

DRAFT MINUTES

**State Historic Preservation Review Board
Friday, September 16, 2022, 9:30 a.m.
In-Person at 450 Columbus Blvd, Hartford and
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams (Recorded)**

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

Absent: Mr. Barlow, Dr. Feder

Staff: Jenny Scofield (presenting), Todd Levine (presenting), Corey Atkinson, Jonathan Kinney, Cathy Labadia, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

Guests (by Agenda Item):

IV.A.1 Rachel Carley (consultant), Matt Hoey (First Selectman), Joel Helander (Town Historian), Beth Payne (Dudley Farm)

IV.A.2 Roysin Younkin (Ryan LLC), Emily Dominijanni (Ryan LLC), Dan Drazen (Trinity Financial), Amanda Alberda (Trinity Financial)

IV.B.1 Robert Corbett (UConn), Laura Cruickshank (UConn), Antoaneta Fedeles (UConn), Scott Brodsky (FM Architecture)

IV.B.2 Peggy Adler

I. Call to Order

Ms. Scofield confirmed that a quorum of Board members was present in person and via Teams. Mr. Edwards called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Ms. Scofield provided the meeting procedures and announced that the meeting will be recorded. Ms. Scofield acknowledged guests in attendance and asked that guests introduce themselves under the agenda items they are affiliated with. She reminded the SRB that voting will be done with a roll call because some members are participating remotely.

III. Approval of the June 17, 2022 meeting minutes

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

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Saunders, to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2022 meeting (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

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

IV. Action Items

A. Completed National Register Nominations

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

1. Dudley Farm Historic District, Guilford (Criteria A and C, local level)

Ms. Scofield stated that staff recommends the Dudley Farm Historic District for listing at the local level under Criteria A and C. This is a farmstead with a Greek Revival-style house and several outbuildings. It was a multi-generational family farm. The core of the farmstead that is extant in the categories of Agriculture and Architecture with a period of significance from 1845 to 1955.

This project was initiated by the Dudley Farm Museum, the property owner. Noticing was sent 30 days before the meeting to the property owner, historical society, and the Town. The CLG response was positive. No other letters were received in response.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Mr. Joel Helander introduced himself as the town historian in Guilford. He appreciated the depth and scope of the narrative and supports the listing. Mr. Helander stated that 20-30 years ago, local school students had to be bussed to Sturbridge Village to experience 19th-century history. Dudley Farm fulfills that void. It is a living museum for this experience. He commented that the date for the origin of house is given as both c. 1845 and 1845. In terms of the standards for dating houses, the date derived for the Dudley House is clear and convincing; he suggested not using circa date. In this case, the house date is pinned to 1844, the beginning of construction, and 1845, its' completion.

Beth Payne, Museum Director at Dudley Farm introduced herself. She is a part-time employee and has been there 8 years. She stated that her work at the museum is rewarding, and she is pleased with Rachel Carley's work and Joel Helander's affirmation. She is looking forward to announcing at their Board and annual meeting the successful passage of the nomination.

Mr. Edwards opened the SRB discussion. He acknowledged that Rachel Carley is the consultant, and that the nomination is well written.

Mr. Edwards accessory structures difficult to know what those dates are and if they are relevant to the nomination. Some of them look as if they are recently constructed, but that may not be the case. Ms. Carley responded that she worked with Beth Payne to determine the dates of the newer buildings the best they could. There are some question marks with some buildings. Many of the outbuildings are non-contributing because they were moved or reconstructed. The milk house (contributing) was reconstructed but contributes to the continuity of resources there. Some sheds

do not have definitive dates. The wood shed is only mentioned in one deed- it existed by a certain date, but as a wide date span because the actual construction date is not known.

Ms. Scofield clarified that there is a resource data table with building dates on page 7-11 of the nomination.

Mr. Wigren stated that it is the nature of agricultural buildings that they get rejiggered, and construction methods and layouts don't follow fashions or easy dating mechanisms. That is something you have to accept.

Mr. Wigren observed that there are so many Dudleys in Guilford; there is a Dudleyville around this area and a Dudleytown, which is a separate National Register district. They are a first family of Guilford. He commented that it is interesting that [the nomination] includes mention of old-fashioned floor plans and cites the William Weld House. He was also a builder.

Mr. Wigren asked if there are any elements of the landscape that contribute to the significance such as fields or orchards. There is mention of a garden or two but they aren't listed as resources.

Ms. Carley responded that she discussed this with Ms. Scofield. There is an herb garden, but it is newer. The orchard is being replanted and doesn't represent the history of the landscape. She did include a charcoal pit. She considered stone walls, but they are a jumble and don't rise to the level of recognition as a counted resource. The museum has tried to retain an idea of the landscape/setting. Ms. Scofield clarified that there is not a countable historic landscape left.

Mr. Wigren commented that it is hard to get a sense of the farm overall. The map is small; it is hard to distinguish between the parking lots and buildings. He requested a larger map, or detail of the central section and more photos of outbuildings and general views.

He noted that the door shown in photo 13 appears to be Greek Revival, not Colonial Revival-style.

Ms. Carley responded that the woodwork in the library looks flat and the door did not exist until the north wing was added. Ms. Payne clarified that plumbing was installed in the house in 1994, had and space was taken to put in rest room; the shelves in the library are not original.

Mr. Edwards suggested looking at the door hardware. Mr. Wigren noted that the door hardware is new.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll commented on the photos and maps. She suggested adding leader lines on Figure 2 to more precisely locating resources or enlarging it. It's hard to tell where the buildings are. She requested more photos to understand the full complex, especially of the contributing resources. Ms. Dyer-Carroll stated that the narrative was rich and appreciated that the in essay from Nate Dudley that referenced working on the farm was woven into the text.

Mr. McMillan followed up on whether or not to remove the circa reference to the house construction date. Ms. Carley will correct the date to be consistent.

A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Mr. Wigren to recommend the Dudley Farm Historic District for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

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

2. Aeolian Company Factory, Meriden (Criterion A, local level)

Ms. Scofield summarized that the nominated property is a factory complex in Meriden. Staff recommends it for listing under Criterion A for Industry at the local level. The complex consists of three buildings constructed from 1887 to 1920 for the production of automatic musical instruments and music rolls. It was purpose-built for that function. The period of significance is 1887, the construction date of the earliest extant building through 1930, when production of automatic musical instruments ceased at this site.

This nomination was initiated by the developer for the property. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent 30 days before meeting and via email to the property owner (East Coast Partners LLC), Mayor and City Manager for the City of Meriden, Meriden Historical Society, and Trinity Acquisitions LLC. Meriden is not a CLG and no letters were received in response to the notice.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Roysin Younkin introduced herself as the consultant for the nomination. Dan Drazen introduced himself as Vice President of Development at Trinity Financial in Boston. Emily Dominijanni also announced herself as a member of the historical consultant team.

Mr. Edwards opened the SRB discussion.

Mr. Herzan stated that the description of the current setting as residential doesn't match the historical development described in the significance, where other industrial complexes are mentioned. He asked if those complexes are extant and what the historic industrial setting looks like today. Mr. Herzan also commented on the original designer for the building who is noted in the nomination, Henry Martin Jones. Jones designed a lot of prominent houses in Meriden; he also designed the Isaac Lewis House in Stony Creek (Branford). Isaac Lewis was a mayor in Meriden who summered in Stony Creek. The [Stony Creek/Thimble Islands Historic District] nomination refers to Jones as a builder architect, not a trained architect. Mr. Herzan requested clarification about Jones' training for consistency. Ms. Younkin responded that most of the industrial setting is gone; there are a couple buildings across the street but most of the primary buildings are gone. A portion of a glass factory complex is still there and there is some sense of light industrial use. She will amend the nomination to clarify that.

Dr. Bucki shared that she is impressed with the thorough history presented in the nomination.

Mr. Wigren raised questions about the workings of pianos. The ads for the pianola shown in Figures 9 and 10 suggest that it was not totally automatic; it relied on guidance from the performer. Ms. Younkin clarified that they were advertised in a dual manner; no expertise was need but the player could demonstrate musicality. The instrument had mechanisms that aided expression. You could express what is moving about music and not just the notes. You could impact how much air was coming through the instrument.

Mr. Wigren shared that his grandparents had an Aeolian player piano. It had levers on the front for the tempo and the volume. He asked about transcribing music to rolls. Ms. Younkin clarified that

the technology for reproducing pianos evolved, and no one needed to play. Initially, the company had musicians hand punching a roll to make a stencil, then the rolls were mass-produced on a machine. Different types of workers were employed in the factory including highly skilled musicians and fine woodworkers to build the cases.

Mr. Edwards noted that the technology for paper rolls continued into the 1950s and later, because people who owned the instruments wanted contemporary music transcribed on papers rolls. Music created in the 1940s and 1950s were transcribed on the paper rolls. He has CDs of George Gershwin playing piano on a paper roll; it is important to the memory of music and how we listen to it. Ms. Younkin stated that there is an archive of paper rolls at Stanford that are still being catalogued. The QRX Company of Chicago was a large producer of paper rolls and may have produced them into the 1980s. There was a large market for nostalgia and also the continued interest in the 1940s and 1950s.

Mr. Herzan asked how many of these instruments survive or if there is a museum of this company’s product. If so, it would be helpful to mention it in the nomination. Ms. Younkin responded that the Smithsonian Museum has the original roll-up pianola. Stanford has some instruments, but the last majority are in private hands. There are a lot of collectors, with an online community.

Mr. Herzan requested editing of inconsistencies of how numbers and stories are written in the text. It would be helpful to standardize that.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan to recommend the Aeolian Factory for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

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

B. Review of Changes to National Register Listed Property

1. Proposed Relocation of 2-4 Gilbert Road, Storrs (Mansfield) and Pre-Move Documentation

Ms. Scofield summarized that this review is for the proposed relocation and pre-move documentation for the building at 2-4 Gilbert Road in Storrs, which is on the UCONN campus and is part of the Connecticut Agricultural School Historic District. Staff requested that the SRB evaluate whether the building will retain its contributing status to the district during the relocation process and after the move. According to the pre-move documents shared with the SRB prior to the meeting, the relocation is proposed to occur within the district. Since the move is within an existing district, National Park Service approval before the move is not required, but it is state policy to complete the pre-move documentation to attempt to retain the status of the property. The building is one of nine cottages built in the early twentieth century that previously comprised “faculty row” and it is one of two that remain. The proposal is to relocate the building to 5 Gilbert Road, the site of a former cottage.

Notice of this review was sent 30 days before the meeting and in accordance with the SRB's policy statement on relocations signed in December, 2020. The notice was sent to several members of UCONN's staff, the Mansfield Historical Society, Preservation Connecticut, and the Mayor for the Town of Mansfield. No letters were received by the State Historic Preservation Office in response. Ms. Scofield acknowledged Robert Corbett of UCONN was present in the room to represent the agenda item, as well as several members of UCONN staff (via Teams), and members of SHPO staff.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Mr. Robert Corbett introduced himself as the Executive Director of UCONN's University Planning, Design and Construction. Other staff on the meeting are Antoaneta Fedeles, project manager for UCONN, and Scott Brodsky from Fennick McCredie Architecture, who completed condition reports and design work for the relocation and rehabilitation. Mr. Corbett stated that since the application, UCONN bid the project and we are in an inflationary period. They are in the process of discussing the scope and phasing with SHPO. They may rebid a portion of the project in the spring but plan to move forward with the relocation this fall.

Mr. Edwards opened the item for SRB discussion.

Mr. Herzan asked if the archaeological significance of the proposed site will be evaluated as part of this process as it is with pre-move documentations that are forwarded to the National Park Service. Ms. Labadia, SHPO staff archaeologist, responded; it is SHPO's opinion that the prior construction, demolition, and site work that has occurred at the proposed new location would have a low sensitivity for archaeological resources, so it is not recommended.

Mr. Wigren stated that he has been involved with this project in his role at Preservation Connecticut, including discussions with SHPO staff and in outlining the procedure and scope of the restoration work. He thinks the building will still contribute to the district, but the document needs a little bit of improvement to make that clear to NPS. He requested that UCONN provide a perspective rendering or elevation showing how the building would be on its new site. There is currently only a photo with "proposed location" stamped over it.

Mr. Wigren commented on the mention of the original "park-like setting" on page 6. He noted that the original setting was a residential quarter. The point is to maintain the sense of the residential quarter that was a significant element of the campus plan. Emphasizing that would help NPS understand the proposed move. The pre-move document would also be stronger if the efforts the university made to avoid the necessity of moving the house are described. Mr. Wigren also requested that the pages be numbered.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren second by Mr. Herzan that the relocation will maintain the property's significance for the National Register (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).

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

2. Review of National Register Status, 69 Waterside Lane, Clinton, Clinton Village Historic District

Ms. Scofield stated that the SRB is looking at listed property proposed for demolition. This is not an application to add or remove property for the National Register. Staff is seeking an advisory recommendation opinion from the SRB on the current integrity of the property and whether they still contribute to the district they were listed within. Notice of this review was sent to the property owner in accordance with the SRB policy statement as well as the Clinton Historic District Commission (HDC), Town Manager, and Zoning office. Staff also completed site visit with owner. Ms. Scofield acknowledged Todd Levine from SHPO and Peggy Adler from the Clinton HDC as present to speak on the agenda item.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment.

Peggy Adler spoke as Chair of the Clinton Historic District Commission. She shared that she is also the author of a book about the history of Clinton published by Arcadia in their *Images of America* series. She clarified that the field card for 69 Waterside Lane is actually numbers 69, 71, 67-1, 67-2, 67-3, and 67-4. The buildings that the owner had originally proposed for demolition were numbers 69 and 71. The demolition application for number 69 has now been withdrawn. The owner is working with SHPO to do a renovation and proposed to keep the front and both sides, while building on the back. The demolition permit application was reposted for just number 71. This building was described in the 1994 National Register nomination with a construction date of 1785 like the house, but it is actually listed on the field card as 1940 and the surrounding cottages are 1960. The HDC doesn't mind if 71 Waterside and the four cottages become non-contributing to the district; they just want 69 to remain and continue to be contributing because of its 1785 construction and association with Captain James Farnham.

Mr. Levine stated staff was at the site earlier in the week. The secondary (c. 1940) building, according to locals, was originally a carriage house or barn, but staff did not observe any evidence of historic fabric on the interior or exterior.

Mr. Herzan stated that he was the National Register Coordinator when this district was created. The Farnham House (Number 69) is prominent on the street. It is close to the street and is a character-defining structure in the district. It has to be considered contributing because of the theme of the district. He is pleased to hear about SHPO staff working out a compromise with the owner to preserve it.

Ms. Adler read notes on Captain Farnham:

There's a small cannon, known as a Carronade, in a park at the South end of Waterside Lane, in Clinton, Connecticut. This Carronade was used in the war of 1776 and was taken from an English privateer by John Paul Jones. The Carronade was then sold to an English merchant, who put it on board his brig. The merchant set sail and when he reached the colonies, his brig was shipwrecked on Saybrook Bar, the sandbar at the end of the Connecticut River. The ship's wreckage was then sold to a lighthouse keeper, who in turn, sold the Carronade that had been on the brig to Captain James Farnham of Waterside Lane, then known as South Street, in Killingworth (now Clinton). The Carronade was later used by the residents of the town during the War of 1812 to repel the attack of a British

frigate that had come into their Harbor. The carronade is extant in a park at the south end of Waterside Lane. A carronade is a short, smoothbore, cast iron cannon, originally manufactured by the Carron Company, at an ironworks in Scotland, which was used by the Royal Navy from the 1770s to the 1850s.

The SRB discussed the voting process since there are two buildings in question.

Mr. Wigren asked if the secondary structure (71 Waterside Lane, c. 1940) was altered since the National Register listing. Ms. Adler stated that she does not know, but there is no resemblance of anything architecturally significant. Marena Wisniewski, from SHPO, stated that the exterior is clad in shingle PVC. There is now a large concrete apron that goes around. It looks like the building was converted prior to the district listing in 1994 based on some interior finishes such as paneling that appears to be from the 1960s. The southern side also has exterior shingles that match the cottages. There is no enumeration or description of the building in the nomination. Mr. Herzan stated that it has lost its integrity and if it was contributing originally, it has lost its status now.

Mr. Edwards asked if there are two motions. Ms. Scofield recommended a separate motion for each building. The SRB amended the original motion to create two motions.

A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Mr. Herzan that the building at 69 Waterside Lane, continues to possess historic significance and integrity to continue to contribute to the significance of the Clinton Village Historic District (Y-6, N-0, Abstained= 1).

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

Board members abstaining: Dr. Bucki

A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Mr. Herzan that the building at 71 Waterside Lane, continues to possess historic significance and integrity to continue to contribute to the significance of the Clinton Village Historic District (Y-0, N-6, Abstained= 1).

Board members voting no: Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

Board members abstaining: Dr. Bucki

C. State Review Board Bylaws (updates)

Ms. Scofield introduced the agenda item. She stated that the SRB was provided with the bylaws approved in December 2020, with proposed edits in track changes. These are changes to update the footnotes with current internet links, resolve outstanding holds for pending legislation (now approved), and update the meeting procedures. Ms. Scofield clarified that the SRB had asked about changing the number of board member required in statute; the Connecticut legislature recommended it should still be ten, if not more. She requested any comments or changes to the bylaws as proposed.

Mr. Edwards invited SRB comment. No comments were heard.

A motion was made by Mr. Edwards, second by Dr. Bucki to accept the bylaws as currently proposed (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).

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

V. Discussion

A. Status report on Study of National Register Updates

Ms. Scofield summarized that there are about 1,700 National Register nominations for Connecticut and around 500 listed between 1966 and 1982. The topic of updating older nominations was discussed at an SRB meeting in 2017; the SRB was interested in prioritizing those in most need of updating, starting with the group listed by 1982. SHPO made an agreement with Preservation Connecticut (PCT) for Stacey Vairo, in her role as a circuit rider, to help study the list of 500. Ms. Scofield and Ms. Vairo have a database to track which nominations need updating and what type.

Ms. Vairo stated that she has been evaluating 510 nominations since the summer. She and Ms. Scofield developed a preliminary methodology for prioritizing. First, some resources are easily identifiable as lost and work will be de-listed. Second, the earliest nominations are some of the most important resources in the state and have a severe lack of information. Ms. Vairo will also identify nominations that lack documentation at NPS (missing forms). Third, districts with a lack of understanding of what is found within them are critical to update. Examples include such as Wethersfield, Litchfield, and Norwichtown; the latter has no clear map, inventory, significance statement or criteria statement. Fourth, priority will be assigned to listings that entirely lack social history or context such as the Elisha Bushnell House in Old Saybrook (the nomination includes a mention of an enslaved person associated with the property, but no other text on the topic). Fourth, local or homeowner requests for nomination updates will be considered. Properties of national significance are also important to update. Project goals for next few months are to make a database of nominations listed after 1982 and start some de-listings.

Ms. Scofield added that this is a large volume of potential updates and she can only handle so many per year. She noted that de-listing lost resources is one of the federal responsibilities under the National Register program. This is a simple administrative process and Ms. Vairo is completing the paperwork for select de-listings. Ms. Scofield shared that as work continues on the priority lists, she will be working on multiple ways for getting updates done and working with other partners or putting out RFPs in the future. The museum staff will also be discussing updating the nominations for their properties.

Ms. Saunders asked for updates on how the 510 nominations are getting widdled away. Ms. Scofield responded that progress will be shared at the next meeting and regularly. Mr. Edwards commented on the increasing quality of nominations over a long period of time and recognized that nominations became more detailed when Mr. Herzan began working at the SHPO. He suggested a separate meeting with board members about the updates.

Ms. Vairo responded that the database includes extensive notes on what is missing from the nominations. Ms. Scofield added that no Connecticut nominations included Criterion D until the

first archaeologist started with in the office, also in the late 1970s. Ms. Scofield and Ms. Vairo stated that a write-up of the methodology for prioritizing will be shared when ready.

Ms. Saunders mentioned that other states have gone through the same thing. She asked if the SHPOs confer and share the approach so as to not reinvent the process. Ms. Scofield responded that she is part of a national listserv of NR coordinators and this topic has come up on the listserv multiple times. It is also a topic of annual meetings, but it is up to each SHPO office regarding how to handle certain things. There are some methodologies to work from.

The SRB discussed whether or not to have a subcommittee to participate in recommendations for updates. Mr. Herzan shared that contributing and non-contributing resource lists were added to district nominations in a supplement when the federal tax credit program started. Those updates are in the paper files but may not be filed with NPS. Ms. Scofield clarified that those weren't filed with NPS. Some may be in the paper files, but some may be in the administrative files stored off site.

Mr. McMillan noted that it will be helpful if the database includes information about why something was de-listed.

Ms. Saunders asked about ground truthing. Ms. Vairo responded that fieldwork will be done in the second phase of work.

Ms. Scofield shared that Ms. Vairo has access to SHPO's draft statewide geospatial system for cultural resources and can view online mapping of nominations while reviewing the forms.

Mr. Edwards remarked on the importance of updates and that this work can continue for decades; some of the most important buildings in state have hand-written nomination with little information.

VI. New Business

Mr. Wigren shared information about Preservation Connecticut's and SHPO's upcoming Olmsted project events planned at Wickham Park in Manchester and Fulton Park in Waterbury. He also shared that PCT and SHPO are receiving the CT ASLA's Olmsted award.

VII. SHPO Staff Report

No staff report was provided.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Herzan to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.