The historic preservation movement is exploring new territory, speakers made clear at “Old Routes/New Routes: Connecticut Preservation Conference,” held on October 16 at the University of Connecticut School of Law in Hartford. Presented by the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation in partnership with the Law School’s Center for Energy and Environment, the State Historic Preservation Office, and the Connecticut League of History Organizations, the conference celebrated the Trust’s fortieth anniversary by focusing on future directions in preservation.

One prominent theme was collaboration. Claire Lanier of History Colorado pointed out that preservation is not really an end in itself, but rather a means of achieving other goals. Old places can add value to many activities, from education to transportation. With climate change becoming the defining issue of our time, environmental issues were a second theme. Addressing sustainability issues also raised the question of regulatory flexibility. The biggest challenge facing preservation is to broaden the audience. Ms. Lanier and history professor Whitney Martinko both probed how language and media can exclude or include new groups.

Maisa Tisdale, president of the Mary and Eliza Freeman Center for History and Community in Bridgeport, offered a specific case, saying “There are populations that are dying to do historic preservation but don’t have the money or the knowledge.” She called on the preservation community to provide the expertise that inner-city residents lack, to level the playing field between them and well-connected outside developers seeking to work in their neighborhoods.

What will the preservation movement of the future look like? Based on “Old Roots/New Routes,” it will be less focused on itself and more integrated into the broad range of activities and concerns that make up American society. It will be particularly allied with the environmental movement, offering insights into recycling existing buildings, neighborhoods, and infrastructures. And it will seek out and speak in the language of all segments of society, not just antiquarians or historians.

—by Christopher Wigren
The year 2016 brings two important milestones for preservation in Connecticut. First is the fiftieth anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which sets the basic framework for historic preservation, including the National Register of Historic Places, preservation-based review of federally-funded projects, and the establishment of state historic preservation offices. The other is the sixtieth birthday of the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office (originally the Connecticut Historical Commission), which assists communities in identifying, documenting, preserving, and celebrating their historic, archeological, and cultural resources. Coming after the fortieth anniversary of the Connecticut Trust in 2015, these dates offer a vantage point from which to think about what preservation is and how we do it.

Over the years, Connecticut preservationists have accomplished great things. Recent initiatives that come to mind are Historic Barns of Connecticut and a pilot study of industrial resources. Both initiatives are joint projects between the Connecticut Trust and SHPO, funded through the Community Investment Act. Historic Barns of Connecticut documented 8,500 barns in the state, added a barns grant program, prompted barn legislation, and brought barns into the media spotlight as an iconic part of the Connecticut landscape that needs to be preserved. The pilot study of industrial resources is a part of Making Places: Historic Mills of Connecticut. The goal is to identify, survey, and stimulate re-use of Connecticut’s vast historic industrial resources.

I have a unique perspective on preservation at the state level because I spent the first ten years of my career at the Connecticut Trust and for three years now have worked at the State Historic Preservation Office, the two statewide leaders in historic preservation in Connecticut. The most important lesson I’ve learned over the past thirteen years is a simple one: successful preservation happens when it is community driven. I have learned it takes a community of like-minded people to carry out successful preservation.

Those of us interested in the conservation, celebration and protection of historic buildings are all preservationists. Despite our different philosophies or interests, we share a passion for our historic built environment. It is our passion that has been the foundation for all that we have been able to accomplish in Connecticut during the preceding decades and it is what will carry us forward in the decades to come. In the words of noted Connecticut historian and preservationist Elizabeth Mills Brown, “These anonymous people are the citizens’ army without which no revolution can take root. I don’t want to belittle the captains, but in the end it’s the army that wins the war…” Mrs. Brown made that statement in 1979 in her talk, “The Hundred Years War: A Historical Account of the Preservation Movement in Connecticut,” and I find, more than ever, that statement to be true.

We who are committed to seeing our historic buildings extant for future generations are that civilian army of community preservationists.

The communities that we seek to preserve can be defined in many ways. For some, it can be their street or neighborhood, and for others, a local historic district or a National Register of Historic Places district. It can be a whole town, or the entire state. It is up to all of us to define our communities and to inspire others to join our preservation community.

How can you inspire others to be a part of the civilian army of community preservationists? That’s where the Connecticut Trust and the State Historic Preservation Office can play a role. Both the Trust and SHPO can provide nonprofit organizations, municipalities and private citizens with technical assistance, financial support, and professional staff site visits.

I charge you all with helping our preservation army grow this year. Share your passion for historic places with a neighbor, friend or relative. Show them why these places matter to you. Bring them to a walking tour, history presentation, or any of the hundreds of events at significant places in the state this year. It’s easy to get technical help, but the real challenge is inspiring the passion that brings people to want the help in the first place. 🍂

The Citizen’s Army
By Todd Levine, Environmental Review/CT Freedom Trail Coordinator

The volunteers who surveyed thousands of barns across Connecticut are part of the citizens’ army who make preservation possible.
In these early months of my tenure at the Connecticut Trust, I am frequently reminded of the work and relationships that long preceded my arrival here. From the assembly of our accomplished staff to the technical services that led to recent ribbon cuttings or grant awards, many of our accomplishments in 2015 are due to effective partnerships and relationships nurtured long ago.

Two names long known to our staff and board have recently come to my attention. Their generosity toward the Trust was cultivated through long-standing membership and the capability of this organization to support their needs and interests in historic preservation.

Lillian Studebaker Hardy donated a beloved family property—the Thomas Lyman House in Durham—to this organization in 2013. After placing a preservation easement on the property, the Lyman house was sold by the Trust to new owners. The house is now under a thorough renovation that will preserve its 18th-century character and workmanship well into the future. The proceeds from Mrs. Hardy’s gift were dedicated to our soon-to-launch revolving loan fund, doubling its financial capacity. In mid-December, the Trust was saddened to learn of Mrs. Hardy’s death in New York. While I never met Mrs. Hardy, she and her family will be forever linked in my memory to the renewal of the Thomas Lyman house and the future accomplishments of our revolving loan fund; her generosity will ultimately extend to preservation successes in all corners of our state.

Laura Burnham Clementsen, a resident of Cheshire, served in the WAVES during World War II, had a career as a school psychologist in Bristol, and treated herself to a motorcycle ride on her 89th birthday. She also had a passion for Connecticut’s historic octagon houses (there are fifteen or so remaining), and her research and writing on these homes, included in the Cheshire Historical Society’s collections, is frequently cited by blogs and websites focused on these distinctive structures. Shortly after her death in 2014, the Connecticut Trust learned we were named in her will. Her unrestricted gift, received this fall, will be designated to our endowment and to cover expenses related to the publication of the Trust’s forthcoming history of Connecticut architecture, a use which I suspect Mrs. Clementsen would find quite to her liking.

The Howard Gilman Foundation has also made a generous gift for Connecticut Architecture. I am grateful that the Foundation, widely known for its support of innovation in the performing arts, broke stride to fund this forthcoming assessment of Connecticut’s influential architectural performances. Publication is expected in the fall of 2017.

I’ll conclude with a celebration of two of our own. Our Creative Places project ended in December 2015. Funded by the State Historic Preservation Office, Department of Economic and Community Development (via funding from Connecticut’s Community Investment Act), this project has documented more than 360 sites associated with 20th-century visual arts and letters in Connecticut. Project Manager Kristen Nietering and Lead Researcher Charlotte Hitchcock completed nearly 200 Historic Resource Inventory forms and have proposed 36 new State Register nominations. More than 160 properties already Register-listed now have updated context for their association with writers and artists. Charlotte’s ready knowledge and Kristen’s consistent curiosity will be missed in the Trust’s office; for myself, seeing this project fall into place has served as yet another effective introduction to this varied state. Look for the launch of our new Creative Places project website this winter.

Thank you for your own support of the Trust.

—Daniel Mackay
dmackay@cttrust.org
Cultural tensions that affect preservation efforts today—local and regional economies and the sometimes competing interests of private entities and the public—continue a fickle relationship with the built environment that has existed since the early days of the republic, according to Whitney Martinko. As communities have evolved, responding to growth, market forces, social and cultural conversations, so too have public and private attitudes toward historic preservation.

The traditional origin story for historic preservation in this country is that of Ann Pamela Cunningham and the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association, established in 1853 to save and restore the Virginia home of the country’s first president, George Washington. Without support from either Congress or the state legislature, the Ladies’ Association nonetheless succeeded in raising the money needed to purchase Mount Vernon in 1858 and, after the Civil War, to begin repairs.

However, Ms. Martinko offered a longer and more complex history of preservation activities that preceded and indeed led up to Mount Vernon. This history shows changing views of what to preserve, and why and how to do so, since at least 1800. Preservation has of course been about saving structures singled out as important to our cultural identity, but it has also been used for an idealized commemoration of historic moments through places, and as a forum on public and private interests.

The late 18th century surveys for the town of Marietta, Ohio, the capital of the Northwest Territory, documented Native American mounds and earthworks, identified as “antiquities.” In 1805, town planners plotted the streets around the earthworks, in a deliberate act of preservation for public space. But this act of preservation was also a selective: the earthworks derived from a civilization long since dead, with no apparent meaning to contemporary indigenous tribes, whose places of importance were simply built over by the same town planners.

The Chidsey-Linsley house was built about 1790 across from the East Haven Green, where General Lafayette and his troops camped during the Revolution. The 1½-story center-chimney Cape is notable for its unusual flaring roof, which swoops out to wide eaves front and back—a feature common in Dutch houses on nearby Long Island but extremely rare in Connecticut. The builders thriftily re-used parts from an older house, which still can be seen in the basement. They even reused an older foundation, which may account for the double front door and the side door—both features typically seen only on larger dwellings. Owned for many years by an architectural historian, the Chidsey-Linsley house retains its original layout and most of the original exterior clapboards. Interior floors, trim, and paneling remain in pristine condition. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the house is eligible for Connecticut’s Historic Homes Rehabilitation Tax Credit. Within walking distance are shops and restaurants, Long Island Sound, and scenic salt marshes.

The 18th-century planners of Marietta, Ohio, preserved ancient burial mounds as historic antiquities, but neglected contemporary Native Americans living in the area. This lithograph also reflects early use of up-to-date communications technology to record historic resources.

The 1820s saw the inception of the idea of restoration, although it often resulted in deliberate architectural improvements or even outright reconstruction. Such was the case with Independence Hall in Philadelphia, when the City commissioned William Strickland in 1828 to rebuild the c.1750 steeple to what it looked like when the Declaration of Independence was signed. Strickland added a clock where none had been, as a sign of progress. In a more aggressive example of this approach to preservation, Ashland, the Kentucky home of Henry Clay, Secretary of State under John Quincy Adams, was leveled by his son and rebuilt on the old footprint in 1854. Clay junior argued that the new structure was a more fitting reflection of Clay's legacy than the original dilapidated home had been. In these examples, preservation was as much about preserving a history or idea as a place.

Starting in the 1830s, when structures of historic or architectural significance were not saved, printed views of buildings lost to demolition became stand-ins for the physical reality. When the President’s House in Philadelphia (from 1790 to 1800 when the city was the capital of the United States) was demolished in 1832, an 1830 lithograph held its place in the public’s eye. Such images, preserving at least the memory of historic buildings for future generations, also began to be used as marketing tools. For example, a 19th-century image of the Old Feather Shop, a Boston business landmark built in 1680, became a merchant’s trade card to draw customers in for increased sales and presumably profit.

Beginning with the Jackson administration, in the 1830s, the political push for the rights of common people were mirrored in a new questioning about the role of preservation. The idea emerged that some buildings were historically important enough to be outside the influence of private development or profit, and therefore not only protected from demolition, but accessible to the broad public.

Uriah Levy, a naval officer and admirer of Thomas Jefferson, subscribed to this sentiment: in 1834, he bought Monticello to preserve it as a monument to the country’s third president. The property had become run-down, and Levy restored and maintained it, welcoming growing numbers of tourists. While some private citizens such as Levy acted alone, others joined together in collective ownership of historic places (later often evolving into historical societies), setting the stage for the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association.

Attitudes about historic preservation and how we express our national identity and sense of place have been changing.
Old Roots/New Routes for Historic Preservation

For Love or Money
Passion and Profit in Historic Preservation

speakers: Tammy Kagan Levine, Partner, Green & Levine, LLP; Ben Paletsky, President, South Farms; Tony Silvestri, City Flats

moderator: Maisa Tisdale, President, Mary & Eliza Freeman Center for History and Community in Bridgeport, and Trustee, CTHP

Moderator Maisa Tisdale opened up the panel discussion by quoting an African proverb: “Learn from the mistakes of others; you can’t live long enough to make them all yourself.”

In this session, three developers who have combined their love of historic buildings with a creative range of funding sources shared the lessons they’ve learned about the flexibility and creativity needed to make historic rehabilitation projects happen. They discussed mixing and matching tax credits, state grants, and other funding sources to address financing gaps, as well as their projects’ impacts on efforts to reinvigorate communities and spur broader economic development.

Tammy Kagan Levine is a commercial real estate lawyer who finds great satisfaction in historic preservation projects. The result, she says, is always something good. However, the path can be lengthy and complicated.

Her project, Loom City Lofts, involved converting the former Roosevelt Mill (1906, NR) in Rockville, to apartments and commercial space. The mill was one of the first structures in New England to be constructed entirely of reinforced concrete. Occupancy was scheduled to begin in December.

A rehabilitation project of this scale begins simply, by establishing a business entity and gaining site control through purchase or purchase option. The complexities increase as one investigates environmental conditions and performs market studies to lenders’ satisfaction. Gaining zoning approval can be complicated and lengthy, as can securing funding through the many sources necessary to see the project through.

Ms. Levine’s basic advice was to build the best possible team of professionals to help with all of the technical aspects of the project: tax credits, applications, underwriting for the funding sources, and countless other tasks. Most important, she said, is building a good relationship with local officials, who have a stake in the success of any worthwhile project. These professionals can be good earpieces and consultants.

Ben Paletsky, President of South Farms, in Morris, described his experience in developing his business as “Betting the Farm on the Farm.” A fourth-generation farmer, Mr. Paletsky has been creatively reshaping the farm’s working buildings with an eye to visitors’ experience and the new farm economy which balances nostalgia and economics.

Ben Paletsky of South Farms, in Morris, says that managing a modern farm requires a mix of hard-headed realism and nostalgia.
In 1970, Mr. Paletsky’s grandfather retired the dairy farm, as the family could no longer live off it. In 2009, Ben began raising grass-fed beef at the farm. But how to get his product to the consumer? The Morris Marketplace farm market was born. With no professional marketing—only word of mouth—attendance grew to 10,000 visitors last year.

Mr. Paletsky said it’s necessary to accept that farming as it was is no longer viable. What is the alternative? What is the future for underutilized farms and barns? He suggested pilot programs of long-term public-private investment to revitalize these resources. Stabilization grants, like the Barn Grant that South Farms received from Connecticut Trust are good, but a larger investment is need. Public sources may be needed, because although most farms are privately owned, each is a community asset with the potential for broader community benefits.

In 2008, New London developer and builder Tony Silvestri opened New London Harbour Towers, a high-rise condominium building, but realized that the surrounding neighborhood was heading in the wrong direction. Working with the State Historic Preservation Office, Mr. Silvestri began purchasing and renovating neighborhood buildings. To date he has bought ten buildings and renovated five of them, each with two to four housing units. His goal: to convert existing good housing stock into affordable owner-occupied units. This will provide much needed affordable housing and also help stabilize the neighborhood.

As Mr. Silvestri soon realized, this work was not just about saving buildings and neighborhoods. It was about saving

continued on page 14
As preservationists, we are not taught how to communicate our subject or write in a non-technical way. To engage the public, telling stories about the people and the buildings they create is a good way to raise interest in preservation. Including a personal experience or an emotional element helps to make the public more aware and feel more connected.

In the conference keynote address, Claire Lanier focused on talking about historic preservation to those not in the field. Stories draw people in, she said. For example, talking about building materials common in a particular community—where they came from, who produced them, how they affected the local economy—helps to tell the history of that community.

Based on her experience at History Colorado, Ms. Lanier suggested five rules for more effectively connecting with the public about historic preservation.

**When you talk about preservation, don’t talk about preservation.** Preservation involves many aspects of a community or place. It offers economic benefits, history of place, and opportunities for reuse, community revitalization, and sustainability. Preservationists should strive to raise awareness about the history of a community, the story of how it was formed, and why it is the way it is today.

One way to communicate with the public is through links with popular culture. For example, in the television sitcom “Parks and Recreation,” characters frequently discuss preservation issues. By citing this familiar show, we can convince people that they already know something about preservation.

**No jargon allowed!** When talking to the public about preservation, it is best to avoid technical terms such as “National Register,” “Section 106 review,” “multiple property documentation,” or “historic built environment”—terms that don’t mean anything to the average person. Instead, try to approach the subject by telling a story in everyday language.

**Find the human story in the story.** Preservation is about people interacting with places. It’s about pride of place. When talking about an historic place, tell how it relates to the history of the area, and people will be more apt to listen.

Most preservationists might describe the Mullen Building at Saint Joseph Hospital in Denver, built in 1934, as a good example of Art Deco design. But a more engaging approach would be to tell the story of the building’s architect, Temple Hoyne Buell, who moved to Colorado in 1921 due to his tuberculosis diagnosis and received medical care from the Sisters of Charity Leavenworth. Designing the Mullen Building for the Sisters was a labor of love for Buell, an expression of gratitude for their help. Stories like this help people connect to significant places, and build the case for protecting them from harm.

**Find the right medium to tell your story.** The modern world offers many vehicles through which to tell a story, ranging from articles in newspapers or magazines, to Buzzfeed, Pinterest, Facebook, or online photo essays and lists.

To engage the public and get people excited about historic preservation, History Colorado asked people to observe Valentine’s Day by putting cut-out hearts on buildings that meant something to them. They then photographed themselves and sent the photos to History Colorado. The organization mapped each building, producing a vivid illustration of buildings across the state that people love and feel strongly about.

**Find the right voice for your story.** To help tell your story, you could engage community members to be a part of the process. Youth, especially, love to give their opinions on matters. Places and local communities are important to them as well as to adults. You can encourage them to use their phones and social media to tell the story.
One way History Colorado engaged young people was through a Preserve America Youth Summit, an intensive immersion into one community. Youth spent a week there, meeting citizens and officials and learning about preservation issues. They engaged in community service projects and were encouraged to use social media to tell others about their experience. After the summit, History Colorado kept in touch with the participants.

For younger audiences, Ms. Lanier created Claire’s Clues, an informational video series. She films herself visiting historic places in Colorado and telling the story of each place in a lively, engaging, kid-friendly way. The videos then air online and on a local public television channel.

These rules can help preservationists actively engage the public and communicate the importance of preserving historic places.

—By Kristen Nietering, Project Manager, Creative Places

---
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Whose Job is it?
Legal and Policy Frameworks for the Next Generation of Preservationists

speakers: Erik Hein, Executive Director, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Offices; Sara Bronin, Professor of Law and Faculty Director, Center for Energy & Environmental Law, UConn Law School and Trustee, CTHP; Mary Dunne, Deputy SHPO, Certified Local Government and Grants Coordinator, State Historic Preservation Office; Leah Glaser, Associate Professor of History, Central Connecticut State University

moderator: Scott Jackson, Undersecretary Intergovernmental Policy Division and Trustee, CTHP

Aptly lead by moderator Scott Jackson, speakers on this panel were asked to identify the issues that hold preservation back from its full potential as an economic and community development tool.

“What’s a Blue state to do in a Red state world?” mused Erik Hein in his remarks. From his position at the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, Mr. Hein has an informed perspective on the degrees of political support at the federal level for preservation.

What’s at stake in the national political conversation? Reauthorization of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), the primary federal funding source is a priority; the current authorization for this funding expired in September 2015. This federal source provides sixty percent of the annual funding for our Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office.

While Congress can continue to appropriate existing funds from the HPF, a commitment to long-term or permanent reauthorization is needed, as are higher annual allocations. Our Connecticut Congressional delegation has broadly and consistently supported preservation at the federal level when asked, noted Mr. Hein, but communities and developers must draw closer links between funding, legislation and economic and community impacts for our federal representatives.

Sara Bronin shared her analysis of emerging legal issues in preservation, and focused preservation’s encounters with new renewable energy technologies. The state has a statutory mandate to produce 23 percent of its energy from renewable sources by 2023. While coastal wind resources are stronger and more consistent than at upland sites, Connecticut’s largest wind energy facility just came on line in Colebrook in northern Litchfield County, after public controversy and legal challenges. Solar installations adapt more easily...

Sara Bronin:
“In light of the potential consequences of climate change, should we shift the balance a bit from historic preservation to encouraging renewable energy?”
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The 2016 Awards will be presented in early April.

DESCRIPTION

Connecticut Preservation Awards honor exemplary efforts in the preservation and enhancement of historic places throughout Connecticut, with the goal of inspiring others to do likewise.

Connecticut Preservation Awards recognize:

- restoration, maintenance, preservation or adaptive use of historic buildings, structures, complexes, neighborhoods, cultural landscapes or landscape features
- studies, documentation or plans for preservation, enhancement, or revitalization of historic places
- individuals or organizations that have demonstrated effective leadership in community, regional, or statewide preservation efforts

Connecticut Preservation Awards are presented to:

- individuals
- nonprofit organizations
- private property owners
- municipalities or other governmental bodies

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Any individual, organization, or project involved in historic preservation in Connecticut is eligible to receive a Connecticut Preservation Award. Nominated projects must have been completed since January 1, 2013.

Nominations may be made without the knowledge of the nominee. Nominations must be made by members of the Connecticut Trust.

Trustees and staff of the Connecticut Trust are not eligible for Connecticut Preservation Awards during the period of their active service.

NOMINATION PROCEDURE

For forms and further information, visit www.cttrust.org or call (203) 562-6312 or email cwigren@cttrust.org.

Nominations must be received by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, February 19, 2016.

---

To the scale of historic settings, but may require close scrutiny before installation to qualify for federal rehabilitation tax credits.

A consistent issue for both residential and commercial structures seeking to use public incentives for rehabilitation is how those programs address proposed energy efficiency and energy conservation upgrades. Will such improvements degrade historic features or appearances? Is there room for innovation and accommodation in such standards and reviews?

Staff from the Connecticut SHPO answer that question in the affirmative. In a recounting of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, Mary Dunne emphasized the flexibility of federal rehabilitation standards and underscored the need for early interaction and dialogue between SHPO and developers to review proposed work.

Linkages between historic preservation and environmental policy were the focus of the panel’s last speaker, Leah Glaser. She presented a range of examples that touted historic preservation’s central—but under-valued—role in larger environmental and sustainability initiatives. Closer collaboration between preservation and environmental advocates is needed; the issue that will force this hand is the impact of climate change and sea-level rise on Connecticut’s communities.

—By Daniel Mackay, Executive Director
The speakers re-assembled as a panel to wrap up the conference by discussing three big-picture questions suggested in advance by conference attendees.

**Question 1:**
*How can we broaden and expand the appeal of historic preservation, especially to younger and more diverse constituencies?*

The panel concurred with Claire Lanier’s theme that changing the language and communication of historic preservation and using digital media are the key to attracting younger people as well as other new constituencies. The message should be that historic preservation is the powerful force behind authentic places.

Panelists agreed that experiencing and interacting with these places first hand is important for deeper engagement. For elementary and middle school students and teachers, recent revisions to the State’s social studies framework encourage site visits, but funding for transportation needs to be provided.

For older students, hands-on volunteer maintenance and repair of historic buildings engages people at a personal level and instills a preservation ethic. Learning rehabilitation skills through paid hands-on work is also a portal to future employment for under-employed youth in distressed neighborhoods.

Training the next generation of the historic preservation profession was discussed. The panel saw the relatively low compensation as an issue here, acknowledging that many students and employers regard work in the field as a labor of love. Students should be empowered to work for appropriate pay knowing that their research has real-world consequences.

**Question 2.**
*How can we create partnerships and overcome regulatory constraints to demonstrate that historic preservation is smart and sustainable?*

The ensuing discussion largely focused on overcoming the regulatory constraints among public agencies partnered in projects involving historic resources. In these, historic preservation is one of several competing objectives along with environmental protection, housing, transportation, smart growth, and/or sustainability.
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Question 3:
In light of the potential consequences of climate change, do we need to reconsider historic preservation priorities?

The panel acknowledged at the outset that the terms ‘global warming’ and ‘climate change’ are polarizing in the national debate at present. There is greater acceptance of the phrase ‘resiliency planning’ to discuss the consequences of damage from severe weather-related events and a need to develop a more nuanced common language. Political acceptance of this as a problem will need to rise up from the grassroots, not flow down from scientists or bureaucrats.

Beyond semantics, an important obstacle to public policy at the federal level is regional differences in environmental events. Wyoming’s concerns with aridity are not the same as coastal areas’ concerns with rising sea levels. Public policy will need to develop on a state-by-state basis. Panelists suggested that historic preservation regulations will need to be flexible in areas of greatest impact, such as the Long Island Sound shoreline.

Panelists noted problems and opportunities resulting from Connecticut’s experience with Hurricane Sandy.

The discussion focused on how best to negotiate regulatory conflicts among partner agencies. Panelists concurred that practitioners and others subject to historic preservation guidelines need a better understanding of the limits of regulatory constraints, especially the means to seek relief, which the panel informally referred to as ‘escape clauses.’ The Section 106 review and consultation process was cited as the escape clause within the National Historic Preservation Act (1966). The process requires federal agencies to consider the impact of projects they fund and approve, and empowers the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with discretion to seek alternatives or mitigate adverse impacts to historic properties where compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards is unfeasible.

For local commissions, an escape clause can take the form of an exemption for economic hardship. Hartford’s municipal preservation ordinance, which provides such an exemption, was noted as exemplary.

It was suggested that preservationists infiltrate other disciplines to understand the objectives of regulatory partners and gain equal expertise in their escape clauses.

Under-surveyed coastal resources, as well as conflicts between the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and new regulations from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) inhibited efficient distribution of $8 million in federal recovery funds for historic resources through SHPO. Clearly, renewed efforts to inventory coastal historic resources and reach compromise on federal standards are needed before the next event. The Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Rebuild by Design program identified strategic opportunities in post-Sandy Bridgeport which are applicable to other Sound shore communities as well. These include re-establishing urban wetlands, introducing better storm-water management, and new surge fortifications such as berms and elevating historic structures.

—by Wes Haynes, Project Director, Making Places
for two hundred years. Ms. Martinko suggested that we use three lessons from history to inform our conversations about the future of the field.

The debate over what preservation can or should be has and should continue to be an ongoing one. The challenge now is to define with ever more inclusiveness the public with whom we want to partner and whom we want to serve. In the 1800s in Ohio, that definition was one of exclusion; today’s definition should be deliberate, consider social and economic inequality, and be regularly revisited.

Building upon the 19th-century precedent of published images, the field must embrace, exploit, and experiment with new media. These can be effective tools to engage and expand the audience for preservation, thereby generating more interest in the places we seek to save and share.

As the Jacksonian democratization of preservation sought to save and share historic places for all citizens, we should democratize the profession itself by working toward a sustainable practice and a living wage. In the 19th century, the fate of buildings important to our heritage often lay in the hands of wealthy patrons. By moving away from an altruistic view of the profession, we can engender the direct participation of a more diverse and representative community in the preservation process.

—by Renée Tribert, Project Manager, Making Places

cultures. Who gets to decide what makes a place? It’s not just up to the developer. The people who live there should have a say, too. Preservation is not just about preserving building fabric, but the fabric of the community and its sense of history. Mr. Silvestri acknowledged that Connecticut Trust and SHPO services and programs can be instrumental in leveling the field between developers and the community by giving stakeholders and residents a voice. Gentrification is not the goal, stable, intact communities is.

Mr. Silvestri echoed Ms. Levine’s warning that many intricate and costly steps are necessary to complete historic rehabilitation projects. Anything that can streamline the process would make these projects more viable. He also suggested that the Department of Housing provide funding for building maintenance on rehab projects twenty years old.

These three developers have combined their love of historic buildings with creative development strategies, and can teach us all how historic preservation can be the path to a vibrant, stable future.

—by Jane Montanaro, Director of Preservation Services

Before Mount Vernon, cont’d from page 5

For Love or Money, cont’d from page 7
Creative Places Listed on State Register

In December, the Connecticut Historic Preservation Council approved seven sites for listing on the State Register of Historic Places through the Connecticut Trust's Creative Places project. The project, funded by a grant from the State Historic Preservation Office, identified sites associated with significant artists and writers of the 20th century. In addition to nominating a total of 36 sites to the State Register, the project has produced an inventory of approximately 360 sites and a Google-based interactive map of places identified in the project. Kristen Nietering managed Creative Places, with Charlotte Hitchcock as researcher. Although the project officially ended in December, the Preservation Council will continue to review State Register nominations in coming months.

AARON KURZEN HOUSE (c.1953), Branford
Aaron Kurzen (b. 1920), artist and art educator.

The house is a Quonset hut reconfigured as a dwelling by Mr. Kurzen.

FAR TWITTERINGS/C. D. BATELOR HOUSE AND STUDIO (c.1734 and c.1930), Deep River
C. D. Batchelor (1888-1977), political cartoonist.

Batchelor was one of many artists and writers who found historic farmhouses peaceful places to live and work.

THORNTON WILDER HOUSE (1929), Hamden
Thornton Wilder (1897-1975), writer.

Wilder built this house with proceeds from his first novel, The Bridge at San Luis Rey (1927).

LONG MEADOWS/HUGH LOFTING HOUSE (c.1805), Killingworth
Hugh Lofting (1886-1947), author.

Lofting wrote his popular Doctor Doolittle books here between about 1920 and 1927.

HEBBELN/GORKY HOUSE (c.1802 and 1945-46), Sherman
Arshile Gorky (c.1902/1905-1948), artist.

Architect Henry Hebbeln remodeled this Federal-era house and rented it to Gorky, who was known for his Surrealist and Abstract Expressionist paintings.

CHAPIN/GRAMATKY HOUSE (c.1923), Westport
Hardie Gramatky (1907-1979), author and illustrator.

Gramatky is best known for his children's books, especially Little Toot (1939). The house was originally built for Joseph Chapin, art director of Scribner's Magazine.

THOMAS WILLOUGHBY NASON HOUSE (1938), Lyme

Nason is known for his finely detailed wood engravings, chiefly of New England subjects.
Loose-Wiles Biscuit Company (1915, 1960)
73 & 77 Homestead Avenue, Hartford

The former Loose-Wiles Biscuit Company facility is available for redevelopment. Comprised of three primary adjoining blocks located on the south side of Homestead Avenue, the plant’s two two-story blocks were erected in 1915, with a one-story addition built in 1960. The early buildings are of brick pier construction, and the addition is concrete block. The structure provided approximately 17,000 SF of space on the first floor including 4,000 SF office space and almost 13,000SF on the second floor. A separate half-acre parcel is included. The site is located just north of downtown in an industrial area and has easy access to I-84. The property has been included in the Connecticut Trust’s Making Places survey and may be eligible for grants and tax credits. For more information on grants, contact Renee Tribert at rtribert@cttrust.org.


327 Laurel Hill Avenue (c.1900)
Norwich

Located in a commercial area just outside the Laurel Hill National Register Historic District, this building may be redeveloped into many permitted uses. Originally a school (c.1900), the site was most recently a restaurant. Located on busy Route 12 on a 0.7 acre site, the building provides 9,727 SF of space. Assessor’s card states that the building has a slate roof and hardwood floors. Property may be eligible for historic tax credits and seller financing.

Contact: Ron Lyman, Lyman Real Estate Brokerage & Development at (860) 887-5000, Ext. 1 or ronl@lymanre.com.
575 Hamburg Road (Rt. 156)  
Lyme  
This picturesque 49+ acre horse farm was a longtime boarding and training stable specializing in hunting and jumping. Located on Eight Mile River waterfront, the site contains a residence (1967), barns, sheds, and a gazebo. Some of the open fields have been used to grow corn and alfalfa. Power lines run through property. Being marketed only for its land value and development potential poses a threat to this historically open rural landscape.

Contact: Sharon & Kevin Kennedy, Kennedy Real Estate Solutions at (860) 304-4433.

Evangelical Baptist Society (1880)  
23 Franklin Street, Ansonia  
Currently being used as a church for a small congregation. Building has stained-glass windows, high cathedral ceiling with ceiling fans, altar and baptismal font. Lower level provides space for child care or meetings. A fully-equipped kitchenette with appliances plus bathroom and handicap ramp are provided. The tower has interior access. The building is situated on a corner lot with ample street parking and is within walking distance to bus transportation. The structure may be converted into a unique home or business. Interior living area is approximately 1,660 SF. Historic tax credits and grants may apply.

For more information and to contact the listing broker, visit http://www.loopnet.com/Listing/19375638/23-Franklin-Street-Ansonia-CT/.
As a site for regular and informal interactions between students and Cornwall residents, the Federal-style farmhouse (built 1814) served as the steward’s family home, the school dining hall, a boarding house, and a nurse room for sick students. The interracial marriages of two students with local white women, one the steward’s daughter and the other from an elite family, evoked a substantial public response and brought early 19th-century assumptions about race-mixing into the open, providing a context for national conversations on race and religion in the early 19th century.

The internationally renowned school attracted self-paying students and charitable donations, but public pressure resulting from the two interracial marriages caused the school’s eventual closure in 1827.

The property was identified through the Asian American Pacific Islander Heritage Initiative of the National Park Service. In collaboration with the National Historic Landmarks Program, the nomination was written as part of a graduate-level course at Brown University taught by Professor Caroline Frank.

**JAMES MERRILL HOUSE,** Stonington

James Ingram Merrill (1926-1995) is considered to be among the most significant American writers of the second half of the 20th century. As a poet, he valued, cultivated and renewed poetry’s traditional practices, and at the same time was boldly experimental. He himself described his poems as “chronicles of love and loss,” and his poems delve into the extremes of rapture and despair, into the comedy of domestic life, the allure of foreign landscapes, and the sublime reaches of occult experience. His work addressed the crucial topics of modern life, and often touched on the complexities and joy of homosexuality.

During a period when most of America was breaking from the strict formalist poetry of previous centuries, Merrill held fast to this style. Over time, he introduced more radical material into his poetry, including well-crafted ruminations about homosexuality, art, and spiritualism.

In the American tradition of Walt Whitman and Hart Crane, of Elizabeth Bishop and May Swenson, Merrill wrote with subtlety and sympathy of homosexual life, illuminating its anxieties and fulfillments. His masterwork, *The Changing Light at Sandover* (1982), is a long epic poem drawing on occult
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practices. In the opening pages Merrill describes the importance of his home at 107 Water Street in composing his poetry. This house, which Merrill and his partner, David Jackson, bought in 1956, played an important role in the development of Merrill’s work and it is where he composed his award-winning poetry for almost forty years.

The property was identified through the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Heritage Initiative of the National Park Service. A National Council for Preservation Education summer intern developed the nomination, in collaboration with program staff.

In The Changing Light at Sandover, James Merrill describes the importance of his home in composing this poetry. He writes,

“Backdrop: The dining room at Stonington Wall of ready-mixed matte “flame” (a witty Shade, now watermelon, now sunburn). Overhead, a turn of the century dome Expressing white tin wreaths and fleur-de-lys In a palpable relief to candlelight.”

In this view of Cornwall, published in John Warner Barber’s Connecticut Historical Collections in 1836, the Foreign Mission School Steward’s house is at the far right, and the school house to its left, highlighted in yellow.
Missionaries and Poets:
Two New National Historic Landmarks

The National Park Service designated two Connecticut sites as National Historic Landmarks in November. The Steward’s house at the Foreign Mission School in Cornwall and the James Merrill house in Stonington (the latter previously listed on the National Register of Historic Places), join the elite list of places given the nation’s highest historical designation. The descriptions below were adapted from the nominations and summaries produced by the National Park Service.

STEWARD’S HOUSE, FOREIGN MISSION SCHOOL, Cornwall
Operated from 1817 to 1827, The Foreign Mission School (FMS) remains the first and last experiment in a domestically located “foreign” mission and represents educational and social politics concerning racial tolerance, Asian and Native American migration, and American identity in the early 19th century. The Steward’s House was part of a three-building complex that provided an evangelical education for more than 100 students from approximately thirty different nations, primarily from Asia, the Pacific Islands, and North America.

The FMS was a religious experiment. Instead of sending missionaries to foreign lands, it brought students to America, believing that a mission school in religiously pious New England would be more efficient and effective than traditional mission schools established within “heathen” settings because it removed these young students from the pagan influences of their native communities.

Between 1817 and 1827, more than 100 students from 30 nations attended the Foreign Mission School in Cornwall. The surviving Steward’s house has been named a National Historic Landmark.

Poet James Merrill did much of his work at his Stonington house, recently named a National Historic Landmark.