

MINUTES

State Historic Preservation Review Board

Friday, June 12, 2020 9:30 a.m.

Teleconference via Microsoft Teams ([Click here for the recording](#))

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

Absent: Mr. Barlow

Staff: Mary Dunne, Cathy Labadia, Jane Schneider, Jenny Scofield, Elizabeth Shapiro, Marena Wisniewski

I. Call to Order

Mr. Edwards called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. Ms. Scofield announced that the meeting will be recorded and took attendance of the State Historic Preservation Review Board (SRB) members. Ms. Scofield acknowledged participants attending the meeting including staff, consultants, and members of the public.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Ms. Scofield announced that the emergency procedures for digital meetings under Executive Order 7B will be followed. She noted that the recording of the meeting had started and requested that each person wishing to speak state their name before giving comments. She noted that during the public comment for each agenda item, the Board will ask who is participating in the meeting that wishes to speak.

III. Approval of the September 20, 2019 meeting minutes

The SRB provided staff with minor edits to the September minutes. Ms. Scofield recorded these amendments.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Mr. Herzan to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2019 meeting (Y-8, 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 all items on the agenda were rescheduled from the March 27, 2020 meeting, which was cancelled due to the outbreak of COVID-19 within the state. For the nominations on this agenda, the property owners were notified by mail and other interested parties were notified by email of the pending nomination, 30 days prior to the March meeting. All parties

were notified of the June meeting by email. Nominations and meeting materials were posted on the State Historic Preservation Office website during the noticing period.

1. Winsted Water Works, Winchester (Criteria A and C, state)

Ms. Scofield summarized that the Winsted Water Works is a 210-acre district comprised of 10 resources within the Mad River Watershed constructed between 1893 and 1895. Staff recommends the district for listing under Criteria A and C at the state level in the categories of Community Planning and Development and Engineering. The period of significance extends from 1893, the construction of the earliest feature, to 1930, when City gained full control over the Mad River's output. Ms. Scofield reported that the nomination was initiated by the Town of Winchester. Notice of the SRB meeting was emailed to the Mayor and Director of Public Works 30 days before the meeting. The Town of Winchester and City of Winsted are not Certified Local Governments (CLGs). No letters of support or objection were received. Gretchen Pineo attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination. Mayor Candy Perez and Jim Rollins, Director of Public Works, attended the meeting in support of the nomination.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment on the nomination. Ms. Saunders noted that she loved the nomination and appreciated the footnotes. She asked about the intended meaning of the term "earth canal prism" on p. 7-7 in reference to the dam and whether that is a typo. Mr. Wigren asked about the meaning of prism. Ms. Scofield answered that the prism is the 3-D space of the canal, or the profile shape if looking at it in section view.

Mr. Wigren asked about the reference to Drummond on p. 15 and whether the locational reference was an error. He also asked about the effects of the water supply system on the development of Winsted; he asked if it expanded the service area or what the effects were on business. Dr. Bucki noted that there is no sense of the ecological impact of the building of the water system and asked whether the dams had impacts on fish. Ms. Scofield noted that a note could be added about that if it was an issue historically. Dr. Bucki asked who would historically have benefited from this infrastructure; who would get the water and benefit from it socially and ecologically. Ms. Scofield stated that the information could be expanded.

In reference to the 1938 and 1955 hurricanes mentioned on p. 8-17, Mr. Edwards asked if there is any reason to discuss the hurricanes; he asked if there was any damage to the water system.

Jim Rollins, Director of Public Works for the Town of Winchester clarified that the Crystal Lake and Rugg Brook reservoirs have self-contained watersheds and did not sustain any storm damage. In terms of whether there was a conflict between Agriculture and Manufacturing, he clarified that the point of the water works was to feed industry. Water was captured from the Crystal Lake, Mad River, and Rugg Brook watersheds, diverted from the Mad River into Rugg Brook, which would go through through the tunnel into Crystal Lake and overflow the Crystal Lake dam. The water moved down Sucker Brook into Highland Lake, then discharge back into Mad River to give water power to the factories. Mr. Rollins also noted that the canal prism is rectangular, not triangular-shaped and is roughly 6 feet by 8 feet. Public water, which was mostly fire suppression at the time, was moved from Highland Lake to Crystal Lake and it became potable water.

Mr. Herzan requested some minor edits of items such as a missing word on p. 7-7 at the beginning of the second paragraph, rewording of the statement of integrity to improve the flow, capitalization of State of Connecticut on p. 8-13, and deletion of an unneeded “the” in the last paragraph on p. 8-17. Mr. Herzan commented that the nomination is a wonderful record of a resource that is often not thought of much. Mr. Wigren commended the town for pursuing the nomination.

Mr. McMillan noted that he enjoyed reading the nomination. He asked for some context about the floods and asked if there was any ancillary benefit when the floods came that may have added to the story of the benefit of this water system. In reference to the mapping of the district boundary, he asked if the boundary is based on the shores of the reservoirs as shown in Figure 2 or on the larger parcels and improvements installed as part of the water system. He noted that the shape and size and level of a lake can change drastically during the course of a year. Mr. Rollins clarified that the ramifications from the flood of 1955, involved the creation of two dams by the federal government that were not part of the Mad River and Crystal Lake reservoirs. The Sucker Brook Dam and Mad River Dam would capture the water before it gets to Winsted. The two reservoirs are isolated from that purpose. Ms. Pineo clarified that the district boundaries were contained to the water sheets because there was later infrastructure that was built on the shores of the reservoirs.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Dr. Bucki to list the Winsted Water Works in Winchester in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).

2. James Alexis Darling House, Woodbridge (Criteria A and C, local)

Ms. Scofield summarized that the James Alexis Darling House property contains a farm cottage, with two historic outbuildings that forms continuous agrarian landscape with the NR-listed Thomas Darling House and Barns (on town-owned land) to the south. Staff recommends the district for listing under Criteria A and C at the local level in the categories of Agriculture and Architecture. The period of significance extends from 1842, when the house was constructed to 1932, when active farming of the property ended. The property owners initiated the nomination for stewardship purposes. Notice of the SRB meeting was sent to the property owners, First Selectman, and Amity and Woodbridge Historical Society 30 days before the meeting. The Town of Woodbridge is not a Certified Local Government (CLG). No letters of support or objection were received. Charlotte Hitchcock attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination.

Mr. Edwards invited public comment on the nomination. Dr. Bucki requested clarification regarding what the Wagon Shed/Workshop was used for in the description on p. 7-7. Ms. Hitchcock responded that the workshop area still contains tools and work benches; it may have been used for farming equipment. Dr. Bucki asked that the nomination be clarified to indicate the use of the building for tools, rather than activities such as horseshoeing.

Mr. Wigren commented that the significance narrative under Criterion A did not include information about the side businesses that James Alexis Darling or other owners may have been engaged in. There is no evidence of anything other than local agricultural work on the property that would indicate another use for the outbuilding. He noted that this property is not a proper architectural history but is lovable.

Mr. Edwards commented that the nomination is interesting in how Ms. Hitchcock documented the social advances of the Darling family. The question about the workshop is an interesting way to look into that. The house is less for sustenance and more for gentleman's farming. It gives a sense of the settlers that migrated to New Haven and surrounding towns.

Mr. McMillan stated that he supports the nomination. He requested that the text on p. 5, paragraph 2, be reworded to note that the setting is an aspect of the integrity. There is a strong pastoral setting. In reference to the dry-laid masonry wall described in the nomination, he requested clarification of how the wall related to the property and context about why it is important.

Mr. McMillan suggested moving the second paragraph on p. 7-6 to the front of the discussion about the building's interior. Describe the structure first, then explain how the floor plan relates to it. Mr. McMillan requested a similar edit on p. 7-8; move the last sentence of the integrity section about evoking feeling up to add to the context. Make a statement about why the property is significant, then discuss integrity and why is it still intact enough to convey the significance.

A motion was made by Ms. Saunders, second by Dr. Bucki to list the James Alexis Darling House in the National Register of Historic Places (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).

B. Changes to National Register Listed Property

1. William Pinto House, New Haven, Proposed Relocation (Review of Pre-Move Documentation)

Ms. Scofield explained the purpose of a pre-move documentation and process for reviewing it within the National Register program. This documentation was noticed 30 days before the meeting. Ms. Scofield summarized that the William Pinto House in New Haven is proposed for relocation from 275 Orange Street, 87 feet to the adjacent lot at 283 Orange Street. It was listed in the National Register in 1985, under Criterion B for its association with William Pinto (Jewish settlement) and Eli Whitney. It also meets Criterion C as a representation of an early nineteenth-century gable-to-street form.

Notice of the pre-move documentation was sent to the property owner, Mayor of New Haven, Historic District Commission, New Haven Preservation Trust, Preservation Connecticut, and the City Plan Commission 30 days before the meeting. Six letters of support were received by the beginning of the meeting and two letters were received that contained concerns for the compromising of integrity through relocation and integrity of the house in relation to new development proposed. All of the letters were shared with the SRB (about 12 pages of comments). Ms. Scofield announced that what the SRB is reviewing is not part of any local approval process. The SRB is tasked with reviewing whether or not the relocation as described in the pre-move documentation compromises the integrity of the building or the qualities which make it eligible listing. The pre-move document has been posted on the SHPO website during the noticing period.

Ms. Scofield noted that several people are attending the meeting for this agenda item including James Sexton, the consultant for the pre-move documentation. Mr. Edwards opened for comment.

Elizabeth Holt of New Haven Preservation Trust requested that the letter of support from the New Haven Preservation Trust for the pre-move documentation be read into the record; Ms. Scofield read the letter, dated May 28, 2020.

Mr. Edwards requested clarification of the National Park Service's (NPS) requirements for pre-move documentations. Ms. Scofield explained that NPS requires information about the reasons for move, the effect on property's historical integrity during and after the move, the new setting and general environment of the proposed site, including evidence that the proposed site does not possess historic or archaeological significance that would be adversely affected by the intrusion of the property, and photographs showing the proposed location. She explained that this is the type of information NPS requires, but they do not require one specific format of the documentation because it may vary on a case by case basis.

Mr. Edwards asked if any members of the public wanted to comment. Mr. Glen Markham, identified himself as the prospective building mover for the project and offered to answer questions.

Mr. Herzan noted that he had questions in looking at the architectural drawings of the new location. He stated that it was not clear from the documentation whether the brick floor (basement) will be moved to the new site. Also, the steps to the front door will be reversed in the new location, which may be an impact to the property's integrity. The building was recorded by HABS, including these details. To keep this building on the National Register, we shouldn't diminish anything the building has now in terms of integrity. Mr. Herzan stated that he is in support of the project in terms of moving the building to preserve it; this is a valuable resource. Mr. Sexton responded that the brick floor appears to have been removed or covered with concrete during the restoration that happened after the nomination was written. It is no longer a visible element of the house.

Mr. Edwards commented on the 1987 renovations and rear addition. He asked if the 1987 renovation was when the 1/1 windows were replaced with replicas of the original windows. Mr. Sexton responded that he thinks the windows are earlier. Mr. Edwards noted that the National Register nomination was approved by the National Park Service in 1985 and a major renovation occurred only two years later. He asked if there is any information about how the 1987 renovation impacted the decorative elements of the house. Mr. Sexton noted that the windows date to 1990. He noted that he shared a document comparing photos from the nomination and current condition. The renovation was mostly additive; it did not result in the removal of a lot of material. A staircase was added to the east side of the house. The material identified in the nomination is mostly intact. Mr. Edwards asked about historic ownership in relation to changes made to the building. Ms. Scofield clarified that because we have different types of relocations, we have different types of documentations. The last one the SRB reviewed was more intensive because of the nature of that project, but it included a matrix of every feature of the building with a construction date and whether the feature had been altered. This may inform the questions you are getting. The SRB requested additional information in the pre-move documentation about how the 1987 changes impacted the property.

Mr. Wigren stated that clearer NPS guidelines regarding what is required for pre-move documentations would be helpful. He commented on the alterations since the 1985 nomination;

some items were missed. Two of three exterior chimneys were removed, the cellar was altered, and the front door was replaced or altered. He asked if the door openings were rearranged or whether the locations of doors were changed. Mr. Wigren asked what the plan is for the basement on the new site; in terms of archaeology, he suggested quantifying how many borings were taken, how deep they were, and note where they were taken; attach the geotechnical report to this documentation. Mr. Herzan noted that the National Park Service will look closely at the archaeological impact of the move on the original site; more information is needed.

Mr. Herzan commented that he is concerned about the reversal of the orientation of the steps shown in the pre-move documentation drawings. He asked why this is necessary. Mr. Wigren observed that if not reversed, the steps would lead people to a driveway. Mr. Edwards stated that the steps and ironwork as they exist now may date to the widening of Orange Street; he asked when that occurred. These are not the original steps, but they may be historic. Mr. Wigren noted that the information about the replacement of the railing is mentioned in the 1985 nomination, but it is conjectural. The railing has been replaced since 1985.

Mr. Edwards asked about the masonry that supports the steps and whether it is red sandstone. Mr. Sexton confirmed that it is. Mr. Edwards commented that if this is matching the facing on the basement wall of the street, it indicated the stairs were there. Mr. Sexton stated that he would raise the question about the proposed stair orientation with the project architects.

Mr. Sexton provided additional information about how the red sandstone will be handled during the move. The project architects confirmed that the red sandstone would be numbered and placed back in original relative positions.

The SRB discussed questions related to the method of the building move. Mr. Herzan asked how the building will be relocated and what measures will be taken to stabilize it during the move. Dr. Bucki asked how much of the foundation will be moved. Mr. Markham, prospective building mover for the project, stated that the foundation move is up to the general contractor. He offered to comment on stabilizing the building. He stated that a table of steel will be placed under the building with steel I-beams running front to back, with cross-steel every 7 feet and in locations of fireplaces. The steel will be shimmed to the existing wood and sprung with wedges. This pre-deflects the steel and takes up the deflection in the wood to keep the building stable from a floor-plane standpoint. It will be moved on steel rails using skate devices that will sit between sections of beams perpendicular to each other. Mr. Herzan requested that this information to be included in the documentation.

Ms. Scofield requested that drawings be referenced when the methods of the move are described in more detail. Mr. Sexton stated that he didn't think such drawings were completed. Mr. Markham responded that drawings showing the steel placement are not typically done, but they could be developed. He stated that everything changes in the field conditions and mentioned an example. A drawing would be subject to change when you get in the field. Something could be done but it would say approximate. Mr. Edwards suggested including a diagram instead of a drawing. Mark up where you are proposing parallel steel and the locations of the track. A diagram could be marked as conceptual layout of the cribbage required in steel to move the house. It could describe the intent, rather than use an engineered drawing. Mr. Wigren suggested just using the text. Mr. Sexton requested confirmation that the Board asked for verbal description only. Mr.

Herzan requested inclusion of some of the qualifiers that the building mover stated. Mr. Markham noted that the main objective is to move the building intact. Mr. Herzan added that describing how that will be done will help with the National Park Service review.

Mr. Edwards commented on the terminology for cardinal directions. He requested that the language from the 1985 nomination used.

Ms. Dyer-Carroll commented that the discussion of integrity on p. 5 and continued eligibility under Criterion B reads as if the property is no longer eligible under Criterion B at all. She asked if this was the intent of the text and suggested editing. Mr. Sexton agreed to edit it. Ms. Dyer-Carroll noted that in the paragraph pertaining to Criterion C on p. 5, information about the change in the stairs and aspects of the foundation should be added. Mr. Wigren asked what "relatively" means on p. 5 under Criterion C in the phrase "relatively undisturbed by the move". Mr. Sexton responded that he will remove the word "relatively".

Mr. Edwards requested re-writing of the sentence in the Criterion B paragraph pertaining to the connection between Whitney and the Pintos; he requested clarification on where that information came from. Mr. Sexton agreed to add a citation or adjust the text.

Ms. Saunders stated that she wants to make sure that the archaeology is well in hand. Some insights into the former lives of residents have been found in similar house moves. Archaeological information should be required. Ms. Scofield summarized that the information we have right now is what is in the report and the geotechnical report that just came in. Dr. Feder asked to make sure there is an archaeological survey both at the current and proposed location. Mr. Sexton responded that an archaeological survey is not planned. The geotechnical report was reviewed by Meg Harper and the comments in the archaeological section of the pre-move documentation are from her. Mr. Sexton noted that he is not an archaeologist, but his understanding was that the area appeared to be a jumbled mix of fill, based on the geotechnical report, just submitted.

Mr. Herzan asked the SRB to amend the motion to be conditional upon the issues raised, including the archaeology and the description of the move. These should be adequately described to make sure the documentation gets through the process.

Peg Chambers of the Preservation Committee and Board of the New Haven Preservation Trust suggested that a reference be made in the summary of the sequence of work of moving the house to explain how the move of the foundation by the general contractor will be coordinated with the move of the house. Dr. Bucki agreed and commented that there are too many things not pinned down yet, including questions about the foundation relocation.

Mr. Herzan stated that he would like to make a motion to approve the move of the building with the understanding that the documentation address the concerns discussed including:

- The method of moving
- Description of how the building will be moved
- Description of how the foundation will be conserved and rebuilt
- Why the porch orientation will be reversed and what the justification of it is
- Archaeological evaluation of existing and new sites

Ms. Scofield added that the comparison photographs and geotechnical report received recently be added to the documentation. She stated that she would like the SRB to look at the complete revised package before sending it to the National Park Service for Review. She confirmed that the revised documentation could be posted on the SHPO website.

Mr. Herzan asked when the development project will begin. Ms. Scofield responded that she does not have that information. Mr. Sexton added that the developers are anxious to move forward where they can without disturbing the Pinto House, but he is not aware of a specific date for the relocation.

Mr. Wigren asked for clarification about when the SRB will be asked to review the revised pre-move documentation, either at the next meeting or before via email.

Susan Godshall from New Haven Preservation Trust (NHPT) stated that NHPT has been in extensive conversations with development team including legal consultants and others. They understand that there is a period of time between the SRB vote and submittal to NPS. They are adamant that they will go forward after that time. She would not like to see the SRB push it off. Mr. Edwards stated that he thought we were discussing posting the pre-move documentation to the SHPO website. Ms. Scofield and the SRB confirmed that there is consensus to review the revised documentation before the next meeting, after it is posted to the SHPO website. Mr. Edwards suggested providing a deadline for the comments.

Ms. Scofield clarified for the record that the purpose of the information being requested is not to delay the project, but to ensure there is enough detail so that the move will be successful in terms of protecting the house and so that NPS who has not been engaged in any conversations has enough information to make a decision.

Mr. Godanski stated that the developers are ready to start the project now and are just waiting for this approval. Mr. Edwards responded that as the chair of the SRB, we are eager to get you going but the point is that by NPS needs certain basic information, which we are requesting be sent to them as soon as possible. Mr. Sexton repeated the process discussed for confirmation and asked if NPS has any delay due to COVID-19. Ms. Scofield clarified that there is no delay and that NPS and SHPO are fully functional through remote working and digital systems.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzan, second by Dr. Bucki to approve the pre-move documentation for the William Pinto House and the retention of its National Register-listed status during the relocation (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).

V. Discussion

No discussion items were discussed.

VI. New Business

No new business was discussed.

VII. Staff Report

Ms. Shapiro announced that the office has hired a new staff person who will serve as Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer and is scheduled to start work on July 6, 2020. Ms. Scofield announced that SHPO has begun a project to create a statewide interactive geospatial system for cultural resources data. All files will be fully digitized within two years. The project builds on the last digitization project but is going much farther.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

A motion was made by Dr. Bucki, second by Mr. Wigren, to adjourn the meeting (Y-8, N-0, Abstained= 0).