

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**State Historic Preservation Review Board  
Friday, December 5, 2025, 9:30 a.m.  
In-Person at 450 Columbus Blvd, Hartford and  
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams (Recorded)**

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

**Absent:**

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

**Guests:**

IV.A.1 Kevin Cunningham, Laura Kline

IV.A.2 Kendall Richey, Renee Tribert, Mary Wilkinson

IV.A.3 Alain Munkittrick, Deborah Shapiro

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Wigren confirmed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. He introduced Board members and described the Board's role.

**II. Review of Public Comment Procedures**

Ms. Scofield provided the hybrid meeting procedures.

**III. Approval of the September 12, 2025, meeting minutes**

No edits on the minutes were heard.

***A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Mr. Herzan, to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2025, meeting, (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-2).***

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

Board members abstaining: Dr. Bucki, Mr. McMillan

**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. Old Plainfield Cemetery, Plainfield (Criteria A and C, Local Level)

Ms. Scofield summarized that the nomination is for a cemetery established in 1711, which had 400 burials from 1711 to 1925. There are three contributing resources – the cemetery site and two groups of grave markers (fieldstone and carved), and three non-contributing resources (two structures and one group of grave markers counted as a single collective object) built or installed after the period of significance. Staff recommended the property for listing under Criteria A and C for its association with European settlement and representation of 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century funerary art, with several works by notable carvers. Land for the cemetery was set aside shortly after European settlement in 1699 and the cemetery served as the Town’s primary cemetery until about the 1840s. The period of significance extends from the establishment of the cemetery in 1711 through 1850, when more burials occurred in newer private cemeteries.

The nomination was initiated by the Plainfield Grave Guardians, a non-profit organization, with support from the Town, which is the owner. It was prepared with a SHPO Survey and Planning Grant. Notice of the meeting was sent to the Town and Plainfield Grave Guardians 30 days before. Plainfield is not a Certified Local Government (CLG) and no letters were received in response. Laura Kline attended the meeting as author of the nomination. First Selectman Kevin Cunningham and a representative of the Plainfield Grave Guardians also attended in support.

Mr. Wigren invited public comments.

No comments were heard.

Mr. Wigren invited SRB comments.

Mr. McMillian stated that the nomination is well-written. He requested that the photographs be reorganized to match the description (rather than by carver). He asked if the DAR tablet mention on p. 7-5 is made of brass or bronze and if the broken granite post in the enclosure mentioned on p. 7-6 is missing or lying around. Mr. McMillan requested that a sentence be added on p. 8-29 to explain who the Mannings were (father and two sons).

Dr. Bucki shared that she liked the section on gravestone motifs and biographies of the carvers.

Mr. Barlow stated that he also appreciated the biographies. Since this was the first cemetery in town, he asked for additional context explaining why the churches didn’t have cemeteries, since often the church is the first part of government in the settlement.

Mr. Herzan suggested that the word Town (of Plainfield) be capitalized throughout the nomination.

Mr. McMillan asked if there is an inventory for the cemetery that captures the gravestone inscriptions.

Mr. Wigren referenced the headstone inscription for Nanny Shepard, which notes her as a “free woman of color”; he asked how other African Americans buried in the cemetery were identified. Mr. Wigren asked how it was determined that the 18<sup>th</sup>-century gravestones were in their original locations. He requested that the photo of the table stone looking down from the top be replaced with a photo showing the legs, and for clarification of “prescriptive” in reference to the Manning stones. He suggested comparing this cemetery to other National Register-listed cemeteries in terms of the number of identified carvers.

**A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Dr. Bucki, to recommend the Plainfield Cemetery for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-9, N-0, Abstained-0).**

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

Mr. Wigren disclosed that he works for the same organization as the nomination author for Agenda Item IV.A.2 and abstained from participation for the action item. Mr. Herzan took over as Chair.

## **2. Jennie Leeds Gardner Cottage, Stamford (Criteria A and C, Local Level)**

Ms. Scofield summarized that the nomination is for a single property formerly used as a worker's cottage. It was originally part of an estate along Strawberry Hill in Stamford. The building was constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and has early 20<sup>th</sup> century updates. Staff recommends the property eligible under Criterion A for Social History and C for Architecture. The period of significance is from its construction in 1878 through 1943, when this building stopped being used for labor quarters. This outbuilding was specifically used for domestic staff such as gardeners and chauffeurs; many of those staff were immigrants. This is a rare holdout in terms of development in Stamford and gives a sense of domestic labor at the time. It meets Criterion C for Architecture as a picturesque cottage.

The nomination was initiated by the property owner. Notice of the meeting was sent to the owner, City of Stamford mayor, planner, and Historic Preservation Advisory Commission, and the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation by email 30 days before. The City posted the notice online. The Certified Local Government (CLG) is in process and no letters were received. Renee Tribert attended the meeting as consultant for the nomination.

Mr. Herzan invited public comments.

Kendall Richey, Planner for the City of Stamford responsible for HPAC, introduced herself and noted that they are working on the CLG response.

Mr. Herzan invited SRB comments.

Dr. Bucki requested clarification about who the servants were because there is a contradiction in the social history text. The xenophobia statement is incorrect; there is a lack of differentiation between the two generations of immigrants. The first wave of immigrants was English, Irish, German, and Scandinavian and the second wave were Eastern and Southern European but that doesn't necessarily mean that they're not going to be chosen as domestic servants. Native-born laborers were increasingly favored over new immigrants. Immigrants of the earlier wave were favored over new immigrants who could not speak English; it's not about a lack of immigrants or ethnic differentiation.

Mr. Barlow noted that the page numbers are missing and should be added. In the comment about the natural landscape under Criterion C, Mr. Barlow noted that Downing did advocate for the manipulation and redesign of the landscape. He had those two distinct categories – either the picturesque or the beautiful and used those as his design tenants.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll requested that association be added to the statement of integrity. She noted that the black label shown on Figure 4 is not clear when printed.

Mr. Herzan asked if there is any reference to the architect of the mansion. Ms. Tribert responded that she did not find one. Mr. Herzan suggested that the property be referred to as a “rare” example rather than an “unusual” example in the summary paragraph; it is not unusual. He asked that the text be edited for consistent use of hyphens. He noted that the history of ownership was interesting and well-written.

**A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Barlow, to recommend the Jennie Leeds Gardner Cottage for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained-1).**

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

**Board members abstaining:** Mr. Wigren

Mr. Wigren resumed the role as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

### **3. Beman Historic District, Middletown (Criteria A and D, state level)**

Ms. Scofield summarized that the Board reviewed the nomination in September; the Board requested clarification of the archaeological significance along with the existence of records and artifacts from the investigations. This information has been added to the nomination.

The land in the district is primarily owned by Wesleyan and the nomination was completed with Wesleyan’s support. One parcel is privately owned. The Middlesex County Historical Society is writing the nomination themselves with help from Jesse Nasta. Notice of the meeting was resent to Wesleyan, the other property owner in the district, and the City of Middletown 30 days before the meeting. Middletown is not a CLG. No additional letters were received. Alain Munkittrick is online to represent the nomination.

Mr. Wigren invited public comments. None were heard.

Mr. Wigren invited SRB comments.

Dr. Feder stated that the primary concern last time was that there was not enough information in the nomination to qualify for Criterion D; there were vague mentions about archaeology but no details. His concerns are addressed in this rewrite and Criterion D is now justified.

Ms. Saunders asked if there would be more added. Ms. Scofield responded that the photos will be cleaned up and Cathy Labadia suggested putting in a map from the fieldwork. Those edits could be made before the nomination is sent to the National Park Service. Mr. Wigren added that the new images need captions.

Dr. Bucki asked about the archaeological potential. She also commented that half of the buildings are outside the period of significance and asked if it could be a district. Ms. Scofield responded that there are 14 contributing resources and 7 non-contributing. The non-contributing properties are houses outside the period of significance. Houses of other ethnic groups built within the period of significance are included because they show who the community was and that the community was not self-segregating.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll requested that the placeholder in footnote 23 be edited.

Mr. Wigren building in photo 11 has a porch with no direct access – he asked if there was a door in the middle. He asked how the book by Claire Smith in the bibliography on p. 30 relates to the nomination; it is not directly referenced in the text.

**A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Dr. Feder, to recommend the Beman Historic District for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.**

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

## B. Bylaws

**A motion was made by Mr. McMillan, second by Ms. Panjwani, to discuss the update to the Bylaws.**

Mr. Wigren introduced that the bylaws are five years old. Some changes are proposed in regards to running hybrid meetings. Mr. Wigren requested Board comments. Ms. Scofield noted that the bylaws were updated in 2022, but a provision that the Board reviews them every 3 years in included. Ms. Scofield noted that several links were updated.

Mr. McMillan asked whether it is necessary to cite the Protection Act related reviews in the section on Board duties. Ms. Scofield clarified that that role is not a direct action in the statutes. The Board’s participation in that is described in a Policy Statement. Mr. McMillan asked about the requirement for nomination authors to attend meetings in Section F. Ms. Scofield clarified that the statement “via any participation options provided” was added.

Mr. Wigren asked about the process to designate committees and whether majority vote of Board membership or majority vote of quorum is required.

The Board discussed tabling the bylaws discussion until more edits are made.

**A motion was made by Dr. Feder, second by Dr. Bucki, to table the update to the Bylaws until a subsequent meeting.**

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

## V. Discussion/VI. New Business

### A. 2026 Meeting Schedule

**A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Mr. Barlow, to accept the proposed 2026 State Review Board meeting dates.**

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

### B. Informational Presentation

Ms. Scofield gave a PowerPoint presentation on recent National Park Service National Register guidance.

**VI. SHPO Staff Report**

Board members discussed upcoming preservation events in the region.

**VII. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Mr. Barlow, second by Ms. Saunders, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:06 a.m. by unanimous vote.