

MINUTES

**State Historic Preservation Review Board
Friday, September 18, 2020 9:30 a.m.
Teleconference via Microsoft Teams ([recorded](#))**

Present: Mr. Barlow (until 10:30), Dr. Bucki (via phone), Ms. Dyer-Carroll, Mr. Herzan (via phone), Ms. Saunders, Mr. Wigren (serving as chair)

Absent: Dr. Feder, Mr. Edwards, Mr. McMillan

Staff: Jenny Scofield, Todd Levine, Mary Dunne, Jonathan Kinney, Cathy Labadia, Jane Schneider, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

I. Call to Order

Mr. Wigren called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. and introduced himself. He announced that he is serving as chair because Mr. Edwards is absent and explained the State Review Board's role. Mr. Wigren took the attendance of the State Historic Preservation Review Board (SRB) members.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Mr. Wigren announced under that the emergency procedures [for digital meetings under Executive Order 7B] the meeting will be recorded. He requested that each person wishing to speak state their name before giving comments.

III. Approval of the June 12, 2020 meeting minutes

Mr. Wigren requested comments on the June minutes. No edits were identified.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Herzan to approve the minutes of the June 12, 2020 meeting (Y-5, N-0, Abstained-0).

IV. Action Items

A. Completed National Register Nominations

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

Ms. Scofield reported that for the nominations on this agenda, the property owners and other interested parties were notified by email of the pending nomination, 30 days prior to the meeting. Nominations and meeting materials were posted on the State Historic Preservation Office website during the noticing period.

1. Armstrong Rubber Company (Pirelli) Building, New Haven (Criterion C, state)

Staff recommends the property for listing under Criterion C at the state level in the categories of Community Planning and Development and Architecture. The period is 1968-1969. Ms. Scofield reported that the nomination was initiated by the owner. Notice of the SRB meeting was emailed to the owner, Mayor for the City of New Haven, City Plan Department, New Haven Historic District Commission, and New Haven Preservation Trust 30 days before the meeting. The Certified Local Government (CLG) response has not been received but is in process. One letter of support was received from the New Haven Preservation Trust. No letters of objection were received. Kendra Waters attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination. Ms. Scofield summarized that the Armstrong Rubber Company Building is an iconic modernist building designed collaboratively by Marcel Breuer, Robert Gatje, and Weidlinger Associates. It was designed as part of a key location in the Long Wharf Redevelopment area. The design was a solution in both the structure and shape of the building; it was designed to be visible from highway and allow for utilitarian function. The box-shaped form hung over base of building and the structural system were innovative. Ms. Scofield noted that Bruce Becker, the property owner, and Susan Godshall of the New Haven Preservation Trust were on the call.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment on the nomination.

Mr. Peter Swanson noted that he was impressed by the nomination. In the conversations about Gatje, Breuer did not consider himself a Brutalist; he felt his work had more to do with light and shadow. Mr. Swanson recommended mentioning this in the text. Mr. Bob Gregson mentioned that he has a tape recording of the tenth anniversary of the Pirelli Building with multiple speakers, including Robert Gatje. One of the reasons the company moved there [to Long Wharf] was to have a special research and development division that was not connected to their manufacturing side; they made a separate manufacturing area in the portion of the building that is now gone. The office tower housed various functions; the executive offices on the top have some elements that still exist. The rest of the building was meant to be functional and could be rearranged. If there is an issue about the interior of the building, the lobby, stairwells, and top floor are the only real elements that were salvageable.

Ms. Susan Godshall, Board member from the New Haven Preservation Trust noted that the Trust submitted a support letter. She read a section of the letter that included a direct quote from Docomomo: "The Pirelli Tire building is a fantastic embodiment of the design ideals held by architect Marcel Breuer. The building is composed of a two-story structure at grade, with four stories of administrative offices 'hanging' above . . . giving the tower the illusion of suspension. Enveloping the entire building are pre-cast concrete panels of varying scale and design. The panels provide protection from the sun, a Breuer preoccupation, and give the façade a tremendous physicality and depth. The end result is a continually changing impression of the building, depending on the day, season, and weather."

Mr. Herzan stated that the nomination includes impressive areas of significance but that the low addition in the back of the building was downplayed. It was not mentioned, and no historic photo was included. It is no longer there but was a part of the original design. He recommended bringing that point out as part of our understanding of the original design; add more description of it in the summary paragraph; add to the record in the narrative and with historic images.

Mr. Herzan mentioned that many of the floors on the interior were open space. Even though abatement has been completed, much of the form and floor plan now is similar to the historic condition. Add historic images of the interior to show this and enhance the integrity argument. Mr. Herzan referenced the description of the building as Brutalist style; he agreed with Mr. Swanson that it is not an illustrative example of the style; if you do decide to call it Brutalist, define the style and explain why this is an example.

Mr. Herzan noted that a lot of work went into putting the property on the State Register of Historic Places. Add a paragraph on the early efforts to preserve this building. Include the date it was placed on the State Register.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll commented that the nomination is well-written. She agreed with the expansion of the discussion of the low part of the building that is no longer there; this would enhance the nomination. She noted that there are text references to both the Long Wharf Development Area and the Long Wharf District and asked if they are the same or are being used interchangeably.

Mr. Wigren shared his concern about the discussion of the rear wing. It was an integral part of the original design; its different place in the program was expressed by a variation in the concrete cladding and it balanced the tower visually. He requested more discussion of the rear wing in terms of design and requested that a more thorough discussion be added in terms of integrity. He expressed concern that the National Park Service might have an issue if a better case is not made for integrity.

Mr. Wigren requested a correction to the statement on p. 8-16 that the urban renewal plan was fully carried out in the 1960s; he disagrees because there were still many vacant lots there in the 1980s.

Mr. Wigren raised discussion about the history for urban renewal in New Haven on p. 8-17. He noted that the nomination makes a thorough case for urban renewal significance and asked if a case could be made under Criterion A with minor modifications.

Mr. Swanson noted that he has plenty of archival information about the building and offered to share it to beef up the discussion of the missing wing and the interior program of the building.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Saunders to list the Armstrong Rubber Company Building in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-6, N-0, Abstained= 0).

2. Edward Bloom Silk Mill, New London (Criteria A and C, local)

Mr. Wigren stated a disclaimer that he works with the consultants who wrote the nomination, but that they did the work independently and not as part of Preservation Connecticut.

Ms. Scofield summarized that the property owner initiated the nomination. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owner, Mayor of the City of New London, New London Historic

District Commission, and New London Landmarks, 30 days before the meeting. The Certified Local Government (CLG) response was positive. No letters of support or objection were received. Ms. Stacey Vairo and Mr. Mike Forino attended the meeting as the consultants for the nomination. Mr. Ted Lazarus, the owner, attended the meeting in support of the nomination.

Ms. Scofield announced that staff recommends the Edward Bloom Silk Mill for listing under Criteria A and C at the local level in the categories of Industry and Architecture. The period of significance extends from 1918, the construction date of the earliest extant building to 1949, when the last large-scale employer vacated. She stated that the property is unique in terms of industrial history. The form is a different shape than we usually see with textile facilities. It is associated with silk manufacturing, but the New London Chamber of Commerce made an effort to bring Edward Bloom, a silk manufacturing magnate from Paterson, New Jersey to New London. The building is narrower than normal to fit on a compact site and also because associated functions did not have to fit on the parcel; Edward Bloom had other facilities to use for related functions.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment on the nomination.

Dr. Bucki stated that the nomination included a fascinating summary of silk production in New London. The connection to other statewide examples of silk production was nicely noted. She supports the listing.

Dr. Bucki requested that the reference to the International Workers of the World (IWW) in 1919-1920 on p. 8-16 be corrected to the Industrial Workers of the World. She noted that Ms. Scofield's comments on the unusual shape of the building satisfies another question she had. Dr. Bucki asked about the relationship of the building to the neighborhood. She is interested in community.

Dr. Bucki asked what is happening with the property now. Mr. Wigren clarified that the Board does not consider that information in making a decision but invited the owner to share if he wished.

Mr. Lazarus responded that he plans to convert the building to a combination of affordable and industrial housing, which is needed in the area. He noted that he had a grandfather in the men's necktie business who used Bloom Silk as a supplier.

Mr. Herzan opened discussion about the period of significance. It cuts off in 1949, but building construction dates extend through 1960, which is more than 50 years ago. He asked if any thought was given to the post-1949 period. Ms. Vairo responded that the property had a series of owners after 1949 and was used as a drug store distribution center.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll stated that the references to Building Number 4 (the addition) do not match up. On p. 7-4 the text includes mention of four buildings on the site but Building 4 is not labeled on the map.

Dr. Bucki noted that the history of the Cheney silk mills in Manchester was nicely done.

Mr. Wigren commented on the statement about wages paid in various industries on p.8-17. He asked how the number of employees compared to the high wages and if the high wages were paid

to a small work force. Ms. Vairo responded that less than 100 people were employed at this mill. The cutlery industry may have smaller comparatively and more highly skilled in a different way.

Dr. Bucki discussed the labor strikes of the mid-1920s; 100 weavers went on strike and 100 workers were still employed in this plant. She noted that the silk industry was turbulent in terms of labor relations and that she liked the discussion of labor in the 1920s that was included in the nomination including the International Labor Defense. Dr. Bucki commented that these strikes had little to do with wage levels. Strikes were also about work processes.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Dr. Bucki to list the Edward Bloom Silk Mill in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-6, N-0, Abstained= 0).

3. St. Mark's Episcopal Church, New Canaan (Criterion C, state)

Ms. Scofield stated that the church, as property owner, initiated the nomination. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owner, Town of New Canaan First Selectman, New Canaan Preservation Alliance, and New Canaan Historical Society, 30 days before the meeting. The Town of New Canaan is not a Certified Local Government (CLG). No letters of support or objection were received. Ms. Scofield summarized that this is a church complex of 3 buildings, 2 structures, and a designed landscape. It was part of a former estate and there are buildings on the property that pre-date the conversion to a church campus. The period of significance is 1958-1962, which corresponds to the construction period of the conversion of the property to a church campus. The church was designed by Sherwood, Mills, and Smith, a local architectural firm from Stamford, but the firm was networked with many nationally and internationally known architects. Staff recommends the church property for listing under Criterion C at the state level in the category of Architecture. Ms. Virginia Adams and Ms. Gretchen Pineo attended the meeting as the consultants for the nomination. Ms. Jill Sautkulis and Mr. George Wright associated with St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Richard Thomas from the church and New Canaan Preservation Alliance, and Ms. Mimi Findlay of the New Canaan Preservation Alliance attended the meeting in support of the nomination.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment on the nomination. Ms. Sautkulis, Director of Operations for the church thanked the Board for considering the nomination and thanked the consultants and property committee. Mr. Thomas noted that St. Mark's has long been recognized as a notable modernist landmark. There are lots of Modern houses in New Canaan that have been recognized and it is important that a community structure also be recognized.

Ms. Adams remarked that the church property committee was so enthusiastic about the nomination and they have incredible records about the church and the building's history. It was a pleasure investigating further this public aspect of mid-twentieth-century Modern architecture in New Canaan.

Mr. Herzan commented that he is impressed by the nomination. It is an ideal record of a building and is a model for other consultants to follow. It is fortunate the information about the property was available and that the church sought recognition.

Mr. Wigren stated church architecture is of interest to him. He commented that an applicable theme for this building may be conservative modernism. There is a lot of attention on the idea that Modernism represents a total break from the traditional, but you can see in this building in references to Gothic architecture and in the liturgical arrangements that the break is not always as total as people wanted us think. The liturgical arrangement to bring the congregation closer to the latter is still only partially met here. It is still a traditional long narrow building with an altar at one end. He mentioned G.E. Kidder Smith's 1964 publication, *The New Churches of Europe*. It is a wonderful comparison to see where St. Mark's church fits in to that larger context. There is similarity to Coventry Cathedral, including the oval shaped reredos, the longitudinal plan of the building and the checkerboard pattern of small openings in the side walls.

Mr. Wigren recommended playing up the discussion of other Modernist churches in the nomination. Listing Modernist churches in the National Register is still relatively new; many have not been listed and the listed churches are not a representative sample. Listed Connecticut churches in New Haven include the Dixwell Congregational Church and the Bethesda Lutheran Church in the Prospect Hill Historic District. The Bethesda Lutheran Church is barely mentioned in the district nomination but is a lot like St. Mark's. It is a liturgical denomination (Lutheran), designed by a local architectural firm with broader connections, and it uses some of the same Gothic ideas in the design. Mr. Wigren will share the survey form for it. Mr. Wigren requested more analysis at the end of the architectural comparison. He asked for more detail on how St. Mark's fit into the larger context.

Mr. Wigren requested clarification in the nomination that Canaan Parish was settled by Congregationalists, and not people associated with the Church of England.

Mr. Wigren commented that the characterization of pre-Modernist landscape architecture on p. 8-30 is too limited. At this time, the Olmsted firm is active, and there is development of parks, parkways, and institutional landscapes. Landscape history at the time includes a lot more than Colonial gardens.

Ms. Adams thanked the Board for their comments. She noted that she will take the comments into consideration and are aware of the boarder landscape context.

[Mr. Barlow left the meeting at 10:30]

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Dyer-Carroll to list St. Mark's Episcopal Church in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

4. Pavilion Hall, Washington (Criteria A and C, local)

Ms. Scofield stated that the property owners initiated the nomination. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owners, Town of Washington First Selectman, and Washington Historic District Commission 30 days before the meeting. The Town of Washington is not a Certified Local Government (CLG). No letters of support or objection were received.

Ms. Scofield summarized that the property is a Queen Anne style building constructed in 1897 by local owners as a public recreational space. It is a prominent building on a highly visible site in the village of New Preston and is the anchor of an intact late nineteenth and early twentieth century streetscape. Staff recommends the property for listing under Criteria A and C at the local level in the categories of Entertainment/Recreation and Architecture. Lake Waramaug is nearby and attracted summer tourism. The period of significance extends from the construction of the building in 1897, to 1940 when the entertainment use of the property stopped and it was acquired by the town. Ms. Sarah Griswold attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination. Mr. Andrew Fry and Mr. Michael DePerno, owners, attended the meeting in support of the nomination.

Mr. Wigren invited public comment on the nomination. Ms. Griswold noted that this is her first nomination. Mr. DePerno stated that he is happy to have the building and honored to have it be nominated.

Dr. Bucki commented that the property is worthy of nomination. She requested that the introduction section of the description be rewritten to clarify that the building is integral to the village.

Mr. Wigren asked who Harry Erikson is. Ms. Griswold responded that he was involved later when the town owned the building and it was used as a boys club.

Mr. Wigren commented that the significance section gets thin after 1899 and requested more information be added to the nomination to document what is going on in the building from 1900 to 1940. Ms. Saunders asked if there are historic era photos that show community events and bolster the history of community participation.

Mr. Wigren asked who the incorporators of the club were. Ms. Griswold responded that there are some names on the deed and she can put more information about them in the nomination.

Mr. Wigren noted that this building was constructed during the golden age of the social club. He mentioned the New Haven Lawn Club as another Connecticut example; it may include some research references. Ms. Saunders asked if there are any postcards of the building. The owners replied that they looked exhaustively for such images of the building; they did not find any postcards. Vintage photos of the street, showing the building were found and displayed in a visitor center in the building. Dr. Bucki asked if there was any listing of events that took place; she was looking for any ethnic association. Ms. Griswold responded that the community was Caucasian Protestants.

Mr. Wigren remarked that the current physical appearance of the property should be documented through the photographs. The photographs in the nomination show the conditions before the now completed rehabilitation of the building. Ms. Griswold clarified that the photographs were taken at the beginning of the nomination process. It is now harder to see the building because there is stuff inside of it. Ms. Scofield commented that it takes some time to get to the nominations and sometimes it happens if it is a fast-moving project.

Dr. Bucki stated that she doesn't know if she can vote on the nomination without the current photographs. Discussion continued regarding sharing photos.

Ms. Saunders asked about the treatment of the fire-truck pit. Ms. Griswold answered that there is a step down where the fire-truck pit was. Mr. Fry and Mr. DePerno shared current photographs of the building. They summarized the rehabilitation work and noted that the proscenium with the original beadboard and stage remain intact on the interior. The SRB discussed the photographs and requested that new photos be added to the nomination. Mr. Wigren stated that the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation [now Preservation Connecticut] gave a preservation award for this project.

Mr. Herzan requested that the nomination text be updated to reflect the recent changes to the building. Mr. Wigren described that the exterior remains the same but has been painted white and the openings under the porches on either side of the ground floor were made into shop windows. The interior had a lot of bare walls before the work, which are now clad mostly in bead board so that the space is finished looking. The opening for the stage has been enclosed with windows, but it is still intact.

The SRB discussed whether or not to hold the nomination until the next meeting. Mr. Fry and Mr. DePerno stated that they would like to keep the nomination moving; they can share photographs today. Ms. Scofield noted that there are several nominations for properties undergoing tax credit or rehabilitation projects in various stages; it is not unusual to see photographs in a stage of preservation and would not want one nomination to be held back for that. Ms. Saunders suggested that the photographs could be viewed in the next couple days to keep the nomination moving; the preservation of the building won an award. The SRB agreed to vote on the nomination conditionally, with the understanding that the current photographs will be shared and reviewed.

Mr. Herzan remarked that buildings like this are not uncommon in the state. He mentioned the statewide survey of theaters and requested that it be referenced in the nomination. These were theaters in small scale and have different forms throughout the state; they were early community centers. The survey was organized by Nancy Savin, an educational TV personality. Mr. Herzan stated that the building is compared to other buildings in New Preston in the nomination but requested that it be compared to other similar buildings of the property type and placed in a statewide context. The building is a type that was represented in other communities. Mr. Wigren offered to help with access to the survey. Ms. Saunders offered to contact Nancy Savin about the theater survey and comparison to this property.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll requested wordsmithing of the integrity statement. The information is in there but it could be clearer and have more punch. Enhance the statement about integrity of setting.

A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Ms. Saunders to list Pavilion Hall in the National Register of Historic Places, conditional upon review of new photographs by September 22 (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

B. Review of Eligibility Status of National Register Listed Property

Ms. Scofield introduced Agenda Item B as discussion of properties that are already listed in the National Register. This is not an action to officially add or remove anything from the National Register; it is a request from SHPO staff to the SRB to get advice and recommendations about the current integrity of the properties. There is no official action to change the status of the properties with the SRB vote.

1. 130 Henry St, 79 Garden St, 736 Atlantic St, and 650 Atlantic St, South End Historic District, Stamford

Ms. Scofield summarized that the South End Historic District was listed in 1986 under Criteria A and C. Mr. Levine introduced himself as SHPO staff. He stated that 130 Henry Street, 79 Garden Street, and 650 Atlantic Street were previously reviewed by the SRB in 2016 under a previous potential CEPA action. At that time the SRB concurred that the properties still contributed to the historic district. The owner was asked to board up the buildings, which they did for 130 Henry and 79 Garden streets, but some of the boarding was subsequently removed or fell out. The owner declined to replace the boarding. 736 Atlantic is new and just came to SHPO attention; it was not reviewed by the SRB. Ms. Scofield noted that Lee Riccetti and Lisa Feinberg were on the meeting as consultants for the property owner.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Herzan that the properties contribute to the South End Historic District.

Ms. Riccetti, from Heritage Consulting Group introduced herself. She was retained by the owner BLT in 2016 to assess the historic values of the properties. Heritage Consulting wrote reports in 2016 that have recently been updated with the new development plan. The firm's work experience includes National Register nominations throughout the country, historic tax credit guidance and local design review guidance. Ms. Riccetti stated that since the National Register listing in 1986, the context of the district and the individual buildings have changed dramatically. For the houses at 79 Garden, 122 Henry, 126 Henry, and 130 Henry, as well as 736 Atlantic; they were characterized as Queen Anne style in the nomination dating to ca. 1895. Heritage Consulting found that the buildings have had alterations since the listing, have lost integrity, and no longer represent the Queen Anne style; they did not find any specific information related to the buildings to suggest they have particular importance to the district. Heritage Consulting understands that the Blickensderfer Typewriting building [650 Atlantic] is important to the community, but there have been alterations to the building. Ms. Riccetti noted that the lack of integrity of the buildings warrants reconsideration and asked the SRB to review the reports before the hearing [with the Historic Preservation Council] scheduled in October.

Ms. Lisa Feinberg [of Carmody Law, representing the owner] requested that the SRB review the aforementioned reports before their decision today because the reports are directly related to the SRB's decision. Ms. Feinberg noted that she just found out about the SRB meeting two days ago. Mr. Wigren asked if the reports were supplied to the State Historic Preservation Office. Ms. Feinberg responded that they were supplied last night. Mr. Wigren stated that the SRB does not have the reports and asked if there is a commitment to not do anything to the buildings until the SRB could review the reports and act on them. Ms. Feinberg stated that there is a commitment to

not do anything until October 21; Mr. Levine has that affidavit. There is a council meeting on October 7. Mr. Wigren noted that the next SRB meeting is on December 4. Ms. Feinberg stated that they cannot wait until December 4th, but thought it was unfair to make a decision without the information [in the reports]. Mr. Levine clarified that SHPO discussed putting the October 7 meeting further out to give the owners of these buildings adequate time to send in all related information; the original letter from SHPO to the owner sent months ago noted that this SRB meeting would be upcoming. Mr. Levine stated the reports were just received yesterday. Mr. Levine noted a hard deadline last week for information to be submitted for this case. Ms. Feinberg stated that she thought there was a miscommunication about a hard deadline; that was not expressed to her, but she noted that she had not had a direct conversation about it with Mr. Levine. Mr. Levine stated that it was mentioned in the letter that her client signed. Ms. Feinberg stated that she did not have notice of this meeting.

Ms. Saunders asked if the Stamford neighborhood preservation group is represented here; they are usually vocal about Henry Street. She asked if they have been given time to read and react. Mr. Levine stated no for this SRB meeting. He noted that they are involved in promoting the preservation of these buildings through the CT Environmental Protection Act process. Mr. Levine referenced the process for this used over the last 25 years. Generally, the SHPO just asks the SRB for advice; this is not something that removes buildings from or adds buildings to the National Register. SHPO comes to SRB to seek professional advice. Ms. Scofield clarified that Protection Act cases go to the state Historic Preservation Council; there is noticing, and involvement and a process related to that. As one step in that, we seek advice about integrity. It is noticed differently because SHPO is not proposing to change the status of the property; SHPO is just seeking advice. SHPO is choosing the manner of a public meeting to do that, but the SRB can advise SHPO on SHPO programs at any time.

Mr. Wigren began to ask if there is a noticing requirement for the SRB to call another meeting in a few days, then asked Ms. Riccetti if she prepared the study that the SRB hasn't seen. Ms. Riccetti responded that her company prepared the studies in 2016 and then updated them to include the new site development plan as well as 736 Atlantic. Mr. Wigren stated that the site development plan doesn't have much to do with this. He asked Ms. Riccetti if she could summarize the major points in the reports. Ms. Riccetti responded that the major points are that the buildings have been altered and there is a lack of integrity. Mr. Wigren stated that that is a little vague and asked Ms. Riccetti to be more specific. Mr. Herzan suggested discussing one building at a time. Ms. Riccetti offered to read the summaries from each report.

Ms. Riccetti referenced the report for 79 Garden Street. The building has been almost totally altered on the exterior. There is vinyl siding, the roof soffit was replaced, it has new roofing material, some windows are missing, and some windows are extant but in poor condition. The interior is not accessible due to the condition of the building. Ms. Saunders asked if this is the condition of the building since 2016. Ms. Riccetti clarified that this was the condition in 2016 and not much has changed. Mr. Wigren asked how the condition compares to 1986. Ms. Riccetti responded that these changes have occurred since 1986.

Ms. Riccetti referenced the report for 130 Henry Street. The building has not been altered as much as 79 Garden Street. The exterior has clapboard siding; at one point it had aluminum or vinyl siding that has been removed. Some windows have been removed; many are modern vinyl units.

The roof has been replaced. A second-floor porch is in poor condition. The interior was not accessible for any of the properties. Dr. Bucki mentioned the fish-scale shingles. Ms. Riccetti stated that the building is in poor condition and has a brick foundation coated in stucco. Mr. Herzan commented on the context; contributing buildings don't need to be individually eligible. It's how they relate to the neighborhood and the National Register district boundaries that have been established. He asked if Ms. Riccetti could comment on the buildings on the other side of Henry street so the SRB can look at them in terms of how they contribute to the placement and form of structures in the district context. Ms. Riccetti noted that the reports have an analysis of Henry Street; there is no consistent character block by block. At one point it was a working-class industrial neighborhood centered around the factory building; now there is a series of vacant lots and new highrises mixed in. On Garden Street, a specific analysis was not done- they focused on Henry Street, which was of concern to HNPP [Stamford Historic Neighborhood Preservation]. On the north side of the block on Garden, there is the typewriter factory and a parking lot. On the east side there are one- to two-story homes, but there isn't a consistent character. Ms. Saunders noted the preserved Yale Town Lock building on Henry Street. Ms. Riccetti noted that her client rehabilitated that building using tax credits.

Ms. Riccetti noted that reports were not prepared for 122 and 126 Henry. They were evaluated in 2016, but they understood those buildings would be retained and preserved but are on the overall site redevelopment plan. Ms. Riccetti spoke of the typewriter building at 650 Atlantic Street. It used to have a large rear wing. There are many missing windows and it is in poor condition. They realized this is an important building to the community and BLT is committed to saving at least a portion of the building. Dr. Bucki asked which parts will be retained. Ms. Riccetti noted that the original front section of the building will be retained. There is a rear 1938 addition that they may or may not be able to keep. The plans are still conceptual. Mr. Levine clarified that BLT is committed to saving a portion of the original main block, not the entirety. Mr. Herzan asked which portion will be retained. Mr. Levine stated that the Atlantic Street side would be retained; they were looking at 60% starting at the façade, working back. There is a mid-century addition that extends the building to Garden Street. Ms. Feinberg stated that the rear portion of the building fronting along Garden Street is not listed as contributing to the historic district. Mr. Levine questioned whether that was called out in the nomination. Ms. Riccetti stated it is described as a non-contributing addition. Mr. Herzan asked for clarification that the original part of the building is being considered for rehabilitation. Ms. Feinberg noted that the majority of the original structure is being considered for rehabilitation but there are environmental issues on the site, including PCB flues that run below the building. With PCBs you don't know how far they go until you get into it.

Ms. Riccetti stated that 736 Atlantic Street has probably seen the most alterations. Based on Sanborn maps, it appears the building was moved; it was closer to the corner of Atlantic and Henry. Mr. Wigren asked if the relocation was since 1986. Ms. Riccetti responded that it was prior to 1986 but was not noted in the nomination. In looking at the building it doesn't have a lot of integrity. All of the fenestration has been changed, vinyl siding was added to the exterior, the interior is chopped up, and it is not recognizable as a Queen Anne-style house. It looks like a modern apartment building.

Mr. Wigren asked the SRB for comments. Mr. Herzan stated that he agrees with the non-contributing qualities of 736 Atlantic, but he is having trouble calling 79 Garden and 130 Henry non-contributing because they do relate to the row of buildings across the street. According to the

Google 2020 map sent to the SRB, that seems recent and current. He is not comfortable recommending a change in status because their form appears intact. The SRB is not scrutinizing the buildings in terms of individual designation; they are looking at how they relate to a historic streetscape. Dr. Bucki agreed. The fact that they are deteriorated doesn't mean that they don't have some architectural integrity especially as it relates to those across the street. She agreed that 736 Atlantic is not longer applicable, but 130 Henry and 79 Garden seem to be intact enough. She asked how to move forward without having the latest documents. Mr. Wigren stated that the buildings may or may not be in existence the next time the SRB meets. There is a hearing scheduled before the Historic Preservation Council the first week in October; the SRB has been asked for advice to the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Wigren noted that the SRB can give advice now based on the material they have and the summary presented or try to schedule another meeting. Ms. Saunders stated that she agrees with Mr. Herzan and Dr. Bucki. She drives on Henry Street often and is happy to see that some of the buildings are still standing. She agrees with retaining 130 Henry and 79 Garden; they are still giving some streetscape depth of history in that location. She would be upset if they are demolished because the SRB did not come forward and tell the Historic Preservation Council how the SRB feels.

Mr. Wigren commented that in looking at the photographs supplied and listening to the summary of the consultant's findings, he has seen houses in the condition of 79 Garden and 130 Henry accepted as contributing properties to a National Register district within the last year or two. They exhibit historic massing and shape, patterns of openings, some detailing such as porches, there is potential for siding underneath. The fact that the buildings have been re-roofed since the 1890s does not detract from their integrity. He stated that the factory building has suffered from loss of windows, but it is recognizable as a relatively intact factory. He agrees that the house on Atlantic Street has lost integrity. He can recognize it as a house of that late-19th to early 20th century period, but it looks like a floor has been added to it and it has more changes to the fenestration than the other buildings. Mr. Wigren stated that the SRB has asked for material from these studies and Ms. Riccetti has summarized them. Unless she feels she missed some key information, Mr. Wigren has no problem affirming the houses on Henry and Garden Street and the factory as still contributing to the district. Dr. Bucki suggested making that a motion.

Mr. Wigren asked if there is any further discussion or if Ms. Riccetti had anything to add. Ms. Riccetti commented that she hopes the SRB will have the opportunity to review the reports at some point. Ms. Scofield stated that she will share the reports with the SRB immediately and if the SRB feels this should be discussed again, we can discuss how to proceed. Mr. Wigren reminded the SRB that this is an advisory action and called for a vote [via roll call].

An amended motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Mr. Herzan that 79 Garden Street, 130 Henry Street, and 650 Atlantic Street continue to contribute to the significance of the South End Historic District (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Saunders that 736 Atlantic Street no longer contributes to the significance of the South End Historic District (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

2. 25 Edward Street, Union Village Historic District, Manchester

Mr. Levine summarized that 25 Edward Street is a contributing resource to the Union Village Historic District, listed since 2002. It was listed under Criteria A and C.

Some SRB members noted that they couldn't see the photographs in the online document; the document was also mailed. Ms. Wisniewski sent the photographs again by email and Board members received it.

Mr. Wigren asked for public comment; none was heard. Ms. Scofield summarized that there are very few changes to the properties in this district since its listing. This property is on a key location in the streetscape; it is at the end of the street, anchoring the edge of a very large district in this location. Mr. Wigren commented that based on the photographs he has, the house looks the same as it did in the National Register nomination. Mr. Herzan referenced an image from Google Earth in 2019; he asked if the building still looks the same now. Mr. Levine responded that he has not been there yet since this just came to SHPO, but he talked to the neighbors and the house looks ready to move-in. Dr. Bucki asked if the building is slated for demolition. Mr. Levine responded that he understands that the intent of the owner is to demolish for parking; the property backs up to a car dealership and the owner wants parking for his staff. Ms. Scofield clarified that the car dealership is on the main road to the other side. This house is in a neighborhood that is facing the other way. This would be encroachment from the commercial businesses on the main road into the neighborhood.

Dr. Bucki stated that this house definitely contributes to the historic district; she doesn't think there is any question. Mr. Herzan asked what direction the car dealership is in. Ms. Scofield clarified that it is behind it; the house faces a street that almost dead-ends. The street is straight, then near this house it bends sharply like an access way toward the commercial area.

Ms. Saunders recommended that the SRB vote on the integrity and the position of the house in the district- it is unchanged.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Ms. Saunders that 25 Edward Street continues to contribute to the significance of the Union Village Historic District (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).

V. Discussion

No items were discussed.

VI. New Business

No new business was discussed.

VII. Staff Report

Ms. Scofield announced that the National Park Service held a National Historic Landmark committee meeting this fall. Two Connecticut items on the agenda passed, including a new NHL nomination for the modernist First Presbyterian Church in Stamford and an update to the NHL documentation for Hill-stead in Farmington. The Hill-Stead documentation was updated with

more scholarship about Theodate Pope Riddle under women's history and expanded information about the outbuildings and the landscape.

Ms. Scofield also introduced Jonathan Kinney who joined the staff from the New Jersey SHPO. He will be serving as Deputy SHPO.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Mr. Herzan, to adjourn the meeting (Y-5, N-0, Abstained= 0).