

MINUTES

**State Historic Preservation Review Board
450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, Connecticut
Plaza Level, Meeting Room E (North Building)
Friday, March 22, 2019, 9:30 a.m.**

Present: Mr. Edwards (chair), Mr. Barlow, Dr. Bucki, Mr. Herzan, Mr. McMillan, Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren

Absent: Dr. Feder, Ms. Sutton

Staff: Jenny Scofield, Cathy Labadia, Todd Levine, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Edwards at 9:40 a.m.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Copies of the public comment procedures were available at the sign-in table and announced by Mr. Edwards.

III. Approval of the September 14, 2018 meeting minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Mr. Wigren to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2018 meeting (Y-7, N-0, Abstained-0).

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.

Ms. Scofield reported that for the nomination on this agenda, the town/property owner was notified by mail and other interested parties were notified by email of the pending nomination, 30 days prior to the meeting. The nomination was posted on the SHPO website and available for download during the noticing period.

1. Waveny, New Canaan (Criteria A and C, local)

Staff recommended Waveny for listing under Criterion A in the categories of Settlement, Social History, and Conservation; and under Criterion C for Architecture and Landscape Architecture. The period of significance is from 1722, the first mention of Lapham Road within Canaan Parish, to 1967 when the Waveny estate was gifted to the town.

Ms. Scofield reported that the nomination was initiated by the New Canaan Preservation Alliance (NCPA); the NCPA and Town held multiple community meetings regarding the nomination during the process. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the NCPA, New Canaan first selectman, New Canaan Recreation Director, Waveny Park Conservancy, and New Canaan Historical Society, 30 days before the meeting. The town is not a Certified Local Government (CLG). No letters of support or objection were received. Four members of the NCPA attended the

meeting in support of the nomination. Gretchen Pineo of PAL attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination.

Mr. Edwards invited the public to comment on the nomination. Ms. Mimi Findlay of NCPA stated that she is happy to have Waveny represented on the National Register. Ms. Rose Scott Long-Rothbart of NCPA stated that she is happy to see the nomination project move forward.

Mr. Wigren began the SRB discussion of the nomination. He noted that the nomination was well-written. The nomination includes a statement that the Tudor Revival style rose to prominence in the 1880s; Mr. Wigren commented that he thought this date was early; for example in *A Field Guide to American Houses*, the beginning date for the style is 1890. He asked what the research was based on. Ms. Pineo responded that it is based on other examples of the style she is familiar with. In terms of the Colonial Revival style, the Hall-era buildings do not appear to match the descriptive examples of Colonial Revival architecture that are cited in the nomination. They are more consistent with an earlier phase of the style in which Colonial Revival and Queen Anne features are blended; this phase is covered in Richard Guy Wilson's book, *The Colonial Revival House*. Mr. Wigren also requested that the reference to architect/builder Frank Shea be edited to note that he was working as a professional.

Mr. Wigren asked why stone walls were not built along the east side of the property. Ms. Pineo responded that she did not find any rationale or data for that while doing the research for the nomination.

Dr. Bucki noted that the last section of the nomination is full of detail on land uses. For example, there is a lot of detail about the Eolia estate on p. 65. She requested that more detail on other land uses be added in Section 7.

Mr. Herzan commented that this is a great nomination. He mentioned Shelburne Farms in Vermont as a nationally known example of a Country Place Estate. Conyers Farm in Greenwich is another Connecticut example.

Mr. Herzan questioned whether the level of significance in the nomination should be raised from local to state. The SRB discussed this idea favorably; no vote was taken.

Mr. Edwards added to Mr. Wigren's remarks about the Colonial Revival style. He pointed out that the Gambrel roof variant of the style was included in a book by Aymar Embury II in 1913. This variant was very efficient because it allowed for the inclusion of a third story of floor space, but the third story was referred to as a half-floor. In Fairfield County, near the Hudson Valley, the notion of the Dutch Colonial Revival style was known.

Mr. Edwards complimented the author on the inclusion of Charles Platt in the nomination as a self-taught architect who designed buildings that fit into the landscape.

Mr. Barlow recognized the inclusion of the landscape as a significant component of Waveny in the nomination. He commented that he did not know about Chandler Manning working as part of the Olmsted team.

Mr. McMillan appreciated the inclusion of the Merritt Parkway berm, designed by the Olmsted Brothers on Waveny land, in the nomination. This mention is important for later protection of the

berm as a historic resource. SRB members discussed the placement of the Merritt Parkway in relation to Waveny.

A motion was made by Mr. Wigren, second by Mr. Herzan to list Waveny on the National Register of Historic Places (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).

B. Review of National Register Status of Listed Properties

2. Central Vermont Railroad Pier (State Pier), State Pier Road, New London

Mr. Edwards placed Agenda Item B.2 ahead of Item B.1 to accommodate guests who attended the meeting. Staff requested that the SRB evaluate whether or not this structure retains enough integrity to maintain its National Register status as an individually listed property. The CT Port Authority is planning improvements that may impact the historic substructure of the pier; SHPO is engaged in an environmental review for the project because it will receive state funding. Representatives present to answer questions about the project included Joseph Salvatore from the CT Port Authority; Martin Abbott and Michael Garbolski from AECOM; and Jeffrey Martin from Eversource. Cathy Labadia, Deputy SHPO, was also available to answer questions during the discussion.

Ms. Scofield summarized that the pier was individually listed on the National Register in 2005 under Criterion A for Transportation and Criterion C for Engineering. Under Criterion A, the pier served as an integral part of the nineteenth-century freight and passenger transportation network, which included land and water components. Freight shipments were received at the pier from its construction in 1876 through 1946. Under Criterion C, the pier is notable as a large nineteenth-century example of engineering with earth-filled masonry perimeter walls designed to resist the force of water, collisions, and its stone fill. The period of significance extends from the construction of the pier in 1876 to 1946 when rail service was suspended. The pier was sold to the state in 2001.

Mr. McMillan commented that although the pier was listed on the National Register under Criteria A and C, the nomination also included language about Criterion D. As we think about the pier going forward, its significance under Criterion D to yield information important in history should be considered. In the significance statement of the nomination, there is a paragraph on archaeology on page 1 and a section about information potential on page 4. A research question regarding where the granite for the pier was quarried from is included in the latter section. Mr. McMillan also mentioned Fort Point in San Francisco, CA as an example of engineering that could stand up to the Pacific Ocean (and is made from granite imported from China).

Mr. Wigren noted that the integrity memo by AECOM provided to the SRB questions the integrity of the pier's setting, but the setting has not changed since the nomination was written.

Mr. Wigren commented that the materials of the pier, such as cleats, etc. sounds like furniture.

SRB members discussed regional sources of granite. Mr. Edwards noted that there was an active granite industry in nearby Westerly, Rhode Island. The Flynt family's quarry in Monson,

Massachusetts was the source of funds invested in historic Deerfield. Mr. Herzan commented that it is interesting how granite was transported – geographic proximity to a construction project was not the only factor. Mr. Edwards stated that the granite used to build the Wadsworth Atheneum was transported from a quarry at the head of a creek in Glastonbury and floated to Gold Street in Hartford.

Mr. Abbott (AECOM) acknowledged that the comments about Criterion D stemmed from the nomination and made sense. He also stated that there has been some loss of integrity of historic materials that date within the period of significance.

Mr. Edwards observed that in the aerial image included on page 10-2 of the nomination, you can see the magnitude of the pier in relation to the harbor. Similar piers existed in New Haven; Mr. Edwards asked if this is the only pier of its type left in the area. Mr. Abbott responded that that is speculated.

In regards to the integrity of the setting, Mr. Herzan commented that the water is an integral part of the setting that remains. However, setting is irrelevant to the areas of significance discussed.

Ms. Labadia provided clarification regarding the portion of the pier with a loss of material.

A motion was made by Mr. Edwards, second by Mr. McMillan to affirm that the Central Vermont Railroad Pier in New London retains enough integrity to continue to be eligible for National Register listed status (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).

1. Nathan Hale Hotel (819 Main Street) and Hooker Hotel (833 Main Street), Main Street National Register Historic District, Willimantic (Windham)

Staff requested that the SRB evaluate whether the properties at 819 and 833 Main Street in Windham continue to contribute to the Main Street National Register Historic District. Ms. Scofield summarized that these buildings are threatened by demolition. They are contributing buildings in the district, which was listed in 1982. The nomination is in an older format with check boxes for the period and areas of significance. Areas of significance noted are Architecture, Commerce, Politics/Government, and Religion. The district is noted for its history as a major railroading and trade center for the surrounding region during the mid- to late-nineteenth century. These two buildings are noted as having been constructed to fill the demand for hotel and cultural facilities in relation to Willimantic's development as a bustling trade center. Todd Levine of SHPO was available to answer questions about this Protection Act case.

Mr. Levine provided a summary of the Protection Act process so far. He also noted that to date, there has only been one loss out of the contributing buildings in the district. Mr. Levine acknowledged that SHPO has a structural report, which indicated that both buildings have damage but could be saved. More deterioration exists at the Hooker Hotel building because of its wood construction, than the masonry Hale building.

Mr. Wigren recused himself because the CT Trust for Historic Preservation paid for the structural report and left the room for the discussion.

Mr. Herzan requested the 1982 photograph showing the buildings from the nomination. Staff passed the photo around to the SRB.

Ms. Saunders mentioned that in the last few years she experienced projects that had no intention of including affordable housing, but later used federal funding to do so.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Mr. McMillan to affirm that the Hale Hotel at 819 Main Street and the Hooker Hotel at 833 Main Street 11 in Windham continue to contribute to the historic significance of the Main Street National Register Historic District (Y-6, N-0, Abstained= 1).

Mr. Wigren returned to the meeting room.

V. Discussion

A. State Review Board Training Presentation

Ms. Scofield introduced Roger Reed, a historian from the National Park Service (NPS), to give a presentation about the National Register program. Mr. Reed provided an overview of eligibility topics and issues that NPS staff encounter during review of National Register nominations.

VI. New Business

No new business was discussed.

VII. Staff Report

No staff report was given at this meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

A motion was made by Mr. Edwards, second by Mr. Wigren to adjourn the meeting (Y-7, N-0, Abstained= 0).