

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, June 1, 2022 @ 9:30 am**

ONLINE TEAMS Meeting (see code for meeting in your email or contact Mary.Dunne@ct.gov or
Jonathan.Kinney@ct.gov for the code)

MEETING

Council: Ms. Elizabeth Acly, Mr. Paul Butkus, Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Chairman Thomas Elmore, Dr. Margaret Faber, Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Vice Chairwoman Christine Nelson, Ms. Sara Nelson, and Dr. Walter Woodward

Absent: Ms. Elizabeth Burgess and Dr. Sarah Sportman

Staff: Ms. Julie Carmelich, Ms. Mary Dunne, Ms. Erin Fink, Ms. Deborah Gaston, Mr. Jonathan Kinney, Ms. Cathy Labadia, Mr. Todd Levine, Ms. Jenny Scofield, Ms. Liz Shapiro, and Ms. Marena Wiesnewski

Guest: Mr. William Allik
Ms. Cassandra Archer
Mr. Jack Beecher
Ms. Mary Falvey
Mr. Mike Forino
Mr. John Martin
Mr. Paul Geary
Mr. John Martin
Ms. Jane Montanaro
Ms. Mora Rowe

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Chairman Elmore read aloud the Review of Public Comment Procedures.

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Chairman Elmore read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest and asked if there were any conflicts of interest. There were none.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes and Transcripts

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

1. Survey and Planning Grant, Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, Inc. Architectural Plans and Specifications for John Sill House, 84 Lyme Street, Old

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, Inc.
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Lyme Academy of Fine Arts, Inc. requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a qualified architect to prepare plans and specifications for the John Sill House (c. 1817), located at 84 Lyme Street, Old Lyme, CT. Staff recommended the application for funding. The Lime Academy is prepared to move forward with predevelopment at this time and they have also budgeted for the construction phase of the project as well. Ms. Dunne hopes that the organization will apply for a Historic Restoration Fund grant from SHPO for the construction phase. This application is purely for the predevelopment phase, which includes some hazardous material investigation and the development of plans and specifications for work that was identified in a 2012 condition assessment. Ms. Mora Rowe was on the call to answer any questions or concerns.

Ms. C. Nelson asked whether landscaping would be part of the project. Ms. Rowe replied no landscape is not a part of this planning phase, but they do have and have consulted with landscape architects and planners. They have three board members who have pledged to help with the funding for landscaping. Their first project would be the renovation and restoration of the Sill House, then while in that phase, they would be looking at a full site development for relandscaping. There are things on the Sill House, like the current handicap ramp that may impact some exterior landscaping towards the back. Some of the bluestone, flagstone pathways, the masonry steps, some of those things have some landscaping issues, but the full landscaping plan would happen during the construction project. After the construction is complete, they would move into the landscaping phase.

Chairman Elmore stated that he was confused because the application says that

a complete preservation scope of work with architectural plans and specs will be developed, but the plans are only being developed to 40%. Where does the project get “chopped off” prior to the construction phase? Ms. Dunne replied just when it starts the construction phase. Included in the original budget was the architect managing the bid process, bidding out, selecting the contractors, and then managing the project. That portion wasn't a large portion of the budget overall. While the predevelopment grants can fund up to full documents, they can apply to HRF with just 40% and then refine them after Council gives their initial input. It does chop off right before finalizing documents and going out to bid and managing the project.

Ms. S. Nelson tried to get clarity on Ms. Dunne’s reply. 40% contract document gets you to halfway through your construction documents. So, you're at a point, but you don't have full plans or full specifications at that point, and if the grant will fund all the way up through 100% CD, it's probably in the owner's best interest to get to an identified stopping point that poises them at the end of development services and at the beginning of the construction services. Ms. S. Nelson added that if you were going to prepare the documents to get you to the HRF application, she might call it 100% DD, as opposed to 40% CD because that's an understandable break in architectural services.

Ms. Dunne added that may be the nuance that she was missing Lyme Academy has the entire budget in hand, we're only providing the \$20,000 of that, but she does understand the benefit of taking it further.

Dr. Glaser asked for the architectural style and significance of the building to be called out in the bid documents. Ms. Dunne replied that SHPO does make a description of the building and as much information as the applicant has on the history of construction part of the RFP.

Dr. Faber asked why the 2012 condition assessment was not completed and did SHPO/HPC fund it? Ms. Dunne replied no, we did not fund it, but part of this effort will be to update it. Ms. Rowe replied correct. In 2014 The Lime Academy of Fine Arts merged with the University of New Haven. The University started some of the work and then they started pulling back and not completing the process, so there's been lots of deferred maintenance and now they're at a critical point in preserving the Sill house. They need to address the roof situation that was called out in that 2012 report, but never fixed. In 2019, the University of New Haven went away, and the Lyman Academy of Fine Arts is now back in charge and fiscally responsible, and it is currently being used a community gallery space for the region’s arts organizations. They are at a point where they must either address the issues or stop using the building, as it will just continue to deteriorate.

Chairman Elmore asked, with that change from University of New Haven back to Lyme Academy of Fine Arts as a standalone entity, is the organization prepared to maintain the building once the money is allocated and work is completed? Ms. Rowe replied yes, that is correct, they have been doing simple corrections. They were worried mostly about the roof and getting through this last winter and when they had roofers come out, they identified that the biggest problem was the

chimneys. They immediately hired a contractor to come in and remove a portion of our chimney and they are now slated to get that work completed and to rebuild them. They have a wonderful facilities team that has really been addressing all the deferred maintenance throughout the entire campus. They are dedicated to maintenance and better maintenance than has been done in the past.

Ms. Carnell had a question and noted in the application that there was an HRF grant in 2013 and she wanted to clarify what that project was. It appeared to be painting and lead remediation, but she wanted to double check. Ms. Dunne replied SHPO did give the Applicant an HRF grant, and it must have been a small one because SHPO no longer holds an easement on the property. Ms. Dunne was not sure if Ms. Rowe was around back then.

Ms. Rowe replied she was not around back then and unfortunately the documentation in their files was not great. She tried to do as much research as she could. She does know that there was lead paint remediation, work done on the foundation, and some work done on the ceiling rafters so that the roof had more stabilization. Windows were also replaced when the University of New Haven took over.

Ms. C. Nelson loved how Ms. Rowe called it the gateway to the campus. The building has such a stately presence on the street and the iron fence is a remarkable feature that is then echoed in the staircase on the front. She wanted to be sure that it is included in their long-term preservation plan. Ms. Rowe replied the fence itself is in fantastic shape, but the railing needs considerable help. The masonry steps are literally collapsing, and the railing there just needs to be redone, whether it's cleaned or sandblasted and then repainted.

Ms. Rowe also stated that they currently have three architects currently on this project. They all very much respect and love historic buildings. It is their top priority to make sure that we retain all the wonderful details of the building.

Ms. S. Nelson responded to Ms. Carnell's earlier question about an HRF grant. It was January 9th, 2013 and there was an HRF grant award of \$55,182 for restoration of the John Sill House.

Chairman Elmore asked Ms. Rowe how she came up with the fee cost for architects and environmental and construction estimates. Ms. Rowe replied, they initially started reaching out to architects to get an understanding of what this budget would look like before we applied for the grant to see if this is something that they could undertake. Those are real numbers that we initially got and have continued to reach out to various architects with a great foundation in historical preservation. Those numbers have been what we've been collecting over time.

2. Survey and Planning Grant, Brookfield Craft Center, Condition Assessment for the “Miller’s House” 290 Whisconier Rd., Brookfield

On a motion by Dr. Faber, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Brookfield Craft Center, Inc.
Amount: \$15,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Brookfield Craft Center, Inc. requested funding in the amount of \$15,000 to obtain the Consulting services of a CFR-qualified architect to prepare a condition assessment for the “Miller’s House” (1790), located at 290 Whisconier Road, Brookfield. Staff recommended the application for funding. This building has been vacant for about 10 years. It was used on and off as studios and meeting space. The Applicant would like to have someone come in and assess the structural and physical condition so that they can make plans to put it in use for an artist in residence. There won’t be a substantial change of use of the building. There are no drawings, and the applicant is anticipating a total project cost of about \$30,000. Ms. Dunne will try to answer any questions or concerns that Council may have.

Chairman Elmore stated to Ms. Dunne that the application says it's a detailed condition assessment and restoration plan to confirm priorities and cost estimates, and then the Applicant is planning to go right to qualified contractors. But are there drawings and specifications in there someplace?

Ms. Dunne replied, no. The Applicant has been informed that a condition assessment is not likely to provide what they will need to go to the construction phase. At this point, they just need to know more about the condition of the house for fundraising purposes. But she doesn’t believe they have anything moving forward after this. They plan to use the document to try to explain to potential donors what the issues are and help them move forward. It is often a misunderstanding that a condition assessment will be sufficient to apply to HRF, which obviously, depending on what's found in that assessment, is not always the case.

Chairman Elmore asked if cost estimates and budget projections were included as part of this. Ms. Dunne replied yes.

3. Survey and Planning Grant, Town of Hamden, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) for Hamden's earliest extant houses.

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, second by Ms. C. Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Survey and Planning Grant, funded by the Community Investment Act of the State of Connecticut, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All grant guidelines and state requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Town of Hamden
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Town of Hamden requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architectural historian to prepare a National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) for Hamden's earliest extant houses. Staff recommended the application for funding. An MPDF provides a context statement for a specific type of historic property. As noted in the narrative, the town is concerned about just the dearth of recognized historic resources, especially their earliest ones. Ms. Dunne did check with Ms. Scofield, SHPO's National Register Coordinator, and Ms. Scofield does think that this budget is sufficient to do the context statement and what's called a case study, which would be that first house that's noted in the application. SHPO does have other MPDFs that address architecture and so, in keeping with our state plan, we're going to want the town to look more at the specific regional uniqueness and the demographics of who lived in or worked in these houses, which will go a little bit beyond just the architecture. Mr. Paul Geary is here from the town to answer any questions or concerns.

Ms. Dunne reiterated that this grant is only paying for the study, the context and one National Register nomination just for the one house that's noted. The MPDF can then be used as an umbrella document under which additional properties can be listed.

Ms. Scofield added that the purpose of an MPDF is to provide a thorough and substantial significance statement so that individual listings can occur much more easily in the future. The reason why there aren't more case studies in this application is simply because \$20,000 wouldn't be enough to do additional individual listings. With an MPDF, you typically do at least one nomination just to make sure that it can be applied properly. The idea is to make it more efficient and affordable for future individual property listings that fit into the overarching context of the MPDF.

Mr. Butkus asked if this was a precursor to an historic resources inventory level of documentation for each of the houses mentioned in the application? Ms. Scofield replied, no, this is a different type of National Register nomination. For example, SHPO did a statewide multiple property context for modernism under which we're still listing individual houses as good representations of the modern movement. We're not doing HRI forms, it's not a survey report. It's a significance statement, written to National Register standards, and a study of all the property types that fit into that within the entire town. What you're getting is the historical significance for those so that you then can do full National Register nominations. But those National Register nominations, because they're linked to this context, don't have to repeat that same information over again.

Dr. Glaser just want to reinforce that for this context, there is a statement in the application that says that demographics, you know, are going to be noted in in all of the occupants of the homes. It's important to do more than just mention demographics when we're preparing this context because she would rather not see just a colonial traditional history for this context. This is a really important step for Hamden to identify some of these older places and having a rich representative context will go a long way towards getting a lot of public support for additional listings. When creating the RFP, she would really want to encourage a broader context for this.

Chairman Elmore asked if this was going to necessitate any additional expertise on the part of the consultant. Ms. Scofield stated that an architectural historian can prepare an MPDF.

Dr. Glaser asked Ms. Dunne, since Hamden is a Certified Local Government community, if there is a match requirement for the grant. Ms. Dunne replied, this is a Survey and Planning grant so there is a match requirement.

Ms. S. Nelson added that she is concerned that the budget is tight if you're doing a National Register nomination with part of the funds, and if you are trying to be as inclusive and diverse in your approach to understand the whole history of Hamden. So, what flexibility is there for putting an RFP out into the marketplace to see how much work the consultants tell you that they can do for the fee involved.

Ms. Dunne replied SHPO could structure the RFP. The context statement is super important because that's the basis for subsequent nominations. SHPO could structure it so that we are asking for the significance statement and the context statement, and we could do an add alt for one house to see if that will work.

Ms. Scofield reminded the group that this is a town wide MPDF, not statewide. So, you do have a finite geographic location, and she believes it is well-known where the early properties are. That makes a big difference, In terms of cost, yes, it's tight, but again it's town wide.

Ms. Dunne added, SHPO is asking for one case study to be applied to test this context statement. We're not expecting consultants to structure a fee based on the number of individual nominations, it's just the one. Does that clarify the difference between an MPDF and a survey? You do have to know where some things are to write the context, but you're not going out and doing survey forms for them, that's not part of the MPDF cover document.

Mr. Paul Geary from the Hamden Historic Properties Commission introduced himself to the Council. They do have a list that they have been working on. The one house, that's included right now, the building dates to circa 1808. We do have another collection of houses that we'd like to apply for again in a second phase. One of the houses goes back to the pre-Revolutionary War period, the other three have dates circa early 1800s to pre-Civil War. To speak to the point about who lived there, that is our mission as well. The Commission is working with the town and the Historic Society to look at the people that lived in the houses and to tell their story, even if it's not Hamden's proudest story. One of those houses in the second wave, the pre-revolutionary one, is one of the few houses that we know in Hamden that had slaves living in it. It's kind of a hard history, but it's a story that we want to tell and want to try and represent all the people that lived in these places as best as we can.

Dr. Woodward agreed with Dr. Glaser's point and stated that it may require a rethink of how you go about the process. To unpack what you're talking about would involve title searches for all these houses and prosopography of all the people who lived in them. The context is going to come out from the interactions of various people and various houses. If you're trying to uncover neighborhood change and impact, that's going to come through multiple searches of multiple houses, and that's a different kind of process. Dr. Glaser added that she believes you must do a demographic sociological survey house by house to get that information. The Hamden Historical Society has a lot of that data.

Ms. Scofield added that the other early houses multiple property nominations that we have are really, old. They're still good, but not active anymore. To clarify Dr. Woodward's question, since there seems to be confusion about what this product is, this is a town wide history. So, you're going to set the stage, you're going to set the background context of what's going on in town during this time architecturally, what are the framing trends, what are the stylistic trends and how do those differ or compare regionally and domestically. Then, when you do individual nominations, you're going to plug into that overarching context and not have to say it all again. Then you're going to give the specific detail for that property that you're listing at that time. You shouldn't have to do deed research to write the context, but you might, when you do an individual nomination.

Dr. Woodward added that sounds easier. Ms. Scofield replied that's the point of a multiple property nomination...to do a lot of that overarching research and have that established so that individual property owner doesn't have to try to do that on their own. They just plug into that and then provide the property specific detail

when they do their nomination. It also makes it a little easier for homeowners to write nominations themselves if some of that is already done.

Dr. Glaser, being a resident of Hamden, knows that there are very few histories written out there and when there's a history provided, it's a very traditional, great white man kind of history. There is knowledge beyond that in Hamden. We are at a stage now where we need to just look beyond the founders and really, look at that broader socioeconomic, demographic content for that early period.

Mr. Geary assured the Council that that is their mission. They understood the dead white man problem going into this process. This is what excited them most about this project, to be able to tell the history that's traditional but also to find some of the non-traditional stories, even if the story is not Hamden's proudest moment. It's a history that needs to be told, and we're trying to present all the different people that did live in these houses. That is a part of the organizations goal and mission, to do something different than has been done before. That's what excited them about this project and that's why they are going so slowly. The pandemic sort of made sure we went slowly, but the idea of doing one house, then a few houses, and then few more, hopefully gives us them the time and resources to tell the story right.

4. CLG Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, Town of Madison, Study Report for proposed Old Elm Street Historic District

On a motion by Ms. S. Nelson, second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to award a Certified Local Government Historic Preservation Enhancement Grant, funded by the Historic Preservation Fund of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to the below-listed applicant in the amount shown. All federal and state grant guidelines and requirements shall be met by the below-listed applicant upon receipt of a grant as administered by the Department of Economic and Community Development.

(Y-8, N-0, Abstaining-1, Absent-2, Recused-0) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Town of Madison
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this report application. The Town of Madison requested funding in the amount of \$8,500 to obtain the consulting services of a CFR-qualified architectural historian to prepare a study report for the Old Elm Street Historic District. Staff recommended the application for funding. Study reports are described in state statute as part of the process of locally designating a historic property or a historic district. State statute 7-147 is the enabling legislation that allows municipalities to designate their own historic districts. The study report has specific components that are required, including an essay on the architectural and historical significance of the district or the property, a detailed description of the

property or district that's going to be designated, and a proposed ordinance that the municipality will pass if the designation makes it through the process.

Madison is Connecticut's newest CLG. They became a CLG a year ago and one of their basic responsibilities under the federal program and under the Connecticut procedures is to put in place local legislation for the protection of historic resources. This is what they're doing. The study report, once it's done, will come back before Council for review and comment. Once those reviews and comments are submitted, it will go on to a local public hearing, and then it goes to the town clerk who issues a ballot if it's a district. Then, 2/3 of the property owners within the boundary of the proposed district need to vote to approve the district for it to move to the local legislative body. The legislative body then votes to either accept the report, enact the local ordinance, and put it under the review of the local commission, or reject it and then the process ends. The ultimate decision on whether this becomes locally designated rests with the local legislative body.

The application today is so that Madison can move forward with hiring a consultant to prepare that study report that starts the process.

Mr. Butkus asked, once the local report is completed, what would be needed to get the property or district on the State Register. Ms. Dunne responded that, prior to 2019, anything that the Council commented favorably on in this process automatically was listed on the State Register. At this point what Ms. Dunne can do is work with Ms. Wisniewski, the State Registered Coordinator, to do an initial evaluation to determine whether the property could also be eligible for the State Register, but it would have to go through the separate State Register process. A State Register nomination is different than a study report. There are things in a study report that are not in a State Register nomination and vice versa. They could put the study report on the same agenda as a state register nomination and quite frankly you could accept or reject both, it is a separate process. Back to the question, the information gathered for the study report should be sufficient to help prepare the State Register nomination. It just won't be an automatic process as it used to be.

Mr. Butkus added that it would benefit the Town to know what the additional cost would be to go through the State Register process as well. Local districts are nice, but it's a big stick over people's head because of the local review, versus the carrot of being on the State Register and potentially being eligible for tax credits. If the goal is to facilitate people preserving their properties and having those resources made available to them, it's in the town's best interest to do that concurrent process. You may encourage people to support creating the local district if they know that at the end of it, they're going to be eligible for some incentives. There always that carrot and stick approach.

Ms. Wisniewski commented, that when dealing with local historic properties and historic districts, a local commission typically does not have any purview over a building's interior. Local historic districts and State Register and National

Register designations serve different purposes. Local designations are primarily regulatory, State Register and National Register are primarily honorary. The Council has the privilege to comment on both types of designations. The designations are very separate and so that's why we did away with the automatic listings. There were local properties that were being listed and SHPO had no idea of what the condition or integrity of the interiors were. It may have just been a shell or a facade, and that's all they were concerned with at the local level. But for this project, because we're looking at a local historic district, we should be able to get enough information so that we have a good base to build off of and so that the next step of a State Register nomination will be less expensive and more expedient.

Ms. S. Nelson commented she is a Madison resident and superbly thrilled that this effort is going to happen because the development pressure on Route 1 coming from both sides of Madison has an impact on this area and it's just terrific that the town has reached a point of agreement to go ahead and have a study done. It's as Mr. Butkus alluded to, when you're dealing with property owners who need to vote in the affirmative, if there is the ability to see that there are some financial benefits to them, it truly does sway votes and that can't be understated. Ms. Wisniewski stated that the State Register nomination would be less expensive because of the work that will be done for the local study report but the most cost-effective approach may be to combine the two work products into a single effort with one consultant team. Ms. S. Nelson asked whether the organizers of the Elm Street Historic District could potentially bring the two together if they were given more funding by the SHPO.

Chairman Elmore asked, per Ms. S. Nelson's question, the grant amount as presented this morning is \$8500. Is say \$17,000 sufficient or do you envision that once we approve this and you have this discussion that they'll come back next month for additional funding to really do what needs to be done for the detail that Paul and others have been talking about?

Ms. Dunne replied, that's a good question. The amount they've asked for without the match is sufficient based on their initial inquiry. To add the state register component, it probably would not be. But, since the CLG grants cap at \$20,000 they could easily ask for additional funding without having to provide any match, but they need to ask for that additional funding. We'd have to get a preliminary determination from Ms. Wisniewski to make sure that this could move forward.

Chairman Elmore stated that he doesn't think they need to know that now, but he thought if the Applicant should come back next month based on additional conversations and they want to also complete the State piece, it would be well received by Council.

Ms. Dunne will have that conversation with them. The town was looking ahead and that additional economic incentive does make the idea of a local designation more attractive. Although, prior to the historic homes tax credit incentive, a lot of

people were more than interested in having districts and properties locally designated without any other incentive other than just preservation.

Ms. C. Nelson asked what if they also teed up a National Register nomination, which would give you additional tax credits up. Ms. C. Nelson does understand that each of these levels of designation does require a certain depth of research but having done a local study she believes it would have been a sweeter sale to the neighborhood had we been able to talk about the benefits rather than just controlling neighbors.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

A. Unfinished Action Items

B. New Action Items

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

IX. Threatened Properties - CEPA Updates – Todd Levine

520 N. Main Street, Suffield

Mr. Levine reported that he met last week at the Attorney General's Office with Mr. Peter Dodd, the property owner, to talk about options. This was referred to the Attorney General's office at the May 4th meeting.

Staff is going to get back to Mr. Dodd by the end of this week. He had suggested moving the tobacco shed off site and out of the historic district. That is very complicated because the barn is 90 feet long. It would have to be dismantled, at least in parts, and there is often significant loss when that happens so.

Mr. Levine stated that he is looking at all the options and we'll get back to him, but it is expected that unless the shed is moved within the historic district, it will remain a referral to the Attorney General's office. It's already been referred, but the next step will be to do a little more research about moving it within the historic district and then it will go upstairs to the actual Deputy Attorney General and then to the Attorney General.

17 Gravel Street, Mystic

Mr. Levine stated that he is continuing to work on this matter. There is an agreement in place, but Mr. Levine has not been able to get in touch with the owner for about a week, which is a little distressing.

Fourth Ward Historic District. Greenwich

Greenwich's 4th Ward Historic District is threatened with 7 demolitions because of a proposed housing project. Mr. Levine as gone out to the site and met with owners and developers and explained how the CEPA process works, and he thought everything was going in the right direction.

But last week the First Selectman reached out to the Attorney General's office about going forward with CEPA, so we'll see how this goes. Mr. Levine expects this will now be on the HPC agenda sooner than later, perhaps the end of summer or September.

X. Preservation Restrictions

a. Norfolk Music Shed, Request for Advisory Opinion on New Addition.

On a motion by Ms. Carnell., second Ms. C. Nelson this application was brought to the table for discussion.

Ms. Julie Carmelich, Preservation Restriction Coordinator with SHPO, introduced herself to the Council. Ms. Carmelich wanted to discuss a proposed addition to the Music Shed in Norfolk, which is in the Norfolk's Historic District. Before she went into the details of the proposal, Ms. Carmelich took a few minutes to provide Council with a little bit of background about the restrictions program.

Ms. Carmelich explained that every time there's an HRF grant that's closed out, there is a preservation restriction imposed on the property. Also, any time the General Services Administration or the State of Connecticut deaccessioned a historic property, it comes with a preservation restriction. Some federal grants, such as Save America's Treasures, Maritime Heritage, and other capital improvement grants from the National Park Service also come with preservation restrictions.

There are currently about 130 active preservation restrictions in the program. Some time out, some fall off the list, others come back on. SHPO generally runs between 125 and 150 restrictions at a time.

In recent years, we have had the assistance of preservation Connecticut, specifically Mr. Mike Forino, who has been a superstar in helping to administer this program with Ms. Carmelich. Mr. Forino does the bulk of the annual site visits and meetings with folks. Together, they make decisions internally and administer the program.

The Historic Preservation Council has an opportunity to weigh in on preservation restrictions under statute and they have in the past. In fact, under previous administrators of the program, everything was brought to Council from in-kind replacement, maintenance, repair, etc. At that point, Council decided that a lot of those items could be handled internally by staff. But Ms. Carmelich stated that she does bring substantial alterations to Council because she values the Council's opinion and expertise and would like input on drawings and plans that come in for new construction and demolition. She

has also brought requests to subdivide property to the Council because that is also an important aspect of a historical property that could impact its integrity.

Ms. Carmelich shared a PowerPoint presentation and described the slides to the Council. Mr. Jack Beecher from Yale University and the School of Music was on the call. Mr. Beecher is managing the site. Architect John Martin was also on the call to answer any questions. Ms. Carmelich and Mr. Forino both met with Mr. Beecher and Mr. Martin and a couple other representatives approximately two weeks ago to talk about the plan. We had some immediate concerns about the addition and its exterior design that mimicked the historic portions of the building just a little bit too closely. As included in Ms. Carmelich's notes, Standard number nine really calls for creating new construction that complements but doesn't mimic the historic core. Ms. Carmelich provided some further Park Service briefs and guidance for anyone who wanted to take a closer look. Those briefs and guidance were also provided to Mr. Beecher and Mr. Martin after the meeting so that they could review the same material that everybody else was going to review as well. After the meeting, Mr. Beecher and Mr. Martin put their heads together and came up with the plan that Ms. Carmelich has presented in the packet, which had some alterations.

The revised plan included the removal of a cupola that was proposed and altered the window bays as well so that the pattern of the window openings didn't mimic the historic. Following this submission, Ms. Carmelich and Mr. Forino pushed for a bit more differentiation. Ms. Carmelich shared a second set of revised plans. She pointed out that the portion of the historic core adjacent to the addition is actually set on piers. As a way of carrying the horizontal line of the piers across a portion of the new addition, the revised plan sheets show lattice work below a porch on the exterior of a proposed hyphen as opposed to shingle cladding.

Ms. Carmelich pointed out that they are proposing to do some interior work in the Music Shed itself. We have no objection to that. We also have no objection to the size or scale of this new addition. They're an expanding organization and they have a lot of need for rehearsal space for their musicians that come. We don't question that. The interior arrangement, or the program that they have designed for is needed. This addition corresponds to their need.

SHPO is most concerned about is whether the exterior design goes far enough to differentiate the old and the new without also losing sight of what this property is and how it can complement the historic building. She is happy to take any thoughts or questions about this plan. Mr. Martin and Mr. Beecher were present to answer any other questions that maybe she cannot.

Ms. Acly asked if the cedar shingles on the proposed new addition would match the existing shingles. Ms. Carmelich replied, that is correct. Ms. Acly asked whether there have been discussions about changing the exterior cladding material on the hyphen or the addition. Ms. Carmelich confirmed that those conversations have been held and she would agree on a different siding for a portion of the new construction. The organization also has a board of trustees that also have opinions as well. We're all trying to find a balance here.

Mr. Butkus mentioned the possibility of changing the exterior cladding material only on the hyphen and that may be sufficient.

Ms. S Nelson agreed with Mr. Butkus. The idea behind this Standard is to be able to look at a building and to understand its story. Cladding the inside of the porch within the hyphen with a different material may be enough to communicate the break between old and new while also avoiding being too different.

Dr. Faber also stated that she felt a change to the hyphen could accomplish the mission.

Ms. Carnell asked about window style and any of the details that differentiate them in the addition. If the intent is to retain the shingle siding, a simple change in the windows could be enough to create more differentiation.

Mr. John Martin commented that it is important to look at this in the larger context of the whole campus. There are three structures out there that would kind of be classified as barn type structures as opposed to the houses and cottages that are out there and all three of those structures have wood shingle siding on them. Mr. Martin stated that he would like to maintain that consistency on the campus.

Ms. Carmelich summarized the discussion and thanked Council for their input.

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney briefly reported that Dr. Glaser was appointed to her second term on the Council. The appointment was backdated to 2020, so Dr. Glaser's second term will expire in 2024. There are also three Council members whose terms are expiring later this year, Chairman Elmore, Vice Chairwoman C. Nelson, and Ms. Carnell. Mr. Kinney will be reaching out to those members to begin that process.

Mr. Kinney also reported that beginning in July, SHPO staff will be in the office on Wednesdays. This is part of a larger DECD initiative to have staff together in the office one day a week.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

Ms Shapiro reported that, unfortunately, the museums have been unable to get a full seasonal staff complement this year, for the second year in a row. There will be five seasonal employees, a few of which will have multiple reporting stations. Neither Henry Whitfield nor Prudence Crandall will have a full-time assigned seasonal. Ms Shapiro is very thankful to have staff member Jodi Polsgrove who will "pinch hit" for staff at the museums as needed. Her primary duty stations will alternate between Old New-Gate Prison and the Eric Sloane Museum. The salary for state seasonal employees has finally been raised to a level where the museums can compete for workers with fast food chains, but we were unable to advertise the positions this year with the new salary, which may account for the low numbers of applicants.

The Prudence Crandall Museum will open for CT Open House Day on June 11, for timed tours. The other museums have opened and have been experiencing steady visitation.

Prudence Crandall Museum

Kronenberger has almost completed work at the museum, however the building is already experiencing bleed-through of rust from the nail heads that we believe were improperly treated prior to the paint application. That situation will be discussed onsite later this week.

All Conex storage boxes are empty and have been removed. The first floor has been emptied of miscellaneous debris (years of stored materials that are not collections) and the final draft of the exhibit interpretive script has been approved for production of exhibit panels. Staff are meeting with the designer on Friday. These initial panels will be mobile and designed for flexibility in the space. We will be testing them for the season and collecting reactions and evaluation from visitors. Kudos to Joan DiMartino who has accomplished a truly Herculean task!

New-Gate

Old New-Gate will be the site of the Prison Arts Program annual fundraiser next week. There will be an art installation, and much more. In addition, the Justice Dance Performance Project Ensemble (formerly the Judy Dworin Performance Project) will be presenting “Emergence” on June 24th on site.

This is a piece originally commissioned by the Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, and is a dance piece framed by the words of Albert Woodfox, who endured 43 years of solitary confinement for a crime he did not commit and joined with the voices of contemporary women and men inside and out of prison. Emergence portrays the extreme isolation and confinement of incarceration while offering hope for a more open, just, and kind world. This performance is being funded through the CT Cultural Heritage funds that the museum received from CT Humanities.

New-Gate also received a Save America’s Treasure’s grant for stabilization and access to the four-story cell block. One response to the RPF was received, and we are pleased with the proposal. Ms. Shapiro will be happy to announce the contractor at the next HPC meeting.

Henry Whitfield

The museum will take part in Make Music Day, an international celebration of the power of live music that takes place each year on the summer solstice, June 21. The museum will be hosting The Afro-Semitic Experience, a group that combines spiritual, sacred, groovy, moving, and sassy musical moments! <https://www.afrosemiticexperience.net/music> They are funded by a portion of the grant from the CT Cultural Heritage Fund from CT Humanities.

Meanwhile, the museum has been fighting termites in the visitor center (treatment is underway) and honeybees in the chimney (deemed “simply visiting” by a local beekeeper!)

The museum has been experiencing a steady stream of visitors, while writing text and designing a new introductory exhibit for the education shed, which will be the first test of the museum’s new interpretive plan that will put the Henry Whitfield House into a colonial revival context.

Eric Sloane

Word is spreading about the “new” Eric Sloane Museum, as evidenced by an email from state Representative Maria Horn asking if the museum would accept a citation from the state in honor of its “delayed” birthday celebration and reopening. Of course, we are thrilled.

The Museum will celebrate the July fourth holiday on July 2, with live music (Dave Paton, if you follow country dance music!), two craft/trade demos, the Friends of the Museum offering interpretation of the cabin, and food for purchase and cupcakes for everyone! Staff is very excited to welcome Charmaine Thacker, who is Eric Sloane’s last living stepchild, and her family. The traditional noon bellringing will take place, as usual, on July 4th.

XIII. Old Business

XIV. New Business

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies – Jane Montanaro, Preservation Connecticut

Ms. Montanaro reported that on Sunday June 5th, 2022, at the Blackstone Library in Branford, Preservation CT is hosting Chris Wigren of the PCT staff and Ms. Scofield of the SHPO staff. They will be giving a presentation on Connecticut’s landscape heritage and Frederick Law Olmsted– SHPO presentation on Olmsted and CT’s Landscape Heritage. On June 11th, Preservation CT is hosting a gallery opening at the New Britain Art League for their Historic Landscape photo contests. They will be announcing the winners of the photo contest and conducting tours of Walnut Hill Park. Finally, today at noon on ZOOM, New London Historian Tom Shook will be speaking about the Black Heritage Trail in New London, 15 sites related to Black life in the City including enslavement, migration, and civil rights.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment

This will be Dr. Walter Woodward’s last HPC meeting. He will be retiring after 17 years, 11 months. The group thanked him for his service, and we wish him well.

On a motion by Dr. Woodward, second Ms. C. Nelson, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Deborah D. Gaston
Jonathan Kinney

***Next regularly scheduled Council meeting:
Wednesday July 6, 2022 – Meeting format to be determined***