

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**State Historic Preservation Review Board  
Friday, June 14, 2024, 9:30 a.m.  
In-Person at 450 Columbus Blvd, Hartford and  
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams (Recorded)**

**Present:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki (phone), Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Herzan (phone), Mr. McMillan, Ms. Panjwani, Ms. Saunders (Teams), Mr. Wigren (Chair)

**Absent:** Dr. Feder

**Staff:** Jenny Scofield (presenting), Jonathan Kinney, Cory Atkinson (Teams), Kevin Berger (Teams), Julie Carmelich (Teams) Catherine Labadia (Teams), Marena Wisniewski (Teams)

**Guests:**

- IV.A.1 Nancy Dolan, Gail MacDonald, Alicia Primer, Daryn Reyman-Lock, Stacey Vairo
- IV.A.2 Virginia Adams, Laura Brown, Susan Godshall, Gretchen Pineo, Sarah Tisdale
- IV.A.3 Stacey Vairo
- IV.A.4 Craig Bloom, Ashlea Ebeling
- IV.B.1 Alan Cosby, Michael Devonshire, Emily Sasaki, Jessica Vonashek

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Wigren confirmed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. He introduced the State Review Board members and the Board's role.

**II. Review of Public Comment Procedures**

Ms. Scofield introduced provided the hybrid meeting procedures.

**III. Approval of the March 22, 2024, meeting minutes**

No edits to the minutes were heard.

**A motion was made by Ms. Panjwani, second by Mr. McMillan, to approve the minutes of the March 22, 2024 meeting, as amended (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).**

**Board members voting yes:** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Panjwani, 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. Cedar Grove Cemetery, New London (Criteria A & C, state level)

Ms. Scofield stated that the nomination is for a 76-acre burial ground established 1851 that contains 17,000 burials. It has 27 contributing and 3 non-contributing resources. Contributing resources include the landscape/site; chapel, mausoleums and vaults, groups of markers, and gates. Staff recommends the property for listing at the state level, under Criterion C for Landscape Architecture with development representing the Rural Cemetery and Lawn Cemetery movements and Olmsted Brothers work in the early twentieth century. It also meets Criterion C for Funerary Art. The period of significance is 1851 to 1960.

Ms. Scofield stated that the nomination was initiated by the New London Cemetery Association, who owns and manages the property, using a SHPO grant. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent 30 days before to the Association, the City, a liaison to the Historic District Commission, and New London Landmarks. The CLG response is in process. Some minor edits were received from New London Landmarks. No letters were received in response. Daryn Reyman-Lock and Stacey Vairo, consultants, and Gail MacDonald, of the New London Cemetery Association were present in support of the nomination.

Mr. Wigren acknowledged that the author of the nomination is a colleague, but did the work under a different organization.

Mr. Wigren invited public comments. None were heard.

Mr. Wigren invited SRB comments.

Mr. McMillan requested a photo key.

Mr. Barlow noted that the landscaping and planting plan mentioned on p. 7-5 is redundant; edit as either a landscape plan or planting plan. He asked if there was an engineer for the engineered features mentioned on p. 7-6. Mr. Barlow asked if the designer mentioned for the Loomis chapel (p. 7-11) was the architect, mason, and general contractor. Ms. Vairo answered yes. Mr. Barlow also requested correction of the mention of John Charles Olmsted on p. 8-43 to clarify that he was Frederick Law Olmsted Sr.'s stepson and nephew. In the mention of Whiting's most famous works, remove Hartford Arboretum, since that was never built. The specimen trees mentioned on p. 8-45 are shrubs.

Dr. Bucki shared that the thoroughness of the description is impressive. She requested correction of the spelling of the "third phase" on p. 7-7.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll commented that the nomination is well researched and written. She noted minor edits on pages 7-5, 8-40 and 8-41.

Mr. Wigren requested more uniformity for the dates of the time periods of the gravestone markers. He also noted that 1790-1820 is not Colonial. The footnote reference for the dates is also from the UK; clarify how that was determined applicable to the United States.

Mr. Wigren asked what the source was for attributing the Palmer Gate to Dudley St. Clair Donnelly. The drawing signed by Donnelly (in the Olmsted drawings) does not look like the gate that is built. Charles Adams Platt may have designed it; there is a design for the gate at Cedar Grove in his list of works. Platt designed Palmer's house.

Mr. Wigren requested that a paragraph summarizing changing attitudes toward death be added before the period-by-period description on p. 8-28. He noted that Neoclassical design is mentioned on p. 8-47 as reflecting republican values, but it was an international phenomenon, exercised in many places. It was chosen for aesthetic reasons in some cases, not just ideological reasons.

Mr. Herzan stated that Connecticut has a large number of distinguished garden cemeteries and requested that the others be referenced to justify state level significance. He commented that the nomination is well written. Emphasize that point in relation to the state significance.

Ms. Panjwani requested description of the side blocks on the Rovensky-Hayward-Plant Mausoleum-(p. 7-14) and the two urns/vases on the side of the Beckwith Crypt (p. 7-16).

***A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Dr. Bucki to recommend the Cedar Grove Cemetery for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).***

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

## **2. Long Wharf Pier, New Haven (Criteria A, B & C, state level)**

Ms. Scofield summarized that Long Wharf Pier is a 930-foot structure built in several episodes. The focus of nomination is on the 1810 stone and earth structure, designed and built by William Lanson, an important member of the City's African American community. The pier is recommended for listing by staff at the state level under Criteria A, B, and C. It is recommended under A for its association with maritime trade during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is recommended under Criterion B in the category of Ethnic Heritage for its association with William Lanson, and under Criterion C as a rare example of 19<sup>th</sup>-century stone wharf. Ms. Scofield noted that it is anticipated that there are still portions of the earlier wharf within the 19<sup>th</sup> century structure. The period of significance is 1810 to 1890, from the Lanson construction of the wharf extension to its purchase by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

The nomination was initiated by New Haven Preservation Trust, using a SHPO Survey and Planning grant, and with permission from the City of New Haven who is the owner. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the City Mayor, City Plan Department, Historic District Commission, and New Haven Preservation Trust 30 days before. The CLG response in process. The City reached out with some questions about contributing and non-contributing elements. No letters have been received in response.

Guests present on behalf of the nomination included Virginia Adams and Gretchen Pineo of PAL; and Susan Godshall and Sara Tisdale from the New Haven Preservation Trust.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment. No comments were heard.

Mr. Wigren invited SRB comment.

Mr. McMillan stated that the nomination was well written. He asked that the definition of wharf on p. 8-18 be added to p. 7-5. He noted that the structure is a result of several building campaigns and suggested the author be precise about what is the wharf versus later pier and concrete slab that gets put on top – to help orient the reader. He also asked for consistency in reference to the harbor or the river.

Dr. Bucki shared that the social history was well done, especially using Peter Hinks essay on Lanson. She asked if the nominated property is just the pier or a larger area and referenced the figure on p. 9-25. Ms. Scofield clarified the boundary shown on the figure.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll commented on the integrity statement and asked that the author specifically mention the word design in the discussion of design significance.

Ms. Panjwani requested more information on p. 8-10 about who Samuel Bache was and how the land was acquired to build the wharf. She referenced the Sanborn map shown as Figure 8 and asked for information to be added to the nomination about how buildings shown in the figure were demolished over time.

Mr. Wigren suggested moving some text from Criterion B under Criterion A regarding the maritime history (increased cargo) on p 8-14. In the mention of the African United Ecclesiastical Society on p. 8-15, explain that the organization becomes the Dixwell Congregational Church. Mr. Wigren also requested correction of “25-ton stones” to “25 tons of stone” on p. 8-17, if accurate.

**A motion was made by Ms. Panjwani, second by Mr. Barlow to recommend the Long Wharf Pier for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).**

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

### **3. Morris and Rose Greenwald House, Weston (Criteria A and C, state level, Mid-20<sup>th</sup> c. Modern Residences in CT MPDF)**

Mr. Wigren recused himself from review of the nomination since a colleague wrote it. He announced he would abstain from the vote and Mr. Herzan would serve as chair for this item.

Ms. Scofield announced that this nomination and the next one are being nominated under the existing Mid-Twentieth Century Modern Residences in Connecticut MPDF. She introduced the nomination for a house designed by Mies van der Rohe for Morris and Rose Greenwald in 1955. The house was expanded by two bays (by Mies) in 1960 and has a Mies-designed garage from the same date. Peter Gluck & Associates added two detached pavilions and a pool 1981-1982, along with an addition to original house in 1988-89. The property is one of three houses by van der Rohe in the United States and is the only one that remains as a residence. Staff recommends the property for listing under Criteria A and C for its association with the Modern Movement in architecture. The period of significance is 1955 to 1960, to cover the Mies van der Rohe work. The property fits under the Mid-Twentieth-Century Modern Residences in Connecticut MPDF as Property Type: F1 Box.

The nomination was initiated by the homeowner, with assistance from SHPO through an agreement with Preservation Connecticut, using the circuit rider program. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owners; Town of Weston First Selectwoman, Land Use Director, Town Administrator, and Historic District Commission. No letters were received in response. The Town of Weston is not a CLG. Guests present on behalf of the nomination include Stacey Vairo, the nomination author and Richard Wolf, the homeowner (with Jane Wright Wolf).

Mr. Herzan invited public comment. None were heard.

Mr. Herzan invited SRB comment.

Mr. Barlow addressed the landscape description on p. 7-5 and suggested it is not an “unfussy environment”. He asked about the mention of the bluestone being framed. Mr. Wolf clarified that the bluestone grid pattern follows the structural module of the house. Mr. Barlow suggested that the mention of van der Rohe starting a new career (p. 8-14) be changed to clarify that he started a new direction in his career.

Mr. McMillan shared that this is a strong nomination. He asked that the photos be reorganized to go in the order of the description (p. 7-5). He asked for clarification of what “Hope’s steel windows” were (p. 7-6). Mr. Wolf stated that Hope’s is a manufacturer in Western New York State; when putting on the addition they used the Hope window system, which is steel, rather than mimicking the original aluminum windows, which wouldn’t have been available. Mr. McMillan requested clarification that the basement is located under the addition (p. 7-7). He also noted a typo on p. 7-7 (“between the spaces” written twice).

Mr. Herzan suggested that information about Hope’s window system be added in a footnote.

Mr. McMillan asked what the original door design was. Mr. Wolf answered that there are original doors that are now painted and there are new doors, which have European white oak veneer.

Ms. Panjwani requested that an image of the basement and the pool be added to the nomination.

Mr. Barlow suggested that the property be considered for national level significance. Mr. Herzan asked if national significance could be added at a later time. Ms. Scofield stated that she would discuss the potential for national significance with the National Park Service. Mr. Herzan shared that the nomination is valid as currently written but supported exploring national significance.

***A motion was made by Ms. Panjwani, second by Mr. McMillan to recommend the Morris and Rose Greenwald House for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-1).***

***Board members voting yes:*** Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Panjwani, Ms. Saunders

***Board members abstaining:*** Mr. Wigren

#### **4. Dr. Harvey and Rhoda Wasserman House, Weston (Criterion C, state level, Mid-20<sup>th</sup> c. Modern Residences in CT MPDF)**

Ms. Scofield introduced the nomination for a Modern house designed in 1964 by John Fowler, a New Haven-based architect who was a protégé of Paul Rudolph. Mae Festa designed the interior. It has a multi-level geometric form with an entrance bridge, and an assemblage of towers and balconies that are organized around a central stair with seven half levels. John Fowler was working in Rudolph’s office when the Yale Art and Architecture building was designed, and similar concepts are represented in this building. A pool and barn on the property are non-contributing.

Staff recommends the property for listing under Criterion C at the state level for Architecture, as the primary work of John Fowler. It demonstrates the trend of modernists creating increasingly sculptural forms during the 1960s, by experimenting with materials and structural capacities. The period of significance is the construction date of 1964. The property fits under the Mid-Twentieth-Century Modern Residences in Connecticut MPDF as Property Type: F4 Sectional.

The nomination was initiated and written by the homeowners. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owners; Town of Weston First Selectwoman, Land Use Director, Town Administrator, and Historic District Commission. Weston is not a CLG. No letters were received in response. The homeowners, Ashlea Ebeling and Craig Bloom were present in support of the nomination.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment. None were heard.

Mr. Wigren invited SRB comment.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll stated that this is a great nomination. She requested that the integrity statement be clarified to call out all seven aspects of integrity.

Mr. Wigren suggested that instead of describing the organization of the building disorganized (p. 7-11), a different word could be used, such as deconstructed or broken up. On the next page, he noted that the practice of having solid, fixed sheets of glass for light and wood panels for venting is not one-off; it was used by many architects in the post-war period. It comes from the scientific rationalist approach of modernism – separating the use into different elements allows them to perform more efficiently. He suggested in the mention of the lighting of the trees outside to explain that the problem of big expanses of glass is that they become a mirror at night; the solution, used at the Glass House, was to light the exterior so you can still see the landscape outside. In the reference to the idea of compression and release in Frank Lloyd Wright's architecture, a small area opens up to a big area - Wright did that but it was practiced by many architects. It goes back to the Pantheon. Mr. Wigren mentioned that he has an obituary for Mae Festa. Her husband was an architect in New Haven; she and her husband worked for John Dinkeloo. There is a body of work there.

Mr. Herzan requested correction of the spelling of Beinecke Plaza on p. 8-12.

***A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Panjwani to recommend the Dr. Harvey and Rhoda Wasserman House for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).***

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

**B. Review of Eligibility Status for NR Listed Property  
25 South Main Street, Norwalk, South Main and Washington Streets Historic District Boundary Increase**

Ms. Scofield stated that the SRB is asked to give advice on this item. It is not a formal change to the National Register record. Notice of the review was sent to the F.D. Rich Company and their representatives 1 week before the meeting, in accordance with the 2020 policy statement. Alan Cosby and Michael Devonshire are present on behalf of the property.

Ms. Wisniewski acknowledged the historic property evaluation report dated April 8, 2024, by Michael Devonshire of Jan Hird Pokorny Associates, which was shared with the SRB in advance of the meeting. She stated that the South Main and Norwalk Streets Historic District was listed in 1977 and enlarged in 1985 and described the coverage of this property in the National Register documentation. The district and subsequent

boundary increases were listed under Criteria A and C. She noted that the City of Norwalk has a 120-day demolition ordinance, but no demolition permit has yet been filed for this property.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment. None were heard at the time.

Mr. Herzan suggested looking at the building in terms of its context [as part of the district], rather than its individual merits. He asked if its massing be missed if the building was gone and if it still has significance for association with commercial development of the area. He stated he believes it does and supports the motion.

Mr. Barlow commented that he agrees with the scale and importance of the streetscape. He stated that he was intrigued by the report – that the original façade was lost and rebuilt. He asked if it was rebuilt with different materials.

Mr. Wigren invited guests to answer the Board's questions. Mr. Michael Devonshire stated that he performed the condition assessment at the behest of the applicants. His charge was to deal with the specific building, not the district or streetscape. He approached it as a preservationist; he noted that he is a preservationist and does a lot of forensic investigation of buildings. Mr. Devonshire addressed the authenticity of the building; it is essentially a historic cornice that has a building attached to it that is a conglomerate of mistreatment. The original sign band has been covered over, there was a reapplication of stucco (over earlier failed stucco) with stronger joints that make it look like a post-modern building. The wood windows do not have traditional joinery; the sash and the frames are rotting and would have to be replaced. The window surrounds originally had a flat Greek Revival look and were replaced with stucco surrounds that have a splayed lintel and keystone, which is historically inappropriate for a building of this date. The cornice is decorative stamped metal and is the only thing worth salvaging on the building; it is possible to remove it without destroying it.

Mr. Wigren acknowledged that the analysis of the building individually is thorough and accurate. He stated that the Board's role is to look at the building as part of the district. The criteria for whether it contributes to the district are buildings that individually may not be particularly distinguished but have enough that they make up a bigger whole. He referenced the scale, form, and fenestration pattern of buildings in the Orange Street Historic District.

Mr. Devonshire shared that he served on the New York City Landmarks Commission for 13 years. He studied whether the property would have been considered eligible for listing in New York; the number and level of changes would have made it ineligible for designation there. These buildings are telling a story and for the common observer, just the tail of a building doesn't really tell the story. In this building, the details are gone.

Mr. Herzan stated that the Board's charge is not to look at the building individually; its absence would be more of a non-contributing affect than the building in its current altered state.

Ms. Saunders stated that she frequently drives through this area and intentionally chooses the route because of its historic character. It would be a great loss to tear apart the streetscape. It comes across as a unified streetscape.

Mr. Barlow noted that a new building could be built there that has the same scale.

Mr. McMillan noted that the boundary increase documentation primarily discusses the streetscape, not the individual components of it.

Ms. Panjwani stated that façade changes can be reversible, but the scale is not.

*A motion was made by Ms. Panjwani, second by Mr. Herzan to confirm that 25 South Main Street retains the qualities which make it contributing to the South Main and Washington Streets National Register Historic District Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).*

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

### **C. Resolution for Jared Edwards**

Mr. Wigren read a resolution honoring Mr. Jared I. Edwards:

#### RESOLUTION HONORING JARED I. EDWARDS FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD

WHEREAS Jared I. Edwards is an esteemed architect and preservationist who has devoted much of his life to infusing communities with a lasting preservation ethic; From architectural projects that proved historic buildings could be not only repurposed, but also reimagined with more dynamic spaces; to gentle direction of local and regional boards; and through serendipitous meetings, Jared finds a way to convince people that preservation is worthwhile; and

WHEREAS Mr. Edwards in his career as an architect specialized in the restoration, rehabilitation, and adaptive use of historic buildings, and with his partner Tyler Smith built a firm that was a recognized leader in historic preservation architecture; and

WHEREAS he provided architectural designs for such significant buildings as Billings Forge, the Connecticut State Capitol, Chick Austin House, Colt Parish House at the Church of the Good Shepherd, Trinity College's Long Walk, the Wadsworth Atheneum—all in Hartford—as well as the Exchange Building in New Haven, the Oliver Ellsworth House in Windsor, and the Richard Alsop house in Middletown; and

WHEREAS SmithEdwards Architects received the Governor's Award for Excellence in Historic Preservation in 2009 and Mr. Edwards received the Harlan H. Griswold Award for Historic Preservation in 2023; and

WHEREAS in addition to his architectural practice, Mr Edwards has been a leader in preservation across Connecticut, as a founder of the Hartford Architecture Conservancy, and a member of boards of the Mark Twain Memorial, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hill-Stead Museum, Hartford Fine Arts Commission, AIA Connecticut's Preservation Committee, the Weir Farm Heritage Trust (establishing Connecticut's first national park), the Victorian Society in America, Strawberry Banke, Historic New England, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Trustees of the Colt Bequest, and the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation; and

WHEREAS Mr. Edwards served on the State Historic Preservation Review Board for more than forty years, from 1980 until 2024, and as chair from 1989 until 2024; and

WHEREAS during the period he led the Review Board he guided more than one thousand nominations for Connecticut properties to listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the members of the State Historic Preservation Review Board, meeting in Hartford on June 14, 2024, go on record as recognizing Mr. Edwards for his exceptional service to the State of Connecticut, its historic landscape, and its citizens; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution is recorded in our minutes.

**A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Mr. McMillan to adopt the resolution recognizing the service of Jared I. Edwards (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-0).**

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

**V. Discussion**

Mr. Wigren mentioned the vacancy on the Board.

**VI. New Business**

No new business was discussed.

**VII. SHPO Staff Report**

No staff report was provided.

**VIII. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Dr. Bucki to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m.