

MINUTES

State Historic Preservation Review Board

**450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, Meeting Room A, North Building, 2nd Floor
Friday, September 15 2017, 10:35 a.m.**

Present: Mr. Edwards (chair), Mr. Favretti, Mr. Herzan, Mr. Wigren (No Quorum)

Absent: Dr. Bucki, Dr. Feder, Ms. Saunders, Ms. Tucker

Staff: Jenny Scofield, Marena Wisniewski, Elizabeth Shapiro, Douglas Royalty

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Edwards at 10:35 a.m. Mr. Edwards and Ms. Scofield explained that due to unanticipated absences, no quorum was present. They announced that the meeting would proceed to allow discussion and comments of all action items. However, no formal vote could be taken.

II. Review of Public Comment Procedures

Copies of the public comment procedures were available at the sign-in table and announced to guests.

III. Approval of the June 23, 2017 meeting minutes

The June meeting minutes were not reviewed because of the lack of quorum.

IV. Action Items

A. Completed National Register Nominations

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

Ms. Scofield reported that for nominations on this agenda, all property owners were notified by mail and other interested parties were notified by email of the pending nomination, 30 to 60 days prior to the meeting. The chief executive officer of each municipality was also notified. All nominations were posted on SHPO website for download.

1. New Haven: Morris Cove (Criterion A, local)

Staff recommended the Morris Cove Historic District for listing at the local level under Criterion A in the categories of Recreation and Community Development. The period of significance extends from 1870 to 1948, the end of trolley service in the neighborhood. Ms. Scofield noted that the district boundary on the overview map distributed during the noticing period reflected the exclusion of 25 Myron Street (a non-historic property). All maps in the nomination will be updated to reflect this correction. Ms. Scofield reported that a public information meeting was held at the beginning of project on April 19, 2016 with notice distributed door to door by the Alderman. Direct mail 30 days before meeting. The Certified Local Government response was positive. Ms. Scofield responded to a few phone inquiries from property owners, but no letters of objection or support were received. Kirsten Peeler and Kate Kuranda of R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. attended the meeting as consultants for the nomination.

Mr. Herzan noted that the New Haven Preservation Trust is in support of the nomination. He stated that the nomination is well written under Criterion A and asked why Criterion C for was left out. Ms. Peeler responded

that some houses in the district have integrity issues; architectural integrity of the district would be of greater concern if architectural significance under Criterion C was included in the nomination. Ms. Kuranda added that the district is a recognizable entity for its architecture, but in evaluation of applicable themes of significance, she did not want to dilute the strength of the significance statement under Criterion A, by adding Criterion C. Mr. Herzan agreed that it is not necessary to use every criterion in a nomination.

Mr. Wigren requested that bungalow be referred to as a building form.

Mr. Wigren noted that the 1911 atlas shows the firehouse as a frame building. He has seen images of an earlier firehouse on the site. The 1920 assessor date seems reasonable for the extant building. It appears similar to firehouses designed by Brown & Von Beren, mentioned in the *New Haven Guide to Architecture and Urban Design*, written by Elizabeth Mills Brown.

Mr. Wigren commented that on page 8-40, there is a lot of discussion regarding high style architecture; more text is needed on vernacular architecture. Look at the Sound View Historic District nomination as a comparison. Mr. Herzan recommended the consultant use the regional survey context for the Eastern Coastal Slope. Mr. Edwards noted that Silver Sands in Milford has architectural similarities. The Town of Waterford also has historic neighborhoods of high style housing with neighborhoods of modest historic housing in close proximity. SRB members discussed that the phenomenon of converting resort communities into year-round neighborhoods was a trend in Connecticut.

Mr. Edwards requested that more detail about the trolley network along the Connecticut shoreline be added to the nomination. He noted that the carousel at Lighthouse Point was an incentive to encourage visitors to come to the area.

2. New Haven: Westville Village Historic District Amendment (Criterion A and C, local)

Ms. Scofield introduced the nomination; she stated that the Westville Historic District was originally listed in 2003 and expanded by one adjacent property in 2006. This amendment is for the addition of two parcels, including a total of three resources; and the one removal of a property that has been substantially altered. This revision will extend the boundary to the river. Ms. Scofield recommended the Westville Village Historic District Amendment eligible under Criterion A and C at the local level, using the same categories in the original nomination. As noted in the original nomination, this area was a locus of industry outside the city center that also led to the commercial establishment of area. The Forsyth Dyeing Company buildings now proposed for inclusion in the boundary were part of this industrial core. The other added property is associated with the district's commercial development within the period of significance (1850-1950). The period has not been changed from the original nomination. The two former textile buildings also meet Criterion C for their industrial designs by the local architectural firm of Brown & Von Beren. The author of the nomination amendment will develop that significance statement. Ms. Scofield reported that owners affected by this nomination amendment were notified by certified mail and the nomination was prepared in coordination with the Westville Village Renaissance Alliance. The CLG response was positive. No letters of support or objection were received. The consultant, Colin Caplan, was not able to attend the meeting.

Elizabeth Donius attended the meeting on behalf of the Westville Village Renaissance Alliance (WVRA). She commented that the WVRA asked Mr. Caplan to prepare this nomination amendment. Westville once had approximately 50 mills.

Mr. Wigren asked why these three properties were not included in the original nomination. Ms. Scofield responded that the original nomination was focused on the commercial properties only, although it was unclear why one adjacent commercial property was left out.

Mr. Wigren requested that the statement under Criterion C be completed.

Mr. Herzan noted that the photo key is missing from the nomination. He also submitted minor edits to Ms. Scofield.

3. Norwalk: Whistleville Historic District (Criterion A, local)

Staff recommended the Whistleville Historic District eligible for listing at the local level, under Criterion A in the category of Ethnic Heritage for its association with Hungarian and Italian immigrants. This group of people specifically moved to Norwalk for industrial employment in town. Ms. Scofield noted that the consultant is currently conducting some interviews of former residents to collect some oral history, so this information may be added to the nomination. Ms. Scofield reported that she coordinated with the National Park Service regarding nomenclature and classification of vernacular property types; she recommended that the consultant identify and describe specific repeated building types. The Norwalk Worker House described in the nomination is one of these types. Ms. Scofield reported that owners of property within the proposed district were notified about this meeting by direct mail. The nomination was initiated by the Norwalk Redevelopment Agency, after completion of a Vibrant Communities Initiative grant project and completion of a historic preservation strategy. Ms. Scofield responded to three phone inquiries, but no letters of support or objection were received. The community is not a CLG. Tod Bryant attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination.

Mr. Bryant introduced the nomination and noted discussion with SHPO regarding the Norwalk Worker House nomenclature. He noted that the Norwalk Historic Commission is in support of the nomination, but no representative were able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Herzan asked if any members of the Hungarian and Italian community still reside in the district. Mr. Bryant responded that there is one Hungarian church and a couple Italian land owners. He noted that the construction of Martin Luther King Drive in the 1980s physically separated a portion of the neighborhood, which used to be larger. Mr. Herzan asked if other Fairfield County communities had Hungarian residents.

Mr. Herzan requested that the use of the hyphen in compound adjectives be addressed as an edit.

Mr. Wigren requested that general geographic references be used in mentions of both immigrant groups to clarify which part of Europe they moved from.

Mr. Wigren asked if there are other extant churches affiliated with this population and if there was another influx of Hungarian immigration in 1956. Mr. Bryant responded that another wave of immigration occurred, but that group of people did not locate in this neighborhood.

Mr. Wigren commented that the building type referred to as the Norwalk Worker House appears to be a building form common in Connecticut. He recommended renaming the building type (gable to street) so it is not limited to Norwalk.

Mr. Wigren noted that the building shown in photos 28 and 29 do not appear to be Art Deco style. They may have Arts and Crafts style elements. Ms. Scofield recommended looking at Main Street property types. Mr. Edwards commented that when these buildings were constructed, brick manufacturing companies were advertising materials for specific design features, such as this parapet design. The ornament is more of a result of advancement in the building industry than an architectural style. Mr. Bryant asked what to call the building. Mr. Edwards noted that it is an early twentieth-century commercial building with a prefabricated panel.

Mr. Favretti commented that the stone walls in the district located at changes in elevation are impressive. He asked if a mason was identified as the person who constructed the walls. Mr. Bryant responded that he did not identify the builder of the walls, but thought that the some of the Italian residents in the neighborhood had masonry skills.

4. Clinton: Hubbell Carter House (Criterion C, local)

Staff recommended the Hubbell Carter House eligible for listing under Criterion C at the local level in the category of architecture as a significant example of late eighteenth-century construction methods. Specifically, the building has vertical plank wall framing, which was common along the Connecticut coastline. Ms. Scofield

noted that additional text that could be used to write a significance statement under Criterion A was provided in the Board's review package. SHPO and the author chose not to include it in the nomination. Ms. Scofield noted that while the property is nominated under Criterion C, the setting is important to the understanding of the house. The nomination was initiated and prepared by the property owner. It was noticed by certified mail; the CLG response was positive. John and Cristina Lozito, property owners attended the meeting in support of the nomination.

Mr. Lozito introduced the nomination. He commented that the property was not included in HABS or WPA documentations in which other properties in town were identified. He feels the National Register nomination is a service to the house that will extend beyond their ownership. Mr. Edwards responded that it is unusual to have an owner-author of a nomination and thanked the Lozitos for their stewardship.

Mr. Wigren commented that some editing of the architectural terminology is needed, but that the building is a characteristic property type. He requested that more historic context about the Cape Cod building type be added to the nomination. He also noted that there is a house in Hamden with a similar arrangement of three windows in the gable.

Board members discussed the mention of Dutch construction methods. Ms. Scofield noted that she added text regarding interaction between members of English colonial settlements (with English building traditions) and Dutch settlements nearby in New York (with Dutch building traditions). Mr. Lozito noted that a lot of the vertical planking is accessible from within the house.

Mr. Wigren noted that it would be helpful to have more photos showing general views of the interior; detailed photos are included, but there is less coverage of the overall spaces.

Mr. Herzan requested that a schematic floor plan be added to the nomination.

Mr. Herzan commented that he was impressed that the book, *Pioneer Houses of Martha's Vineyard, Surviving Colonial Architecture: 1642-1742* was consulted. He asked if this building had parallels to Martha's Vineyard. Mr. Lozito responded that this house seems more robust and larger in scale with a steeper roof pitch than the similar houses on Martha's Vineyard.

Mr. Herzan noted that the setting makes this house special. He requested that the building be referenced as a Colonial Cape Cod at the beginning of each section to clarify the time period.

Mr. Edwards commented that Figures 5 and 6 are not clear. Mr. Lozito responded that these historic images have already been blown up and sharpened, but he will try to improve the resolution.

Mr. Wigren requested that references to the Third Period in Colonial architecture not be used. These time periods are not really followed any more. Say Late Colonial period instead.

Mr. Herzan asked if there is a case for significance under Criterion A. Ms. Scofield noted that the Board was given additional text (not in the form) to discuss that topic.

5. Hartford: Neiditz Building (Criterion C, local)

Staff recommended the Neiditz building eligible for listing at the local level under Criterion C for its significance as an early commercial example of the Modern style in Hartford. Ms. Scofield noted that there are few examples of this property type in Hartford because much of the office space from this time period was constructed in the following decades. The nomination was initiated by the property owner and notice of the Board meeting was sent by certified mail. The CLG response was positive and includes a letter of support from City staff, written on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission. Three other letters of support were received from the owner (Shelbourne Pearl, LLC), Martin J. Kennedy (president, Lexington Partners LLC), and Alan B. Lazowski (Chairman & CEO of LAZ Parking). Aileen Bastos of Crosskey Architects attended the meeting as the consultant for the nomination.

Mr. Herzan commented that the technical information in the nomination is detailed, but an analysis of the building's relationship to the site needs to be added. The property is significant under Criterion C, but the significance is not coming across clearly in the nomination.

Board members discussed the architectural style of the building, regarding whether it is International style or Mid-Century Modern. This discussion included review of the ribbon band windows and whether they were inspired by the International style, LeCorbusier, or catalogs of architectural materials. Mr. Edwards noted that the banded windows came out of architectural catalogs. He asked if the consultant obtained the original construction specifications for the building. He noted that the Neiditz Company might still have those records. The building is finely crafted, but is a product of available materials. The building is an example of commercial investment in Hartford and is Mid-Century Modern style.

Mr. Edwards commented that in 1946, there was a promotion/special sale of aluminum storefronts. The vertically stacked windows on this building and terrazzo floors also likely came out of catalogs for architectural components; the architect was likely looking at these contemporary publications. Mr. Edwards requested that the consultant look at architectural journals of the time period. He noted that the work of architects such as Morris Lapidus and Victor Gruen were influencing design ideas at that time.

Mr. Wigren commented that the design of the building reminds him of the Modern style designs Douglas Orr produced before he returned to using the Colonial Revival style. He was working with the design in a way that was not cutting edge.

Mr. Herzan requested editing of the capitalization of Modern vs. modern.

Mr. Wigren asked if the quote about the building being the first modern building constructed in 25 years was puffery. Ms. Bastos responded that she looked in the city and did not find anything downtown that was comparable.

Mr. Edwards asked where the architect Willard Wilkins went to school. He asked if the consultant used the Avery Index. Ms. Bastos used the AIA directory, but not Avery; she does not know where Wilkins went to school.

Mr. Wigren suggested that the discussion of the murals might be an issue for the National Park Service because they are outside the period of significance.

Mr. Edwards stated that the way the nomination sentences are written could be read in two ways; Wilkins invented forms or Wilkins used products invented by others. It needs clarification. You can make a case that this building was the result of a commercial design approach and represents what material manufacturers were providing to designers. This building could have been the first, with many people doing the same thing (using designs influenced by material manufacturers).

B. Review of National Register Status of Relocated Property

Hoyt-Barnum House, Stamford

Ms. Scofield introduced this agenda item by stating the objective. If a quorum was present, staff would request that the Board vote on whether to recommend that the relocated Hoyt-Barnum House remain on the National Register of Historic Places. She summarized that the Board approved the pre-move documentation in December 2015, followed by the National Park Service (NPS) in March, 2016. The property was relocated last fall and rehabilitation work is now complete. Ms. Scofield reported that the NPS has specific post-move information requirements, stated in federal regulations, but there is no required format for providing this information. NPS requires that post-move documentation include a letter notifying the Keeper of the date of the move, photos of the property on its new site; and revised maps, acreage and boundary description.

Ms. Scofield reported that the City of Stamford sent a letter to NPS to provide this information; this letter was shared with the Board in their review package. The letter also outlines changes from the approved pre-move

plans. Ms. Scofield reported that SHPO and the Stamford Historic Preservation Advisory Commission (HPAC) were informed throughout the process. SHPO also requested that the City prepare a new National Register nomination for the property. A new nomination is in progress, but is not yet ready for Board review. The nomination can be sent after the other documentation. Ms. Scofield also noted that all requested archaeological studies were completed and reviewed by SHPO's staff archaeologist.

The CLG response from the City regarding the retention of the Hoyt-Barnum House's National Register listed status was positive. A letter of support was received from HPAC with the statement that "HPAC wholeheartedly supports the re-listing". Jeff Pardo, city construction manager; Lou Casolo, city engineer, and Chris Williams, architect for the project; attended the meeting to answer questions about the move process and current condition of the building.

Mr. Casolo reported that the City undertook the project and did what they said they would do to the best of their ability. Since the original nomination for the building was brief, they are in the position of re-writing it and hope to have it ready for the next meeting. Mr. Casolo stated that the team is available to answer any questions about the structure and relocation. He commented that the building was carefully documented while it was separated into two sections.

Mr. Herzan commented that this project was a heroic feat and that Mr. Pardo had given him a tour of the relocated building. Mr. Herzan was pleased with the appearance of the building during the tour.

Mr. Pardo added that every detail of the house was carefully discussed; no work was thrown together.

Mr. Herzan stated that the stone work is impressive.

Mr. Favretti and Mr. Edwards asked why so much site lighting was installed. Mr. Williams responded that the building code requires emergency lighting from the building to the public way, which in this case is the parking lot. When the landscape plantings grown in, the lights will be more covered. Mr. Edwards added that the lights do detract from the setting.

Mr. Edwards requested that the mayor's letter to NPS be part of the public record. Ms. Scofield responded that it is.

Mr. Edwards asked for a show of hands from Board members in favor of supporting the continued National Register status of the building. All members present responded in favor; no official vote could be taken.

V. Discussion

Revision of Approved Stonington Cemetery National Register Nomination

Ms. Scofield introduced the agenda item. She summarized that the board approved the National Register eligibility of the property at the June 23 meeting based on criteria stated in the nomination. At that time, the Board requested that the nomination be brought back for comment once edits requested during the June meeting were complete. Ms. Scofield reported that the consultant did a substantial amount of additional work, editing, and revisited the site. Staff is happy with the revisions. She noted that the Board was provided with a copy of the nomination document that contains all of their June comments, along with the consultants' responses to them. This was provided so that the Board could see how each comment was addressed. Kirsten Peeler and Kate Kuranda attended the meeting as consultants for the nomination.

Mr. Wigren thanks the consultants for making the time period classifications in the document clearer. He asked if the time periods were based on this property or some other source. Ms. Peeler responded that Scott Goodwin [a contributor to the nomination] identified time periods common to other cemeteries in Connecticut.

Mr. Wigren stated that on page 7-12 in the discussion of cemetery arrangements, there is one other pattern to be mentioned. This is the family plot with a large central marker.

Mr. Edwards commented that at Cedar Hill Cemetery, the original plan states that there would be a marker for the family, only with certain stones rising above the ground. This is a variant of the Sedgewick Pie, but different. He noted that Mr. Favretti completed landscape restoration work at Cedar Hill Cemetery.

Mr. Wigren stated that the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 8-33 implies town ownership. There is a layering of Romantic sensibility with Neoclassical design; this is a hybrid design. Ms. Peeler responded that she agrees.

Mr. Favretti commented that on page 8-29 (end of last paragraph) the New Haven Burying Ground is mentioned as a pioneer example of ornamental plantings; he suggested that it is not a pioneer example. Ms. Scofield noted that this statement was included in response to a Board comment from the June meeting. Mr. Wigren noted that he made the previous comment. Mr. Favretti and Mr. Wigren discussed the plantings. Mr. Favretti read from an 1863 report that the “shrubby, trees, and monuments, are so liable to be injured, that most persons are deterred from attempting improvement upon their private lots, and a great portion of the ground is entirely destitute of trees, shrubs, or anything whatever to shade the walks . . .” Mr. Favretti noted that in 1796, the New Haven Burying Ground only had street trees. Mr. Favretti and Mr. Wigren agreed to follow up with more clarification regarding this the topic after the meeting.

Mr. Favretti requested that Jacob Weidenmann be mentioned on page 8-33 in addition to Strauch.

Mr. Herzan thanked the consultant for making the document what it is. Mr. Edwards commented that the inclusion of responses to comments in the draft was helpful.

VI. Staff Report

Ms. Scofield reported that SHPO staff will be working from the new office location on Monday, September 18. She will follow up with logistical instructions for Board members for the next meeting. She noted that at the next (December 1) meeting, Board members will be asked to choose schedule a meeting schedule for 2018.

VII. New Business

Mr. Edwards requested that the Board and SHPO develop an opportunity for members to call in to ensure quorum.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:30.