architecture as it occurred in the 1890s and less cerebral as it occurred in the late 1870s or as early as the 1860s in England. In reference to the world's fair, that was all about the Classical Revival, not the Stick Style. Mrs. Knight obviously bought a set of Classical tiles as ornament, which would have been inspired by the world's fair, but architecturally, she wasn't shopping in Chicago.

Mr. Wigren commented that the mental health aspect of the nomination was fascinating. It was helpful to him to learn that terms he is familiar with as being terms of abuse and derogatory comments had a scientific definition in the nineteenth century. He asked about the Mansfield Training School; clarify the reference to the name and original location. He noted that well-intentioned people can have different attitudes about treatment.

Mr. Wigren requested more architectural context. Add more information about what other people who were building big houses at the time were building. In regard to the reference to the world's fairs, the update to the Stick Style comes slightly before. It is also difficult to prove a direct connection to the world's fairs (say something resembles a book rather than it copies a book). He asked for confirmation that the technology in the house was there during the historic period. Incorporation of new technologies is another part of the architectural history for this time period; for example, explain where the electricity is coming from if discussing new electrical fixtures.

Mr. Wigren commented on the social history portion of the significance statement. He noted more context would strengthen the section on Fannie Mars; there is not yet enough information on this topic for a nomination. By the 1850s, slavery had been abolished in Connecticut, so there is less significance in saying that a person is free. He asked how many black people were living in Salisbury at the time and where they were working; he requested more information about what we learn from black life in Salisbury at the time from this person. Dr. Bucki asked if the reference to James Mars is in reference to the same person who is established in the Connecticut history record as a documented slave experience. Ms. Hoeller confirmed it is. Dr. Bucki noted there are some secondary works and his memoir that could be included.

Dr. Bucki referenced the history of eugenics and care for mentally disabled people. She suggested including books such as Adam Cohen's *Imbeciles* (2016), and older social histories, such as David Rothman's *Discovery of the Asylum* (about the origins of asylums). Cohen's book is about the supreme court case of Buck vs. Bell in 1927. It would place the Knight story in a well-established

social history. It would place the history on p. 8-15 and 8-16 in context as representative, not an outlier. Overall, this is a fascinating example.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll followed up on the discussion. She stated that it would be helpful to place the history in a national context and understand if the shift in approaches from father to son was a national theme. She requested that photographs be cited in sequential order. She stated that this is a great nomination and house and thanked Ms. Hoeller for preserving it.

Dr. Feder expressed objection to the casual use of the historic terms such as imbecile or feeble-minded unless they are part of official titles or in quotations. He requested that beginning on p. 8-13, use terms current for 2021. Dr. Feder recommended replacing the footnote terminology definitions with an explanatory paragraph at the top of p. 8-13. Explain the terms used then are not the ones used now, then use current terms unless you are quoting someone. He requested a rewrite of the third paragraph on p. 8-15 in reference to the children of immigrants. Add clarifying statements that these were not people with a modern diagnosis of intellectual disability; they were presumed disabled because they could not speak English or answer cultural questions. [broken audio: The U.S. has a history of diagnosing immigrants as being mentally deficient when their only real challenge was the fact that they were not fluent in English or conversant in the details of American culture. There is an entire exhibit at Ellis Island about this.]

Dr. Feder stated that he would like to see more information about George Knight. [broken audio: The nomination should make a stronger statement about his embrace of eugenics. It's a terrible part of American history and George certainly seems to have been a major player at least on a local level.] Dr. Bucki noted that a lot of the information about eugenics is in Adam Cohen's book. Ms. Scofield noted that there are a lot of historical threads SHPO felt important to recognize and carefully tried to place each concept under the appropriate criteria. She asked the SRB if they feel that expanded text on the eugenics movement fits under social history. The SRB responded yes. Ms. Scofield noted that George Knight was living in this house while engaged in that work.

Mr. McMillan applauded Ms. Hoeller for her research. He stated that Criterion B is a hard sell to make with a residence. In regard to the household, he asked if there is any information on what spaces in the house were used by Ms. Mars and the children. Did they have rooms of equal size and accommodation as the other residents of the house? You can use this lens to understand their treatment, in the absence of the school. Ms. Scofield clarified that the school was started in the house. Ms. Hoeller added that Dr. Knight had up to 14 students in the house with his wife, servant, and two sons. Mr. McMillan noted that there is some context there; not long before that mentally ill would be placed in prisons as opposed to homes. Ms. Hoeller stated that you can envision where the students and servants lived in the layout of the house and the third floor in particular. Mr. Wigren raised an issue that the house was remodeled in the 1890s after the students lived there. Ms. Hoeller clarified that there was a rear addition to the house and the south porch was enclosed, but that minimal changes were made to the floor plan. The rest of the 1890s remodeling was decorative. Mr. McMillan pointed out that the location of the house also says something; it is not tucked away far from sight. The house is on a main route. Dr. Bucki stated that as a result, the discovery of the asylum is a progressive move. Whether children or adults, taking people out of jails, placing people in a restorative environment is a shift. Eugenics tricky- it is hard to state these are bad people – they are misguided people but are trying to do the right thing.

Mr. Edwards referenced the Caldwell light fixture on the third floor. It must have been installed recently or moved from another location in the house. You can't draw conclusions about that fixture because there's no photo of what was there before the fixture. It is made by a prominent manufacture; there are multiple ways to purchase it. Ms. Hoeller responded that she has been in touch with a person whose grandmother and great-grandmother previously lived in the house. She is working with her to identify which features are truly original. Ms. Hoeller found the chandelier in a second-floor back room and moved it to the third-floor location.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Dr. Feder and Dr. Bucki to recommend the Knight House for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).

Board members voting yes: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Feder, Mr. Herzan*
Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

* recorded vote later in the meeting (due to technical issues)

B. Review of Eligibility Status of National Register Listed Property

1. Deborah Chapel, 151 Ward Street, Hartford (Frog Hollow NRHD)

Ms. Scofield stated that this is not an application to add or remove property from the National Register. She summarized that SHPO is seeking recommendations from the SRB about the current integrity and whether the property continues to contribute to the National Register district that it is part of. The owners and representatives of 151 Ward Street, the City, and Hartford Preservation Alliance were notified of this meeting per the SRB policy statement. The meeting materials were available online through the SHPO website prior to the meeting.

Mr. Levine provided an overview of the National Register listing. The property is a contributing resource to the Frog Hollow National Register Historic District, listed in 1979 and expanded in 1984. This property is identified as 153 Ward St which is the Congressional Beth Israel Cemetery in 1890. The building in question is the Chapel. The construction date is listed as 1873 on the assessor's card, but the actual construction date has been as 1886. This is within the period of significance for the district. The district was listed under Criterion A in the categories of community planning and industry as an unimpaired demonstration of the development of a 19th century, factory-based urban neighborhood and for technological advances produced through the neighborhood's factories. The district is also significant for its architecture or Criterion C, including excellent, well preserved examples of their building types and Hartford's best architects of the area are represented by several buildings within the district.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Matthew Hoberman introduced himself as an attorney at Butler Norris & Gold, representing Congregation Beth Israel, the owner of the building. He stated that the building is located at 151 Ward Street and that the building is neither historical nor significant. It is simply old, it looks good, and it's got some architecture from the late-nineteenth century. Mr. Hoberman commented on the context of how the property was added to the National Register. He noted that the property was not included in the original nomination and neither were a lot of other religious buildings in

the area. He thought the listing was to allow residents in that area to take advantage of historic tax credits so they can redo their houses. The building and this area were included in the district in the 1989 expansion, but he does not know why. No notice of the designation was sent to the property owner. The address 151 Ward Street is not listed in the nomination. No notice of the nomination was received for that address. The city still maintains a mailing address of 153 Ward Street, which is shown in assessment records as simply the cemetery. Mr. Hoberman referenced the roster of all property owners in the district in the original nomination and noted his client was not included.

Mr. Hoberman stated that the property is subject to litigation and there is an appeal. There are people in favor of preserving this building; his client does not want to preserve the building. In reference to the eligibility status of the property, Mr. Hoberman stated that there is an opportunity for the SRB to correct the nomination; this property was omitted, and the property owner wants to keep it omitted. The property owner was not notified in 1989 that it was to be included in this district. This property owner does not want this building included in the historic district. He stated that the property does not have historic significance [because] there's no evidence that anyone of notoriety ever had a service there for themselves or for anyone else. Mr. Hoberman referenced the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA), which prohibits government entities from implementing restrictions on a property owner's use when it comes to religious land use. He stated that if this designation or eligibility is in conflict with his client's rights under RLUIPA, and if his client does not achieve what they want to achieve with respect to the City of Hartford, he will look to the SRB as responsible in violation of RLUIPA as well as the City.

Dr. Elissa Sampson introduced herself as an urban geographer who specializes in the nineteenth century and Jewish migration. She stated that in terms of the Devorah [Deborah] society and its building, you have something historically quite distinctive here. That has to do with the nature of women's work, Jewish woman's work, and migration. In reference to whether or not the congregation in its current day form found the building to be interesting or significant, she read a quote from its previous well-known Rabbi, Rabbi Avraham J. Feldman. He published a [100th anniversary] book about the congregation that has a section about the value and historic importance of its initially German-speaking Devorah society. [The Rabbi was a Jewish immigrant.] Dr. Sampson read from the section called the "Ladies' Deborah Society". The Society was founded on May 1, 1954. In the book the Rabbi referred to the society as: "The first Jewish Woman Society in Harford, probably the first in Connecticut. It began as a sick visiting - a sick benefits society, until recently the society had also an insurance feature. The Members prepared shrouds for the dead. They made layettes for the children of the poor. They stayed up with the mourners. They provided clothing for the needy. They were the original 'case workers' of the Jewish community of Hartford. They endowed a free bed at Saint Francis Hospital and a Deborah Room in the Newington Home for Crippled Children." The book goes on and on about the society's contributions and how they worked in this funeral chapel, which was rather unusual for women to have established. Typically, it was men who established burial societies both in Europe and in the States in terms of immigrant societies. The book includes a reference to 1943: "The Devorah Chapel at the Congregation's cemetery was a gift. [In other words, a then recent gift, when it's noted here in 1943] from the Ladies Deborah Society." Until very recently the society paid all of the maintenance costs of the Chapel. They did that from the burial fees. "At the time of the building of the present Temple the Society made available a substantial sum to pay for the Library that is to be part of the educational facilities of the Congregation. The Ladies' Deborah

Society is not an auxiliary of the Congregation Beth Israel, but throughout the years the Society met at the Temple, and its membership came largely from this Synagogue. It has been so closely identified with the life and activities of the Congregation, that the Society belongs in the Centennial record of Beth Israel.” Dr. Sampson noted that that was the Congregation speaking, so she thinks the current stance on the part of the congregation is quite recent. If they didn't notice that they had become part of a historical district in the 1970s and the 1980s and the 1990s, it [also] seems rather odd that they wouldn't read their own literature on the Centennial, and many other archives. Dr. Sampson found this book in the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati, a famous archival repository of American Jewish history, and particularly that of German Jews and their migration. Dr. Sampson stated that it seems odd that others cherish this Jewish women's, Connecticut, and Hartford civic history, but that the Congregation itself, which has been suburban since the late 1930s, has turned its back on its urban origins. Dr. Sampson offered to answer any questions. She noted that there are many Jewish historians who are concerned with this move.

Mr. Hoberman followed up about the categorization of the Deborah Society. He stated that historically it was an elitist society that only allowed members of daughters and wives who had ancestors that were also members of the temple, so they were exclusionary. They refused to allow new members of the congregation to become members of this society. They went so far as to institute a blackball procedure. He continued that this shouldn't be something that is lionized as a Great Society for women of either the late-nineteenth century or present day. He stated the elitist issue is a fact and circumstance that should be under consideration in the eligibility status of this building if new facts and circumstances are going to be entered into the record.

Dr. Sampson responded that the exclusionary aspect in which you had to have an ancestor who was the member (a female ancestor, presumably) of the society only happened after the synagogue received the gift of the chapel and the money for the library from the Deborah Society. At that point, they had dissolved and simply became a society of those who are the descendants. Before that they were actually open in terms of their membership. She stated that looking at the historical record is useful in this regard. The congregation has many of these papers, as does an archive within Connecticut synagogues. The pandemic, of course, impedes access, and of course the synagogue would like to open up those nineteenth-century records. Many of us read German and can help the synagogue in understanding its own history. Dr. Sampson added that this is not a move that is understood well on the part of the congregation by those who study German Jewish women's history.

Mr. Hoberman responded that nothing in the original nomination or in the amendment indicates anything about Jewish women's history. He questioned whether the SRB has the ability to introduce new facts and circumstances that were not in the original nomination record.

[Mr. Wigren assumed the role of Board chair for the remainder of the meeting.]

Mr. Wigren invited additional public comment.

Marcus Ordonez, a resident of Frog Hollow, spoke about the historical value of the Chapel. He shared that he frequently walks by the cemetery and has done multiple historic tours with Hartford Preservation to learn more about the cemetery and its history as Dr. Sampson just reviewed. He noted that that is information that people within the neighborhood have been aware of, which is

neighbors care about whether or not this structure stays on the historic list. He believes it should. Mr. Ordonez stated that his opinion goes along with the visual history of Hartford and the historic buildings that are in the area - specifically Frog Hollow. He stated that when it was in use, the Chapel helped the people within his neighborhood, and he doesn't want to lose that history. He added that it's not just a good-looking old building. You can see that it does have historical value and it's actually in relatively good condition considering that it's been abandoned, and gated. Mr. Ordonez stated that he hopes the decision is made to keep it on the historic list, because it's important to the neighborhood and the history of Hartford.

Mr. Hoberman responded that his client did approach the Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ) of Frog Hollow and they had supported his client's demolition of this property and that's on record with the application. He noted that he appreciates Mr. Ordonez's opinion but that is in conflict with what a local-operating board (who either can withhold or grant approval for certain actions that take place within that zone) can do. That is how Hartford Planning and Zoning has set it up, and that is how the Hartford Historic Preservation Committee has set it up as well.

Mr. Ordonez responded that he is a member of the Frog Hollow NRZ. He asked Mr. Hoberman if he was saying that the NRZ was in favor of demolition of the building. Mr. Hoberman said that he has a letter from the NRZ to his client that that was submitted to the Hartford Preservation Commission and states that there was no objection. He asked Mr. Ordonez if he was speaking on behalf of the NRZ. Mr. Ordonez replied no and that he is strictly a member of the NRZ. I'm not speaking for the entire.

Calvin Parker introduced himself as a resident of Frog Hollow. He noted that he is not particularly a historian but could speak to the value of the building and its presence and the addition that it makes to the neighborhood it is in. While conforming in the style of a number of the other architecturally significant buildings in the neighborhood, it is also distinctive in its own particular position, not just because of its location, but because of the uniqueness of the structure. As a piece of architecture, he believes as a neighborhood resident that it is significant. Mr. Parker noted that he is interested in the fact that the counsel for the congregation is dismissive about something that is old and something that is architecturally interesting or significant because having had some history of working with historic preservation, he doesn't think those two things that should be dismissed. He stated that in terms of the cultural significance of the property, regardless of whether the women in Hartford at the time were minding their P's and Q's, the fact that this was an endeavor of women in a synagogue and that they were the ones who were initiating and self-actualizing and doing all of the things that people in the women's movement want to talk about these days and the fact that they were doing it at that point in history, is also culturally significant. He also commented that it appeared the counsel for the congregation was threatening the SRB about some sort of forthcoming litigation regarding a statute having to do with whether the rights of the religious organization are going to be impeded by your action. He stated that this seems to be an unusual stance for the congregation to take. He continued that, if this matter is going to be litigated it will be litigated in a court of law by people who are expert in that particular statute. They will work out the difficult issues if they are difficult, as to whether there is any sort provision that would prevent the action that the SRB is considering. Mr. Parker observed that the SRB's charge is simply to determine whether the building remains significant. He stated that it is already significant, and a special occurrence would be needed to demonstrate that the significance it had

when it was put on the Register has somehow gone away. He noted that the SRB should not be cowed in fulfilling its responsibility to determine whether this building is historically significant.

Mr. Hoberman responded that the significance he was discussing would be the standards that the SRB board should be upholding, not just the cultural significance. He claimed that there is nothing in the nomination application to discuss what those standards are. He stated that the Register is being used by the City of Hartford in order to defend its position; they claim that this property at 151 Ward Street is listed in the National Register. Mr. Hoberman stated that in the nomination and amendments, it's not listed. He argued that the property was omitted from the nomination and assumed it was omitted because it was associated with religious use. He referenced RLUIPA again and asked the SRB not to promulgate any mistakes that have been made in the past.

Ms. Scofield clarified that the property was included in the listing through the 1989 amendment. It is mentioned as part of the cemetery and at the time of the listing you wouldn't necessarily enumerate each monument that is located within the cemetery. She noted that the nomination amendment was signed by the National Park Service in 1989. There would have been noticing associated with that amendment. Ms. Scofield explained that in terms of religious properties, the National Park Service allows for the listing of properties on the National Register of Historic Places for other reasons besides religion, such as architecture or its integration into the neighborhood or for social history. This is covered in National Register guidance bulletins. She stated that the National Park Service designed the National Register as an honorary recognition program, meant to encourage stewardship; layers of local legislation laid on top is a city matter and is not part of the National Park Service's National Register program.

Mr. Hoberman responded that on the nomination page submitted on March 21, 1989, 151 Ward St is not listed there. He stated that 153 Ward Street and Zion Hill Cemetery are listed there and there are separate assessed parcels. He stated that the Hartford Assessor has this shown as 151 Ward Street. He asked the members of the SRB to look past the administrative decision that the property is listed and come to their own conclusion because he disagrees.

Mr. Wigren clarified that it is not within the SRB's power to determine what is and isn't listed on the National Register. That's done by the National Park Service. He stated that the SRB is here to determine whether or not the building still has historic and architectural integrity.

Mr. Hoberman replied that it's a simple determination. He stated that the SRB can pawn that obligation off on the National Park Service, but he does not see the address on the application. He noted again that he believes there was a mistake in the past. He stated that he believes the State Register mirrors exactly what's in the National Register and there's a promulgation of this past mistake.

Aaron Gill, Chair of the Frog Hollow NRZ joined the meeting to clarify the previous question about a letter from the NRZ. He commented that perhaps the NRZ's current thoughts and feelings about the Deborah Chapel may have been misunderstood or misrepresented this morning. He clarified that the NRZ offered a letter of support for preservation of this beautiful structure in May of this year. He noted that the structure is an incredible asset to the neighborhood, and it can be even more valuable with some with some love and the TLC that it needs. Mr. Gill offered to

answer any questions on this stance or the thoughts of the NRZ. He stated the Frog Hollow NRX fully supports the preservation of the Deborah Chapel.

Mr. Wigren asked if there is anyone else from the public who wished to speak.

Dr. Sampson added that she has no problem obtaining letters from other historians and geographers of German Jewish history in America to amplify her comments.

Rhodee Gine, a resident Frog Hollow and a member of the Frog Hollow NRZ voiced his support for preservation of the Chapel. He stated that it is a beautiful structure and the community has galvanized around saving structures like this. Many people have come out to get involved specifically around the cemetery and in raising their awareness of this issue with Chapel. He stated that there are others within the community that would be willing to demonstrate that they also believe the building should be preserved. Dr. Sampson has gone through the historical significance of it and residents don't want to lose any more history in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wigren asked for any more members of the public who did not have a chance to speak. Hearing none, he closed the public discussion and invited the SRB to comment.

Dr. Bucki, speaking as a social historian and a historian of immigration and ethnicity, stated that she welcomed Dr. Sampson's commentary on a piece of history that she was not aware of. She noted that the social history and the building itself is significant, as is the cemetery as an important early urban display of an immigrant community building an institution. She asked for clarification about whether the owners are abandoning the cemetery and who is taking care of it. Mr. Hoberman answered that the cemetery is still under the synagogue's control and there is no intention of abandoning it. It is just a building that the discussion is about. He stated that the committee chair of the cemetery committee has much more history about the challenges that there have been, or this, as some people have called suburban synagogue to manage the urban cemetery. There are adjacent cemeteries that are run by other organizations; some of those cemeteries have become derelict and other members of the community have stepped up to maintain them. He added that there may be an opportunity if the building is demolished to utilize that space for additional plots in order to keep a better connection to the neighborhood and the historical roots of that cemetery in this congregation.

Dr. Sampson requested an opportunity to respond. She stated that in general, there is a problem in terms of cemetery maintenance, cleanliness, particularly when cemeteries are no longer proximate to their congregations. She observed that in this case, it's an urban area surrounded by other cemeteries in green space, and the Friends of Zion Hill Cemetery have been busy doing cleanups and inviting others to do cleanups. The cleanups are something that the congregation may or may not be involved in.

Mr. Hoberman responded that the Friends of Zion Hill is not associated with the synagogue, but the building itself is preventing adequate monitoring of this cemetery. The location of the cemetery is across the street from a police substation. The building inhibits efficient monitoring of the cemetery to prohibit vandals from getting in through the fences. If the building was not there it would be easier to keep the cemetery clean.

Mr. Wigren asked the SRB for any further comment. He reiterated that the SRB was asked to determine whether or not the building has historic and architectural integrity to contribute to the district. If it is determined by the National Park Service that the building is not properly listed in the district, that's another matter, but that's not the SRB's charge to determine.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Dr. Bucki that the Chapel at 151 Ward Street continues to contribute to the significance of the Frog Hollow Historic District (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

Board members voting in favor: Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wigren

Board members absent from voting/left meeting: Dr. Feder, Mr. Edwards, Ms. Saunders

Mr. Herzan pointed out that if there are any issues about identification in the inventory of the nomination, the boundary line on the map trumps that. Anything within the boundary is listed even if an error was made in the numbering of the resources or the addresses. Technical corrections can be made for errors in that regard, but what really counts is whether the resource is within the mapped boundary as it has been submitted to the National Park Service. Mr. Hoberman added that in 1989 when these other properties were listed, the legal description was not updated to include the cemetery.

V. Discussion, VI. New Business, and VII. SHPO Staff Report

Mr. Wigren combined items V, VI, and VII in the agenda. He announced that most of the Bigelow Boiler Factory in New Haven was demolished. The City had an RFP out for stabilization work, but the building official deemed it unsafe. The demolition affected the core of a historic district.

Ms. Scofield announced that SHPO and Preservation Connecticut's landscape survey project is in full-swing and several survey teams are currently doing documentation work and community events. She also announced that the National Historic Landmark Committee will meet this fall and the NHL nomination for the Barnum Museum is on the agenda.

Mr. Wigren clarified that the landscape project is related to the Olmsted firm and is part of the build-up of Olmsted 200, the celebration of the anniversary of Frederick Law Olmsted Sr's birthday.

Dr. Bucki asked for a review session on regulations pertaining to demolition and the SRB's legal role. Ms. Scofield answered that SRB training of any kind could be held at any time, either in an annual session or in topic-specific 15-minute sessions. The SRB discussed restarting topic-specific sessions.

VI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second, Mr. Herzan, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:50 a.m.