

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Wednesday, March 3, 2021 @ 9:30 am**

MINUTES

This meeting was conducted in two parts, each on a separate online platform. The first part took place remotely via Microsoft Teams. All the agenda items except Item IX.a. were heard during this portion. Attendees of the meeting then switched over to the Zoom platform for Part 2 of the meeting where the 151-153 East Main Street project in Clinton (Agenda item IX.a) was heard.

Part 1 – Microsoft Teams

Council: Ms. Marguerite Carnell, Dr. Margaret Faber, Ms. Karyn Gilvarg, Dr. Leah Glaser, Ms. Christine Nelson, Chairwoman Sara Nelson, Dr. Sarah Sportman and Dr. Walter Woodward

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

Guests: Mr. David Cooley
Ms. Marissa Gibbs
Ms. Diana Ding and Ms. Michele Rulnick
Ms. Mary Falvey, CT Preservation Action
Ms. Jane Montanaro, Preservation Connecticut
Mr. Chris Wigren, Preservation Connecticut
Ms. Nanette Armstrong

I. Call to Order for Part 1 of meeting

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Chairwoman Nelson read aloud the Public Comments Procedures.

III. Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest

Chairwoman Nelson read aloud the Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest.

Dr. Faber disclosed that she is a member of the Middlesex YMCA (Agenda Item V.c.) but was not aware that an application was submitted and will not benefit personally in any way because of the project being awarded funds.

IV. Review and Approval of Minutes

a. February 3, 2021

On a motion by Dr. Faber, Second by Ms. Carnell, the February 3, 2021 minutes were approved with corrections.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining -1) (Roll call vote)

Chairwoman Nelson requested that the order of the agenda be rearranged and that item XIII. Old Business be moved up and heard immediately following agenda item V.d.
(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

V. State Historic Preservation Grants – Action Items

a. Survey and Planning Grant, Arts and Crafts Association d/b/a Gallery 53, Condition Assessment for 53 Colony Street, Meriden

On a motion by Ms. Christine Nelson, Second by Ms. Gilvarg, the Historic Preservation Council votes to recommend the award of 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-7, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Arts and Crafts Association, d/b/a Gallery 53
Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Arts and Crafts Association d/b/a Gallery 53 requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 to obtain the consulting services of a 36 CFR-qualified architect and appropriate team to prepare a condition assessment of 53 Colony Street. Staff recommended the application for funding. Ms. Dunne and Ms. Fink met with the Board and staff of Gallery 53 in Meriden. Originally the applicant wanted to apply for a Historic Restoration Fund grant, but SHPO typically recommends a Survey and Planning Grant first so that the applicant has the information needed to assess the property and determine what work to prioritize. Mr. David Cooley was on the line to answer any questions or concerns.

Dr. Faber asked what was the purpose of the legal support service in the budget? Ms. Dunne replied the applicant acquired an attorney pro-bono in case any legal issues arose due to dual ownership of the property and access to the building. The assessment will be done for the entire exterior, but the interior assessment will only be for the side of the building owned by the gallery. Mr. Cooley added that money was budgeted for that purpose in case any issues arose.

Chairwoman Nelson asked if there are existing building plans. Mr. Cooley replied the art gallery has been an ongoing operation, but on the 51 side of the building, the owner had the area cleared out due to a hoarder situation. The owner of that side does have floor plans approved by the city. With a consultant's help, the applicant will be able to modify the top floor to generate additional revenue. This is no floor plan for the gallery side now. Chairwoman Nelson added that she asked the question so that it could be included in the scope of work for the grant and assist the applicant going forward. Ms. Dunne added that this would be added to the RFP. Mr. Cooley agreed that this was a good point, and he will make sure building plans are included.

Chairwoman Nelson asked Mr. Cooley what work he was hoping to get done with a Historic Restoration Fund grant. Mr. Cooley replied that the roof was a priority. It is not an emergency yet, but it does need repairs. Different contractors that looked at the roof were not in agreement on the urgency of the repairs, so the applicant is looking for an unbiased opinion. There are also other repairs and painting that need to be done. Chairwoman Nelson suggested to Ms. Dunne that the applicant acquire a consultant that is a roofing expert. Mr. Cooley added there is some water coming in through roof, but it was not urgent.

Chairwoman Nelson asked a question on behalf of Council member Mr. Tom Elmore, who was not present at the meeting. In terms of the grant application, specifically about the Condition Assessment and the Solutions on page 13, can the applicant clarify what he is looking for from a roofing perspective and from a budget standpoint. Mr. Cooley replied that from a roofing perspective, he believes they have at least 5 years left on the current roof with repair work so there is time to figure out what the best long-term solution is. The applicant would like to get the most out of the building and would also like a professional architect to examine access and egress issues. This building is 127 years old and is the heart and soul of the downtown area, with the gallery being the center point. Mr. Cooley thanked SHPO and the Council for their time and assistance.

b. Survey and Planning Grant, New Milford Trust for Historic Preservation, Condition Assessment for 34 Main St, New Milford

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, Second Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of 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-7, N-0, Abstaining -1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: New Milford Trust for Historic Preservation

Amount: \$20,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The New Milford Trust for Historic Preservation requested funding in the amount of \$20,000 in order to obtain the consulting services of a 36 CFR-qualified architect and appropriate team to prepare a condition assessment for the Nathaniel Taylor/Charles Barlow home at 34 Main Street in New Milford. Staff recommended this application for funding. Ms. Dunne and former SHPO staff member Ms. Alyssa Lozupone met with Mr. Greg Farmer about 2 years ago in New Milford and this house was viewed. SHPO staff visited the property to see what work needed to be done and what grants the applicant could apply for to complete the work. Mr. Rob Burkhart of the New Milford trust for Historic Preservation was not on the call, but Ms. Dunne answered any questions or concerns.

Dr. Faber mentioned that on Page 7 of the application, the Applicant is asking for recommendations for potential uses of the building that would generate a revenue stream, which would be more of a Feasibility Study. How in depth are they planning on going within the Condition's Assessment? Ms. Dunne replied that \$20,000 will not cover more than the Condition's Assessment so there will not be any in depth feasibility study although it would be good to know what the organization has in mind.

Ms. Gilvarg agreed with Dr. Faber. Ms. Gilvarg also wanted to know if the grounds will be part of the Conditions Assessment? Ms. Dunne replied that they are generally not. Ms. Gilvarg also asked if the contents of the building were going to be evaluated or would that be a different project? Ms. Dunne replied that will be a whole other project and she will suggest that the Applicant apply for an IMLS grant or a Collections Assessment.

Mr. Elmore sent in a comment by way of Chairwoman Nelson. Mr. Elmore wanted to mention that when the applicant is evaluating potential uses for the property that the landscaping and site should be considered as well as parking regulations and zoning, which can both affect potential uses.

Ms. Carnell asked if there are existing drawings of the building? Ms. Dunne replied that there are not, but that they will be included in the RFP as drawings are critical for documenting the structure and planning future projects. Ms. Dunne may make this a required product for all condition assessments going forward.

c. Survey and Planning Grant, Middlesex YMCA, National Register Nomination for 99 Union Street (the Northern Middlesex Y Building), Middletown

On a motion by Dr. Faber, Second by Ms. Gilvarg, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of 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-7, N-0, Abstaining -1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Middlesex YMCA
Amount: \$10,000

Ms. Dunne presented this application. The Middlesex YMCA requested funding in the amount of \$10,000 in order to obtain the consulting services of a 36-CFR qualified architectural historian to prepare a National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Northern Middlesex YMCA building located at 99 South Union Street in Middletown. Staff recommended the application for funding. Ms. Dunne, Ms. Wiesnewski, and Ms. Scofield all agreed that an individual National Register nomination would be best for this resource. They also agreed that \$10,000 will be sufficient funding to complete the project. Ms. Diana Ding and Ms. Michelle Rulnick from the Middlesex YMCA were on the line to answer any questions.

Dr. Faber pointed out that on the project timeline, Exhibit D, the date needs to be changed to the 3rd instead of the 1st upon approval. Ms. Dunne agreed to revise the date.

Ms. Gilvarg asked if the site and landscaping were going to be assessed as part of the nomination. Ms. Dunne replied that these are generally considered as part of a nomination. The consultant, if hired, will coordinate that with Ms. Scofield if the grant is approved. Ms. Scofield mentioned that the NPS is paying closer attention to landscapes and that a section has recently been added to the National Register nomination to recognize landscape features.

Mr. Elmore submitted a question through Chairwoman Nelson. Mr. Elmore was curious whether the amount of the grant was sufficient for a building of this size? Ms. Dunne replied she consulted with Ms. Scofield and she felt the amount of the grant would be enough for this project.

d. Partners in Preservation Grant, CT Trust for Historic Preservation d/b/a/ Preservation Connecticut, CT Olmsted Landscape Documentation, Statewide

On a motion by Ms. Gilvarg, Second by Ms. Christine Nelson, the Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of a Partners In Preservation 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-7, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation, d/b/a Preservation Connecticut

Amount: \$175,000.00

Ms. Dunne presented this application. Preservation Connecticut requested funding in the amount of \$175,000 to obtain the consulting services of a qualified consultant(s) to develop a historic context and survey of historic landscapes in Connecticut designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., and the Olmsted Firm. Staff recommended the application for funding. This effort corresponds with the beginning of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr.'s birth which will be in 2022. Despite how active Mr. Olmsted and the firm were here in Connecticut, not many of the related sites have been formally documented. The consultant will develop a historic context focusing on Olmsted's work in Connecticut and will document selected Olmsted sites across the state. A landscape survey form will be produced that will be used to document the sites and will be able to be used for future projects as well. Ms. Scofield and Mr. Chris Wigren of Preservation Connecticut were in attendance to answer any questions.

Ms. Christine Nelson asked if the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) were involved with this project since they are great at celebrating Olmsted every year. Ms. Scofield replied yes.

The National Association for Olmsted Parks started the nationwide initiative for state, local, and national groups to celebrate Olmsted's work, recreation, and landscapes. Connecticut ASLA is absolutely engaged in that effort. Mr. Wigren, Ms. Montanaro, and Ms. Scofield were scheduled to have an online meeting yesterday with CT ASLA, but Ms. Scofield lost power and could not host. Connecticut ASLA is looking to update their Olmsted Trail website. They will not be doing a physical survey, they are looking to update their site with research materials, which dovetails nicely with this effort. The National Association for Olmsted Parks has an olmstedonline.org site where an interactive map displays Olmsted firm projects and links to archives with digitized information. NAOP is also looking for source materials that may not be in the National Archives. There may be local material they have not accessed yet, so this project works well with those efforts. Ms. Barbara Yager is part of the Advisory group, ASLA and on the board of NAOP. In terms of history, we are still missing the context of Connecticut as part of the larger Olmsted story.

Dr. Woodward asked if landscape designers or historians make a distinction between the projects designed by Olmsted, Sr. and the ones designed by the firm later? And in CT, how many are Olmsted himself and how many were the firm? Ms. Scofield replied there is a distinction between the properties. A lot of the Connecticut properties are associated with his sons. NAOP is also looking at the legacy of Olmsted, Sr. training and educating other landscape designers. Olmsted started his career here in Connecticut and it is where his inspiration came from, so telling this story is very important.

Ms. Gilvarg mentioned that there are a lot of projects credited to Olmsted, but he may have only been involved through correspondence, such as Edgewood Park in New Haven. New Haven may deny having any information because it requires time and research to find them, but Ms. Gilvarg is happy to assist.

Chairwoman Nelson mentioned that this is a terrific and exciting project, but what is the expectation from a product standpoint? The application mentions that there are 298 Olmsted landscape commissions in CT. Preservation CT's budget allots \$85,000 for the actual survey. It appears that approximately 1.75 to 3 hours were allocated per site. Ms. Scofield stated that it is 8 hours per form. There is also \$65,000 for the context so a lot of research time will be included in the writing of the context.

Ms. Scofield expects that we will not have legal access to all 298 sites, or some have been destroyed or they are already listed. SHPO will try to coordinate the clustering of sites to minimize travel. The eight hours per site is based on the completion of approximately 150 forms. Ms. Scofield priced out the work at \$65/hour which is around what a mid-level person at a firm would cost. If all 150 forms are not completed, that's okay, what we are really trying to understand is where these sites are in CT and what their status is.

Ms. Carnell stated that, from the standpoint of a consultant, she feels the hourly rate is a little lean, and perhaps a more senior person could train the mid-level employees to pick out the subtleties in the landscapes.

Also, does the 8 hours per form include travel time? Ms. Scofield responded that she can't anticipate how each different firm would work the hours, but she would hope that the consulting firm/team would include that in their proposal.

Chairwomen Nelson reiterated that there is enthusiasm and support for the project, the Council just wants to make sure that there are sufficient funds to hire an appropriate team with in-depth knowledge to develop a great product. Chairwoman Nelson asked if Ms. Scofield had a team of people working with her. Ms. Scofield responded that she has been working for four years with an advisory team. She will be creating the landscape form with the advice of the advisory team.

Ms. Montanaro mentioned that Mr. Wigren has an extensive background in studying landscapes. Preservation CT is looking forward to administering this grant and they have had many generous offers of assistance. This is going to be a great scholarship tool and a wonderful engagement tool for the organization, and they are looking forward to promoting the work the consultants are doing on social media, a variety of programs, and their newsletter. They are also looking forward to partnering with other groups working on promoting Olmsted's work this year.

XIII. Old Business

a. Historic Restoration Fund Grant, First Church of Christ Congregational in Suffield, exterior painting of wood trim, Suffield (Item 5B on 2/3/2021 agenda – tabled until 3/3/21)

On a motion by Ms. Carnell, Second by Dr. Faber, the Historic Preservation Council voted to bring this item back to the table for consideration. I
(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1) (Roll Call Vote)

The Historic Preservation Council voted to recommend the award of a Historic Restoration Fund 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-7, N-0, Abstaining –1) (Roll call vote)

Applicant: First Church of Christ Congregational in Suffield
Amount: \$35,000

Ms. Fink presented this application. The First Church of Christ Congregational is requesting funding in the amount of \$35,000 in order to repaint the church's exterior wooden surfaces including doors, windows, and door frames and trim, and related areas such as tower louvers and trim, exterior paneling, and portico ceilings. Staff recommended the application for funding.

At the February HPC meeting, Mr. Elmore raised concerns about the impacts of a lift on the gravestones in the cemetery that abuts the building.

Ms. Fink put Mr. Elmore in contact with the Town and the owner of the cemetery, the First School Society. A plan was discussed to require a contractor that had experience with similar situations. The contractor that provided the quote will be able to paint the windows on the cemetery side of the building using scaffolding in a manner that would protect the gravestones and accomplish the project in a sensitive manner.

Regarding the questions about the budget that Council had at the last meeting, Ms. Fink explained that the applicant used a quote of \$61,000. SHPO typically adds a 20% contingency, which would be \$12,000. However, because the applicant only has about \$35,000 to spend on the project, the contingency was reduced, bringing the total project amount to \$70,000 and the grant amount to \$35,000.

Ms. Fink also confirmed that there is a revised scope of work and that 32 windows will be painted as part of the project.

Chairwoman Nelson clarified that Mr. Elmore was not working directly with the applicant, he just made the introduction since he knew the correct town official for the applicant to speak with.

Ms. Gilvarg added there was a minor typo on the budget amount on Page 21 of the application. Chairwoman Nelson added that the typo does not change the amount of the application in anyway. Ms. Fink will correct the error.

VI. State Register of Historic Places Nominations

VII. Local Historic District/Property Study Report/s

VIII. Archaeological Preserves

X. Preservation Restrictions

XI. Report on State Historic Preservation Office – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney commended the SHPO staff for their hard work over the past couple of months, not just on their regular program work, but also on special projects like the Olmsted project Council just heard about and the preparation for the HPC meetings, especially when there is a CEPA hearing.

One of the other things SHPO staff has been focusing on was federal historic preservation advocacy week. Mr. Kinney asked Ms. Dunne to speak briefly on her efforts to arrange meetings with Connecticut's federal legislators.

Ms. Dunne explained that Preservation Action and NCSHPO co-sponsor a preservation advocacy week each year, typically around the second week of March. SHPO generally sends one or two staff members down to D.C. and they were ready to go in 2020, but it didn't happen because of the stay at home order. This provides more flexibility because SHPO can have more staff and partners in each meeting, since they are virtual.

The event usually takes place over 3 days, but on Wednesday SHPO tries to meet with each member of the CT congressional delegation. The primary request is for continued support of the Historic Preservation Fund, which is a congressional appropriation. We have been successful in the past as the amounts have been increasing every year, which is a great benefit to our office. There are also various other legislative asks that come up each year. Ms. Kathy Maher will be attending and possibly Dr. Leah Glaser. The event is wonderful because it gives SHPO an opportunity to interact with other SHPOs from across the country and to get a national perspective.

XII. Report on Museum Properties – Liz Shapiro

The Eric Sloane Museum and Old New-Gate Prison both plan to reopen in May. The Whitfield Museum is a bit more complicated because of the building's architecture and layout (in the Whitfield House and in the visitor's center), so it may not open until the early summer. Much of the reopening schedule will have to do with the vaccine roll-out and when the museum staff receives their vaccinations.

The museums are also waiting on the implementation of a new Point of Sales system which should be in place by the end of May. This is a bigger project than it may seem, because of the transfer of data from the old system to the new, as well as the implementation of an online sales platform – all of which needs to interface with the financial systems that are used by our finance office.

There is a substantial completion date of July 2021 for the work at the Prudence Crandall Museum. Curator Joan DiMartino is currently scheduling presentations on the Prudence Crandall story, and the history of the museum. She will be collecting feedback from participants, so the presentations will serve double duty as focus groups for ongoing interpretive planning. Her next presentation will be to employees of the state's judicial branch.

In general, the museums continue to prepare for reopening. SHPO has been approved to hire up to seven seasonal employees, and Human Resources should have those positions listed in the next week or so.

Ms. Shapiro will also be presenting at NEMA's CT Museums advocacy online forum next week.

XIV. New Business

a. Update on Historic Preservation Council Appointments – Jonathan Kinney

Mr. Kinney reported that there will be 6 slots on the HPC to be filled this year. Four members are currently serving on expired terms and will be replaced by new members. These are Dr. Margaret Faber, Ms. Karyn Gilvarg, Ms. Kathy Maher, and Chairwoman Sara Nelson. Two slots are open with the resignation of Dr. Jeff Partridge and Dr. Fiona Vernell. Mr. Kinney has sent out 15 invitations statewide to potential new appointees. He has received positive responses from five people. The rest have declined due to time constraints or conflicts in their schedules.

Mr. Kinney will follow up with documentation from the Governor's office to be completed by the people who have responded. The plan is to do two separate rounds of appointments. The first group will fill the two empty positions and one of the expired terms.

The idea is that the experienced members will be able to work alongside the new members for at least a few meetings. The SHPO hopes that second round of appointments will be made in the late Spring or early Summer to replace the additional three members. Mr. Kinney hope to have and update at next month's meeting.

XV. Liaison with Public & Private Agencies

a. Ms. Jane Montanaro – Preservation Connecticut

Ms. Montanaro mentioned that Friday is the last day to submit nominations for the 2021 Preservation Awards. Nominations can be sent in on the website, preservationct.org. They look forward to seeing all the great projects that come in.

b. Ms. Mary Falvey – Connecticut Preservation Action

Ms. Falvey mentioned that the Governor's budget is looking good. The budget is not taking anything from the Community Investment Act (CIA), which is considered an off-budget fund. The Planning and Development Committee of the General Assembly is holding a hearing Friday on House Bill 6547, which involves putting together a working group on the preservation of historic properties. CPA will be putting messages out in support and requesting greater representation on the working group by local preservation groups. As currently written, the legislation includes only SHPO, Preservation Connecticut, and local historical societies, but no mention of the local groups that focus specifically on preservation. CPA had their annual meeting Monday and welcomed new board member Aaron Marcavitch, the new Executive Director of Connecticut Landmarks.

XVI. Public Forum

XVII. Adjournment of Part 1 of meeting

On a motion by Ms. Christine Nelson, Second by Dr. Faber, the Council voted to adjourn Part I of the meeting.

(Y-7, N-0, Abstaining-1) (Roll call vote)

Part 1 of the meeting was adjourned at 10:48 a.m.

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

----- x
In Re Property at: :
: :
151 East Main Street and :
153 East Main Street, : March 3, 2021
Clinton, Connecticut :
: :
-----x

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING - PART 2

(via Videoconference)

Held before Historic Preservation Council Members:

SARA O. NELSON, Chair
KARYN M. GILVARG, Vice Chair
MARGUERITE CARNELL
DR. MARGARET M. FABER
DR. LEAH GLASER
CHRISTINE NELSON
DR. WALTER WOODWARD, State Historian
DR. SARA SPORTMAN, State Archeologist

Transcription Services of
FALZARANO COURT REPORTERS, LLC
4 Somerset Lane
Simsbury, CT 06070
860.651.0258
www.falzaranocourtreporters.com

A P P E A R A N C E S:

State Historic Preservation Office:

Elizabeth Shapiro
Jonathan Kinney
Deborah Gaston
Mary Dunne
Marena Wisniewski
Todd Levine
Cathy Labadia
Erin Fink
Jenny Scofield

Preservation Connecticut:

Brad Schide, Preservation Connecticut
David Goslin, Crosskey Architects
James Grant, James Grant Associates

Resync Property Solutions, LLC:

Jay Kurup, Resync
Benjamin Whelan, BTW Construction
Anthony Bolduc, Stevens & Associates
Daniel Morrisey, Morrisey Engineering
Keith Ainsworth, Esq.

Members from the Public:

Peggy Adler
Alan Kravitz
Megan Stine, Clinton Historical Society
Jake Clinton
Gloria McQueeney, Clinton Historic District Comm.
Bob Bishoff

AGENDA

- 1
- 2 I. Call to Order for Part 2 of Meeting
- 3 II. Review of Public Comment Procedures
- 4 III. Code of Ethics/Conflict of Interest
- 5 IX. Threatened Properties
- 6 XVII. Adjournment of Part 2 of Meeting
- 7
-

8

9

10 (Proceedings commenced at 11:03 a.m.)

11

12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on

13 record. Today's date is March 3rd, 2021 and the

14 time is 11:02. Thank you.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you. This is Sara

16 Nelson, I'm the Historic Preservation Council

17 Chair. I am convening Part 2 of the meeting.

18 The Council members seated with me this morning

19 are Karyn Gilvarg, the Vice Chair, Marguerite

20 Carnell, Margaret Faber, Leah Glaser, Christine

21 Nelson, Sara Sportman and Walter Woodward. And

22 we have quorum.

23 I would just like to go over a few

24 housekeeping things before we get started. So

25 Part 2 of the meeting is scheduled to run between

1 11:00 and 12:30 p.m. We will be unable to extend
2 the time of the meeting past 12:30, so we will
3 make every effort to move as expeditiously as
4 possible through all of the different
5 presentations and the conversations there
6 happening.

7 For those of you who are visitors today
8 I just want to identify the process, the sort of
9 format for one of these agenda items. I will
10 read the motion, the motion will be moved and
11 seconded. There will be a presentation by staff.
12 After the presentation by staff there will be a
13 presentation of not more than 20 minutes by the
14 owner and their representatives.

15 Following that there will be a
16 presentation of not more than 20 minutes by our
17 statutory partner, Preservation Connecticut.
18 Excuse me, Preservation Connecticut is going
19 first with the owner following second. My
20 apologies.

21 There will be an opportunity for
22 council members to ask questions at the end of
23 each of those two presentations, and then after
24 we have heard from those two parties members of
25 the public will be invited to speak. Some of you

1 may have already submitted your names and any
2 written statements to staff. If you haven't
3 already done so the letter that you have can be
4 directed via email to Marena Wisniewski, and it's
5 Marena.wisniewski -- Marena, is that correct?

6 MS. WISNIEWSKI: That's correct, Sara.

7 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. @ct.gov, who will
8 be tracking all of the letters and making them
9 available into the record.

10 Marena will be helping me by
11 identifying for people who are speaking when
12 they're getting close to the end of the time
13 limit. So for somebody who has been given 20
14 minutes for a presentation, we'll give you a 5-
15 minute warning and 1-minute warning. And for
16 members of the public given the number of people
17 who wish to address us today there is a 5-minute
18 maximum and we will help you by giving you a 1-
19 minute warning. And we're doing this just to
20 make sure that we're hearing from everybody.

21 And we are interested in getting new
22 information which each presentation. So in the
23 interest of time and out of fairness to all, if
24 you are in agreement with the points that have
25 previously been made by one of your colleagues

1 just signal your agreement as opposed to
2 restating again so that we can continue to get as
3 many people speaking as possible.

4 We ask before you speak that you
5 identify yourselves by name and that you state
6 your affiliation for the record. And let me just
7 see if there's anything else.

8 If there are members of the public who
9 have not submitted their information and who are
10 lately coming into this process after we go
11 through having heard from everybody whose name we
12 have in advance we will ask for a show of hands
13 via Zoom and we will then call on people in the
14 order in which we see them.

15 The last thing I want just to review
16 for the owner's benefit and the Connecticut
17 Trust's benefit is that Council had a 196-page
18 agenda packet and I would just like a show of
19 hands for all the council members who have been
20 able to read through all of that material, and
21 that's just to demonstrate that we have a
22 thorough understanding of the information that's
23 been submitted to date. So in the interest of
24 time you don't need to restate things that are in
25 the agenda packet. We'll be looking for new

1 information.

2 Okay. We have a Code of
3 Conduct/Conflict of Interest policy that we
4 follow. The Historic Preservation Council votes
5 on matters which provide leadership service and
6 economic benefits to property owners and
7 consultants, local governments and not-for-profit
8 organizations. Given this responsibility and to
9 maintain the highest professional standards in
10 the discharge of our duties it is important to
11 maintain a strong code of ethics for all council
12 members and Department employees.

13 In order to avoid possible violations
14 of the Department of Economic and Community
15 Development ethics statement it is necessary for
16 the Council to be aware of any situations in
17 which there's real potential or apparent conflict
18 of interest involving anyone here. A conflict of
19 interest may occur when the public official's
20 participation in agency matters results in
21 personal financial gain.

22 You have been provided of the DECD
23 ethics statement in governing state statutes.
24 Having reviewed them in today's agenda members of
25 the council and staff are now asked to disclose

1 any affiliation with entities or projects that
2 may create a conflict of interest as defined by
3 agency policy and pursuant to Connecticut General
4 Statute 1-79 through 1-89 entitled Code of Ethics
5 for Public Officials. Once disclosed the member
6 or staff may recuse themselves from that
7 particular agenda item.

8 Having read this statement are there any
9 council members or staff who wish to disclose a
10 conflict of interest with this agenda item?

11 None noted. Okay.

12 So before I read the motion just a
13 brief background. A letter of invitation was
14 extended to the property owner with an appended
15 list of questions, materials helpful in
16 documenting the lack of prudent and feasible
17 alternatives to demolition. The material that
18 was forwarded to SHPO was placed in the drop box
19 and made available to all interested parties.
20 And so any information provided by the owner was
21 made available and any information provided by
22 Preservation Connecticut was made available to
23 all parties.

24 I want to remind everybody that this
25 discussion and review is not a discussion about

1 the historical merit of the structure, structures
2 plural actually, which is not a subject of
3 debate. The buildings are both included on the
4 National Register listing for Clinton Village
5 Historic District and are identified both as
6 contributing structures to the district.

7 Okay. Now to the motion. The
8 Connecticut Historic Preservation Council votes
9 to request the assistance of the Office of the
10 Attorney General to prevent the unreasonable
11 destruction of the historic properties at 161
12 East Main Street and 153 East Main Street,
13 Clinton, Connecticut pursuant to the provisions
14 of Sections 22a-19a of the Connecticut General
15 Statutes.

16 Is there a motion to move this?
17 Margaret?

18 MARGARET FABER: I move it. Margaret.

19 CHAIR NELSON: And a second? I'm
20 sorry, I didn't hear who the second was?
21 Marguerite. Okay.

22 Todd, can you start by giving us
23 background please?

24 TODD LEVINE: Yes. Good morning
25 everyone. For the record my name is Todd Levine,

1 I'm an architectural historian for the State
2 Historic Preservation Office and I am liaison
3 between HPC and the Attorney General's Office in
4 potential SEPA cases.

5 On January 11th, 2021 our office was
6 notified via email from the Clinton local
7 Historic District Commission member that the Dowd
8 House located at 151 East Main Street and the
9 adjacent corn crib in Clinton, Connecticut was
10 threatened with demolition. The buildings are
11 within the National Register of Historic Places
12 listed Clinton Village Historic District, listed
13 on the National Register in 1994.

14 The demolition process began on January
15 11th when an attempt to demolish sign was posted
16 on the front door of the subject properties. The
17 municipality has a 90-day demolition delay
18 process through Planning & Zoning.

19 On January 14th, 2021 SHPO and
20 Preservation Connecticut staff did an exterior
21 site visit from the public right away.

22 On January 23rd a petition objecting to
23 the demolition was started on Change.org in
24 Facebook. Within 24 hours there was 390
25 signatures, 272 of which were from residents of

1 Clinton which spurred the SHPO's formal
2 investigation. To date there are 784 signatures.

3 On January 28th our office contacted the
4 owner, Resync Property Solutions and the owner's
5 legal representation, Keith Ainsworth, about the
6 SEPA process. We requested interior access for
7 Preservation Connecticut's tack team which would
8 provide an opportunity to historic structural
9 engineers and historic architects to determine
10 integrity and develop prudent and feasible
11 alternatives. Attorney Ainsworth declined until
12 the owner's design team and structural engineers
13 had an opportunity to evaluate the site
14 themselves but suggested after their analysis
15 access would be forthcoming.

16 On February 4th SHPO sent an invitation
17 letter to Attorney Ainsworth inviting him and his
18 team to today's meeting to determine whether the
19 proposed destruction is reasonable in light of
20 the associated facts and circumstances and to
21 provide expert support and exploring alternatives
22 to demolition.

23 On Thursday, February 11th SHPO
24 scheduled access for the tack team for Friday,
25 February 19th, which was reschedule due to weather

1 to Monday, February 22nd, which is when the team
2 finally got access. And on February 26th our
3 office posted the report that you all have found
4 in the drop box.

5 Lastly, on March 26, so forthcoming the
6 State Review Board will review the property at
7 its regularly scheduled meeting to confirm they
8 continue to contribute to the National Register
9 district. Thank you.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Todd.

11 So the first presentation would be by
12 Preservation Connecticut. And Brad, would you be
13 leading that?

14 BRAD SCHIDE: Yes.

15 CHAIR NELSON: Brad Schide.

16 BRAD SCHIDE: Good afternoon,
17 everybody. Brad Schide, I'm (undiscernible)
18 writer for Preservation Connecticut, formerly
19 Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation. On
20 behalf of myself, Jane Montenaro, staff and all
21 the community you're going to hear after me and
22 all the 900-some pages or so you guys got, we
23 thank you guys, Historic Council, for the
24 opportunity to try to pose an alternative to
25 demolition.

1 I'm joined in part of my presentation
2 today by the team that Preservation Connecticut
3 usually pulls together, Dave Goslin is from
4 Crosskey Architects and Jim Grant from James
5 Grant Structural Engineers. They will follow me
6 and then I'll kind of come in the back end and
7 kind of wrap up.

8 Let me see if I can share -- why can I
9 not find it -- well, we can work from the -- for
10 some reason I can't pull it up at the moment.

11 Let's move towards -- there's two
12 properties here as everybody knows. There is 153
13 East Main Street and then there's 155-157 East
14 Main Street. One of them is -- both again as
15 Sara said, both are contributing structures on
16 the National Register, so it's not about the
17 history so much as what we were trying to get to
18 is figure out, you know, what could be a possible
19 alternative.

20 Our focus again, I want to be clear
21 what our proposal that we're striving for here is
22 not to stop the development, it's also not to
23 decrease density, it's also not to make the
24 development not work. I think our premise here
25 was to come in and try to incorporate the

1 structures within the larger development they've
2 already planned. I think it's 32 units. It's a
3 very large site. It's almost all the residential
4 units are going to be in back, and they discussed
5 about knocking these two down which again they
6 can more or less tell you why they need to do
7 that.

8 CHAIR NELSON: I'm going to interrupt
9 you one second, Brad.

10 BRAD SCHIDE: Sure.

11 CHAIR NELSON: Is there a graphic you
12 would like on the screen that SHPO staff could
13 put up that you can speak to?

14 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah, I had it on my --
15 for some reason I cannot pull up my --

16 DAVE GOSLIN: Brad, I could all it up.
17 Do you want the site plan that they proposed?

18 BRAD SCHIDE: No, actually I was just
19 going to try to get some photos that the council
20 already has.

21 TODD LEVINE: We'll pull them up.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. I think that
23 would just help facilitate the conversation.

24 BRAD SCHIDE: Sure. I'm sorry, for
25 some reason I can't pull it up.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

2 (Site plan on shared screen.)

3 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah, here -- this is the
4 site plan we're going to eventually talk to but
5 the photos unfortunately this is not -- if we're
6 looking at this, yeah, that doesn't really help.
7 But we'll get -- Dave is going to go into the
8 site plan later. But let me be really clear what
9 the two buildings are and then Dave can go more
10 into the site plan itself.

11 Again, we're trying to work to
12 incorporate mainly 153 Main Street which is a
13 colonial kind of federal style house, and the
14 other building has two pieces to it, there it is,
15 a corn crib in the front of it and then there is
16 a -- there it is.

17 (Photos on shared screen.)

18 BRAD SCHINE: Great. Yes, that was
19 what I was trying to get to. There we go. Yeah.
20 So 153 East Main Street, there we are right
21 there, and this is 155. And am I able to scroll
22 down on this? Yeah. So I just want to be clear
23 this is the corn crib right here, and the balance
24 of the site is the commercial structure on the
25 155-157, and this is more of a street view. This

1 is the corn crib and the commercial building here
2 and this is the colonial/federal style structure.

3 So, again, our main intent here is to
4 try to save the streetscape and the developer
5 right now are not proposing that.

6 In terms of the community I think Todd
7 laid out the timing of this. We pretty much
8 heard about this around January. We did meet
9 with a lot of the community, a couple of very
10 strong community advocates, and as Todd said
11 there are probably right now I guess 785 names.
12 But I think more importantly there was probably
13 about 270 I think it was -- and again you'll hear
14 testimony after mine to get the exact numbers on
15 that, but of wanting to save one or both of the
16 structures.

17 And you will see -- and I should also
18 say in the timeline of things we actually did not
19 -- we did make a site visit for the exterior but
20 we were not able to get inside the building until
21 February 22nd, this last week, and I do have some
22 pictures we can go through and look at briefly.
23 But I do want to say it was not -- and we also
24 got a budget number from them to rehab the house
25 and the startling new information or I should say

1 new information we got from the owner's rep at
2 that meeting was that they wanted to move the
3 house and it wasn't clear exactly where they were
4 going to move it, but the cost that you see in
5 your packet, the 891,000, at least that's the
6 last one I got, did include moving costs. And we
7 started to talk to them at the site and they
8 seemed to suggest that that was real important.
9 So I don't know if they're going to address that
10 in their presentation, but it was unclear to us
11 why that was necessary and, you know, where
12 exactly those costs were.

13 If you maybe scroll down on the next
14 page here, so I just want to kind of walk through
15 a little bit of the property. This is again 153
16 East Main Street. You can see the fan light
17 (phonetic) and a lot of the historic trim is
18 there. That is vinyl siding however. The thing
19 I want to point out to, this is behind the house
20 though, there is a large -- you see the structure
21 here, very large structure in the back, that
22 actually is an indoor pool and that is obviously
23 not historic and we are not trying to preserve
24 that. So that would basically free up space.
25 The developer does need space there doing a

1 septic and well water, so they do need leaching
2 fields, they need a lot of space. So we're not
3 looking to save that piece of it.

4 You can go to the next page. Yeah, and
5 again I just want to kind of walk through
6 generally, again it's vinyl sided but you can see
7 the 12 over 12 historic windows, actually there's
8 a different historic window elsewhere on the
9 property but this is a 12 over 12.

10 We finally got inside the house, you
11 can see some of the fireplaces are intact. This
12 is one. Go to the next page. So I can go to the
13 next page there -- I can't -- make it go. No.

14 Yeah, so there's the center stairway
15 that is pretty much intact. You see some
16 historic doors, plaster, floors are in excellent
17 shape. There doesn't seem to be any issues
18 there. Wide plank floors.

19 This is the different historic window.
20 I'm not sure why this one is different. Maybe
21 it's an addition or a different time period or --
22 once again we had about an hour on February 22nd
23 to go through everything so it wasn't clear from
24 us what all the historic different time periods
25 was.

1 Next page. Yeah, so this is just
2 another fireplace. You can see also some of the
3 historic doors that are still intact. So what's
4 down here, you're saying what the heck is that.
5 Well, inside the commercial building and the corn
6 crib, so this is 155-57. Inside there's pretty
7 much a lot of I guess debris and store materials
8 I guess when the house -- I guess it was a store,
9 it was like a store that sold baskets and stuff.
10 All those baskets didn't sell and I guess they
11 just threw it all in the house. Anyway, so
12 there's quite a bit of that.

13 If you go to the next page.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Brad, I'm just going to
15 interject for one moment. I know you've got some
16 other team members who will be speaking as well.
17 You're about at 10 minutes into your
18 (indiscernible).

19 BRAD SCHIDE: I'm finished, I just want
20 to highlight the crib and then we'll turn to
21 David.

22 So this is the corn crib. I just want
23 to be clear this is the front side of it and this
24 is kind of the back side, so this is the
25 commercial building and the corn crib is in the

1 front. This is facing East Main Street.

2 I do want to point out to you that
3 these are not on a permanent foundation. And Jim
4 Grant can probably address that, that this could
5 be moved offsite.

6 With that I'll turn it over to Dave
7 Goslin who will look at that site plan and then
8 that would be followed by Jim Grant talking about
9 some of the structural issues.

10 DAVID GOSLIN: Thanks, Brad.

11 For the record my name is David Goslin,
12 I'm a principal with Crosskey Architects. And we
13 were sent the site plans for this a few weeks
14 back from the site plans, and Marena, I don't
15 know if you can share you screen with me, I have
16 -- I want to start with the site plan that we
17 were first given and go with that.

18 (Site plan on shared screen.)

19 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: You were just given
20 access.

21 DAVID GOSLIN: Okay. Can you all see
22 my screen now?

23 MARENA WISNEWSKI: No.

24 BRAD SCHIDE: Dave, you might want to
25 just -- we're running out of time so you might

1 just want to focus on your site plan and what you
2 did.

3 DAVID GOSLIN: Marena, if you could
4 just go back to the site plan that you just had
5 up. I'll talk briefly about the proposed site
6 plan that they had. They were obviously
7 proposing to remove the existing buildings along
8 East Main Street and put in new buildings facing
9 the street. They have four new buildings
10 proposed along the street. They were kind of a
11 mixed use structure, there was office space on the
12 first floor with condos above, and behind that
13 they had units totaling to 32 condo apartments.

14 I basically took that sketch and did a
15 trace overlay and I came up with the sketch that
16 is currently on the screen. This sketch is
17 basically preserving the existing house along
18 East Main Street kind of shown in black. I did
19 remove the pool addition off the back because
20 it's really not significant to the structure, it
21 was added later, and the reason to remove that is
22 it gives us more depth to the site to kind of fit
23 in some of the newer buildings.

24 And then over to the right is the corn
25 crib. This is showing the corn crib remaining

1 although the corn crib as Brad said is not on a
2 foundation, could very easily be moved and
3 relocated to another property if need be. But I
4 am also calling for the demo of that rear
5 commercial building because it's in pretty rough
6 shape. And the demolition of that allows us to
7 get more of the newer buildings into the back.

8 So with this sketch I was able to still
9 maintain the 32 units of new apartments or condos
10 that they were proposing towards the rear. I did
11 so by pretty much rotating the septic field in
12 order to kind of get the buildings that are on
13 the straight run a little close together. Now, I
14 will say I'm not a civil engineer and I think a
15 lot of this will still need to be vetted by a
16 civil engineer, but from what I can -- and from
17 the site plan we were given these septic fields
18 include each unit has its own septic along with
19 the reserve, so that's why there's one that's
20 solid and one that's dashed for each of the
21 units.

22 So in doing this I was able to maintain
23 the same number of units that they were proposing
24 and still keep the existing structures in the
25 front. Now the existing house can be continued

1 and reused as a residence or it can be converted
2 and reused as a professional office building or
3 another use.

4 The access road that is providing
5 access to the back, I kind of located it in the
6 same location where the existing curb cuts are
7 for the driveway to the house and to the retail
8 building so it really doesn't alter the street's
9 approach or access from the street.

10 So basically what this is really
11 showing is that I think there is a prudent and
12 feasible alternative to demolition and that the
13 developer can still achieve the goals he's trying
14 to get and maintain the existing structures to
15 the front.

16 So basically that wraps up my portion
17 of this and, Brad, I think Jim is going to go
18 next?

19 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: You have five
20 minutes.

21 JIM GRANT: Hello, this is Jim Grant,
22 James K. Grant Associates, structural engineers.
23 I've been a consultant to Preservation
24 Connecticut and to SHPO for quite a long time.
25 I've seen many structures from this age and the

1 residential house is in sound condition except
2 for the first floor which does have some
3 significant problems. But the foundation, the
4 stone foundation is stable. The floors, even the
5 first floor, are fairly firm when they're under
6 foot traffic. We had several people in the house
7 on the 22nd when we visited and I couldn't detect
8 any real issues from people walking around.

9 The roof framing is in good condition.
10 It may need some investigation if it's determined
11 that it needs to support additional snow loads
12 but that is easily accomplished.

13 The house really aside from the first
14 floor framing which should be upgraded and can be
15 designed for whatever occupancy is proposed, the
16 house is in good condition but if it was moved I
17 think even though it's not really a very
18 challenging house to move, could undergo some
19 distress and cause some issues. I think it's
20 best to keep it on its existing foundation.
21 There is some movement in the stonework but it's
22 very minor and it's about 200 years old. It's
23 got a good history of soundness so I think there
24 will be no problem continuing to support the
25 house on the existing foundation.

1 The first floor framing should be
2 replaced and it can be done by a contractor
3 that's experienced in this kind of work. It
4 could be replaced in sections rather than all at
5 once.

6 The two chimney stone mass foundations
7 are sound. They do contain timbers that are
8 compromised from insect damage but that could be
9 corrected at the time that the first floor
10 framing is replaced. But basically it's in good
11 condition.

12 The corn crib is also in sound
13 condition. The timber frame within it, can't see
14 much of it at the floor level but what was
15 visible was in good condition. The siding as you
16 can see from photographs needs some work but
17 that's nonstructural and can be repaired or
18 replaced as needed. The main issue there is that
19 it's not on a permanent foundation. It appears
20 to be supported on some stone slabs and even
21 though it's independent structurally from the
22 house from the structure behind I think that it
23 is actually attached to it, which gives it some
24 stability to resist wind loads. If the rear
25 house was removed it would have to be secured on

1 a permanent foundation to be able to resist wind
2 loads. But it's basically -- the structure of
3 the corn crib is sound and can be either
4 preserved in place or moved.

5 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah, and just to
6 conclude, Sara, so the thrust of our testimony is
7 that we were not given enough time to evaluate
8 costs. Jim has made some references to --

9 MARNIA WISNIEWSKI: You have one minute.

10 BRAD SCHIDE: -- made some reference to
11 structural issues. What we would be asking the
12 council to do today or the owner, April 1st I
13 think is the deadline, so it's either extending
14 the demo time period or AG involvement to foster
15 that time period so that we have more time to
16 evaluate the cost and the options. Thank you.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you, Brad.

18 So first what I'd like to do is open it
19 up for council member questions for Connecticut
20 Trust presentation or actually anything that Todd
21 said by way of his introductory remarks.

22 Council members? Okay, Margaret.
23 You're on mute still.

24 MARGARET FABER: I'm sorry.

25 So I just wanted to discuss the cost to

1 make sure I understand this. So it seems that
2 based on Preservation Connecticut's study that
3 less money is going to be needed to remediate and
4 renovate the property than what has been proposed
5 by the owner. If moving the structure costs, you
6 know, approximated 300,000 as Preservation
7 Connecticut said, then based on the Morrisey
8 budget of 891,400 restoring the structure in
9 place would be about 591,400. And if replacing
10 the building with a replica using modern
11 materials would cost 450,000, which would
12 obviously have no historic integrity and not
13 conform to the Secretary of the Interior's
14 standards, then the budget of 141,400 to retain
15 the original National Register structure I think
16 would be both feasible and prudent.

17 And this isn't even taking into account
18 the funding and tax credits available to the
19 project which could be significant. So I'm
20 wondering if I'm understanding that correctly.

21 TODD LEVINE: Yeah, I could comment on
22 that. I think -- a couple things. One is that
23 there is after the owner's cost analysis we asked
24 -- because he had provided that with the plan to
25 move it. That was a plan to move it over and

1 back. And I requested that he change it for
2 keeping it on site. So he has an addendum to
3 that that is in your packet where he says, well,
4 the change in cost for not moving is only 80,000.
5 So I'm sure when they get to their presentation
6 they can clarify that because it's a little
7 unclear to me as well.

8 And then secondly in terms of our
9 office's ability to provide financial assistance
10 because of the nature of the for-profit developer
11 and the size of the development of the historic
12 property, I don't believe they would be eligible
13 for tax credits nor grants.

14 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you. Other
15 council --

16 BRAD SCHIDE: I just want to add that
17 should we get an extension what we would be doing
18 is Dave Goslin would do a formal scope of work
19 that we think is truly needed in the property as
20 a rehab, and then we would actually have it
21 priced out by a general contractor. Just to let
22 you know what -- and I think that would answer a
23 lot of Margaret's questions.

24 We're operating on a -- and I have not
25 seen the new budget either until Todd just

1 mentioned it. So just so you know.

2 CHAIR NELSON: So this is
3 (indiscernible), one question for Dave and for
4 Jim. I just want to clarify for the record the
5 structural repairs that are required for the
6 first floor can be done from the basement below
7 and that the repairs can be such that they could
8 yield a floor loading for either continued
9 residential occupancy or office occupancy if that
10 were judged to be desirable.

11 JIM GRANT: Yes, that's correct. The
12 flooring, the existing flooring would need to be
13 taken up first and then the structural repairs
14 made, and then the original flooring replaced on
15 it. But it can be designed for whatever loading
16 is appropriate or proposed for the building.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. And the follow-up
18 question, Dave, this is for you. So in terms of
19 the building and your experience with doing
20 adaptive reuse in residential projects, do you
21 see that this building has the potential in situ
22 for either two residential units or one
23 commercial unit with a residential unit? I'm
24 just trying to evaluate its potentiality.

25 DAVID GOSLIN: I think that can go in

1 several different directions. The whole building
2 could be converted to commercial. I'm thinking
3 just, you know, you think a law office where it
4 can be multiple -- one firm in there with
5 multiple offices, the bedrooms and the dining
6 room and all that stuff become private offices.
7 It could also be split into a two-family where
8 each floor is an apartment. There's certainly
9 enough square footage there to support that.

10 I think the first floor is just under
11 or just over -- just under a thousand square feet
12 so that potentially could get a one bedroom on
13 each floor. Whether you do it with a commercial
14 mixed use and commercial on the first floor and
15 the second floor, that's possible. I don't know
16 how marketable that would be but it is certainly
17 possible.

18 CHAIR NELSON: All right. Thank you.

19 Other council members --

20 JIM GRANT: Just to add something on
21 the second floor.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

23 JIM GRANT: The second floor is now for
24 residential use, if it became office use we would
25 have to be sure that the loads are monitored so

1 you didn't exceed its current capacity.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Or the second floor
3 framing would need to be augmented.

4 JIM GRANT: That's right. Yes.

5 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you for clarifying
6 that.

7 Margaret, you have a question?

8 MARGARET FABER: I do. So just to
9 confirm. So you found that the structural issues
10 are -- you think that they're going to be
11 repairable and when you were reviewing the
12 structures you noticed that much of their
13 integrity remains. Is that correct?

14 JIM GRANT: That's correct.

15 MARGARET FABER: Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIR NELSON: Other council member
17 questions?

18 Okay. At this point what I'd like to
19 do is turn to the owner of their representatives.

20 Mr. Ainsworth, are you the one who will
21 be presenting?

22 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: I'm one of the
23 persons who will be presenting, yes. Thank you.

24 So Madame Chair and members of the
25 council, my name is Keith Ainsworth, I'm a

1 private practice environmental attorney. I've
2 been practicing environmental law for the last 31
3 years. I have offices in New Haven, Connecticut
4 and currently located in Madison during the
5 pandemic.

6 And it is my privilege today to
7 represent Resync Property Solutions which is the
8 property owner. I just want to give it a brief
9 introduction and I will turn it over to my team
10 here and that includes Tony Bolduc who is with
11 Stevens & Associates which is a civil engineering
12 firm, Daniel Morrisey, who is a structural
13 engineer, and Jay Kurup, by the way, is the
14 owner's representative. He is the principal in
15 Resync. And Ben Whelan of BTW construction who
16 did our construction estimates.

17 I did want to address one point that
18 was repeatedly stressed and I think it was unfair
19 to the owner. First of all, I want to stress
20 that this a private property and in America we
21 still have private property rights. It was
22 repeated over and over again that we just got
23 access; we were denied access. I thought that
24 statement bothered me the most because when Todd
25 Levine contacted me I specifically never said the

1 words "we don't let you in, we deny." It never
2 happened.

3 What I said was we want to get into the
4 property first. We wanted to do our own analysis
5 and we said we would provide them access if on a
6 mutual agreement that there was a need for
7 further access. I find the suggestion that we
8 were somehow uncooperative to be offensive. I
9 was nothing but solicitous and generous with my
10 time. My client immediately hired a structural
11 engineer and retained at his expense my services
12 and the services of the other professionals to do
13 an analysis on this property for its reuse.

14 So they did get access, it was with
15 permission. This is private property, they had
16 no right to be there except by request and we
17 gave it.

18 Number two, we were also able to do our
19 analysis on the property and we have presented it
20 to you. I think it's interesting to note that
21 with all of these historic recourses being
22 focused on this property that the attention to
23 detail is rather shockingly limited. There was
24 the statement that the property was going to be
25 moved. Well, first of all, if you had looked at

1 the plans our estimate for moving it or restoring
2 the property was to lift it and then restore the
3 foundation in an adjacent location, in other
4 words, just moving the house just over a little
5 bit, not somewhere else on the property, but just
6 literally a few feet over so we could put in a
7 proper foundation to support the structure.

8 Number two, it didn't cost \$300,000.
9 Mr. Schide is absolutely incorrect in that. He
10 was actually off by a figure of -- a factor of
11 10. Our estimate does not include \$300,000 in
12 moving costs. It was 30,000, actual 37, but some
13 of those costs involve other elements. So it's
14 not \$300,000 to move it.

15 Number two, when we were informed that
16 we should provide a restoration cost in situ,
17 because the initial set of questions we were
18 given by SHPO we answered and it didn't say in
19 situ. It just said what are the costs for
20 restoration. So we did a restoration which was
21 just next door.

22 However, when we were informed of that
23 condition we revised our numbers and the numbers
24 went up because it costs more to move the house
25 up and restore it on its exactly location because

1 you have to get underneath and redo the
2 foundation. If we're going to do the restoration
3 we're going to do it correctly so that it can
4 support a mixed use. But the way, this is a
5 mixed use zone and so they talk about converting
6 it to multi-family and commercial requires a zone
7 change. I don't know what we would qualify for
8 that.

9 Number two, there was some talk already
10 about, a generous discussion about the tax
11 credits and the grants that would be available to
12 us. They're not.

13 So of those many signatures on the
14 Facebook and Change.org petitions which are of
15 uncertain origin and credibility, no one has
16 stepped forward and said we would agree to help
17 you in restoring this residence. No one has
18 offered money, no one has offered to buy it. It
19 was on the market for two years without offers.
20 My client stepped in to do something that was
21 allowed by zoning.

22 And while I know that the historic
23 integrity of these buildings is not the subject
24 of this discussion, that's being parceled out
25 into another meeting, everyone seems to take for

1 granted that the corn crib is somehow a
2 contributing structure. While it was listed that
3 was practically in error.

4 We have submitted in the packet, you
5 will see an aerial photograph from 1970 and
6 that's page 38 of the document that's on the drop
7 box, and that aerial photograph, you look, the
8 corn crib is not in existence on that site at
9 that time. I clearly was moved in after 1970,
10 we're not exactly sure when, but it's of recent
11 origin. And since the stated objective was to
12 protect the streetscape, if you're trying to
13 protect the streetscape that's historic, when you
14 would actually move the corn crib.

15 Now, we are not proposing at this point
16 to demolish the corn crib. We have had several
17 offers by folks within the community to move it
18 to actually a more farm-like setting where it
19 would probably be more appropriate. So that
20 resource will be preserved but not on this site.
21 That's our intent.

22 As for the residence we have analyzed
23 that and I will turn that over to Tony Bolduc of
24 Stevens & Associates to discuss his findings and
25 also some comments about the alternative that was

1 proposed by Crosskey.

2 TONY BOLDUC: All right. So this is
3 Tony Bolduc. I'm just going to give a heads up
4 too, I have Ben Whelan with me here so at some
5 point when he speaks, you know, I'll face the
6 camera more to him. But back to the point.

7 On page 67 of the package it shows an
8 alternate layout and just to glance off of this.
9 So our office has laid out the site and received
10 approval from Clinton Design Review and
11 (indiscernible) Health District. Any change to
12 the orientation of the building or the layout
13 will require a revisit by both Design Review and
14 the Health District. This will further delay the
15 process and add a significant cost to the
16 developer as he will need to develop plans for
17 said change both civil architectural/structural.

18 Also the proposed schematic layout by
19 Crosskey Architects by their own admission does
20 not take into consideration the septic. The
21 septic system shown on this layout for units 3
22 through 10 and 27 through 30 do not meet the
23 state's requirements for fact-to-face separation
24 for adjoining septic systems. It also lacks a
25 septic entirely for the 151 house, and by that is

1 not a feasible alternative to our layout. And
2 that's my spiel for the site plant.

3 And with that I think I'm going to turn
4 it over to Dan Morrisey if he's available.

5 DAN MORRISEY: Hi, everyone. I'm Dan
6 Morrisey, Morrisey Engineering. We looked at the
7 structure of the existing house and the corn
8 crib. I don't have a lot of issues on which I
9 disagree with James Grant. I think we're pretty
10 much on the same page here. There's a few minor
11 points I want to bring up though.

12 He mentioned the roof framing. It's
13 woefully inadequate by modern standards. If we
14 were going to leave the house exactly as is,
15 continue as an uninsulated private residence, it
16 would be acceptable. But I don't know what we
17 can leave it as an uninsulated private residence.
18 Once we had insulation we have to increase the
19 load capacity to accommodate modern snow loads.
20 We basically need to double the amount of roof
21 structure there. So significant reinforcement of
22 the roof is required in addition to the repairs
23 of the first floor as he detailed.

24 Also, part of the contributing to fact
25 that the first floor is rotted out is the fact

1 that there's no mortar in the foundation walls.
2 There's water running through the basement of
3 this building. We need to halt that in order to
4 preserve any new structure we build. So whether
5 we replace the foundation or waterproof the
6 foundation or repoint the foundation we need to
7 do some work there to mitigate water entry to
8 preserve any new structure we put in.

9 Other than those I agree that the
10 residence is in good condition other than the
11 first floor and the obsolescence of the roof.
12 The corn crib itself can be easily moved. The
13 retail structure behind it is in very poor
14 condition. I think we're on the same page there
15 and I think it all comes down to what it costs to
16 do these repairs that we both agree on. So I
17 think I'll kick it back to Ben for that
18 discussion.

19 BEN WHELAN: Hello, Benjamin Whelan,
20 owner of BTW Construction. I was brought into
21 the residence and looked at the repairs that
22 would be needed after Dan put his report together
23 and I do agree that we can fix anything. The
24 question that becomes in any owner's mind is how
25 much does it cost, which is why we were proposing

1 what we did which was to actually lift up the
2 building and move it to a new foundation which
3 would be more economically prudent than leaving
4 it in its current place.

5 As Dan stated, we do have foundation
6 issues with water. There is a sump pump in there
7 right now. Right now at this time of year there
8 is quite a bit of water which has contributed to
9 some issues. In order to mitigate that issue a
10 traditional cast foundation is more economically
11 product then trying to work with the stone
12 foundation that's there and basically running the
13 risk of it collapsing while you're trying to
14 waterproof that foundation.

15 We also had the Clinton building
16 official onsite because the owner's plan is to do
17 a mixed use. He basically said in a letter which
18 is included that a change of use will constitute
19 a basic upgrade of all codes. He said there will
20 be some exemptions for things such as insulation
21 but as far as public safety and use it will have
22 to come up to current code.

23 In fixing that first floor the most
24 economical way to do it is to lift the house and
25 reframe the floor underneath and deal with the

1 insulation issues and other things such as wiring
2 from the exterior. Again, my cost for looking at
3 this from an owner's perspective as to what it
4 would cost, our numbers will allow us to build a
5 new structure to meet its needs for far less
6 money than restoring that structure. Thank you.

7 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: Well, and then to
8 just return back, the building official's letter
9 from the Town of Clinton is at page 37 of the pdf
10 document that's in the drop box.

11 (Letter brought up on share screen.)

12 So I'd like to say that -- yes, thank
13 you. That is the letter I was referring to. So
14 that change of use letter basically says that if
15 we're going from a residence to the mixed use
16 which is required in the zone and which is what
17 we're proposing for this development, that there
18 are -- we have to meet current building codes and
19 that contributes to some of the cost for
20 maintaining this building.

21 The numbers that we have can be found
22 at page 33 or 36 of the package on the drop box
23 and you'll see those. You'll see at page 39,
24 you'll see the photograph looking west with the
25 residence on the right, and what you'll see there

1 is that this residence is actually at the very
2 tail end of this historic district. It's been
3 jerrymandered to capture the large house at the
4 end of the district which is just to the east at
5 the intersection of Route 145 and Route 1. That
6 I think was the intent because they took a
7 photograph of that in the National Historic
8 Register nomination. They never took a
9 photograph of this particular residence.

10 And you can see that they added a tail
11 onto the district which I believe they were
12 trying to capture this other rather significant
13 historic structure. Because the district next
14 door, if you look at the aerial photographs at
15 page 185, 186 and 187 of the drop box, what
16 you'll see is that the district covers two
17 properties next door. One is the Clinton Motel
18 and another condominium development which are not
19 historic at all. And of course if you look at
20 the site where it says 151 East Main Street
21 you'll see across the street is a bank, a nail
22 salon and an engineering office of no particular
23 architectural significance of recent vintage, you
24 know, 1980s and probably sooner.

25 And so what happened is the district

1 was jerrymandered to actually capture another
2 building. So I just wanted to point out that
3 there are some realities here. This is not the
4 Liberty Street and Clinton Green area which is
5 very historic and actually has a cluster of these
6 structures. This one stands along surrounded by
7 buildings of varying degrees of historic value.

8 MARENA WISNEIWSKI: You have 5 minutes.

9 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: So I just wanted
10 to point out that those things exist. And let me
11 see if I got any notes here. I just want to make
12 sure we cover the issues that we have in the time
13 that we have. Let me see.

14 Well, as far as feasible and prudent
15 alternatives I don't think that the SHPO Office
16 has proven either that they have a feasible
17 alternative. One, their alternative presented by
18 Crosskey actually doesn't meet code, doesn't
19 address a septic system for one of the units and
20 violates other septic codes. So it's not really
21 feasible.

22 And then number two, nothing in the
23 earlier presentation by SHPO and its team
24 addresses the prudence part of it. They just
25 basically said it can be done. We would agree

1 physically you can preserve this building but the
2 numbers are extraordinarily high compared to the
3 value of what will result. It's about a \$450,000
4 value and the it's almost a million dollars to
5 restore the building. No rational human being
6 would put that kind of money in a development,
7 although if someone is willing to put in a fair
8 share of that my client would certainly consider
9 it. But we're open to questions at this point.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Mr.
11 Ainsworth, and your team.

12 Let me first turn to my fellow council
13 members and ask them for questions that they
14 have. Margaret? You're on mute, Margaret.

15 MARGARET FABER: So sorry. I'm having
16 trouble with that. So I just wanted to mention
17 that I understand it cost is an element of the
18 prudent standard but it's a subsidiary factor in
19 all but the most exceptional cases and shouldn't
20 figure prominently in our deliberations. So I
21 just wanted to remind council of that as we
22 learned previously.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Margaret.

24 Other council member questions?
25 Margarite Carnell.

1 MARGUERITE CARNELL: I was wondering
2 was the owner aware of the building's historic
3 status when it purchased the building?

4 CHAIR NELSON: Mr. Ainsworth, could you
5 address that?

6 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: Actually, I don't
7 know the answer to that, but I'm not sure that's
8 relevant to be honest.

9 CHAIR NELSON: Other council member
10 questions?

11 I have one while people are working
12 their mute buttons. This is a question for Mr.
13 Whelan, the contractor. How many buildings
14 dating 1800 have you worked on in the last five
15 years restoring?

16 BEN WHELAN: I've worked on three.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Three. And where were
18 those located?

19 BEN WHELAN: Branford and North
20 Guilford.

21 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. And what was the
22 -- were they residential, were they commercial?

23 BEN WHELAN: The historic buildings
24 we've done have been residential in the past five
25 years.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 Margaret?

3 MARGARET FABER: I'm wondering if has
4 the owner attempted to sell the historic
5 structure as an alternative to demolition? I
6 know they're on the market previously but has the
7 owner attempted to sell.

8 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: I can answer that.
9 We've actually contacted a company that is called
10 Historic Barns out of Texas. They worked with
11 the Middlebury Land Trust, another client of
12 mine, to take a 1725 colonial structure which the
13 disassembled for just I think \$4,500 and some
14 debris costs or site costs, and then they
15 relocated it to I think to Ohio, restored it to
16 gorgeous condition, I think it was featured on a
17 television series. But they do impeccable work
18 and we have contacted them. They contacted me
19 back to say they wanted to do an analysis on it.
20 They were of course in Texas and so they go hit
21 by this ice storm. That delayed their response
22 to me.

23 So I don't know what their eventual
24 interest is but we do have apart from that a
25 number of folks who are interested in taking

1 architectural details from it and using them in
2 other structures as opposed to taking the entire
3 structure as a structure. We would be willing to
4 consider --

5 MARGARET FABER: I think I maybe
6 misstated the question. I mean in situ. So have
7 they tried to subdivide in such a way that you
8 could sell the historic parcels separately?

9 TONY BOLDUC: Can I jump onto that one?
10 This is Tony Bolduc. So just part of the process
11 was to -- for this development did not include a
12 subdivision. So in order to split this off it
13 would, again, further the process along. We'd
14 have to do another analysis making sure it all
15 worked to subdivide the property. We haven't
16 looked at doing that because it would push this
17 farther down the line.

18 I mean again, anything is possible but,
19 you know, cost-wise we have not.

20 CHAIR NELSON: I want to just follow up
21 on that question because on the town map, if you
22 go to the town's GIS system, it actually is shown
23 as two parcels. So there's the front parcel of
24 the street, and the rear parcel which seems to
25 have an easement for access that comes down on

1 the west side of the house.

2 TONY BOLDUC: Correct. So we're doing
3 a lot line revision to incorporate an even number
4 of septic systems on each lot, which is part of
5 the Connecticut Health Code. So any change in
6 that -- it's actually an owned strip to the back
7 piece, but any change in the layout that we have
8 would again have to go back to the Connecticut
9 Health District and if we were to add another lot
10 we could have to go back, pull out application,
11 go back to Planning & Zoning and rework the
12 layout. But again, there's a reason this was
13 divided the way it was is to keep an even number
14 of septic systems on each lot.

15 CHAIR NELSON: And Todd, correct me, is
16 my understanding correct that Planning & Zoning
17 is actually waiting for information from what
18 comes out of this meeting?

19 TONY BOLDUC: I'm sorry, was that
20 address to me or --

21 CHAIR NELSON: It was to Todd Levine.

22 TONY BOLDUC: Okay. Sorry.

23 TODD LEVINE: Yeah, they have a meeting
24 scheduled for later on this month and then their
25 last meeting they tabled this issue. They wanted

1 to see what happened here.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. So in fact this
3 is still an open agenda item for the Town of
4 Clinton Planning & Zoning?

5 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: I can address
6 that. It is. We are currently before P&Z and at
7 the last meeting this came up that we were in
8 discussions and we were going to attend this
9 meeting, and the Commission asked that we report
10 back on the 8th, which is the next meeting as to
11 the results of the discussions that we had.

12 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. All right. And I
13 just wanted, while you're on the line, I just
14 want to clarify one other question, Mr.
15 Ainsworth.

16 So you referenced the change of use and
17 the code requirements inherent in a change of use
18 which I understand. But if the residence were to
19 remain residential, it's an existing use right
20 now, so there's no requirement that it has to
21 change from residential to mixed use technically,
22 correct?

23 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: If you look at the
24 letter at page 37 -- let's see if I can pull that
25 up.

1 (Letter on share screen.)

2 Yeah, it's a change of occupancy.
3 We're actually triggering the change of occupancy
4 rule which requires upgrade in the codes and
5 that's due to the fact that we are in a mixed use
6 zone and in order to do this project we actually
7 have to have a mixed use element, and so we can't
8 do the project without doing the mixed use. And
9 so that triggers the code requirement. If we
10 were to leave that residence as a residence, yes,
11 but then we can't do the rest of the project.

12 CHAIR NELSON: But the follow-up
13 question would be could the corn crib structure
14 heavily modified satisfy the mixed use
15 requirement that you need in order to do the
16 residential development?

17 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: That's an
18 interesting question. The corn crib is a unique
19 --

20 CHAIR NELSON: Right.

21 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: -- is a unique
22 commercial enterprise, the basket shop that runs
23 out of it. That's not part of the plan but -- I
24 don't actually know the answer to that. I mean
25 actually, Tony, have you looked at the corn crib

1 as being a reused part of the mixed use?

2 TONY BOLDUC: So I haven't looked at it
3 as part of the mixed use I mean because I keep
4 going back -- I'm going to throw this other thing
5 out there even though it wasn't part of the
6 question, as for historic value a corn crib with
7 windows in it, so I never really looked at that.
8 But if you were to leave that in place it would
9 be at the cost of unit 4 on our layout. So to
10 keep the corn crim would require the loss of one
11 of the units. So it wasn't really one of our
12 options.

13 DAN MORRISEY: Excuse me, everyone,
14 this is Dan Morrisey. May I do a couple of
15 comments on this subject?

16 CHAIR NELSON: Um-hum.

17 DAN MORRISEY: Regardless of the change
18 of occupancy triggering a code requirement, if
19 the building is going to be occupied the first
20 floor needs to be rebuilt. It is not safe in the
21 current condition.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Yep, understood.

23 DAN MORRISEY: Also, if the building is
24 going to be insulated that triggers a code
25 requirement for reinforcement of the roof. It

1 doesn't require a change of occupancy, it
2 requires a change in the loads. Once you change
3 the loads you have to bring the structure up to
4 code. So the first floor and the roof will both
5 need to be rebuilt in order to use this building
6 for any use.

7 CHAIR NELSON: I understand the point
8 that you're making and thank you for clarifying
9 that into the record. What I was exploring was
10 whether the house had to have the change of use
11 which then requires yet another level of
12 intervention beyond --

13 DAN MORRISEY: Right.

14 CHAIR NELSON: But thank you.

15 DAN MORRISEY: The bulk of the
16 intervention is just for use, not even for a
17 change.

18 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

19 Todd, you were raising your hand?

20 TODD LEVINE: Thank you. I just had a
21 question. My understanding was that there was
22 going to be new construction on the streetscape
23 of I think 4 units was what you guys were going
24 to do at some point in this, which were mixed
25 use. So if you kept this building, if you even

1 had one of those as mix use would that satisfy
2 the requirement for the rest of the site? Is the
3 deal 4 mixed use units on the street to do the
4 rest of the residential?

5 TONY BOLDUC: If you want I'll jump in
6 on this. So yes, our approach was for two mixed
7 use units. We could vary them but again it would
8 be slightly back to the drawing board on our
9 part.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Would somebody be able
11 to put up the owner's original site plan, the one
12 that they're proposing to proceed with just so
13 that we have that as a background graphic?

14 TONY BOLDUC: If you can -- I'll give
15 it a shot if you can let me share the screen.

16 CHAIR NELSON: Sure.

17 TODD LEVINE: Who requested control?

18 TONY BOLDUC: It's Tony.

19 TODD LEVINE: Tony?

20 TONY BOLDUC: Yep.

21 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: Actually, I have
22 it up on my screen.

23 (Pause: Site map up on shared screen.)

24 TONY BOLDUC: There we go. Does
25 everybody see that all right?

1 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, thank you.

2 BRAD SCHIDE: So -- I'm sorry, Brad
3 Schide, just a question. You guys were planning
4 to do mixed use anyway on those front -- with or
5 without the historic building, so all the change
6 of occupancy and letter from the town would apply
7 to you whether the historic house stayed or not,
8 correct?

9 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: That's correct,
10 but it's much more expensive to keep -- to do
11 that on the historic building than it is with new
12 construction.

13 TONY BOLDUC: Well, I got to just back
14 up for that one second. So that letter was only
15 for the existing house. You know, new
16 construction was always under that, you know, the
17 scrutiny of the new building code.

18 BRAD SCHIDE: Correct. So I'm saying
19 that you still have to follow all the codes even
20 if you're doing new construction there. It's a
21 change of use and there's actually nothing there
22 now.

23 My point is the timing, you're kind of
24 arguing that this will take a lot more time and I
25 guess I'm not understanding why this would take

1 more time if you save the building versus doing 4
2 new buildings in the front.

3 TONY BOLDUC: So timing would be back
4 to Planning & Zoning, back to the Health
5 District, the town engineer would have to re-
6 review it, and restoration projects take a lot
7 longer than new construction. So that pushes the
8 timeline out quite a bit.

9 BRAD SCHIDE: So just to clarify then,
10 so you're in Planning & Zoning and you're not
11 showing any buildings along East Main.

12 TONY BOLDUC: Yep. We're showing the 4
13 that are shown on the site plan up on the screen.
14 1, 2, 3 and 4.

15 BRAD SCHIDE: Well, I guess I'm not
16 following. So why would you have to -- I mean
17 you're already in the process, correct?

18 TONY BOLDUC: Yep.

19 BRAD SCHIDE: With the Health
20 Department and the change of occupancy and the
21 whole thing, right?

22 TONY BOLDUC: Health Department has
23 already approved this. Design Review has
24 approved this and said that any change to this
25 plan will require re-review by them. The same

1 thing with the Health District, any change that
2 we make would be another re-review by them. The
3 town engineer has signed off as of two days ago
4 and they would have to re-review.

5 BRAD SCHIDE: And I'm sorry, one final
6 question. So if the corn crib is removed offsite
7 you could conceivably do the two new buildings on
8 the -- well, on my right.

9 TONY BOLDUC: Correct.

10 BRAD SCHIDE: And if you kept the
11 historic building in its same place it would be
12 less intense for the Health Department, correct?
13 So it probably would be -- it would not -- my
14 point is it would not be more complicated, it
15 would probably be less because you're having less
16 water usage, correct?

17 TONY BOLDUC: It is still -- I mean
18 less, more, it still requires their review.

19 BRAD SCHIDE: Right, correct. Yes.

20 TONY BOLDUC: Okay.

21 BRAD SCHIDE: Sorry, Sara.

22 TONY BOLDUC: No, no worries.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. So I just want to
24 quickly double check with council. So we at
25 about 12:15 right now. I want to make sure that

1 we asked all the questions that council members
2 have. So last chance for council member
3 questions and then I want to open this up to the
4 members of the public who've been waiting to
5 speak.

6 CHRISTINE NELSON: Madam Chairman?

7 CHAIR NELSON: Yes, Christine.

8 CHRISTINE NELSON: Christine Nelson.

9 So just in terms of the local process it appears
10 that from this conversation they're still in the
11 design permitting, not the construction
12 permitting. So they're not so far along that the
13 conversation of the plans cannot change. I just
14 wanted to point that out. They do not have
15 permits to construct so nothing has been granted
16 in terms of construction. They're still in the
17 design phase.

18 These kinds of changes are very typical
19 and the fact that the public hearing and the
20 process is still open with the local Design
21 Review Board is a good thing for this
22 conversation to continue.

23 I do want to thank the developer for
24 being forthcoming and sharing their due
25 diligence. The letter from the building official

1 requiring bringing everything up to code for a
2 change of use, it seems like that needs to be
3 explored a little bit more as we go back and
4 forth on whether or not this is actually a change
5 of use.

6 Additionally, under the Building Code
7 Section 1201.1.1 there's an exception for
8 historic buildings that I don't feel has been
9 explored correctly. Typically what happens is
10 the developer is able to have a conversation and
11 negotiation if you will on each of the required
12 safety features under the building code and take
13 a look at it in terms of the context of the
14 historic structure. And that's a report that is
15 prepared and I did not see anything along those
16 lines in the package, so I think there's
17 definitely a need to continue this conversation
18 and see if some of that price could be whittled
19 down a little bit to make this a little bit more
20 amenable to you folks. Thanks.

21 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Christine.

22 Todd?

23 TODD LEVINE: I'll just state our
24 office helps and assists with that with the local
25 building official and the state building official

1 to work through exactly this kind of process. So
2 we would be able to assist you folks on that too.

3 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you, Todd.

4 No other council member hands? All
5 right. Marena, I'd like to start calling on
6 members of the public that signed up to speak.

7 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Sure. The first
8 person is Peggy Adler.

9 CHAIR NELSON: Peggy -- oh, hold on one
10 second. Marguerite, you had your hand up?

11 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Yes, I'm sorry. I
12 couldn't quite find the button. I just wanted to
13 request clarification regarding approval of the
14 Design Review Board. On page 46 of the packet I
15 see that Mr. Kravitz had proposed an amendment to
16 the motion as follows: Design Review Board
17 recommends that the Dowd House be incorporated
18 into the final building plans, and then the
19 motion was seconded and it carried unanimously.

20 So I just want a clarification as to
21 whether or not Design Review Board is definitely
22 directing that the Down House be incorporated
23 into the final plans or not.

24 TONY BOLDUC: So I'm going to answer
25 that. So they don't have the authority to make

1 that recommendation. They're just throwing out a
2 recommendation. It's not set in stone. They can
3 only make a recommendation.

4 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Right.

5 CHAIR NELSON: And their recommendation
6 to the Planning & Zoning Commission, correct?

7 TONY BOLDUC: Correct.

8 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

9 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Okay. So this
10 plan is in opposition to what the Design Review
11 Board has recommended as well as in opposition to
12 the Clinton Historic District Commission has
13 recommended in terms of saving the building.
14 Just want to note that.

15 TONY BOLDUC: Can I comment on that?
16 They also did approve the plans as presented, so
17 I guess it's a mixed signal that they're sending.

18 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: Actually more than
19 that. It's actually they don't have the legal
20 authority to actually go beyond the design that
21 was presented.

22 MARGUERITE CARNELL: That may be but
23 they still made a recommendation. That was
24 important enough for them to make the
25 recommendation. Just want to note that.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Marguerite.

2 Okay. Marena, you had called --

3 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Peggy Adler.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Ms. Adler?

5 PEGGY ADLER: Yes. Did you still want
6 to site plan up on the --

7 CHAIR NELSON: If it is of benefit to
8 any of you we can continue or if not we can close
9 it.

10 PEGGY ADLER: No benefit to me, I don't
11 know about the others.

12 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

13 TONY BOLDUC: I'm sorry, I didn't hear
14 whether she said take it down or not.

15 CHAIR NELSON: She said --

16 PERRY ADLER: No, I would prefer to
17 have it take down, but can you hear me?

18 CHAIR NELSON: Yes.

19 TONY BOLDUC: Yes. All right, I'm
20 going to take it down now.

21 PEGGY ADLER: I'm Peggy Adler. I live
22 at 5 Liberty Street here in Clinton and I'm the
23 person who created the online petition to save
24 151 East Main Street which to date has over 780
25 signatures. And of the first 390, 272 were of

1 Clinton residents and I'm offended by the fact
2 that Attorney Ainsworth would even imply that
3 they might have bogus.

4 I am not opposed to the applicant's
5 proposed development in general but am opposed to
6 the demolition of the house at 151 East Main
7 Street in particular. This house is on the
8 United States Department of Interior and National
9 Park National Service, National Register of
10 Historic Places, is in the United States
11 Department of Interior and National Park Historic
12 District and is in the Clinton Planning & Zoning
13 Commission's regulations as the East Main Street
14 Village District.

15 Present day Clinton has an amazing
16 number of 17th, 18th and 19th century buildings
17 still standing which are listed in the United
18 States Department of Interior's Department of
19 Parks National Register of Historic Places. The
20 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as
21 amended established the National Register of
22 Historic Places. The act authorizes the United
23 States Secretary of the Interior to maintain and
24 expand a National Register district sites,
25 buildings, structures and objects significant to

1 American history. Administration of the National
2 Register of Historic Places is as I stated before
3 by the Department of the Interior's National Park
4 Service.

5 Clinton, Connecticut's Clinton Village
6 Historic District established under the National
7 Register Registration Act is comprised of 144
8 contributing buildings, two structures, two
9 sites, six objects for a total of 154 resources.
10 These resources can be found on Clinton's
11 Cemetery Road, Church Street, East Main Street,
12 Liberty Street, Old Post Road and Waterside Lane.

13 The authentication process spanned many
14 years of study done by historic resource
15 consultants and was followed by a review by the
16 State's Historic Commission. In Clinton's case
17 it is known that the photographs of the
18 candidates for the district were taken
19 approximately 1980 and the consultant's report is
20 dated March 25, 1994.

21 The following East Main Street
22 buildings are in the aforementioned Clinton
23 Village Historic District and were originally
24 built as single-family dwelling units, but each
25 today houses a business on the first floor and

1 some an apartment or two on the second floor. 50
2 East Main Street, built 1710, Chamber of
3 Commerce. 79 East Main Street, built 1900,
4 Milone Chiropractor. 104 East Main Street, 1763,
5 the White Dress Bridal Shop. And 130 East Main
6 Street, built 1735, law offices.

7 These are just a few and as you can see
8 they were successfully repurposed while retaining
9 their historic significance. For example, energy
10 efficient windows are available that have divided
11 panes just like the ones in the 17 and 1800s and
12 look just like the originals.

13 Thus, rather than allow the demolition
14 of 151 East Main in order for a structure to be
15 built in its stead which might not be as sturdily
16 constructed and would be required to conform to
17 Clinton's Planning & Zoning regulation at Section
18 15 by meeting all of the architectural standards
19 of the East Main Street Village District, I
20 respectfully request that the applicant be
21 required to renovate the interior of 151 East
22 Main Street with the building remaining in place
23 on its current foundation in order to accommodate
24 the offices and apartments they are planning for
25 that building's replacement. Thank you.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Ms. Adler.
2 Marena, who is the second person?

3 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Alan Kravitz.

4 CHAIR NELSON: You're on mute, Mr.
5 Kravitz.

6 TONY BOLDUC: Alan, you're on mute.

7 (Pause.)

8 ALAN KRAVITZ: Here we go. You're on?

9 TONY BOLDUC: We can hear you.

10 ALAN KRAVITZ: I'm going to refrain if
11 I might from reading what I wrote because a lot
12 of what I dealt with is covered, has been
13 covered. I'd just like to emphasize that this is
14 not just the house, this is a house that's part
15 of a larger development project and the property
16 was critical for access, the property in question
17 was critical for providing access to these units.

18 There is a secondary access point over
19 an easement but it's kind of -- the potential for
20 another access point over the easement that was
21 granted. And it seems to me we're dealing with
22 an application for a large development and a
23 relatively dense large development, very tight
24 large development which maximizes development on
25 the site. And there should be some consideration

1 in evaluating the historic structure in terms of
2 cost because it was so -- the site is so critical
3 to the functionality of the project.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Kravitz.
5 And you have a written statement which you --

6 ALAN KRAVITZ: I have a written
7 statement. I should disclose I am a member of
8 the Design Review Board and of the Planning &
9 Zoning Commission.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you for clarifying
11 your relationships and, yes, please forward that
12 statement to the office for our files.

13 Marena, the next person?

14 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Megan Stine.

15 MEGAN STINE: Thank you. I am a past
16 president and current board member of the Clinton
17 Historical Society and a former member for 7
18 years of the Historic District Commission. And I
19 was asked to write a letter on behalf of the
20 Clinton Historic Society which I have done and
21 you have in your packet. I was asked to read
22 that but I'm not going to read the entire thing
23 again in interest of time and because you have
24 that information. But I want to read part of it
25 and before I do I just want to make a few notes.

1 There seems to have been a question
2 about whether the house number is 151 or 153. We
3 referenced the house as 151 East Main which is
4 what it shows up as on vision appraisal. We are
5 talking about the house when we advocate for
6 preservation. And although of course we'd be
7 happy to see the corn crib preserved we are not
8 advocating for preservation of the corn crib on
9 the site. That wasn't part of our advocacy.

10 Secondly, just a quick note that Mr.
11 Ainsworth referred to the signatures on
12 Change.org, absolutely I take exception with the
13 question of whether those are legitimate
14 signatures as well. We sent out a notice once
15 Peggy Adler had initiated the petition to all of
16 our members and immediately there were a great
17 many responses. We got emails as well as we know
18 that those members of ours -- we have over 300
19 members who always respond about preservation
20 issues and they signed that petition.

21 And the third thing is that Mr.
22 Ainsworth said that this building stands along as
23 if -- and that the Historic District was
24 jerrymandered. If it stands alone, and I don't
25 believe that it does as a historic resource, that

1 would be because of lack of preservation. That's
2 exactly the problem here. When things are lost
3 then suddenly you have new building in between
4 with old districts and that's exactly our
5 concern.

6 I just want to read a bid of my letter.

7 In addition to its architectural
8 integrity and historical value this house has
9 enormous importance to the residents of Clinton
10 by virtue of the contribution it makes to our
11 historic streetscape. As is true in many small
12 towns throughout Connecticut historic houses and
13 buildings are the essential elements that give
14 our town its beauty and identity. When these
15 properties are destroyed one by one the character
16 of the village slips away and can never be
17 replaced.

18 Clinton residents are deeply aware of
19 the value of preserving our historical resources.
20 We take pride in have a greater number of
21 historic structures remaining intact along our
22 Main Street than any of the other neighboring
23 shoreline towns in this part of Connecticut.

24 In recent years when older buildings on
25 Main Street were threatened with destruction to

1 make room for commercial development many of the
2 200 members of the Clinton Historical Society
3 along with other like-minded citizens wrote to us
4 asking us to take the lead in advocating for
5 preservation. As a result of citizen involvement
6 a condominium development at 159 East Main Street
7 was granted permission to go forward only on
8 condition that the small 1720 house be preserved
9 rather than torn down.

10 In the most recent effort more than 500
11 people showed up at multiple Planning & Zoning
12 meetings to express their hopes that historic
13 buildings would be preserved. Solutions that
14 allow economic progress and historic preservation
15 to co-exist seem like the best of both worlds to
16 us.

17 Let me be clear in saying that we are
18 not opposed to the development of condominiums on
19 this property and do not wish to stand in the way
20 of economic development. Rather we urge the
21 developer to preserve the federal style house and
22 incorporate it into the project instead of
23 tearing it down. The character of our small New
24 England town, it's charm and appeal rely heavily
25 on the historic houses and public buildings --

1 MARENA WISNEIWSKI: One minute.

2 MEGAN STINE: -- we work so hard to
3 preserve. And once these buildings are gone, the
4 rich heritage and appeal of our town will be lost
5 forever. And frankly I just will add that
6 disadvantages the developer as well. So we ask
7 you to help us seek protection for the house at
8 151 East Main in Clinton so that we can preserve
9 an essential historical resource. And I thank
10 you very much.

11 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Ms. Stine.
12 Marena, who is the next person?

13 MARENA WISNEIWSKI: Jake Clinton.

14 JAKE CLINTON: Thank you.

15 I should point out that I am now a
16 member of the historical -- Clinton Historical
17 Society as an alternate member. I was sworn in
18 last week.

19 I'm not going to read my letter
20 totally. I would ask that it be included in the
21 record though, dated February 10th.

22 I think it's very important that the
23 architectural integrity of 151 East Main Street
24 in Clinton be preserved. It's part of our
25 history, built 220 years ago.

1 I take issue with Mr. Ainsworth's point
2 about jerrymandering in that right round on Route
3 145 around the corner there is also a period
4 piece house that has been reconditioned. And so
5 the historic district is what it is, it runs from
6 the river to roughly 145. And actually I would
7 point out that Mr. Ainsworth's comments about
8 some of the structures across the street, the
9 bank and that, those were repurposed,
10 unfortunately, and weren't saved. And there's
11 several buildings that that, you know, they don't
12 fit in the district because there was no concern
13 about saving the historical importance of
14 buildings along the stretch of Main Street. The
15 motels would not be built in today's guidelines,
16 as my home at 135 East Main would not be built
17 today either. But I love that I live in the
18 district. I moved back here from California when
19 I retired after 40 years on the West Coast. I
20 came home to Clinton, I love this town and I want
21 to see that the history of this town is
22 preserved.

23 I'm not against the development. I
24 think it's over -- there may be too many units in
25 there but that's for Planning & Zoning to take a

1 look at. I'm just trying to express my concern
2 that it's important that we save and protect our
3 community. And I think you for the moment.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Clinton.
5 Marena, who is the next person?

6 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Gloria McQueeney.

7 GLORIA McQUEENEY: Hi. I'm just -- I'm
8 the Clerk for the Historic District Commission in
9 Clinton and I'm going to read a letter that the
10 Historic Commission asked me to present.

11 The letter was dated February 18, 2021
12 and addressed to Todd Levine, State of
13 Connecticut.

14 Regarding the preservation of 151 East
15 Main Street, Clinton, Connecticut, the Clinton
16 Historic District Commission hereby supports
17 saving the home located at 151 East Main Street,
18 Clinton, which is listed on the National Register
19 of Historic Places and is also part of the East
20 Main Street Village District in Clinton.
21 Sincerely, the Clinton Historic District
22 Commission.

23 And we copied Mike Rossi, Chairman,
24 Town of Clinton Planning & Zoning. Thank you.

25 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Ms.

1 McQueeney.

2 Marena, the next person?

3 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: And the last person
4 to sign up is Bob Bishoff.

5 CHAIR NELSON: Mr. Bishoff, are you on
6 the line? You may be muted.

7 PEGGY ADLER: He may have had -- he has
8 a 1:20 appointment to get his first vaccination
9 so -- and his vaccination is up in Middletown.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

11 All right. Is there anybody whose name
12 that we are not aware of who joined the meeting
13 to speak to this agenda item?

14 MS. McQUEENEY: I do have a copy of the
15 letter that Bob Bishoff wrote. If you want I can
16 read that. It was submitted though I believe.

17 TODD LEVINE: Yeah, we have a copy of
18 it. It's in the packet in fact.

19 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. All right. So no
20 other people to speak to this agenda item? All
21 right.

22 The time -- I'm just checking, so the
23 time right now is 12:30, I know for certain we
24 have a quorum until 12:45. Council members, I'd
25 like to ask you if there are missing pieces of

1 information, questions that you have that you
2 need further information on before a deliberation
3 or whether you have learned enough from today's
4 proceedings to enable the -- and to make this
5 easiest why don't I just do this in -- this is
6 whether you have enough information to render a
7 decision.

8 Marguerite Carnell?

9 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Well, I guess if
10 push comes to shove I suppose so, but I guess I
11 would like more information and more time. I
12 just feel like this whole process is very rushed.
13 You know, we're talking about a house that's 220
14 years old and there's this project schedule
15 that's driving everything and I really would like
16 to see everybody step back and take some extra
17 time to fully explore all of the options.
18 Because as Ms. Adler said, you know, once the
19 house is gone, it's gone and there's no getting
20 it back. So I would really advocate for some
21 more time to let Preservation Connecticut's team
22 do its work.

23 CHAIR NELSON: Let me just jump in for
24 a second. Mr. Ainsworth, can you answer whether
25 your owner, your client, would be willing to

1 delay the demolition of the house to facilitate a
2 more comprehensive review of some of the things
3 that we've discussed at the meeting today?

4 ATTORNEY AINSWORTH: I would want to
5 consult with my client but having had some
6 discussions on this topic before, at the moment,
7 no. We are moving ahead with our project as it
8 is. We have taken into account SHPO's
9 suggestions, we've done some analysis that they
10 requested. In fact we've done everything that
11 they've requested and that's what we came here --
12 we presented everything that they requested us to
13 do. And so...

14 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you. I
15 will just continue. As council members identify
16 things they may just keep asking you some
17 questions.

18 So thank you, Marguerite, for that
19 valuable input.

20 Margaret Faber?

21 MARGARET FABER: Yeah, I feel like I do
22 have enough information to refer this to the
23 Attorney General and I think by being with the
24 Attorney General that more time will be afforded
25 to look into these matters.

1 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Thank you,
2 Margaret.

3 Karyn?

4 KARYN GILVARG: I have enough
5 information to make a decision on this matter.

6 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

7 Christine Nelson?

8 CHRISTINE NELSON: I think I would have
9 liked to have seen a little bit more information
10 about the costs but given the lack of willingness
11 to postpone the delay I'm ready to act today in
12 accordance with what we have been asked to do.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

14 Sara Sportman?

15 SARA SPORTMAN: Yes. While this
16 process does seem incredibly rushed and it would
17 be good to have more time and more information, I
18 think that it is possible to vote today.

19 CHAIR NELSON: Okay.

20 And Walter Woodward?

21 WALTER WOODWARD: Same thing. I'd like
22 more information on costs but I am prepared to
23 vote.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. Council members,
25 in addition to more information on costs, are

1 there -- anything else that you wish to highlight
2 as contributing to your decision-making today?

3 Okay. Karyn Gilvarg.

4 KARYN GILVARG: Yes. You know, at a
5 very sort of abstract level I want to echo what
6 Margaret, Megan Stine and the other folks from
7 the Clinton Historical Commission said. I think
8 part of the value of the site on East Main Street
9 is its location in a historic district, which I
10 think is important to the town and important
11 frankly to marketing the town and to marketing
12 any future units on this site. And so there's an
13 irony to have the development team want to
14 destroy one of the very assets that makes the
15 site valuable. I just want to make that comment.

16 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Karyn.

17 Do council members have any other
18 questions or comments they'd like to make?
19 Christine?

20 CHRISTINE NELSON: I'd like to make a
21 comment also just in terms of the historic
22 resources, it's not just the two structures but
23 it's the district itself and the streetscape that
24 is defined by this density of houses and the
25 pattern of houses along the street. And as the

1 person from town pointed out that in the past
2 there hadn't been an appreciation for that and so
3 there was a loss and degradation of that scene
4 and this process is exactly how we continue to
5 review that and how to maintain the integrity of
6 the scene. And I feel like that loss of this
7 building would be a destruction and at this point
8 it has not been made -- an argument hasn't been
9 made that it can be reasonably avoided.

10 CHAIR NELSON: Thank you, Christine.

11 Any other council members?

12 Okay. So let me just go back and I
13 want to read the motion again. What you would be
14 voting on is that the Connecticut Historic
15 Preservation Council votes to request the
16 assistance of the Office of the Attorney General
17 to prevent the unreasonable destruction of the
18 historic properties at 151 and 153 East Main
19 Street, Clinton, Connecticut pursuant to the
20 provisions of Sections 22a and 19a of the
21 Connecticut General Statutes.

22 Okay. So that is the motion before us
23 on a roll call vote.

24 To refer, Margarite Carnell?

25 MARGARITE CARNELL: Aye, to refer to

1 the Attorney General.

2 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber?

3 MARGARET FABER: Aye.

4 CHAIR NELSON: Karyn Gilvarg?

5 KARYN GILVARG: Aye, to refer.

6 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson?

7 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye.

8 CHAIR NELSON: Sara Nelson, abstain.

9 Sara Sportman?

10 SARA SPORTMAN: Aye.

11 CHAIR NELSON: And Walter Woodward?

12 Walter, you're on mute.

13 WALTER WOODWARD: Sorry. Can you hear
14 me?

15 CHAIR NELSON: Now we can.

16 WALTER WOODWARD: Aye.

17 CHAIR NELSON: Okay. So the motion
18 passes unanimously. The motion was to refer to
19 the Office of the Attorney General.

20 Todd, you will follow up with Mr.
21 Ainsworth and the owner's team to kind of outline
22 the process from this point forward.

23 TODD LEVINE: Yes, I shall.

24 CHAIR NELSON: For all of you who are
25 visitors today I want to thank you for your time,

1 for staying through this meeting. Your
2 perspective was very helpful to hear, and your
3 records, your letters, your comments that have
4 been submitted will be in the record itself for
5 our meeting.

6 All right. So the last remaining
7 business is to actually adjourn Part 2 of the
8 meeting. May I have a motion to adjourn?

9 CHRISTINE NELSON: So moved.
10 Christine.

11 CHAIR NELSON: And a second?

12 MARGARET FABER: Second, Margaret.

13 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret. Okay, thank
14 you.

15 On a roll call vote to adjourn.
16 Marguerite Carnell?

17 MARGARITE CARNELL: Aye.

18 CHAIR NELSON: Margaret Faber?

19 MARGARET FABER: Aye.

20 CHAIR NELSON: Karyn Gilvarg?

21 KARYN GILVARG: Aye.

22 CHAIR NELSON: Christine Nelson.

23 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye.

24 CHAIR NELSON: Sara Nelson, abstain.
25 Sara Sportman?

1 SARA SPORTMAN: Aye.

2 CHAIR NELSON: And Walter Woodward.

3 WALTER WOODWARD: Aye.

4 CHAIR NELSON: All right. Council
5 members, thank you for your time as well. And we
6 will next see each other the first Wednesday of
7 April. Thank you.

8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off record at 12:43
9 p.m.

10 (Proceedings concluded: 12:43 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

1
2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 81
4 pages are a complete and accurate transcription
5 to the best of my ability of the electronic
6 recording of the HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL
7 MEETING held before Sara Nelson, Chair, via Zoom
8 Videoconference connection on March 3, 2021.
9

Suzanne Benoit

10
11 _____
Suzanne Benoit, Transcriber

Date: 03/10/2021

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23