MINUTES
January 26, 2000

The meeting of the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was called to order at National Life, 6th Floor Conference Room A/B at 9:15 a.m.

Members Present: David Donath, Historian, Chair
Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Vice Chair
George Turner, Historic Architect
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member (arrived at 12:40 p.m.)
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian
James Petersen, Historic/Prehistoric Archeologist

Member Absent: Elizabeth Boepple, Citizen Member

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, SHPO
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Lanora Preedom, Administrative Assistant
Jane Lendway, CLG Coordinator (9:35 a.m. - 10:10 a.m.)
Eric Gilbertson, Deputy SHPO (arrived at 10:10 a.m.)

I. Minutes - Motion made by Mr. Andres to accept the minutes, second by Mr. Mallary. The following changes were noted by Mr. Petersen: page 3, middle of third paragraph, remove “a”, to read ....whereas these are among.... ; page 4 middle of third paragraph, remove a “0”, should read, “11,000”; and on page 6 end of first full paragraph, put a question mark after ...worth saving? Voted unanimously.

III. Revisions to CLG grant selection criteria – Ms. Lendway – Purpose is to suggest changes to the grant selection criteria for the CLG program – as it relates to the new Vermont Downtown legislation. She passed out the criteria and requested changes and gave the Council background on the program – of the eight CLG’s only five are most likely to become designated downtowns. Ms. Lendway explained that the new criteria are weighted differently to allow for a little more interpretation, and blended the Priority I and II, there are no changes to Priority III. She explained the reason for blending is because the older CLG’s are ready for implementation and in the past Priority II money
was not awarded until all Priority I applications were awarded. There was discussion regarding weighting and the competitiveness of the program. The Council asked why more towns are not CLG’s. Ms. Lendway explained that it is another Commission which needs to be formed with designated individuals and the towns do not appear to want to make the commitment for what appears to be a small amount of money. Jim moved to accept the draft selection criteria for priority 1 projects, second by Glenn, unanimous.

Mr. Donath asked if the Council should respond to the Hartford letter that was sent to the Council prior to the meeting. Ms. Lendway said she will respond to the CLG’s about the decision today. Mr. Donath would like to respond to Mr. Schectman, Ms. Lendway will prepare it on behalf of the Council.

II. Meeting dates – February 24, March 16 (Grants – Middlebury), April 20 (Lyndonville), May 18

IV. Preservation Grants – Mr. Gilbertson passed out scoring sheets and explained the procedure to the members. He will show one slide for each project to give the Council the opportunity to put back projects that were cut in staff review. Mr. Andres disclosed that he is on the Board of Trustees at Sheldon Museum, however, he has been out of the process where they discussed applying for a grant. Mr. Donath noted that there is no financial gain for Mr. Andres. Mr. Turner went back to the minutes of December 27 where it indicates that they should be concerned regarding financial benefit and double decision-making. It was the consensus of the Council that there is no conflict and he does not need to recuse himself from the Sheldon Museum application discussion.

Mr. Gilbertson took the members through the scoring criteria.

After viewing the one-slide show, the Council agreed to accept staff recommendations. However, they decided to put the Blodgett School in Lemington, and the Old Goshen Church, Bradford, back in for Advisory Council review and will therefore review 32 applications.

Mr. Gilbertson proceeded to show slides and explain the projects. The summary and score sheets are attached to the record copy of the minutes.

Belcher Library, Stockbridge – if they receive a grant the Council recommends they put on a metal roof. They received the financial need point.

Sharon Congregational Church, Sharon – Mr. Donath suggested that if the Council is going to call painting a metal roof maintenance, then in the same vein, replacement or repair of slates should also be considered maintenance. Ms. Lawless asked if this project is funded she would like to specify that the money go toward the roof. The members agreed. No financial need point.
Middlebury Town Hall, Middlebury – two letters of support for this project. There was brief discussion regarding the seriousness of the roof. There is an architectural report on this building. This will not receive the financial need point.

Town Hall of Chittenden, Chittenden – Charlie Parker report. No financial need point.

District School House #8, Tunbridge – This is on the National Register as a contributing building. No financial need point.

Holley Hall, Bristol – No discussion. No financial need point.

Naulakha Spring House, Dummerston – Mr. Andres questioned the request for reimbursement of architectural fees. This may be eliminated if they receive a grant. No financial need point.

Blodgett School, Lemington – Mr. Gilbertson noted that the cost of this project could be decreased to $2,500 because they will no longer need to purchase new siding. If they receive a grant they will repair the existing clapboard. They received the financial need point.

Ethan Allen Firehouse, Burlington – Letter of support from the CLG. This request is part of a larger project and there is no financial need point given.

Fletcher Free Library, Burlington – No financial need point. Mr. Gilbertson noted there was a letter of support from the city.

Flynn Theatre, Burlington – Flynn has agreed to repair rather than replace the marble inset above the door. No financial need point. It was noted that this building is not in the designated downtown.

Chittenden Grange Hall, Chittenden – They receive the financial need point. No further discussion.

Guilford Center Meeting House, Guilford – They do not receive the financial need point. They have a letter of support from the selectboard. Mr. Turner asked if the budget seems realistic and the council agreed that it does not appear adequate.

Haskell Free Library, Derby Line – No discussion. No financial need point given.

Henry Sheldon Museum of Vermont History, Middlebury – Mr. Gilbertson mentioned that if they receive a grant they will need very good technical consultation regarding consolidation of the marble. Ms. Lawless suggested they may also want to try to apply for a grant through the Save Outdoor Sculpture program. No financial need point given.

Old Rutland Railroad Water Pump Station, Alburg – Mr. Gilbertson noted that this project could use an architectural assessment and that it may also qualify for a TEA-21 grant. No financial need point given.

Shelburne Town Hall, Shelburne – Support letter from the CLG commission. No financial need point given. No further discussion.

Stonebridge Inn, Poultney – There was discussion regarding repairing the roof instead of what was requested in the application. There is a Tom Keefe architectural report and various letters of support. The financial need point is not given.

Trinity Episcopal Church, Milton – No financial need point.

Union Meeting House, Huntington – Mr. Andres noted that it is positive that they are adding the library use for this building. Financial need point given.

Vergennes City Hall Opera House, Vergennes – Mr. Andres asked why they are applying for windows, when they have the need for stabilization of the side walls. Mr. Gilbertson noted that they are also in for a legislative appropriation. Ms. Lawless asked if the need for the walls could be addressed. Mr. Gilbertson noted that the veneer has been stabilized and that perhaps they are looking for more money from other sources. No financial point given.

Yester House of the Shelburne Vermont Art Center, Manchester – No financial point given.

First Baptist Church of South Londonderry, South Londonderry – There is a Tom Keefe architectural report. No financial need point given.

First Church of Barre Universalist, Barre – No financial need point.

Old Goshen Church, Bradford – Added back in after staff cut. Mr. Turner said that the steeple needs an assessment. If they receive a grant, the Council suggests that it be for the piers - $11,000 request. No financial need point given.

Paramount Theatre, Rutland – No financial need.

Shard Villa, Salisbury – Financial need point given.

Tenney Memorial Library, Newbury – No financial need point awarded.

Thorp Barn, Charlotte – This barn is owned by a municipality and they have also applied for a barn grant. Town wants to conserve as an interpretive center. No financial need point.
Unitarian Church of Montpelier, Montpelier – The financial need point is not awarded.

Vergennes Pumphouse, Vergennes – Mr. Turner suggested that the electrical, earthwork and ramp components be removed from the request, changing application to $8,500. No financial need point given.

During lunch Ms. Wadhams passed out the Agency Annual Report. Announced the $4,000,000 one-time appropriation for downtowns and that the Governor doubled the Downtown Fund to $800,000. Reported on the downtown bills H-408, the Agency’s and H-475, the Vermont Forum on Sprawl, and said that H-475 may become part of H-408.

Ms. Wadhams noted that the Division will appear before House Institutions on Friday on the Capital Budget request. The sites budget and grants need to be addressed. She also reported on the progress of the Plymouth Cheese Factory lease. The Council will draft a letter supporting the increased dollar amount in the Capital Budget for the sites and grants.

A future agenda item will be to discuss meeting with the Governor regarding the budget amounts requested for grants and historic sites.

VII. SHPO Report

Ms. Wadhams updated the Council that the AOT PA is still in the process of being developed and will be sent to the members prior to signature.

The CDBG is going through an evaluation, part of the concern is historic preservation and archeology. Ms. Wadhams said that there is going to be an archeology retreat to discuss these concerns and to come up with solutions.

The following grants are awarded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge</td>
<td>Belcher Library</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury</td>
<td>Middlebury Town Hall/Knights of Columbus Hall</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>District School House #8</td>
<td>$2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Holley Hall</td>
<td>$5,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Ethan Allen Firehouse</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Fletcher Free Library / Carnegie Building</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden</td>
<td>Chittenden Grange Hall</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>Guilford Center Meeting House</td>
<td>$3,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Line</td>
<td>Haskell Free Library</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury</td>
<td>Henry Sheldon Museum of Vermont</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Union Meeting House</td>
<td>$3,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre</td>
<td>First Church of Barre Universalist</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Paramount Theatre</td>
<td>$5,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Shard Villa</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte Montpelier

Thorp Barn Unitarian Church of Montpelier

$9,000 $10,000

Totals $99,506

Mr. Petersen moved to accept the grants list as presented, second by Ms. Lawless, with changes in amounts to the following: Ethan Allen Firehouse from $10,000, to $5,000; Holley Hall, change request from $5,750 to $5,075; Fletcher Free Library, from $10,000 to $9,000; Union Meeting House, from $10,000 to $3,566; Thorp Barn, from $10,000 to $9,000; Chittenden Grange Hall, from $10,000 to $9,000; and Middlebury Town Hall from $10,000 to $7,500. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Mallary made the motion that the Thorp Barn, Charlotte and Chittenden Grange Hall, Chittenden appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, second by Mr. Andres and voted unanimously.

There were no alternates named.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Submitted,

_____________________________
Shari Duncan
Division for Historic Preservation

Approved: ____________________
NOTICE

The Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will hold their monthly meeting on Thursday, February 24, 2000 from 9:00 to 2:00 in the Vermont Council on the Arts Conference Room at 136 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont.

AGENDA

I. Schedule/confirm meeting dates 9:00
   A. Set agenda for meeting with AOT Sect. Bryan Searles

II. Minutes – January 26, 2000 9:30

III. State Register Designation
    A. Scampini Block, Barre 9:45

IV. National Register – Final Review
    A. The Orchards (Southern Vermont College), Bennington 10:00
    B. 143 Highland Avenue, Hardwick 10:15

V. National Register – Preliminary Review
    A. Merck Forest, Rupert 10:30

VI. Old Business
    A. Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor – Council Comments 10:45
    B. AOT PA update 11:10
    C. Grants – Scoring non-preservation criteria 11:15
    C. Support for Grants programs – Letter to Legislature 11:35

Working Lunch

VII. SHPO Report 12:00

VIII. Archeology Report 12:30

IX. 22 VSA 14
    A. West Fairlee School, Fairlee (tentative) 1:00

X. New Business 1:30
February 24, 2000

The meeting of the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was called to order at 9:20 a.m., by Peter Mallary, Vice-Chair.

Members Present: Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Vice Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian (left at 12:30 p.m.)
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member (left at 2:00 p.m.)
George Turner, Historic Architect
Jim Petersen, Archeologist
Beth Boepple, Citizen Member

Member Absent: David Donath, Historian, Chair

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, SHPO (10:25 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.)
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Elsa Gilbertson, National Register Specialist (9:30 a.m. - 11:20 a.m.)
Scott Dillon, Survey Archeologist (12:00 p.m. - 2:40 p.m.)
Eric Gilbertson, Deputy SHPO (11:10 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.)

Guests Present: Rebecca Purdom (10:20 a.m. - 11:20 a.m.)
Steve Libby (10:20 a.m. - 11:20 a.m.)
Rick Burroughs (1:40 p.m. - 2:40 p.m.)
Mark Roth (1:40 p.m. - 2:40 p.m.)
James Hughes
Mark Montminy
Jay Ancel
Lawrence O'Downell

II. Minutes - The Council reviewed the minutes of the January 26, 2000, meeting. Mr. Turner inquired if Ms. Lendway had prepared a letter to the Hartford CLG, as noted in the minutes. Ms. Boone apologized for not having it prepared, and will bring it to the next meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Andres to accept the minutes, seconded by Ms. Lawless. The following changes were made: page 1, under Revisions to CLG grant selection criteria, remove
Council discussed the draft letter to Senate Institutions, dated February 23, 2000. Ms. Lawless thought it missed excitement at seeing projects happening around the state and how important they are. Mr. Andres' opinion was the letter sounded reportorial. The tone could be more aggressive in how important these programs are. There are no other programs. People feel compelled to go directly to the Legislature. Council continued discussion later in the meeting.

III. State Register Designation

A. Scampini Block, Barre - The Owner requested this designation. Ms. Gilbertson distributed photographs and summarized the building's character. The Council reviewed a survey form on the property. Mr. Andres moved, Ms. Boepple seconded. Voted unanimous. Mr. Turner asked why they weren't seeking NR status. The Council encourages them to pursue NR nomination.

IV. National Register - Final Review

A. The Orchard (Southern Vermont College), Bennington - The Council received copies of the nomination before the meeting. The CLG reviewed the property and commented that it appears to be eligible under Criteria A and C and for state and national levels of significance. Ms. Gilbertson noted that the national level question would have to be decided in the broader context of the architect's work. The CLG also recommended that the nomination include a description of the innovative concrete floor. Mr. Andres moved to accept under Criteria A and C, seconded by Mr. Petersen.

Ms. Boepple noted that she is on a board with the consultant who prepared the nomination but there is not fiduciary relationship or possible benefit to her. The Council noted that no conflict exists. Ms. Lawless noted that there may be additional statuary that could be included in the nomination. The landscape design could also be researched and included. Motion was passed unanimously. Ms. Gilbertson noted the fine architectural analysis done in the nomination.

B. 143 Highland Avenue, Hardwick - Ms. Gilbertson explained that this building has undergone rehabilitation in the RITC Program. The Council reviewed the photos. They had received copies of the nomination before the meeting. Mr. Andres moved under Criteria A and C. Ms. Lawless seconded. Mr. Andres noted that the building appears so rehabilitated, that it almost appears to be new. Ms. Lawless noted the importance of the context developed in the nomination. Motion passed unanimously.

X. New Business - Ms. Boone asked Mr. Mallary, Mr. Andres and Mr. Petersen to confirm their desire to be re-appointed to the Council when their terms expire on February 28, 2000. They did and the Division will recommend their re-appointment to the Governor.

VIII. Archeology Report - Jim Petersen gave the Archeology Report as follows. Vermont archeology is apparently in its usual state of flux, with significant developments and changes occurring in recent months. A matter of particular interest to the Advisory Council, that of Early Paleoindian sites at Okemo in Ludlow, is moving to resolution. The Okemo Corporation has
apparently agreed to avoid the few 11,000 year old Paleoindian sites found last autumn during its first phase of planned ski area expansion. Although no further study will occur at these highly significant sites in the near future, they will be preserved for study at some later point. It is possible that a second phase of ski area expansion will require further study of them since their preservation has eliminated 175 car parking spaces and 20 bus parking spaces in the proposed project. The US Army Corps of Engineers and Division for Historic Preservation are guiding management and presentation decisions about these cultural resources.

Secondly, the Agency of Transportation has scheduled a meeting for March to discuss standardization of archeological procedures across its many consultants, including its direct state-wide consultants, subcontractors to its environmental and engineering design consultants, and consultants working directly with local municipalities. As more and more consultants and subcontractors have become involved in Vermont archeology, consistency has begun to drop and some substandard work has crept in, in large part due to decentralization of consulting archeology for the agency. The meeting scheduled for March should help address these concerns.

Thirdly, the proposed highway bill and other Agency of Transportation projects continue to challenge archeologists working in Vermont. This is especially the case where previous reviews of particular projects have been inadequate and cultural resources may be lost without proper identification, evaluation and mitigation. A 2.9 mile project on Route 7 in Charlotte is a good example of this problem, where earlier review 10 years ago cleared most of this important travel corridor and now there is strong reason to believe this earlier review was inadequate. Is it possible to revisit a case such as this one? This matter is currently under review by the Division for Historic Preservation.

Finally, Vermont archeologists eagerly await finalization of the Division for Historic Preservation’s Vermont Archeology Task Force Report, which will present priorities for Vermont archeology based on a series of meetings in 1999 by the Task Force.

Some questions followed Mr. Petersen’s report. Ms. Boone noted that the Division plans an internal archeology retreat on March 17th with Greg Brown and Kathy Beyer.

Mr. Andres asked if the request for further study in Charlotte could come from the community, e.g. the Charlotte Historical Society. Discussion of pros and cons followed.

Members asked if Okemo might merit an award for modifying their plans to avoid the important archeological sites.

I. Meeting Dates - The March 16th date was confirmed. Ms. Boepple will most likely not be able to attend. The April 20th meeting will be in Lyndonville. Mr. Mallary will not be able to attend. The May 18th meeting was confirmed and the June meeting was set for June 14th.

V. National Register - Preliminary Review

A. Merck Forest and Farmland Center, Rupert - Rebecca Purdom described the development of Merck Forest and Farm in the 1940’s as center for education for local landowners about
farmland and forestry techniques. She showed slides and maps of the property. It is 3,150 acres. The Center has a $400,000 budget.

The Council discussed how the nomination would be presented. Ms. Gilbertson noted that Merck's original farm is turning 50, and the nomination would include the original 2,500 acres under A, for ag significance, and C, as a good example of a rural landscape. It is a managed working landscape. It would be a rural historic district.

Steve Libby noted Preservation Trust of Vermont (PTV)'s interest. Landscape designation is a way to unite landowners in a common effort to preserve rural areas in upland areas. PTV would likely help fund the NR nomination. The process would be developed as a model. Related efforts include an oral history project with the Folklife Center and research by noted landscape historians. Mr. Turner noted that the landscape is unusual because it is empty of the people/farmers who created/inhabited it. The social history is very important to a nomination. Mr. Petersen noted the rich archeological heritage of the landscape. Mr. Turner noted the possible development of Criterion B for Merck's significance. The Council recommended that the nomination proceed.

VI. Old Business

C. Grants - Scoring non-preservation criteria

Mr. Gilbertson distributed a copy of the grants program handout for legislators. He went on to describe the grant scoring categories - preservation criteria and non-preservation criteria (handicap access, financial need, and downtown). Ms. Boone asked if the geographic point should be considered the same way.

Ms. Lawless noted that lack of applications is a result of a lack of support for development of applications. Ms. Wadhams noted you could have 2 rounds to give people a second chance in a year? Could the DHP and the Council give the time?

The role and activities of the Preservation Trust of Vermont were discussed. The Council discussed how to support development of good applications - website, handout with slides, PTV grant assistance, etc. How to deal with bad applications for good projects? Grants are seasonal - work occurs during summer. That would argue against 2 rounds. Continue to seek more funds, more personnel. Grant writing help desk at HP Conference. Could also be done at Farm Show or Tunbridge Fair. Booth backdrop could have project photos.

Handicap access points too great a factor. Council would like to see a single point factor (of 1 or more points) added for access. Council Members could award “up to” 5 or more points for geographic distribution, by consensus.

Ms. Wadhams wants a policy on alternates if a recipient declines a grant. She also wants a policy that recognizes the cases where a DHP grant will make or break a project; i.e. it would not happen without the grant. Mr. Gilbertson noted also a category where the benefits to a community, especially small communities are recognized.

The DHP will develop a more specific proposal and bring it back to the Council.
D. Support for Grants Program

The Council returned to the discussion of the letter to the Senate Institutions Committee and the testimony planned for later in the afternoon. Some members wanted a more aggressive approach to convey the compelling need for the program. Mr. Andres noted the need to convey that for many people this is their only grant source. Need to make the connection to economic benefit.

The Council needs to bring the crisis call to the Governor soon. Get in on the development of the budget for next year. Convey urgency, but avoid righteousness. Mr. Andres asked if this is the time to make individual calls to Legislators about this year's grants requests, and the answer was yes.

I. Meeting Dates

A. Agenda for meeting with Brian Searles

- Ms. Wadhams wants it to be a positive exchange and to get a good agenda

- Schedule it for May, so Mr. Mallary can be present

- Include a general discussion of the truck issues, and the need for identifying and protective resources in transportation corridors

Put 20 minutes in the next meeting to discuss truck issue and agenda items for May meeting with Brian Searles.

VI. Old Business

B. AOT PA Update - Ms. Boone summarized the status and pointed out revisions that had been made in response to Council concerns. The Council felt that the changes were appropriate. Mr. Petersen questioned number 2 on Exempt List.

A. Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor - Council Comment

Ms. Wadhams summarized the study that identified the corridor and set out 4 options for the future: do nothing; each state decide for itself and then form partnerships; official authorization as a Heritage Corridor; by Congress; quadracentennial celebration (to recognize Champlain's two trips to Lake Champlain and the changes that occurred thereafter).

Agency would like Corridor designation. It would bring money for development. However, an intermediate step might be more prudent and acceptable. Therefore, the Agency wants to support the Quadracentennial, with $250,000 - 500,000 funding. Comment deadline has been extended to April 1\textsuperscript{st}. Ms. Wadhams asked if The Council wanted to comment as a group or individually. Council supports similar comment. Mr. Turner suggests that the letter should state how the additional money from the Corridor designation is sorely needed. Mr. Petersen noted that VAS has written a letter supporting Corridor designation. Ms. Wadhams stated DHP would draft a letter for the Advisory Council.
VII. SHPO Report

Downtown Bill - Two bills were merged. Ms. Wadhams noted that there is support for language to prohibit demolition of historic buildings in downtowns if Act 250 exemption for downtowns passes. Dollar amount in bill has been reduced to $2 million from $4 million.

Preservation Trust of Vermont’s 20th Anniversary will be held September 10th from 2:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., at Breeding Barn at Shelburne Farms.

Staff Reorganization - Ms. Wadhams described reorganization plan and attendant pay grade changes for some staff.

Director’s Position - Proposed legislative change to make Director’s Position exempt has been eliminated.

Plymouth Cheese Factory - Senator Bob Wood asked for a review of the RFP process. That has occurred, and has been approved by auditor.

IX. 22 V.S.A. 14

A. West Fairlee School, Fairlee - Ms. Boone described why the project was coming in without advance materials to the Council - because of the applicant’s time schedule (bid in March, construction in April).

Mr. Dillon summarized the project. The options appear to be: write off archeo; require archeology before construction; clear school now and investigate playing fields elsewhere.

Mr. Turner asked what we expect to find, and have similar resources been found elsewhere. Mr. Dillon responded that areas like this have not been studied, so sites have not been inventoried. The Council considered options and lamented the dilemma of the timetable.

The School Superintendent Mark Roth, project architects and others, joined the Council for discussion of the project. Rick Burroughs, Project Architect, summarized contents of the package that they had prepared for the Council. Mr. Roth noted that the two Fairlee Elementary schools are on the state’s worst school lists. One school would serve West Fairlee and Vershire.

Mr. Dillon summarized the archeological sensitivity of the parcel. Mr. Petersen confirmed that the site is sensitive and likely to yield an important archeological site. He outlined the difficult position that the Council is in with the project coming before them just before construction. Mr. Burroughs stated that a delay would trigger “construction inflation”. Mark Roth said that the public’s good will on this project would be stretched too far if this project is delayed now. He hopes the project can be a living laboratory on archeology for the community and the students as a middle ground.
Mr. Dillon stated the terrace near the house may have been modified, leveled, in the past, and could be less sensitive. A drainage way separates this terrace from a more sensitive zone. The eastern half of the school sits on the sensitive area. Members asked if the school district could phase construction, first school and drive, then playing fields, and allow time for archeological investigation? Mr. Petersen noted that the work might cost about $3,000 to $5,000 to clear the 15-acre parcel. Work could not begin until May 1 - 15, when the ground thaws.

It was noted that the foundation on the site was the old store. It could be buffered so that it could be avoided. Mr. Roth stated he could write a grant to the Council on Humanities for an archeologist in residence. Mr. Petersen noted if there is nothing there, the clearance would take just a couple of days, but if an archeo site is discovered it would be a more complicated matter.

The Council also discussed the adjacent historic barn, which is listed on the State Register of Historic Places. The unrepaired barn would be an attractive nuisance for the school. The Council felt taking the 2 small extensions off the barn would not be an issue. James Hughes of Fairlee Historical Society said that a committee had been formed to try to save the barn. Questions were discussed regarding whether archeological investigation could begin earlier through tenting and thawing the ground? Mr. Petersen noted the frost is especially deep this year and early testing would be very hard. Mr. Burroughs summarized the conclusions of the discussion:

- District should get consultant right away and proceed with a plan approved by DHP (8 meter test pits)
- not as concerned about the 2 out buildings attached to the barns
- try to retain barn with cupola

The school visitors left. The time schedule is that they plan to open in October. The septic field is the most likely place to yield sites, as well as the upper playing fields. DHP will write a summary. Ask the district to keep DHP informed; report back in a month. The Council needs more information before they can give them a conclusion.

Ms. Boepple moved to adjourn at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Petersen seconded. Meeting was adjourned.

Submitted,

Shari Duncan, Administrative Assistant
Division for Historic Preservation

Approved: 3.16.00

Date
NOTICE

The Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will hold its monthly meeting Thursday, March 16, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., at the Vermont Community Foundation, Court Street, Route 7, Middlebury, Vermont.

AGENDA

I. Meeting Dates 9:00 a.m.
   A. Confirm dates
   B. Set agenda for May meeting with Brian Searles 9:05 a.m.

II. Minutes 9:25 a.m.

III. Election of Officers 9:35 a.m.

IV. Certified Local Government 9:45 a.m.

V. Barn Grants 10:45 a.m.

Working Lunch 12:00 p.m.

VI. SHPO Report

Adjourn 4:00 p.m.
The meeting of the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was called to order at 9:20 a.m., by David Donath, Chair.

Members Present: David Donath, Historian, Chair
Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Vice Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member
Beth Boepple, Citizen Member
George Turner, Historic Architect
Jim Petersen, Archeologist

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, SHPO (9:45 a.m.)
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Eric Gilbertson, Deputy SHPO
Jane Lendway, (9:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.)
Shari Duncan, Administrative Assistant

I. **Meeting Dates** - The scheduled April 20, 2000, meeting to be held in Lyndonville at Lyndon Institute was changed to April 13th. The meeting to be held in the same location and to start at 10:00 a.m. The May 18th meeting was confirmed.

There was some discussion as to whether Brian Searles, Secretary of AOT, would be attending the May or June meeting. It was agreed that he may attend either meeting.

It was noted that the Historic Preservation Conference will be held on May 12, 2000, in Vergennes and advantageous to attend.

II. **Minutes** - The Council reviewed the minutes of the February 24, 2000, meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Andres to accept the minutes, seconded by Ms. Boepple. The following changes were made: page 1, Mr. Andres left the meeting at 12:30 p.m., page 7, delete “the cost would be”, and add “that the work might cost”, add at the end of the second paragraph, “but if an archeological site is discussed it would be a more complicated matter” and, at the last paragraph, delete “of no adverse effect”.
Mr. Mallary noted that the Journal Opinion had published a story on the West Fairlee School project. It was a positive article. Mr. Petersen noted that the project team had called him to ask for help in developing an RFP and he did assist them.

IV. **Certified Local Government** - Ms. Lendway was present to address the Council. The recommendations for CLG Awards were made to the Council. The total amount requested through applications was just under the amount of funds available - $1,211.00. There will be an announcement of another round in the next few months. There were 9 applications. Historic Preservation Staff carefully reviews each application for compliance. On the Review Team is Eric Gilbertson, Elsa Gilbertson and Jane Lendway. Mr. Mallary moved to accept the recommendations and Ms. Lawless seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Ms. Lendway had a request for a slight change in the selection criteria for future use. She handed out those changes. The changes were minor. Mr. Petersen moved to accept the changes and Mr. Andres seconded. The vote was unanimous.

II. **Meeting Dates** - There was discussion about the upcoming meeting with Brian Searles, AOT Secretary. Ms. Wadhams stated that the purpose of the upcoming meeting with Mr. Searles is to provide an introduction to the Council; a summary of the PA; information on the Council’s role in the PA; concerns about transportation in Vermont, especially the truck issue; where does AOT stand on the issue and what are they doing presently. Mr. Petersen suggested the Council have something drafted on what their concerns are. Mr. Andres agreed to take comments from the council members and draft the concerns and make recommendations based on what he receives. He will bring the draft to the next council meeting for review.

III. **Election of Officers** - The floor was open for nominations. Ms. Boepple nominated David Donath for the Chair. Mr. Donath declined. Mr. Petersen nominated Peter Mallary. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Andres. The vote was unanimous. Mr. Mallary accepted. Ms. Lawless nominated Glenn Andres as Vice-Chair. Ms. Boepple seconded. The vote was unanimous. Mr. Andres accepted.

II. **Meeting Dates** - There was more discussion about the meeting with Brian Searles. Mr. Mallary asked if the Council could have him attend the April meeting versus the May meeting. Mr. Petersen suggested the Council offer him the choice of which meeting he would attend. Ms. Wadhams will invite Molly Lambert, Secretary of Agency of Commerce and Community Development to the same meeting. It was stressed that the meeting should not be adversary but more of a bridge building experience. Mr. Petersen suggested again that the Council summarize their overall concerns. Some of the target areas include: Route 7, 9, 103, 4, 2, 78, 22A and 30. Traffic issues were discussed. It was agreed upon that community centers are being killed. Middlebury has an average of 7,000 vehicles per day traveling through. Ms.
Wadhams stated Vermont is no longer a leader among states on land use planning. Could the Council use Middlebury as an object lesson at the Brian Searles meeting? Mr. Donath suggested Woodstock as the site of the next Advisory Council Meeting. While inside some of the downtown buildings in Woodstock, the traffic can not only be heard but felt through vibrations. It was agreed that the Council would schedule the location around Brian Searles calendar.

II. **Minutes** - At the last meeting, George Turner asked about a follow-up letter to the Hartford CLG. It was stated Ms. Lendway had already mailed the letter out. Ms. Boone passed around a copy of the letter.

V. **Barn Grants** - Eric Gilbertson stated there were a total of 51 applications to consider for this year’s Barn Grant Program. The Council viewed one slide of each of the projects, Mr. Gilbertson gave a brief description of the work proposed based on the application summary (attached to minutes) of each project that was previously mailed to the Council. The Council held a brief discussion on all projects. The Historic Preservation Staff had performed an earlier review of each application and based on the criteria and recommended 25 projects receive more detailed review by the Council. The Council decided to review 3 additional projects along with the staff recommendations.

The following applications were presented to the Council using multiple slides and the summaries of the projects as a basis for discussion.

- **Thorpe Barn, Charlotte** - Mr. Gilbertson noted that a Historic Preservation Grant was awarded to this project this year. The Council questioned whether they should receive both grants. The Council suggested that grants from both programs would only be awarded under very special conditions and that the staff would develop guidelines.

- **The Ledges, Wolcott** - Discussion on repair method for foundation.

- **Beany Corn Crib, Cornwall** - Discussion of use and urgency of repair for sills.

- **Cate Farm Barn, Plainfield** - Discussion of location, work and use.

- **Stark Homestead Tobacco Barn, Halifax** - Discussion of removal of rear section which is newer, in very poor condition and made of used materials with no foundation.

- **Old King Farm Barn, Benson** - The Council wondered whether this was a local landmark. They discussed this as a ten building complex that was a rare survivor of a 19th century farm layout. The “multiple building” nature of the application was discussed. Mr. Gilbertson suggested that it was appropriate as all the buildings were in a similar state of disrepair and needed the work to preserve them.
Sargent Horse Barn, Chittenden - Discussion of work proposed and the importance of the complex. Had received grant for the adjoining barn in the past and the work looked good.

Darling Barn, Peacham - Discussion of size of barn, its visibility and the need for the work.

Frog Valley Farm Heifer Barn, Starksboro - Discussion of use as start up farm and the work.

Gaylord House and Barn, Waitsfield - Discussion of work, the fact that they had a Part II RITC approval and the use of steel in the joinery in recent work.

Nuissl Farm Barn, Berlin - The Council thought the budget seemed very low for the work needed and questioned whether the work could get done on the submitted budget. There appeared to be a site drainage problem.

Sleepers Meadow Farm Barn, Newbury - This project is a continuation from the past. The owners have received funding from other sources. Everyone agreed this was a rare barn and a good project.

Desserau Farm Silo, Barre Town - Mr. Gilbertson pointed out that these silos are quite rare in Vermont. This particular one is one of the very few still standing. The Council questioned whether putting on a new roof would really help at this point. They were concerned with the fact that the tiles appear to be heavily damaged and what would happen next? Also discussion of how long the repairs would last.

Weiser Storage Barn, Westminster - The Council had much discussion on this project. It appears the budget is very low for the work needed. The materials seemed questionable. It was suggested that Mr. Gilbertson work with these folks in the future.

Old Cheese Factory, Poultney - Discussion of condition and lean of building and if the repair methods proposed were adequate to address the problems.

Russell Red Barn, Sudbury - Discussion of the work proposed. Council was concerned about the outbuildings on the property.

Usle Farm Barn, Barre Town - The Council thought the budget was low on this project. The workplan mentioned power washing and Mr. Gilbertson recommended against power-washing a project of this sort.
Gibson Barn, Newbury - The Council agreed this barn is in serious trouble. The budget seemed very low. Mr. Gilbertson noted that the budget was low, as the owners themselves would be responsible for doing most of the work. The Council suggested Mr. Gilbertson offer advice on the repair of the cupola's and follow-up to make sure the standards were being followed.

North Chittenden Grange Hall, Chittenden - There was much discussion around the funding of this project. The Council questioned whether the Division would be the sole source of funds for the project. They have already received Historic Preservation Funds through the last grant. Mr. Gilbertson assured the group that the project is much bigger than shown in the application. The owners would be coming up with more than half of the total budget.

Baslow Barn, Lincoln - Discussion of work, treatment and use. Setting very important.

Longe Dairy Barn/Milkhouse - Enosburg Falls - The Council agreed that this project had a beautiful cupola. The owner doesn't need to repair the cupola in order to do his work. He would be doing much of the work himself. It was suggested by the Council to have Mr. Gilbertson check on the louvers.

Scapeland Farm Old Barn, Whiting - Discussion of treatment for silo and how long it would be before rot set in. Compliments on the maintenance of the slate roof.

Lavely Farm Horse Barn, East Burke - The Council thought the budget was very low. Mr. Gilbertson suggested that the budget was okay as long as the sills were in good shape. Discussion and agreement that work on the house was acceptable to maintain NR eligibility.

Winn Tavern Carriage Barn, Whitingham - Discussion of age and the proposed work.

Howacres Scale Barn, Tunbridge - Discussion of the importance of the working farms in this valley and this farm. The proposed work was discussed.

Burbeck Barn, Dorset - The National Register eligibility of isolated barns was discussed, as was the proposed work. Concern for the outbuilding in the slide was discussed.

Stone House Farm, Cavendish - This project had no slides and only a few photographs. The Council felt the applicant was not specific in its description of work to be done.

The Council reported their scores for each project and determined which projects should receive the "Financial Need" point. Ms. Boone listed top projects in order of score, reported them to the Council and illustrated them on a distribution map.
The following projects will receive 2000 Barn Grant Awards:

- Old King Farm Barn, Benson: $6,891
- Darling Barn, Peacham: 6,250
- Sleepers Meadow Farm Barn, Newbury: 7,500
- Gibson Barn, Newbury: 7,457
- Baslow Barn, Lincoln: 7,500
- Longe Dairy Barn, Sheldon: 7,500
- Scapeland Farm Old Barn, Whitingham: 6,574

**TOTAL**: $49,672

Alternates:

- Sargent Horse Barn, Chittenden: 5,875
- Frog Valley Farm Heifer Barn, Starksboro: 7,500

Mr. Donath made the motion that all projects selected for awards and the alternates appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, seconded by Ms. Boepple. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Turner moved to adopt the grant awards per the above list, seconded by Mr. Donath. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Turner suggested that the Council or through the Preservation Trust, pursue grants to raise additional funds for this Barn Grant program. There was much discussion on ways to raise more funds for this program. Should the Council seek funds elsewhere? Should a letter be written to Senate Institutions asking for more funds? Dick Mazza is the one to contact. He has been very supportive of giving monies to this program. Ms. Wadhams suggested that someone write a summary of the program with colored pictures of the projects to illustrate how important this program is. Ms. Boone offered to draft a letter. It was agreed by all that there is too little money for this program and many worthwhile projects do not receive funding due to a lack of money, not interest.

There was some discussion on the policy of awarding grant money. Should an applicant be eligible for the Historic Preservation Grant and the Barn Grant? Currently there is nothing in writing and if the Council thinks this is an issue, they should write something up so the applicants know up front what the rules are. Mr. Gilbertson said the issue doesn’t often come up but does occasionally. Ms. Wadhams suggested someone from her staff could draft up the language and bring it to the next meeting.
Mr. Petersen asked the question of does the Council know if the applicant follows the standards? Mr. Gilbertson is the person who monitors the projects. The applicant only receives funds after proper documentation is submitted to the Division.

Mr. Mallary moved to close the meeting, Ms. Boepple seconded. The vote was unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Submitted,

\[signature\]
Shari A. Duncan
Division for Historic Preservation

\[approved\] 4/13/00
NOTICE

The Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will hold its monthly meeting Thursday, March 16, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., at the Vermont Community Foundation, Court Street, Route 7, Middlebury, Vermont.

AGENDA

I. Meeting Dates 9:00 a.m.
   A. Confirm dates
   B. Set agenda for May meeting with Brian Searles 9:05 a.m.

II. Minutes 9:25 a.m.

III. Election of Officers 9:35 a.m.

IV. Certified Local Government 9:45 a.m.

V. Barn Grants 10:45 a.m.

Working Lunch 12:00 p.m.

VI. SHPO Report

Adjourn 4:00 p.m.
NOTICE

The monthly meeting of the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will be held on Thursday, April 13, 2000 from 10:00 a.m to 3:30 p.m. in the Conference Room in the E. Harris Brown Building at Lyndon Institute, Lyndon Center, Vermont.

AGENDA

I. Schedule/confirm meeting dates 10:00

II. Minutes 10:05
   A. March 16, 2000 meeting

III. Act 250 – Determination of Significance 10:15
     A. Alumni Hall / Given, UVM Campus, Burlington
     B. Converse Hall, UVM Campus, Burlington

IV. 22 VSA 14 - State Project Review 10:45
    A. State Shelter, Smuggler's Notch, Cambridge

V. National Register - Preliminary Review 11:05
    A. Sunnyside Farm, Hartford
    B. 120-126 Benmont Avenue, Bennington
    C. 501-507 South Street, Bennington

VI. Tour of Lyndon Institute Campus Preservation Projects 12:15

VII. National Register – Final Review 1:15
     A. 68 Highland Avenue, Newport
     B. Samuel Gilbert Smith Farmstead, Brattleboro

VIII. SHPO Report 1:35

IX. Archeology Report 1:50
X. Old Business
   A. Discussion of Transportation Issues in Preparation For Meeting with Brian Searles
   B. Support for Grants Programs – Letter to Legislature
   C. Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor – Council Comment Letter
   D. AOT PA Signing

XI. New Business
Minutes

April 13, 2000

Members Present: Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian, Vice Chair
David Donath, Historian
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member (left at 1:30 p.m.)
George Turner, Historic Architect

Members Absent: Elizabeth Boepple, Citizen Member
James Peterson, Historic/Prehistoric Archeologist

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, SHPO
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Shari Duncan, Administrative Assistant

Guests Present: Liz Pritchett, Consultant
Steve Wry, Director of Operations, Smugglers’ Ski Resort

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 10:10 a.m., at Lyndon Institute, Lyndonville, Vermont.

II. Minutes - The Council reviewed the minutes of the March 16, 2000 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Andres to accept the minutes, seconded by David Donath. The following changes were made: page 2, change “Behind the Times” to “Journal Opinion”, add “Mr. Andres” in the blank, page 3, strike “has lost ground” and add “no longer a leader among the states”, in section II., Minutes, change George Turner “had a” to “asked about a”.

I. Meeting Dates - The following meeting dates were scheduled: May 18th in Montpelier, June 14th in Montpelier and July 24th or 25th in Grand Isle. The meeting in July will be combined with the Preservation Trust Retreat at the Lake House. There was much discussion on the August AC Meeting as vacation schedules need to be considered.
It was decided that the August meeting will be on Friday the 25th at Seyon Ranch in Groton.

IV. 22 VSA 14 - State Project Review

A. State Shelter, Smugglers' Notch, Cambridge - This project had been before the Council in November of 1998. Ms. Pritchett stated in 1998, Smugglers’ Notch was looking to the Council for guidance on what to do with this building. They had concerns over the safety of the building and were interested in building a larger, safer building than the old CCC Building that was presently used for a youth ski program. At that time, the Council determined the building to be SR eligible and asked Smugglers’ to go back and look at different uses for the building.

Liz Pritchett gave a report on the steps Smugglers’ has taken since going before the Council in 1998. It was determined by an Engineer and Sue Bulmer of Forests, Parks and Recreation that the building is very small and not suitable to be moved. Ms. Pritchett stated that Smugglers’ Notch is proposing to document the site with photos and demolish the building. Mr. Donath moved that the project was adverse under criterion 3A, Mr. Andres seconded. Discussion followed. Ms. Pritchett stated she didn’t like recommending demolition but it appears to be the only reasonable option. The building isn’t a good example of the CCC period, unsure of what the original purpose of the building was and there is not as much significance as other CCC buildings. Ms. Pritchett explained that the entire framework has deteriorated as had the roof and was unsuitable for public use. The vote was unanimous that this project had adverse effect.

Mr. Andres asked if Smugglers’ Notch had the history on the building. Steve Wry from Smugglers’ Notch stated that there are slides from 1956. Mr. Andres suggested that Smugglers’ try to build the story out with emphasis on the probability that the building was most likely the original base ski lodge, the CCC period and the ski industry being historic.

Mr. Donath was not convinced the building could not be moved. Steve Wry indicated he was not an expert on the moving of buildings but he did know there was extensive rot in the joists. He stated that wood pieces could be just pulled off with the bare hand. Mr. Turner stated it was unreasonable to reconstruct the building and shared Mr. Andres' opinion. He requested that Smugglers’ document the early use after it was figured out. Mr. Donath asked what kind of documentation did Smugglers’ have in mind. Mr. Wry stated they were willing to do whatever was asked of them by the Council. Ms. Lawless asked the Council if it was fair and reasonable to ask so much from Smugglers. Mr. Turner answered that the Council is only asking them to incorporate images of its role. Mr. Andres moved that the adverse effect be mitigated with documentation of the building that would include historic material and a narrative of the early days of the ski industry. He asked that a final product be sent to the Division for Historic Preservation, Vermont Historical Society and the New England Skiing Museum. Ms. Lawless seconded, no further discussion, voted unanimous.
III. Act 250 - Determination of Significance

B. Converse Hall - Ms. Pritchett summarized that Fletcher Allen Healthcare would like to remain in Burlington as their main base but they need to expand the facility. The buildings are outdated and cannot provide adequate care and they would like to consolidate in order to provide full service healthcare all in one place. The project area involves University of Vermont property, the Hospital Complex (listed on the State Register in 1983), Converse Hall and Alumni Hall.

Converse Hall was built in 1894 or 1895 and is the earliest mens dormitory documented at UVM. The interior is gone and the exterior is intact. (CLG comments were reviewed and acknowledged). Mr. Andres made a motion to declare Converse Hall eligible under criteria 1, 10 and 16, Mr. Donath seconded. The vote was unanimous.

A. Alumni Hall/Given - Mr. Donath made a motion to declare Alumni Hall/Given eligible under criteria 1, 8, 10, 14 and 16. Mr. Andres seconded. A discussion followed. Ms. Pritchett gave some history on the building. The architect was Skidmore Owings Merrill, as carried out by Freeman, French, Freeman. This is not part of a district because there are many contemporary buildings in the vicinity. Mr. Turner stated that the age of the building isn’t as important factor as the style and quality of the building is. Ms. Pritchett said there is an abundance of new construction interspersed and didn’t feel like this was a district. Mr. Turner asked why the architects would want to demolish any of the buildings. Why couldn’t they work with what they have there? Mr. Andres asked why would the buildings be demolished if they are still intact? Ms. Pritchett answered by saying the building was in poor shape with much leakage and she has been told the building will not adapt to a new HAVC system.

Ms. Wadhams stated that the City of Burlington is fighting to keep the hospital located there. Ms. Pritchett said the Converse building is not being taken down and they were planning to re-focus on Converse to highlight. Ms. Boone suggested that the Council encourage UVM/Hospital to list Converse on the State Register. Mr. Andres said he found it difficult to make one building eligible and not the other. The Council voted unanimously that Alumni/Given are eligible for the State Register.

V. National Register Preliminary Review

B. 120-126 Benmont Avenue, Bennington - This is a multi-story building with a stair tower and housed mill workers. It is within a group of similar buildings. The Regional Affordable Housing Corporation is asking that the grouping could be a mini district in the National Register because of three generations of joint ownership. Ms. Boone stated she had asked the CLG for comments and they had hoped all of Belmont would be nominated as a district. The Housing Group has already purchased and rehabilitated other buildings and would like to use the tax credit. There is one landlord who would not cooperate in a district nomination. The Council is being asked to determine if it can be a mini district and then encourage the entire area. Mr. Turner said he was not in support of this small grouping. Mr. Donath stated the grouping was not all
that compelling. Ms. Boone said this project is not similar to Carrigan Lane which was developed and built as a complex. Mr. Mallary stated he was not all that enthusiastic and felt they would have to prove this is a valid way to go.

C. 501-507 South Street, Bennington - This is an affordable housing project. It was originally picked up in the 1985 survey. The request is for individual nomination based on architectural merit. The CLG says it should be nominated on that merit. Mr. Donath said the project would probably be eligible if there is a story but would be marginal with no story. Mr. Andres asked if they work on it could it lose good details like ceilings, exterior trim, front door? He thought they should be advised to be very careful with the details. The Council recommended that the nomination proceed.

A. Sunnyside Farm, Hartford - This is a request to extend the existing district in Hartford Village. This property is outside the district and only 3 buildings away from the district. The CLG says okay. Mr. Turner inquired as to what the 3 properties in between the district and this property are like. Ms. Boone says they have not indicated what kind of properties these are. Mr. Mallary thought the Council would need more information on the in between buildings. Request additional information.

VII. National Register - Final Review

A. 68 Highland Avenue, Newport - The Council had received copies of the nomination ahead of time for review. Mr. Donath made a motion to approve the nomination under criteria A and C. Mr. Andres seconded. Mr. Turner asked if this was an individual nomination and Ms. Boone answered yes, it is. The vote was unanimous.

B. Samuel Gilbert Smith Farmstead, Brattleboro - The Council had received copies of the nomination ahead of time for review. Ms. Boone stated they had shown interest 10 years ago. Mr. Andres thought it was important to have a site plan. The barn is the best building there. Ms. Boone indicated the file includes information on the earlier review in 1994 by the Council. There were some consultant problems. Ms. Boone said there were no comments from Elsa Gilbertson but because she scheduled it for final review she must believe it is adequate to proceed.

Mr. Andres pointed out that the external form of the building is the only significant point. There is talk of the history of the house that is no longer there. There is not much left for historic importance inside as everything has been replaced. Mr. Turner said that the history of the site was important. Mr. Mallary asked where the original house had been located. The Council looked over the plat and could not find the original house. Mr. Andres thought there was a pattern of a farmstead. The Council voted unanimously in favor of a motion to approve the nomination under criteria A and C.

VII. SHPO Report - Ms. Wadhams gave a brief summary of the NCSHPO meeting she attended last month. They discussed some national legislative issues. The big issue was to try and get more money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF).
Ms. Wadhams reported on the Archeological Retreat held last month. The group consisted of Agency Staff and Project Review Team. The group discussed the concerns around archeology and brainstormed on solutions. They felt the first step in moving forward is to sell archeology as an asset. It seems that nobody understands the value of archeology. The next step is to prioritize and get a workplan in order.

Ms. Wadhams announced the Division and Agency of Transportation had signed the Programmatic Agreement that Nancy Boone and Scott Newman of AOT had worked so hard on. The Feds are looking at this agreement as a model. Ms. Boone is working on a manual that is slated to be finished by September.

The Grant Program was brought up by Ms. Wadhams. She felt it was important to start lobbying for more funds earlier than in the past. Maybe a timeline should be set up to engage the group to lobby for more money. Mr. Turner stated he thought the Council needed to be constructive about getting more money. Should the Council be trying to get funds in other places? How does the group interact with other groups who should be an ally? Ms. Wadhams said she would bring it up at the retreat in July. The Council is looking for a broader solution. Ms. Wadhams stated Senator Jeffords is committed to looking for federal dollars.

Brian Searles and Molly Lambert will attend the Council meeting in May. Mr. Andres stated he had not heard from any of the Council Members on what their thoughts/concerns were so he had not compiled any kind of a list to address at the meeting. Ms. Wadhams felt the Council should talk with Brian Searles about concerns but be careful to not make him defensive. Mr. Andres said that Europe has built roads around centers. Mr. Turner asked if the bypass is the answer? Mr. Donath asked if you declare hopelessness or seek out a solution. What is it that you can ask for constructively? Ms. Boone requested the Council provide Brian Searles with some information on their backgrounds. Mr. Mallary suggested that we give him the information in advance. The AC members will provide staff with that information if we need it. Mr. Mallary will work with Ms. Wadhams and staff to prepare for the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Submitted:

Shari Duncan
Division for Historic Preservation

Approved: 6/14/00
MINUTES

June 14, 2000

Members Present: Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian, Vice Chair
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member
George Turner, Historic Architect (left at 1:00 p.m.)
Elizabeth Boepple, Citizen Member
James Petersen, Historic/Prehistoric Archeologist

Members Absent: David Donath, Historian

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, SHPO
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Shari Duncan, Administrative Assistant
Giovanna Peebles, State Archeologist
Scott Dillon, Survey Archeologist
Curtis Johnson, RITC Program
Tina Ruth, General Counsel, DHCA

Guests Present: Cathy Hilgendarf, Department of Education
Property Owner

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 9:40 a.m., at the Vermont State House in Montpelier.

There was discussion regarding agenda changes.

V. National Register - Preliminary Review

Mr. Johnson presented the project to the Council in the absence of Ms. Gilbertson.
A. Random House, Calais - Mr. Johnson said that this property meets the Agricultural Resource MPDF and appears eligible for the National Register. Mr. Johnson explained that this property is a 66-acre farm in Calais and has the context of early Vermont farms. The property is currently listed on the State Register of Historic Places. There is some question on the integrity of the two main structures. The main house is a small cape with a central chimney and an unfinished staircase and loft. This building is missing the original ell and has a 19th century replacement. The barn was originally a 3-bay barn and is missing one of the bays. There was some discussion about the integrity of the property. Mr. Johnson said he felt the property had been over restored but looks close to the way it looked in c. 1800 - 1810. It was the consensus of the Council that this property appears eligible for the National Register.

II. Minutes - The minutes from the April 13, 2000, meeting were passed out and reviewed. A motion was made by Mr. Andres to accept the minutes, seconded by Ms. Lawless. The following changes were made: page 1, add Mr. Donath in the blank, add “left at 1:30 p.m.”, next to Ann Lawless; page 3, change “unanimous” to “unanimously” in the second paragraph, add style after “important factor but the building” in the third paragraph, in the next to the last sentence in the last paragraph change “small grouping” to “this”; page 4, change “build” to “built” in the first sentence of the first paragraph, in the second paragraph add the street numbers to the address, in the third paragraph, place a space between “inbetween”, in the sixth paragraph, delete “important was” and after the history of the site, add “was important”, at the end of paragraph six, change “unanimous” to “unanimously”, on the SHPO Report, delete the entire fourth sentence.

I. Schedule - Advisory Council Meetings will be held on the following dates: July 25 & 26 at the Lake House in Grand Isle, August 25 at the Seyon Ranch in Groton and September 28 in Montpelier.

IV. Act 250 - Determination of Significance

A. Milton School, Milton - Ms. Boone passed around a Town of Milton survey book for review. The property is located off from Main Street on School Street. The building was built in 1945 and has not been used for a number of years. The new owners are proposing to use the building for elderly housing and in the process of obtaining an Act 250 permit. The question at hand is whether the property has historic significance under criteria 8. The owner stated the building is of the original cinder block, brick and concrete. The windows have been changed due to vandalism. The replacement windows are very different from the original as they were changed to accommodate future lowered ceilings. Ms. Wadhams stated that the purpose of the Council review was to determine if the building is eligible for the State Register. Mr. Turner moved that the building be determined ineligible and Mr. Andres seconded. Mr. Andres
said the building was typical of its period. Mr. Turner agreed and stated there were better examples that are actually maintained and used as schools. Ms. Wadhams stated the tax credits would be jeopardized because of the window changes. The owner agreed and said that most of the windows had been changed. The Council voted the building to be ineligible with Ms. Lawless the only one opposing.

III. **Certified Local Governments** - Ms. Lendway stated there is $1,211.00 left over from the March awards. There is also an estimated $2,800.00 surplus from projects that come in under budget. She surveyed award recipients and asked if they would be interested in training and received a positive response. The training workshop would be for design professionals and certain communities involved in design. The goal would be to teach folks how to publish design review guides. Ms. Lendway asked the Council to approve the money for the training. Ms. Boepple made a motion to use the money for the workshop with a second from Mr. Petersen. The Council voted unanimously.

IV. **22 VSA 14 - State Project Review**

A. **West Fairlee School** - Ms. Boone handed out information submitted by John Stewart on this project and gave a brief overview. The project had previously been before the Council and there were two main concerns; 1) archeological questions on the playing field and 2) removal or rehabilitation of the barn. An archeological survey was performed and the results were that there were no sensitive areas identified. After the Council's initial review of the project, the School District put together a task force to study the barn and its potential uses. That committee is recommending that the barn be demolished. Cathy Hilgendarf from the Department of Education presented her thoughts on the project. She stated she had not been to the site but had been involved with the building of the school. This project is part of the building of three schools in the district. Ms. Hilgendarf stated that the district was already over budget and had no money left to rehabilitate the barn. It was her understanding that the barn was in serious disrepair and a hazard to the children who will be attending the school. The entire Council was dismayed over the recommendation to demolish the barn. They all felt they were misled to believe that the barn was an important part of the school project. Mr. Mallary voiced his concern over the change in plans for the barn. He said when the project was originally presented to the Council, the school district supported the barn and had some plans to use the barn as a Health Center. Ms. Hilgendarf understood the Health Center to be in a different building than the barn. Ms. Wadhams expressed concern over the school district not applying for a barn grant if they were serious about saving it and using it. Mr. Petersen felt that this change came at the eleventh hour to everyone's surprise. Mr. Andres questioned whether the barn was in the budget for the project. Ms. Hilgendarf commented that by the time the project got
started, the lowest bid was 15% higher than the lowest estimate had been. Mr. Turner expressed that he felt the committee didn’t do a thorough enough job. There are certainly other areas to find resources. They could have looked at other alternatives. Ms. Lawless commented that someone had put effort into writing a grant but did anyone study the plans for use? Mr. Andres suggested that possibly a fence could be erected to keep the school children away from the barn. Mr. Mallary stated the Council did not have a hint that the barn would come down and that should be relayed back to the school district. The project was never presented with demolition of the barn in mind. Ms. Lawless expressed concern over the plans to remove the barn and that there would be no investigation of the history of the complex. She suggested that the Council recommend a structure report be done and encourage the school district to obtain a stabilization budget crafted by a knowledgeable person with barn expertise. Mr. Turner thought the Council should recommend a follow through on the educational component of restoration of the barn and try harder to stabilize it to be used later for school district purposes. Mr. Mallary asked Ms. Boone to draft a letter to be sent to the school district. The letter will include recommendations for containment and look further for available funds.

VI. SHPO Report

Ms. Wadhams told the Council that Abenaki bone fragments were found on private property on Monument Road in Highgate, Vermont. The Division has been working closely with the Abenaki Indians and the property owner to come up with a solution as to what is in everybody’s best interest. The State is trying to resolve the issue as quickly as possible but have run into certain legal issues. Currently the State is trying to purchase the land and have plans to re-bury the remains. The Division is trying to work out a long-term solution to the Monument Road issue.

Ms. Wadhams said there is another archeological issue in St. Johnsbury that came up recently. In an old cemetery, underneath the Caledonia County Court House, several more bodies were found during construction of the front plaza of the building. Some of the bodies will remain on site and will be recognized with a memorial plaque.

There was a meeting of the United States Postal Service on June 15, 2000. The Division has received numerous notices for potential projects that were not on the list provided to them in September 1999. The Postal Service is looking to relocate many of their facilities in locations with larger parking lots to accommodate large trucks and are proposing to use the 1980 Suburban Mall Model.
Ms. Wadhams reported that an additional one million dollars was given to the Downtown Program from the Legislature. Jane Lendway and Joss Besse are busy writing the guidelines on how the money is to be used.

Ms. Wadhams stated that the Division is working on archeological prioritization. They are reviewing the guidelines and trying to come up with something concise and not defensive. The guidelines should be balanced and have a program that is defensible and protects the resources of the state.

Molly Lambert and Brian Searles will be invited to attend the August or September Advisory Council meeting.

Ms. Wadhams reported the death of John Coolidge, son of the late President Calvin Coolidge. She and other Division staff attended the memorial service held on June 20, 2000 in Plymouth, Vermont.

IX. **Archeology Report** (as presented by James Petersen)

Vermont archeology continues to remain in the public eye, with several recent issues pertaining to human skeletons of particular note. Most notably, several or more Native American skeletons on Monument Road in Highgate were disturbed by private construction in early May near the banks of the Missisquoi River. Even though the archeological sensitivity of the area has been long known, private landowners elected to excavate a foundation hole near the river, and with close examination, fragmented human bones were found in the backfill.

Representatives of Vermont Division for Historic Preservation and the University of Vermont were called in to examine the finds, and found at least one partial skeleton still in place. The landowner was mistrustful of representatives of the Abenaki, the Abenaki were very upset by the disturbance of human skeletons, and the VDHP (and officers) were caught in the middle. Through the patient negotiations of the VDHP and others at the Agency level, this crisis has been largely resolved and the State of Vermont is progressing to purchase the property in question. This example clearly demonstrates how archeological sites can easily fall through “cracks” in the regulatory system, even for a site as “obvious” as a cemetery. One can conclude that other less obvious sites in less obviously sensitive areas are lost each year.

The second issue concerning human skeletons, before the preservation community is that of the Caledonia Court House Cemetery in St. Johnsbury. As we sit here, archeologists are excavating human skeletons dated c. 1790-1850 that were left in the ground when the courthouse was constructed c. 1854-1856. In this case, skeletons that are endangered by courthouse renovations can’t be removed, numbering as many as 10-20, will be left in place and covered over during constructions and various others, perhaps another 20-40, remain beneath an existing driveway and monument area. Skeletons will be left in place due to financial and scheduling issues, but in this case, they will be recorded and should
not need to be disturbed in the future. No public controversy has attended this recent work in St. Johnsbury in large part because there are few, if any, advocates for the deceased.

Other recent archeology events include a recent Act 250 Rules meeting that was held in Montpelier in late May. This meeting will be covered in another portion of today's meeting, so it will need not be much discussed here, except to say that it was an "eye-opener" for me personally as a professional archeologist. There are some vocal opponents, or at least challengers of Act 250 regulatory archeology here in Vermont.

Finally, I would like to call your attention to a public outreach/public education program that will take place over the whole month of July 2000, in Colchester, Vermont. This public archeology effort is related to the CCCH project and will involve a UVM field school, a volunteer component for the public and one or more summer school components for older children. Excavation will center on a 2000-year-old site potentially endangered by the CCCH project. This public archeology opportunity will be soon advertised through local newspapers and has been already advertised in archeology newsletters. It would be great to have members of the Advisory Council visit during July. Contact the UVM Consulting Archeology Program, phone 802-656-4310.

X. Old Business

A. Rules

1. Rule 4, Act 250 - The big picture is setting a schedule on how to move with the rules. The Division had a meeting in May with developers and other state agencies to get comments and concerns. The focus of the meeting was on archeology with no discussion on historic buildings/structures therefore; there will be a second meeting in the future to address historic buildings.

Ms. Boone stated that the meeting went well and the topics couldn't really be written into the rules but the group hoped their thoughts/ideas would be reflected in the results. Some of the topics discussed at the meeting included: establishing a fee pool for archeological studies, who has the burden of proof, predictive models and raising the significance threshold. It was agreed by all that attended the meeting that it was productive and helpful in hearing other ideas.

B. Rule 7, State Undertaking - There was much discussion on Rule 7. It was stated that the Division is committed to communicating with other agencies before finalizing the rules. It was agreed that all agencies should be given the opportunity to comment. There was talk about the process of how things would take place, each agency would identify their own
resources and enter into a memorandum of agreement. Work would be
done with each department in a timely manner. Ms. Wadhams stated that
there needed to be a realization that the Division and the Advisory Council
are willing to come up with reasonable solutions.

C. “Historically Significant” Land Areas - Through the Act 250
process there was a question about historical significance for properties
not listed on the State Register. The proposed rule is that the Division can
sign off unless the SHPO requests a review or the applicant wants the
Council to review the project. Mr. Mallary asked what would happen if
there was a political shifting and perhaps a new SHPO? Could the
Council request to review a project? And what would trigger the review?
Could we add “Chairman” to the rules as a potential requester? Ms.
Boone suggested that it should be written into the rules that the Chairman
may request a review if they felt it was necessary. Ms. Ruth stated that it
could turn into a big issue if not defined in the rule.

Ms. Boone stated the timeframe would remain the same under Rule 7.
She was apprehensive about the 8-day turn-around and doesn’t want to
start off on the wrong foot by forcing the timeframe issue. Ms. Peebles
stated that if the applicant is requesting the review, it is up to them to get
the materials submitted in a timely manner. Ms. Boone asked if anyone
had suggestions to please let her know.

There was some discussion about the predictive model. The predictive
model shows sensitivity, not significance. The Council should revisit the
predictive model issue at the next meeting.

X. New Business - Mr. Petersen moved to close the meeting. Ms. Boepple seconded.
The Council voted unanimously to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By

Shari Duncan
Administrative Assistant
Division for Historic Preservation
August 18, 2000

Sue Jamele  
Project Review Coordinator  
Division for Historic Preservation  
National Life Building  
Drawer 20  
Montpelier, VT 05620-0501  

Dear Ms. Jamele:  

Enclosed please find information on the Robert H. Gibson Rivergarden, a project you and I had discussed over the telephone a few days ago. I've included the following for your review:  

• Project description  
• Photographs of the Rite-Aid building (with abutting buildings) before renovation work and a sketch of the exterior facade once completed.  
• Sketch of interior walkway under central glass atrium  
• Sketches of façade, floor plan and roof plan  
• Boundary plan  
• Map of downtown  

BABB wishes to submit a grant application to the Downtown Transportation and Related Capital Improvement Fund for $75,000 that will help to cover the cost of construction. We are already receiving some federal and state funding for the project. The Rivergarden will provide important and needed amenities for pedestrians in terms of public space, information, public bathrooms and an opportunity to enjoy views of the River in downtown Brattleboro.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Nelle R. Hanig  
Executive Director  

Enclosures
Description of Robert H. Gibson Rivergarden Project

The Robert H. Gibson Rivergarden will redevelop the former Rite-Aid building, a vacant structure and significant eyesore in downtown Brattleboro. The project will address important economic, social and physical needs. It will help to enhance Brattleboro's downtown district and the High Street gateway, a major entry point into downtown from Interstate 91. In addition, it will provide public space in downtown as well as spectacular views of the Connecticut River and Mount Wantastiquet.

Public gathering space in the heart of downtown Brattleboro is almost non-existent. The Rivergarden will meet this vital need, serving as a magnet for activities and a source for information about events, shopping and other goings-on in town. It will have the capacity to host concerts, a small farmer's market selling local products, concessions, cafes and seating for relaxing and talking to friends or just reading the newspaper. Public restrooms also will be provided. A substantial portion of the space will be enclosed with a glass atrium, allowing the public to enjoy it during Vermont's harsher months.

While Brattleboro's downtown overlooks the Connecticut River and Mount Wantastiquet, there are virtually no opportunities for the public to view these special resources. The Rivergarden will afford sweeping views of the river and mountain, initiating the re-establishment of the historic connection between this community and the river.
NOTES

1) Bearings are based on a magnetic observation.
2) Reference is made to the following deed:
3) Reference is made to the following plans:
   A) A plan titled "CENTRE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, MAIN STREET, BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT, PREPARED BY W. E. SEEKER, DATED 7-12-1975.
   B) A plan titled "MASSIVE BLOCK, BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT, PREPARED BY J. E. HELVY, DATED 3-03-1920, AND RECORDED IN THE BRATTLEBORO TOWN CLEK'S OFFICE, PLAN BOOK 18, PAGE 128."

BOUNDARY & TOPOGRAPHIC PLAN
BUILDING A BETTER BRATTLEBORO, INC.
155-157-159 MAIN STREET
TOWN OF BRATTLEBORO
WINDHAM COUNTY
STATE OF VERMONT

DATE PLAN: 12-08-1999
DATE SURVEY: 11-29-1999
DRAWN BY: DAM
CHECKED BY: DAM
SCALE: 1"=20'

SVE Associates
P.O. Box 1618, Brattleboro, VT 05301-1618
Phone (802) 257-5581 Fax (802) 257-9728

Graphic Scale

(c) 1999

Legend:
- IRON PIN FOUND
- MANHOLE
- TELEPHONE MANHOLE
- LIGHT
- TRAFFIC SIGNAL
- WATER VALVE
- UTILITY POLE
- GUY WIRE
- UTILITY BOX
- CATCH BASIN
- DECIDUOUS TREE
- PROPERTY LINE
- RAILROAD ROW
- OVERHEAD WIRES
- RAILROAD TRACKS
MINUTES

August 25, 2000

Members Present: Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian, Vice Chair
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member
George Turner, Historic Architect
Elizabeth Boepple, Citizen Member
James Petersen, Historic/Prehistoric Archeologist
Dave Donath, Historian

Staff Present: Eric Gilbertson, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Sue Jamele, Environmental Review Coordinator
Debra Sayers, Program Services Clerk

Guests Present: John Ostrum, Department of Buildings and General Services

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 9:40 a.m., at the Seyon Ranch, Groton.

I. Schedule – Advisory Council meeting for September 28th has been changed to October 3rd in Montpelier, scheduled the next meeting for October 26th in Montpelier and November 30 in Montpelier.

II. Minutes – The minutes from the June 14, 2000 had the following changes: page 3, add Ms. “Hilgendorf” in the blank, page 5, under archeology add “partial” in the blank and in the same paragraph in the third sentence from the end, replace “human archeological sensitivity” to “a cemetery”. On page 5, in the last paragraph, change the word “officers” to “others”.

...
III. **National Register – Preliminary Review**

Mr. Gilbertson presented the projects to the Council.

**194 and 196/198 Columbian Avenue, Rutland** – Mr. Gilbertson stated the Maloney House is not in a Historic District and is separated by time and space from nearby neighborhoods. On Columbian Avenue, only the house next door is contiguous. Mr. Andres commented that the “2 buildings together make a nice ensemble”. This history of the original owner, Thomas W. Maloney is significant to Rutland social and political history. The council agreed that it met criteria a and c for listing on the National Register.

**469 Ha’ Penny Road – Peacham** – The owner submitted historic and recent photographs of the house and a write-up about its history. Over the years the building has been changed by major and minor additions. A portion of a barn has been moved and attached to an “L” in the 1950’s. Mr. Gilbertson suggested that they look through the State Register book of Peacham to compare it to other buildings in town. Mr. Andres said it is a nice house and well maintained and certainly not as altered as some. Mr. Donath asked if there was more history available on the property. Mr. Gilbertson replied the only information he had was what was submitted and what was in the survey. Mr. Donath suggested that maybe it could be eligible as Farmstead NR because the barn in the 1950 photo is really nice. Mr. Andres stated that the house alone was probably not eligible on its own but if the barn still existed it could perhaps be eligible as a farmstead. The Council agreed to ask for more information about the barn and setting to see if it would be eligible as a farmstead.

IV. **22VSA 14 – State Project Review**

**Pittsford State Police Academy Smokestack** - This project was withdrawn from consideration by the Department of State Buildings as they now intend to repair the top of the smokestack.

**Mcfarland House, Barre** – Drawings and photographs of the building were presented by John Ostrum of the Department of Buildings and General Services. Mr. Ostrum stated that the building has been neglected and marginally used for a number of years and certain sections of the building were deteriorating. The building will be used for state offices and the existing health clinic. He described the location and setting of the building and that it was made up of three major sections constructed since 1914. Mr. Donath moved for the building to be eligible for the State Register. The motion was seconded by Mr. Andres. It was unanimously approved as being eligible for the State Register. Mr. Ostrum went on to present the changes that will be made to building. He stated that the building needed a focal core that will be created to provide handicapped access and a means of egress. 

Mr. Ostrum explained that the 1914 entrance will be repaired and the stairs will be repaired and slightly extended using Barre granite. The arches will be glazed at the back of the columns so as not to be visible and to provide a vestibule. This will be the employee entry only. Handicap parking will
be on the other side of the building. Windows will be restored using Bi-glass, an insulating glass that is fitted in the existing sash. Vinyl liners will be used due to lead paint. The 1960's addition will have replacement windows, steel stud wall on the inside system, around the perimeter of building to enclose wiring and hold insulation since building is not insulated and the walls are plaster on construction tile and it would be destructive to run all the needed wires. The floor finishes (linoleum and terrazzo) will be repaired or replicated. The radiators are not reusable due to their condition and the new wall installation. A new revised entry proposal (Plan B) was just developed and looks better than first proposal. A conference room and mechanical room addition will be placed on the current roof because the building is bearing wall construction and there is no place to put a large open space. It will be set back from the edge, be no higher that the existing elevator rooms and have a pitched metal roof to shed the snow load closer to the walls. Construction is scheduled to begin in February and expected to take 12 to 15 months. Mr. Donath stated the changes to the 1949 features are sensitive and overall they have done a good job. Mr. Donath liked the revised plan B for the entry. Mr. Andres stated it is an important building in Barre. Mr. Donath moved that the project will have no adverse effect on plan B. Seconded by Ms. Boepple. The Council approved the motion unanimously. Mr. Mallary stated everyone present is pleased and impressed with the proposed renovations and the presentation.

V. SHPO Report

Eric Gilbertson presented the SHPO report.

Covered Bridge Meeting: A meeting of engineers, contractors, preservationists, and the public discussed the dilemma of replacement of original material in covered bridges when the original plan is to repair them. The Fuller Bridge in Montgomery was used as an example of a 100% replacement, when repair and restoration was planned. Determination of condition prior to disassembly for repair through non-destructive testing was discussed as one way find out the extent of repairs early in the project. The “overbuilding” of repairs due to the engineer determining a very low load rating that is far less than actual experience shows was extensively discussed. This is probably caused by two factors: Using very low grading ratings for the wood in the bridge and; an incomplete understanding of how the truss system floor and the rest of the bridge works as a composit structure. Methods for reducing the dead-load on the bridges would also help as the dead-load may be more destructive than the live load. The meeting was a success and put Vermont in the forefront in searching for solutions to these problems.

School In Colchester: An early (pre-1810) log (or plank) school house was discovered in Colchester. Scott Morrison realized that the building was unusual and contacted the town. They have raised funds to move the building. It is very well constructed and in very good condition.
Federal Appropriation: If the current proposal for permanent funding for Historic Preservation and Environmental Programs (CARA) passes, the National Park Service estimates that Vermont will receive $617,000.

Legislative Grants: Thus far 60 of the 65 Legislative Grants have been paid by the Department of Buildings and General Services. The issue of Council Review was brought to Mr. Gilbertson’s attention by the mandated Division Review of the Lemmington School project. Senator Illuzzi wanted to be sure this was restoration. None of the other projects have been reviewed. Commissioner Brown suggested that next year the Institutions Committees be notified of the 22 VSA review required by law and that the recipients be notified. State Buildings sends a letter to them notifying the recipients. This review could take considerable staff and Council time. The Council agreed to take the matter up later.

VI. Barn Grant Changes – Mr. Gilbertson stated barn grant applications will be sent out in mid-September. The barn grant program received $100,000 this year. Mr. Gilbertson talked about raising the maximum requested amount from $7,500 to $10,000. The advantages and disadvantages of maximizing the distribution of the funding with $7,500 grants and giving the Council more flexibility with $10,000 grants were discussed. No motion was made to change the maximum amount of the grants so they will remain at $7,500. The Council will revisit the amount next year after the effect of the $100,000 program is determined.

VII. Archeology Report (as prepared by James Peterson)

The matter of the unmarked Native American cemetery on Monument Road in Highgate has been in part resolved with the purchase of the small private property by the State of Vermont. Although expensive and entailing complicated negotiations, this purchase prevented further disturbance to the cemetery site. Salvage screening of the huge piles of disturbed earth at the cemetery has been ongoing since June, and after 2 1/2 months, only about one half of the piles have been adequately screened to recover human bone. Literally, hundreds and hundreds of bones have been recovered, suggesting as many as 15 individuals or more had been disturbed. Discovery of a copper (or brass) crucifix substantiates the suspected early historic period date of the cemetery, likely dating to the late 1600s or 1700s. The Abenaki have requested funding from the state of Vermont to help support the labor-intensive screening of the disturbed earth but this has not been resolved. Protection of undeveloped private property nearby should be a priority, perhaps involving the town of Highgate and more certainly the state. Also, further development of a protocol for handling such discoveries should be a priority, likely best coordinated by the Division for Historic Preservation, in the near future.

Secondly, the resolution of the historic Euroamerican cemetery in St. Johnsbury has been easier. The UVM Consulting Archeology Program worked there during May and June, to first identify several dozen additional graves in the northern and western portions of the Caledonia County Courthouse property. About 8-10
partial or complete human skeletons were recovered where it seemed likely that courthouse rehabilitation would need to disturb them. There was no public outcry related to this work, quite unlike the Highgate matter. Public education will be a substantial part of the final reporting by the archeologists.

Thirdly, the Vermont AOT has been supporting considerable archeological studies this summer, including ongoing work related to the Bennington Bypass, as well as studies along Route 78 in Swanton and Alburg, and Route 7 in Brandon - Pittsford. Of these and other studies the largest recent studies are related to Route 78, where relocation of the highway near the Missisquoi River has required identification and evaluation of various buried (and therefore likely significant) prehistoric sites. In addition, a salvage data recovery excavation will take place this fall in Alburg at the western end of a new bridge and causeway across Lake Champlain. Nautical archeology, studying ruined barges, has also been done this summer by the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum.

Fourth and finally, I am happy to report that the archeology field school and public education program in Colchester related to the Chittenden County Curcumfrential Highway (CCCH) project that was a success this summer. Over 50 volunteers participated in the salvage work at a prehistoric site endangered by the CCCH, along with the UVM students. In addition, about 65-70 children took part for day long spells and over 100 visitors witnessed the field work during several public education days. With the support of the VAOT, this program will be repeated next year somewhere within the CCCH project area.

VIII. Old Business

West Fairlee School Barn – The Council held a brief discussion. Nobody has received any negative input from the letter the Council sent to the applicant. Mr. Mallery will look into the status of stabilizing and locking the building.

Transportation Issues - The Council held a discussion on the issue of transportation planning based on the projection by Jim Wick at the Preservation Trust Retreat. According to Mr. Wick traffic would double over the next 20 years. This would obviously created problems in Vermont. Mr. Andres suggested the Division for Historic Preservation needs to assert itself in the process. The Council will prepare to discuss this matter in the upcoming meeting with Transportation Secretary Brian Searles.

IX. New Business

Mr. Mallary suggested at a future Advisory Council meeting to be held in Montpelier, the staff for Historic Preservation be invited to come and explain to the council exactly what they do. He stated that with the change in the members of the AC it would be helpful to them.

Mr. Mallary moved to close the meeting, the council voted unanimously to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
1. Project Description:

In 1994 the state acquired the dilapidated 54,220 gross square foot former hospital/nursing home for use as a regional state office building. The "Y" shaped three-wing structure, which was built in three phases in 1914, 1932, and 1949, has essentially lain dormant under state ownership until sufficient legislative interest and funding could be obtained to renovate the building and surrounding 3.4-acre site. The building has been re-roofed and kept heated to prevent further deterioration. The building is 80% vacant with the exception of two of the first floor wings which are occupied by 1) the regional office of Labor and Industry and 2) the Peoples Health and Wellness Clinic, a non profit low cost health clinic.

In 1999 the architectural firm of Freeman, French Freeman was hired by the Department of State Buildings and General Services to begin the programming of the project and to develop bid documents. This past spring, the Legislature appropriated 1/3 of the necessary construction funding and is expected to approve the remaining funding this coming session. Asbestos abatement will begin in January of '01 with construction restoration/renovation to start in April. Build out and site work are expected to take 15 months with occupancy tentatively scheduled for July of '02.

The overall project goal is to discretely restore and renovate the historic outmoded hospital complex into a safe, comfortable, and dignified office building for the state's clients and employees. Occupants will be regional offices for the Departments of: Welfare, Health, Aging and Disabilities, SRS, Labor and Industry, Forests and Parks, Fish and Wildlife, and Environmental Conservation. The Peoples Health and Wellness Clinic will also be allowed to remain in the building. Original exterior and interior finishes will be restored/replaced in kind whenever possible. Windows will remain operable. The economic revitalization of downtown Barre will be enhanced by 124 state jobs and paychecks remaining within a one block walking distance of the downtown shopping area. Parking will be shared with the Vermont State Historical Society (to be located across Washington Street at the former Spaulding Graded School building) on weekends and during evening museum hours which will enhance the use of an adjacent historic building which lacks visitor parking. A small addition to the existing fourth floor is planned to fulfill ADA access, program, and exiting requirements. This addition will contain a 50 person conference room which will be available to the community on an after hour basis.

The present hospital complex is in need of the following major items:
- a thorough exterior cleaning and selective masonry repairs to the 1914/1932 roof parapets, 
- restoration of the original 1914 entry,
- an entire new plumbing, mechanical and electrical /lighting system, 
- a new ADA entry and secure central circulation core with ADA elevator and restrooms,
- restoration of the 1914/1932 wood double hung windows & replacement of the 1949 aluminum windows, 
- wall insulation (the present building is entirely un-insulated ), 
- an exterior drainage and lightwell system along the building’s south elevation, and 
- an upgraded site plan – new driveways, parking areas, lighting, storm drainage, fire hydrants and selective re-landscaping.

2. Public Benefit:

See third paragraph of item #1 above.
Project Location: [see attached Barre City map and existing/proposed project site plans]

The building complex is located on the south side of Washington Street one block east of the intersection of Routes 302 & 14. The west/northwest portion of the steep hillside into which the building is built is entirely wooded. The north side of the site is bounded by Washington Street and across the street is the former Spaulding School property. Site access is gained from Perry Street, which is to the east of the site. The south and west sides of the site are bounded by Spaulding Street. To the east and south sides of the site is a 19th century residential neighborhood which is composed of single family and multiple family homes. These homes are currently well screened - and will continue to be screened - with landscaping material.

Property Importance:

The property is not listed currently on the State or National Register of Historic Places. It should be added to these registries.

Affected Parts of Property: Building areas impacted by the conversion from hospital to office use will be minor portions of the original 1914 entry and a portion of the 1949 roof. The existing 1968 public entry on the buildings' south side will be replaced with a new entry.

Social/Cultural Context: The public heavily visited the hospital/nursing home site from 1915 through the early 1990's. The building complex once included a nurses' dormitory residence and a doctors' residence. Both of these buildings were torn down prior to the State of Vermont's acquisition of the site.

Federal Funding?

None available for this project.

6/7. Visual Documentation/Photos:

See attached color photos of building exterior/site context and B&W drawings of site plans, floor plans and elevations. Additional drawings to be presented at the Advisory Board meeting on 8/25/00.

Property Part of a District?

Not at this time.

Adverse effect on a Historic Property?

No, this project will rescue a historic property from probable demolition. Estimated restoration/renovation cost is $7,000,000.

Adverse Impact Mitigation?

Adverse impacts will be avoided by the design and use of new architectural elements in a historically sensitive manner. The 1914 entry restoration, the new south entry, and the partial 4th floor extension will be discussed at the 8/25/00 Advisory Board meeting.

Adverse Impact Cost Comparison?

Not applicable. The impact of the project will not be adverse. This is a WHITE KNIGHT project.

8/18/00
JPO: State of Vermont, Department of Buildings and General Services
MCHARLAND STATE OFFICE BUILDING

EAST ELEVATION (LOOKING WEST DOWN WASHINGTON ST.)
1949 WING

NORTH ELEVATION (1914 ORIGINAL HOSPITAL WING)

1914 ENTRY & 1949 LOADING DOCK

1914 ENTRY - DETAIL

SOUTH ELEVATION (LOOKING NW) (TOWARD MATERNITY)

SOUTH ELEVATION (LOOKING NE TOWARD 1914 WING AND 1960'S ENTRY)

NW ELEVATION (MATERNITY ON RIGHT, 1949 ON LEFT)

1949 NORTH ELEVATION (FROM SPAULDING GRADED SCHOOL)
What was once the largest marble mill in Pittsford at the turn of the 20th century is now quiet, but still standing on the site (14) is an electric powerhouse built of marble blocks, and a large chimney stack, decorated at the top with patterned brickwork.

but they were only able to complete the marble foundation story, which they then roofed over.

In 1911 the Vermont Marble Company bought out many of the marble works in Pittsford, including the Rutland-Florence Marble Company, founded in 1901 and one of their biggest local rivals. Bought at a cost of $700,000, Rutland-Florence had among its many assets a mammoth marble processing mill (14) at Florence. Still standing at the site are a tall brick chimney and an electric power substation built with marble block walls. A similar powerhouse (4) and a related stone shop also survive further to the north near another quarry.

In 1900s Pittsford marble workers constructed this chapel (11), convenient to their homes around the Florence area quarries. This building is rather unusual because, although the roof is covered with local slate, the walls are built of man-made pressed stone blocks instead of marble.

and that same year donated $20,000 to the Town for the construction of a library (B17) in memory of his brother. Facing the southern end of the Pittsford village green, this small library built of warm-orange brick is handsomely detailed with a large, Romanesque style arched entry in the central pavilion, and a tower in one corner. In the early 1900s town voters approved the construction of two, substantial, brick municipal buildings: the 1 story Town Office (B13, 1910) in the village with large, round arched windows, and the 2 story Lothrop School (C56, 1911) in Hitchcockville with its massive hip roof. After the 1795 meetinghouse, long used for a town hall, burned down in 1922, voters also authorized the construction of a Colonial Revival style replacement (C55) behind the Lothrop School.

Two institutions of statewide significance were also established in Pittsford in the early 20th century. When U. S. Senator Redfield Proctor, founder of the Vermont Marble Company and former Vermont governor, decided in 1903 to sponsor the construction of the Vermont Sanatorium for Tuberculosis, he chose for its location a parcel of land just north of Pittsford village. The stately calm of the main building (42, 1907), with its symmetrically arranged windows and monumental portico, and its rural site provided the ideal setting thought necessary to cure this dreaded disease. In 1922 the year after the sanatorium became a state institution, Redfield Proctor, Jr., his sister Emily, and other Rutland County philanthropists had the Caverly Preventorium for children (41) built just to the west of the sanatorium. The preventorium was named in memory of Dr. Charles S. Caverly, the son of Dr. A. M. Caverly (his house B20). Charles was a leader in the field of tuberculosis prevention, prescribing clean, hardy living to fortify the constitutions of potentially tubercular children. The children lived in a wood-shingled Colonial Revival style building, sleeping on the projecting second-story porches, and went to a nearby schoolhouse run by the institution.

THE TURN OF THE CENTURY brought a number of civic improvements to the three villages in the center of town. In 1894 Dr. Henry E. Walker had a large, 2 1/2 story, Colonial Revival style summer home (37) built in Hitchcockville,
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Commerce & Community Development
Division of Historic Preservation
Shari Duncan
National Life Building, Drawer 20
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-0501
Re: Vermont Advisory Council

Dear Shari:

This letter is in regards to a one bay garage that is located at the Southeast State Correctional Facility in Windsor, Vermont. The Department of Building and General Services would like to remove the garage and replace it with a three bay garage.

The one bay garage and adjacent house was used by the herdsmen when the Correctional Department used inmates to farm the area around the Correctional Facility.

Mr. Mike Coxon, the superintendent at the Correctional Facility is very familiar with the history of the prison and the land before the prison was built. I believe that the Correctional Facility lands was once the lands of three farms and the herdsmen’s house is the only remaining building.

If you have any questions please give me a call at 828-3391. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Henderson
Maintenance Contracts Engineer

cc:  William Martin, Director of Maintenance, BGS
     Jim Richardson, Director of Facilities, BGS
     Dave Burley, Chief Engineer, BGS
     Brian Craig, Waterbury District Supervisor, BGS
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Background -

Brown Ledge Camp is a summer camp for girls aged 10 to 18 located on Malletts Bay in Colchester, Vermont. It was founded in 1926 and is owned and operated by The Brown Ledge Foundation, Inc., a 501(c)(3) corporation whose mission is the preservation and perpetuation of the camp. Brown Ledge offers an elective program in horsemanship, theatre arts, field and water sports. Campers are given a good deal of autonomy and responsibility. They live in small rustic cabins with 3 or 4 girls, but without a counselor. One is assigned but she lives in a separate cabin with other staff members. Activities operate throughout each day and campers choose to attend the activities they desire, when they desire, without having to sign-up. The camp program is designed to foster independence, self-confidence and self-reliance.

There are approximately 80 buildings of various sizes on the camp property. With few exceptions these buildings were built between the 1920s and 1960s and are of simple, rustic design with exposed framing and bark siding. All are seasonal buildings used only in the warm months of the year. The property is on a peninsula of Malletts Bay and has some open field area. A majority of the property is quite heavily wooded hiding most buildings. Few buildings are visible from the lake or from the property of others.

Project Description –

This project proposes to construct a new dining hall on the site of the existing dining hall, which is in the center of the cabin area and near the camp headquarters building. The new building is designed to incorporate the architectural style and themes of the other camp buildings as well as the functions of the bakery, walk-in cooler and dry storage room, currently located in three separate buildings adjacent to the dining room. The increased size of the proposed dining hall will encroach on the footprints of the current bakery and walk-in cooler and be quite close to the storage room. In light of this, demolition of the existing dining room, bakery, walk-in cooler and dry storage room is contemplated.

The age of the existing dining room is unknown. Its main portion appears in photos taken in 1927. Surrounding portions of the building do not appear in those photos and were most likely built at various times over the succeeding decades. As additions were added shed roofs were attached to the existing structure, some of which were built over previous roofs. To keep the dining area as “one room” the original external walls were replaced with periodic 4 x 4s. The building has exposed studs, rafters and other framing components with large areas of screening on exterior walls. It is lightly framed and has additions which are not structurally well integrated. This has allowed much settling over
the decades leaving a building which is largely out of level/plumb and permitting not well integrated components to separate somewhat. While we had originally entertained the thought of renovating the existing structure, we quickly came to realize that there was no substantial core with which to work.

The dining hall plays several critical roles within the camp program. In addition to efficiently delivering meals, it is called upon to foster a sense of community and belongingness, as well as facilitating the exchange of vital information through announcements and casual table conversation. The unstructured Brown Ledge activity program and cabin design are focused on individual autonomy and self-reliance. Meals consistently pull camp together as a group, instilling camp culture and values. Campers have time to ask questions, report how they are doing and receive support and guidance from table counselors.

The design and size of the existing dining room significantly reduce its ability to function under the present load. Current crowding produces high noise levels, increased room temperatures and restricted traffic flow. Instead of a pleasurable experience, frustration rises and everyone’s focus turns to completing the meal. Eating has become a race, announcements difficult to sit through and table communication significantly eroded. These things have compromised the total camp experience.

The walk-in cooler (approximately 145 square feet) was built in the 1970’s. It is actually a building built around a used cooler removed from the interior of an old hotel or similar. We feel it is not architecturally significant or useful for another purpose.

The bakery (approximately 160 square feet) is of unknown age, mostly likely 40 to 50 years old. It was fairly heavily damaged in the ice storm of 1998 and functionally repaired. We feel it too is not architecturally significant and is similar to almost 80 other buildings on the property. Saving it would require adjusting the position of the proposed dining room to the north which would reduce the small amount of coveted open space we call “The Grove”.

The dry goods store room (Approximately 180 square feet) is really a portion of a building which also houses the maintenance shop. Current plans call for removing only the store room which would leave a similar looking yet narrower building. This too is advocated to improve siting of the proposed new dining hall.
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The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 9:40 a.m., in Conference Room B, Sixth Floor, National Life Building, Montpelier.

I. Schedule – Advisory Council meeting for October 26th (from 9:00-5:00) in Room 10, State House, Montpelier, November 30 in the Rutland area, no meeting in December, and January 4, 2001.

II. Minutes – The minutes from the August 25, 2000 meeting had the following changes: page 2, remove “but would be isolated as a historic building” from the Rutland NR Review; drop the second “s” in Andres under Peacham Property NR Review, and page 4, capitalize the “A” in abenaki in the Archeology Report.
III. 22 VSA 14 - State Project Review

Jim Richardson, Director of Facilities, Department of Buildings & General Services. As Director of Facilities, Mr. Richardson is in charge of finding space for all branches of State Government. Primarily he is asking the Advisory Council for an informal opinion of his proposals. He has several proposals for helping to alleviate some of the existing crowding problems in Montpelier and Waterbury. The Montpelier projects are a long-term vision/goal, as parking would have to be dealt with first. Mr. Richardson is quite sure that Legislature will appropriate funds in the coming year to provide for building a parking structure and at that time these proposals will be looked at. The proposals he is talking about will require the moving of historic buildings that are on the State Register and are as follows:

1) One Baldwin Street, Montpelier - This building, better known as the “pink lady” is located to the immediate left of the State House. They are proposing to move this building from its current location to the former location of its sister building at 5 Baldwin Street. Moving this building would be a relatively easy building to move and they plan to line it up with the same front on the street. The purpose of the move is to expand the State House in a way that utilizes the best possible space. Mr. Richardson showed a model of the existing State House and surrounding buildings. The proposed move of the “pink lady” would create enough space for a building to be built and connected on the east side of the State House.

2) 118 State Street, Montpelier - This building houses the Veterans Affairs Office and is located between the Agriculture Building and the Motor Vehicle Building. Formerly this building was part of the old railroad complex. The proposal is to move this building from its current location to across the railroad tracks, fronting it onto Taylor Street. The idea is to put it in front of the railroad tracks so in the event there was ever passenger rail service; this building could be used as a railroad depot. Its original design is that of a building to be near the railroad. The move would allow for a pedestrian connection between what would be an attractive plaza on State Street to the new Riverwalk and Bike Path along the river. The goals of the City State Commission were to increase opportunities for the State to add additional buildings and space within the complex, get the parking off the river and to create an attractive Riverwalk, create new taxable properties within the Capital Study Area for the City of Montpelier, and to provide additional parking. If the building were moved, one of the suggestions for its future use is to house a Science and Technology of Vermont Museum or maybe use as a central heating supply center. Mr. Mallary stated the Council would like to see pictures and possibly tour the site of the proposed project.

3) Father Logues Cottage, Waterbury - This building is a small bungalow built for the Chaplain for the Waterbury State Hospital. It is isolated and sits near Wasson Hall. The State has been looking for significant space to build a new building to ease over-crowding at the Waterbury Complex. If this building was moved or demolished, a new building could be built that would connect Wasson Hall with Buildings 1, 2, 3 and better serve the needs of the State. Mr. Richardson stated the cottage is currently empty and doesn’t fit in with other buildings in the area. There are no definite plans on where the building would be moved but stated there were alternate locations available. He said he understood the importance of the history of the building in context with the rest of the complex and how the Waterbury State Hospital grew over the years. There is some other space available to build within the Waterbury State Complex although that space is limited. The Council stated they would like
Mr. Richardson shared some of the ideas from the Masterplan that will be implemented over the next twenty years. The first step in the Masterplan is the parking issue in Montpelier and the proposed plan is to build a parking structure. All the work included in the Masterplan would result in displaced parking so they would need to have a parking structure in place before moving on to the next steps. Mr. Mallary, on behalf of the Council, expressed thanks to Mr. Richardson for coming in so early in the process and asking the Council for advice. The Council expressed concern over the proposed changes at the State House on the west side. They felt that using the west side of the building would change the context of the State House and inquired as to why the east side of the building wasn’t being considered for construction. Mr. Richardson stated that the east side was ledge and also the utilities are buried on that side, making it difficult to do construction on that side of the building. He said it was not impossible but would be very difficult and there is not as much space on that side. Mr. Andres stated that in order to justify moving the “pink lady” there has to be a pretty super design for the State House that explains why the house needs to go. He is concerned about preserving the setting for the State House and by placing a building right beside it would somewhat ruin the sense of isolation of the building. Mr. Mallary suggested the move of the building be connected to the design of the proposed building. Mr. Richardson noted that the design for the new structure would have to be sympathetic to the existing structure and the plan is to retain a nationally acclaimed architect to do the design. He stated there were many options but they all required the moving of the “pink lady”.

Mr. Mallary said he felt the Council would like to talk over the proposal and felt they would most likely want to see the complete package before commenting on moving the building. Mr. Andres stated his concern was more with the impact the move of the house would have on the State House than the actual building itself. Mr. Richardson assured the Council that the plan is to design a building that would not detract from the State House. Ms. Wadhams stated that preferably the building might go on the eastside of the State House. Mr. Richardson said there were the restraints such as water, gravity, ledge, square footage, underground utilities, etc., to consider when planning the project. Ms. Wadhams asked if there had been a feasibility study done? Mr. Richardson answered no, there has been no study done to build a 30,000 square foot building on the eastside. Mr. Donath stated that putting the building on the westside would significantly compromise the integrity and should be made to studying the eastside and how the building may fit there. Mr. Richardson assured the Council an architect would be hired to explore all the options.

III. Act 250 - Project Review

A. Brown Ledge Camp, Colchester - Ms. Boone introduced Bill Neilsen, Camp Director and Owner. He explained to the Council that he and his wife had owned the property since 1983. There are 180 campers per season and 70 staff members. Campers come from all over the United States.

Mr. Neilsen passed around photographs and gave a brief overview of the camp and activities. The camp was founded in the 1920’s. The complex consists of 81 buildings that have had
various additions added over the years. The proposed project is to demolish the existing dining room and build a new one in the same location. The dining room has had at least five additions put on over a period of time. Mr. Andres stated his thought was the entire complex is eligible for the State Register but the individual building by itself is a mess. He said the smaller buildings are much more typical of the historic quality of the camp. Mr. Turner agreed. Mr. Donath moved the entire complex is SR eligible under criteria 1, 2 and 16, noting that the character and history is a jumble, reflecting many periods of construction and changes for the dining hall. The Brown Ledge Camp is eligible and the dining hall is a contributing part. Mr. Andres seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

V. New Business

Winooski Downtown Project - Eric Gilbertson gave an overview of what is happening in Winooski. There is a major redevelopment project by the Winooski Redevelopment Corporation in downtown Winooski. The proposed project includes 800 units of housing, major retail space and 3,000 parking spaces on 22 acres of land. They are committed to quality building/design standards. The Division asked for an inventory of impacted historic buildings and they have come up with a total of 15. Those 15 buildings are most likely eligible for the State Register. In the initial talks, they committed to something with the buildings. Mr. Gilbertson asked how can one weigh 800 housing units against 15 buildings that would most likely be lost anyway. Mr. Gilbertson said the Division is asking for a set of conditions to be put in the Act 250 permit, document the buildings and no demolition of the buildings before the proper permits are in place. The mitigation that is now on the table is to create a formula for the Redevelopment Corporation to invest in the downtown and try to achieve some equivalency for taking the 15 buildings. Mr. Gilbertson will keep the Council updated on the project.

VII. SHPO Report

Monument Road, Highgate - Vermont Housing Conservation Board helped the Division buy the Bushey Lot on Monument Road. After the purchase, the plan was for the Abenaki to retrieve the bones and rebury them according to their custom. It took four months with volunteers to aid in the reburial. The Agency of Transportation helped with the cost to finish the work. Debra Blom, Anthropologist from UVM, went through the bones and documented at least 19 individuals and maybe as many as 30 bodies. The artifacts dated back 1500 years. These bones came from an area of 20’ x 30’.

The Abenaki have now blocked Monument Road because an excavator was back and digging two new cellar holes. The Abenaki would allow passenger cars through but would not allow the excavator through. Ms. Wadhams and Greg Brown, Commissioner, Department of Housing, worked on negotiations all week to find a solution. Scott Dillon, Survey Archeologist, was sent up to go through the two dirt piles that had been recently excavated to see if they contained bones. There were no bones found in the two dirt piles but the Abenaki have not allowed construction to continue. A meeting has been scheduled for the Department to meet with Town Officials to see what the town might be able to do. A meeting will soon be scheduled for the Department and the property owners. The Department is trying to find a long-term solution for Monument Road such as setting up a fund for property owners to be able to do an archeological assessment before construction.
begins. The Department is also working on a plan to be able to purchase property at fair market value from the owners if bones are found on their lots. The long-range plans include: 1) attempt to change legislation; 2) more land conservation through purchase; and 3) public education. The Vermont Land Trust and Vermont Housing Conservation Board are involved and willing to work with the Department on future land conservation. The Department hopes to get a plan in place to deal with these issues in a more sensitive way in the future.

**Alburg Gravel Pit** - A skeleton was found in a gravel pit and the State Police notified the Division and asked for assistance. Giovanna went up with the State Police and she stated the bones appeared to be very old but the site was not consistent with a crime scene.

**Historic Sites Tour** - On September 19th several folks from Tourism, Tom Torti, a representative from the Vermont Film Commission and Agency folks went to Hubbardton, Burtch Udall, and Calvin Coolidge State Historic Sites. The purpose of the tour was to familiarize these people with the sites and what the needs are and how much money is needed to fund these sites. Mr. Torti was confident there is more that Department of Buildings and General Services can do for the sites. A follow-up meeting will take place in the near future to go over, in detail, the amount of increase the Division will request for the sites and also the grant program.

**United States Postal Service** - The USPS is coming up with projects of a scale and size that seem inappropriate for certain towns. Westminster and East Barre are having problems right now. Emily did a tour with Jeff Munger from Senator Jeffords office, last week and heard many complaints about proposed plans to change current post office locations. There is another meeting planned with representatives from the USPS, Senator Leahy’s office, Senator Jeffords office to discuss other options for postal service locations.

**Division Changes** - Elsa Gilbertson replaced Audrey Porsche as Regional Site Administrator for Chimney Point State Historic Site. Curtis Johnson is leaving his position as tax credit specialist to go to Agency of Transportation. After these positions are filled, staff will come in and review with the Council exactly what they do.

**VIII. 22 VSA Chapter 14 - State Project Review**

**B. Herdsman’s House Garage, Southeast State Correctional Facility** - Kevin Henderson from Department of Buildings and General Services was present to request demolition of a historic building located on the Windsor Correctional Facility property. The demolition would make room for a new building that would house state-owned heavy maintenance equipment. The property consists of 900 acres and previously had 3 working farms that the inmates worked. Photographs were passed around for the Council to view. The building the State would like to demolish had not been used for a number of years and was remodeled to be used for office space. Mr. Henderson believed the building to be that of 1940's or 1950's and the remaining buildings are a mix. Mr. Andres agreed. There was not enough information given to examine the entire compound. Mr. Andres suggested that the building should be looked at separate from the complex. The Council agreed. Mr. Andres made a motion that the building was not eligible for the State Register because of its age, condition, quality and generally doesn't meet the criteria for the State Register. Mr. Donath seconded. The vote was unanimous.
C. Grand Isle County Court House, North Hero - John Ostrum from the Department of Buildings and General Services was present to request comments on making changes to the Court House and attached building for the purpose of upgrading security. Mr. Ostrum believed the Court House was built in the 1890’s and an addition built on sometime later. The addition serves as a sheriff’s office. Much of the interior of the sheriff’s office has been remodeled with low quality materials. The woodwork has no detail and has been painted. The proposed changes will include door, window, staircase and wall changes in the Sheriff’s office building. There are plans to add a bathroom and vestibule. The exterior will be left intact but most of the interior will be changed.

The proposed changes to the Court House include building a partition of wood and glass to increase security after going through a metal detector unit. In order to make room for the partition, there is a need to make an office smaller and the proposal would require the shifting of a wall. Mr. Ostrum stated there is evidence that the walls have previously been tampered with. It was hard for him to find out how the original wall structure had been laid out and the plan is to take down the suspended ceiling to what he suspects is the original plaster underneath and see if they can find a pattern. Ms. Boone stated the existing floor plan dates to 1903 with the exception of some very small changes. In 1903 there was a major renovation and information found suggested that the staircase was in a different location but there is no positive proof. There is crown molding and window trim from the 1903 remodeling project. The Department of Labor and Industry has stated a sprinkler system will need to be installed.

Ms. Boone has visited the project area and gave an overview of what the Council needed to do. She stated the complex is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The two places of potential concerns are the changing of the doors on the Sheriff’s building and the changing of the interior floor plan on the Court House. Ms. Boone felt the Sheriff’s building had no significant features and no finish detail. The exterior does have detail. The door change has some significance because this was the sheriff residence and house. The two doors indicate there were two different functions. The proposed changes will leave only one door. The Court House interior is definitely 1903. Upon entering the building there is a lobby, a central corridor and there is some significance to that plan. One would come in and there was a circulation path that went back to the jail cells. There is trim and side lights at the front entrance with the stairs rising to the right. The proposed changes will change the effect upon entering. Mr. Ostrum stated there are most likely other options and recommends that Nancy and the Council be involved in the final design solutions. Mr. Andres had some concerns about retaining some of the original lines. Mr. Ostrum thought if they could investigate further into the underlying wall structure they may be able to come up with other solutions. Mr. Andres stated he was happy to see the State trying to make the historic Court House work despite some of the obstacles. The Council suggested Mr. Ostrum document the buildings, especially the Court House through photographs.

IX. Old Business

Code of Ethics - Ms. Boone stated there was a change in the code of ethics but Tina Ruth, General Counsel for the Division, confirmed that the changes were minor and dealt with
conflict of interest. The Council had previously signed the code of ethics at the August meeting.

Rules - Ms. Boone presented a copy of the final draft to Council Members and stated the rules would be filed later in the week with Interagency Committee on Administrative Rules (ICAR). ICAR will review the rules and have an opportunity to make suggestions. The Division will meet with ICAR in two weeks to discuss proposed changes. After the comment period, the rules will be filed with the Secretary of State’s Office. A public hearing will be scheduled to take any further public input. The public hearing will most likely be held on November 21, 2000. Because of anticipated public interest, Ms. Boone is toying with the idea of having the meeting on interactive television, using 6 or 8 sites. Ms. Boone suggested that the Council could possibly staff the sites. Following the public hearing and comment period the rules will be filed with the Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules.

The Council discussed Rules 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 12. There was some discussion on each rule but the general consensus is that the Council supports the final draft of the rules. They were especially happy to see in rule 4 and 7, the Councils right to request an Advisory Council review of historic significance on unlisted property.

Mr. Mallary made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Andres. The vote was unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 3:30.
MINUTES

October 26, 2000

Members Present: Peter Mallary, Citizen Member, Chair
Glenn Andres, Architectural Historian, Vice Chair
Ann Lawless, Citizen Member
George Turner, Historic Architect
David Donath, Historian
Jim Peterson, Archeologist

Staff Present: Emily Wadhams, State Historic Preservation Officer
Nancy Boone, State Architectural Historian
Shari Duncan, Administrative Assistant
Sue Jamele, Environmental Review Coordinator

Guests: Molly Lambert, Secretary, ACCD
Brian Searles, Secretary, VTrans
Kathy Callum, GeoArc, Inc.
Bob Sloma, GeoArc, Inc.
Al Ransom, Crown Point Road Association

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 9:07 a.m., in Room 10 at the Vermont State House in Montpelier.

I. Schedule - Advisory Council meeting for November 30 to be held in Rutland, a meeting for December was tentatively scheduled for the 14th. Meetings were scheduled for January 4th and February 8th, both to be held in Montpelier.

IV. Transportation Discussion with Molly Lambert & Brian Searles

Mr. Mallary noted the discussion was about building a partnership between VTrans and the Division for Historic Preservation. He summarized some of the Council's concerns as: 1) how to work together to identify resources, 2) heighten public awareness, and 3) how can the Council help before hot spots crop up. Mr. Mallary stated the Council feels very positive with some of the work being done by VTrans and is looking to be proactive.
Mr. Andres showed slides addressing specific traffic concerns on historic corridors with historic resources. The increased traffic has created many problems including; businesses closing due to traffic noise or congestion, buildings suffering damage because of truck weight and water run-off, and many town centers are just not working.

Mr. Andres stated there is a great need to complete an inventory of the many sensitive historical resources along corridors before putting more projects on the table. Mr. Mallary said the Council would be willing to help in any way they could including advocating for funds to undertake a survey/inventory of the historic resources. Mr. Petersen felt it was important to identify the range of resources in order to name the most important pieces to the State. Everyone agreed that it was important to complete a historic resource inventory/survey.

Mr. Searles stated VTrans is in the process of doing many good things for the State. He said there is a 10-month freight study in progress and hopefully it will serve as an aid in planning for the future in trying to move freight off the highways. Some of what he felt were good solutions for traffic problems hit roadblocks because of a money shortage. Mr. Searles noted that currently VTrans is trying to promote the use of rail and stated that 166-mile stretch of rail service on the western corridor will cost 70 million dollars to build versus a highway that will cost 1 billion dollars. Rail will not solve the problem but will alleviate some of it.

Ms. Wadhams stated a historic resource inventory was a priority for the Division and would like VTrans to partner with them. Ms. Lambert felt the ultimate challenge is to get the message out to people in decision-making positions of why this effort is important. Mr. Searles stated VTrans will be happy to partner with the Division in identifying commercial, environmental, archeological and historical resources. Ms. Lambert suggested the Division send a formal request to VTrans. In summary, everyone agreed that there is a need to protect Vermont and its many resources that contribute to the quality of life in Vermont. Ms. Wadhams will do a verbal follow-up with Ms. Lambert and Mr. Searles, and Mr. Mallary will draft a letter stating the Council's support of doing a survey.

V. Old Business - DHP Rules

Ms. Boone passed around a copy of the final draft of the rules that were submitted to ICAR. She stated the interagency review went fairly smooth. There were some last minute problems with Rule 7 so it was decided it needed more work and will be submitted at a later date. Rule 3 was submitted with technical changes and will move through the process with the other rules. Rule 12 was submitted with questions on the quorum issue. The Division is hoping the Secretary of State's Office will help to clarify the issue.

The schedule is to file the rules with the Secretary of State's office next week after the technical changes are made. There is a public hearing scheduled for December 4 on interactive television. The public comment period ends 7 days after the final public hearing scheduled for December 11. The final changes will go to LCAR in January and hopefully the rules will be adopted by the end of January.
VIII. State Register - Preliminary Review

92 East Allen Street, Winooski - This is a request to list this property on the State Register and is not a preliminary review as stated in the agenda. The Council had to review this project for architectural merit, as that was the only information provided to them by the owner. The Winooski survey book was passed around for review. Mr. Donath made a motion that 92 East Allen Street be listed on the State Register under criteria 1, 2, and 16. Mr. Andres seconded. The vote was unanimous.

VI. Archaeology Report - (as written and read by Jim Peterson)

As I reported several months ago, this has been a busy year for Vermont Archaeology and for archaeologists working in the state. The most complex and controversial issue has been the matter of the Abenaki burial ground on Monument Road in Highgate. Screening of the massive backdirt piles removed by a backhoe in May, 2000, was completed in September, after a huge volunteer effort over the summer and in the end, with the financial assistance of the VAOT. The VAOT made funds available to several of its archaeological consultants, who pitched in and finished collection of the disturbed human skeletons early this fall. The DHP apparently made a very substantial time investment in its negotiations with the Abenaki and the landowners to resolve this matter, and the State of Vermont ultimately purchased the property to compensate the landowners. The DHP also supported analysis of the human remains including over 6000 broken bones, physical anthropologist, who determined that between 19 and 30 individual skeletons had been disturbed. Though broken, their relatively fresh condition, associated artifacts (such as an 1826 U.S. penny and a large number of apparent coffin nails date ca. 1790 - 1830), and oral history all help establish that this cemetery is attributable to the historic period, probably dating no more than 200 - 300 years old, and likely younger. Reburial of the human remain by the Abenaki is scheduled for November 4, 2000.

Unfortunately, final resolution of this matter has not been possible because it has raised broader issues related to the archaeological sensitivity of a larger area along Monument Road in Highgate. The Abenaki are very concerned about other construction and proposed construction in the immediate area, and this led them to blockade Monument Road for several weeks in September. The DHP and local officials have met with the Abenaki and the developers to help resolve ongoing concerns, but as far as I know, there has been no final resolution to date. This issued may have broader ramifications in the future.

On a more positive note other archaeological work in Franklin and Grand Isle counties this summer has produced outstanding scientific information. Consulting studies related to VAOT work in Alburg and Swanton along Route 78 have produced evidence of various prehistoric Native American occupations, and these studies show great promise for resolution of various research questions related to prehistoric and perhaps early history along the lower Missisquoi River and nearby Lake Champlain. Many of these sites are National Register eligible, it seems. Various other consulting archaeology studies have been done this year and some are still underway all across Vermont, from the Champion Lands in the Northeast Kingdom to Addison and Bennington counties, and elsewhere. The results of some of these studies will be made available in the future.

Finally, progress has been made towards resolution of a statewide archaeological prioritization plan undertaken by DHP, although the “fine points” are still under discussion. Based on extensive
discussions concluded over a year ago, State Archaeologist Giovanna has shared her draft versions with the DHP and earlier today with me and other archaeologists included in the original advisory group. Further discussions will be necessary, but ultimately the DHP hopes to use the prioritization plan toward positive ends.

VI. SHPO Report

Emily reported that the summer-long work of sifting through the backdirt piles at the Bushey lot on Monument Road in Highgate has been completed. The majority of the work was done by volunteers although the Division and AOT collaborated in getting a team of archeologists from a nearby AOT project to spend several days working at the site. The remains of a minimum of nineteen individuals were documented by Deborah Blom, the forensic anthropologist and she assumed that there could be a total of approximately 30 individuals based on the bone material found. The Abenaki Self-Help group and Acting Chief April Rushlow will plan the reburial of the bones at the site for sometime this fall.

Just as the work at the Bushey lot was being completed, two new house sites were excavated in what is known as the Jedware Subdivision off Monument Road, causing the Abenaki to blockade Monument Road in protest of further development in the area and the Abenaki obtained an injunction to halt further work for a week. Scott Dillon and April Rushlow evaluated the backdirt piles and didn't find any human remains. It is critical that a long-term policy for any further development on Monument Road be established. Greg Brown will be hosting a series of meetings with interested parties in the next month or two in order to get input and ideas and further the discussion. We will be meeting with the Governor's Commission on Native American Affairs, Swanton and Highgate town officials, Monument Road property owners and legislators.

The Division and the congressional delegation staff continues to hear from communities that are concerned about USPS plans to relocate the local post office. The standard USPS building and site plans and specifications are often not appropriate in design and scale for Vermont village centers and downtowns. They are more appropriate in a suburban setting - a shopping mall or new development outside of town. Emily reported that the Division is working with the congressional delegation to convince USPS officials to look at a different model for some of Vermont's communities.

Emily filled the Council in on changes in Division staff. Elsa Gilbertson will be taking Audrey Porsche's position as the site manager for Mt. Independence, Hubbardton and Chimney Point. The position has been vacant since Audrey Porsche moved to Maryland with her family last month. Elsa will begin to transition out of her current position as the National Register Specialist and into her new job at the end of the year. Sue Jamele, who currently manages the environmental review process for the Division, will be moving into Elsa's position. We are advertising for Sue's job and also for a replacement for Curtis Johnson's position as the Tax Credit Specialist. Curtis has moved on to a part-time position at AOT co-managing the TEA-21 enhancement program. After 17 years at the Division, Curtis has accepted a position that will allow him to work part-time and pursue his photography career. Once these positions are filled, the whole staff will meet with the Advisory Council so you can meet the new people and hear first hand who does what at the Division.
IX. National Register - Preliminary Review

A. Crown Point Military Road - Kathy Callum and Bob Sloma, GeoArch, Inc., and Al Ransom, Crown Point Road Association were in attendance to present the project to the Council. This is a multi-property submission. A NR preliminary review is the first step in protecting the road. The applicant proposed Crown Point Road is significant under:

- Criterion A - Contributions & Patterns of History
- Criterion C - Engineering of the road
- Criterion D - Potential to contribute to archeological knowledge in the future

The project area includes Pittsford, Proctor, Rutland Town, Rutland City and Clarendon. This portion of the road has been selected for nomination because it is the best-documented portion and as other portions of the road become identified, those stretches of road can become designated. Some of the resources for the MPDF that are being evaluated now, include but not limited to; retaining walls, encampments, cattle pens, grave sites, and sites associated with important people.

Ms. Callum stated property owners have been notified and comments were encouraged. All the comments received were positive with the exception of one negative comment. The Council agreed the project was a noble undertaking and recommended that it proceed.

III. National Register - Preliminary Review-Reconsideration

469 Ha' Penny Road, Peacham - Ms. Boone passed around photos of the property and a letter sent by the owner. After much discussion, the Council came to the same conclusion as the last review of the property; there isn't enough information to give the project a nod. Mr. Andres thought the project lacked sufficient information on the buildings and its occupants and the owner needs to put together a more thorough application. Mr. Donath suggested the Council send a letter defining what the Council is looking for and the Council agreed to make the following suggestions:

- Articulate the context of the alterations
- Document each phase and tie in to the history
- Hire a professional

II. Minutes - The minutes from the October 3, 2000 meeting were accepted with the following changes: page 2, line 16, change to read “would be a relatively easy”; page 3, line 31, change sentence to read, “Ms. Wadhams state that preferably the building might go on the eastside of the State House, line 36, change sentence to read, “ the westside would significantly compromise the integrity and should...”, page 4, line 30, change VHCB to Vermont Housing Conservation Board, line 40, change Emily to Ms. Wadhams, change Greg to Mr. Greg Brown, Commissioner, Housing & Community Affairs, line 41, change Scott to Mr. Scott Dillon, and page 5, line 9, change gravesite to crime scene, line 22, delete sentence, “The USPS would like....”.

Mr. Mallary made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Andres. The vote was unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 3:45
Wednesday, September 27, 2000

Dear Mr. Eric Gilbertson
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
National Life Office Building
Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-0501

Re: State Historic Sites in Winooski

Dear Mr. Gilbertson:

Please find photos of 92 East Allen Street, Winooski, Vermont enclosed with this letter. I am writing to seek eligibility for my apartment building, which I purchased a short while ago, and have been aggressively remodeling and renovating. I am attempting to get it listed on the State Historical Sites.

As mentioned in our conversation this morning, several buildings within the project area of East Allen Street were included in a non-comprehensive Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey conducted in 1979 and is listed on the State Register of Historic Places. Some of these properties are:

82 East Allen Street
86 East Allen Street
102 East Allen Street

92 East Allen Street is between these properties and maybe eligible for the State Register and will need to be identified. From City of Winooski clerk records, the house is estimated to have been built in 1895. I have also included some old iron nails, which I removed, while working on the foundation this summer. Also, I would like to mention there is a lot of historic wood in the framing (exposed in the basement) and trim throughout the building, not to mention the gallant Queen Anne Style home with 9' foot ceilings on the first two floors. You can also notice four claw foot tubs in three out of the six bathrooms plus a couple apartments have sliding pocket doors that appear to be in faultless shape and the slate roof is in great shape, as well, even after 105 years.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Vaughn Jipner
For himself and Deborah Jipner
Vaughn Jipner, owner of property located at 92 East Allen Street, Winooski, has contacted the Winooski Historical Society. Mr. Jipner is in the process of seeking 92 East Allen Street's eligibility or the potential to be eligible to be included in the Winooski Historical Society.

According to information, a portion of the Winooski Redevelopment Project is located within the Winooski Falls Mill Historic District, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Several buildings within the project area of East Allen Street were included in a Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey conducted in 1979 and is listed on the State Register of Historic Places. These properties are:

- 82 East Allen Street
- 102 East Allen Street

Mr. Jipner's property, 92 East Allen Street is in the middle of these mentioned properties and may be eligible for the State Register or local historical significance and will need to be identified.

It should be noted that these early Surveys were not comprehensive and there may be other structures within or adjacent to the project area that are eligible and will need to be identified.

Rita Martel
Winooski Historical Society
(802) 655-1846
92 EAST ALLEN ST. WISCO
PARTIAL FRONT SIDE VIEW
Interior ornate woodwork
Pocket Doors in Apartment # 11 #3
92 East Allen, Winoski

RENOCATED/REMODELED LOWER SECTION OF BACK SIDE
POOR QUALITY
ORIGINAL
## GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1-1</td>
<td>3-1-1</td>
<td>5-7k</td>
<td>7-7k</td>
<td>7-7k</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1-1</td>
<td>7-1-1</td>
<td>7-7k</td>
<td>7-7k</td>
<td>7-7k</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Floor</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3-1</td>
<td>Cellar</td>
<td>2-1-1</td>
<td>7-9k</td>
<td>5-9k</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>5-5b</td>
<td>7-7b</td>
<td>5-5b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $1075 Total**

**ASA None**

**LSP 9**

**TOPO 95**

## TRANSFER RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilt Lassett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SHORE FRONT &

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Base Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LAND INFO

**Zoning:** CBD

**Tillage:** Pastures

**Neighborhood:**

**Access to Parcel:** Site

**Access upon Parcel:** Site

**Topography:** Site

**View:** Site

**Soil Drainage:** Site

**Shape:** Site

**Waterway:** Site

**Other:** Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places

John D. and Maurine M. Rosenberg
469 Ha'Penny Road
Peacham, Vermont 05862

Our classic Vermont farmhouse in rural Peacham nicely illustrates the thesis of Thomas Hubka's *Big House, Little House, Back House, Barn: The Connected Farm Buildings of New England* (1884). Our "Little House," the oldest part of the present structure, was originally a modest Cape and survives today, strikingly intact, as our present country kitchen and work room. Hand-hewn beams and original plaster work are still visible in the work room, along with the nine-over-six sashes that retain their antique glass.

We believe that these two germinal rooms of the present house date from the very end of the eighteenth century or the very beginning of the nineteenth. The hundred-acre lot on which the original Cape was built first appears in the Town records in 1773. In 1805, one Abiel Blanchard, referring to this same tract of land, writes of "the farm I now live on in said Peacham." We believe that he is referring to the original Cape that survives within our now-enlarged house. The roof of the Cape, with its original shakes, can still be seen enclosed inside our present attic—a roof within a roof—and a section of weathered, but beautifully preserved clapboard, from the exterior of the old Cape, topped by a graceful cornice, now functions as one of the interior walls of our present study.

The "Big House," which now serves as our main living area, was built off the east end of the original Cape and, we believe, dates from the first half of the nineteenth century. This main house, quite elegant for a farmhouse and remarkably well preserved, is notable for its original wideboard floors, upstairs and down; finely detailed woodwork throughout the house; its original staircase and balustrade; the liveliness and grace of its architectural spaces as one moves from room to room; the classic proportions of the dining room, with original mantle and Rumsford fireplace (the iron bar that once held kettles is still in place; the perfectly preserved fenestration, including two unusual eighteen-pane, floor-to-ceiling living room windows, which open out upon a totally unobstructed, verdant view of Mt. Washington fifty miles due east of us, without a single man-made structure in our line of sight.

Built off the south end of the original, sun-oriented Cape is a slightly later shed area ("Back House") which formerly served as living quarters for the farmhands and now contains our study. A local cabinet maker, Matthew Burak, who restored one of our original sashes, dated the windows as "no later than 1810." The added shed
remained unpainted into the twentieth century, as can be seen in the background of the 1909 photo of the then owner of the house, George Pattridge, seated in the first automobile to appear in Peacham.

Later in the twentieth century, in the 1930s or 40s, a "new" structure, now used as our garage and storage area, was transported and attached to the east end of the shed. (To revert to the book title, this was the "Barn" that was added to the "Back House" or shed.) But this "new" addition was itself an historic structure—either an old barn or a carriage house constructed without a single visible nail. Mortise and tenon joints are fit into the 8" x 8" vertical supports, indented with ax cuts, and the tree bark on the hand-hewn ceiling beams still clings to the logs from which they were cut. A south-facing Greek Revival porch was in place by 1940 and gable windows were added about this time to bring more light to the upstairs bedrooms, a near necessity for a New England Cape in winter. These final additions appear in an early Ektachrome of the house in winter by Arthur Griffin, the well-known New England photographer, taken c. 1950 (print enclosed).

Such in brief is the history of the gracious dwelling that has evolved over two centuries. Some eight generations of owners have always respected its past by incorporating—rather than obliterating through "improvement"—older features into the more recent structure. The result is an historically authentic, organically evolved form, neither frozen in a moment of time nor thoughtlessly altered. For most of its two hundred years, ours was the only house on Ha'Penny Road (see Beers Atlas, 1875), the most tranquil and beautiful of Peacham's byways. We are located exactly a mile and a half from the center of historic Peacham village, yet we are surrounded by farmed fields, rolling hills, unspoiled vistas. The bells of the Peacham Congregational Church reach us faintly and only on a southeast breeze. A more constant sound is the lively, ever-flowing brook that traverses our ten acres, waters our rock gardens, exits the property through a little falls, and then passes under a beautiful old stone bridge on Ha'Penny Road, one of only two still standing, so we are told, in all of the township of Peacham.

26 July 2000
Index to Photographs


2. Xerox copy of 1909 photo of house without gables or porches. Note unpainted shed and first automobile in Peacham, a Reo.

3. South facade, old Cape nestled between Big House and shed/garage.

4. East front, Greek Revival porch, part of shed.

5. West face, original Cape wedged between shed to right and main house rising above Cape. Note original chimneys on Cape and main house.

6. Original Cape seen from north showing attachment to main house.

7. Dining room with original fireplace. Birthing room to left, stairs in center, door to living room on right.

8. Present study, showing section of unpainted external clapboard of old Cape, with once-external cornice intact above clapboard and (not shown) passing through rest of shed to present exterior of house.

9. Present workroom, once western half of old Cape. Note original hand-hewn beams and clear swirls of original plastering in upper rectangular panels.

10. Present garage, once a barn, showing original pegs, mortice and tenon joints, ax marks on old 8 x 8s.

11. Hallway with original stairs and floor.

12. Original door in upstairs bedroom, with 18th century feathered joint and original hardware.

13. Original, 20" wideboard bedroom floor, with 12" rule showing width.

14. Brook, falls, edge of rockgarden, with house in background.
## General Description

### Structural System

1. **Foundation:**
   - Stone
   - Brick
   - Concrete
   - Concrete Block

2. **Wall Structure**
   a. Wood Frame: Post & Beam
   b. Load Bearing Masonry: Brick
      - Stone
      - Concrete
      - Concrete Block
   c. Iron
   d. Steel
   e. Other:

3. **Wall Covering:**
   - Clapboard
   - Board & Batten
   - Wood Shingle
   - Shiplap
   - Novelty
   - Asbestos Shingle
   - Sheet Metal
   - Aluminum
   - Asphalt Shingle
   - Brick Veneer
   - Stone Veneer
   - Bonding Pattern:
     - Other:

4. **Roof Structure**
   a. Truss: Wood
   b. Other:

5. **Roof Covering:**
   - Slate
   - Wood Shingle
   - Asphalt Shingle
   - Sheet Metal
   - Built Up
   - Rolled
   - Tile
   - Other:

6. **Engineering Structure:**

7. **Other:**

### Appendages:

- Porches
- Towers
- Cupolas
- Dormers
- Chimneys
- Sheds
- Ells
- Wings
- Bay Window
- Other:

### Roof Style:

- Gable
- Hip
- Shed
- Flat
- Mansard
- Gambrel
- Jerkinhead
- Saw Tooth
- With Monitor
- With Bellcast
- With Parapet
- With False Front
- Other:

### Number of Stories:

- 1½

### Number of Bays:

- 3x3

### Approximate Dimensions:

- 30x30

### Entrance Location:

- Gable front, right bay

### Threat to Structure:

- No Threat
- Zoning
- Roads
- Development
- Deterioration
- Alteration
- Other:

### Local Attitudes:

- Positive
- Negative
- Mixed
- Other:
ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL OR STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION:

Gable front - Classic Cottage
central chimney
molded cornice - plain returns
plain frieze - rakes
corner boards
3/4-length sidelights
floor to ceiling 9/9 sash on gable front
single bay entrance porch - pedimented gable
full-width porch on side
2 shed dormers on side elevation

RELATED STRUCTURES: (Describe)

1 - barn.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

This gable front Classic Cottage is enhanced by the use of simple Greek Revival
details such as the cornice returns, plain frieze and corner boards. The floor
to ceiling windows on the gable front are unusual.

REFERENCES:

SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT:
Open Land □ Woodland □
Scattered Buildings □
Moderately Built Up □
Densely Built Up □
Residential □ Commercial □
Agricultural □ Industrial □
Roadside Strip Development □
Other:

RECORDED BY:
N. Gail Byers
ORGANIZATION:
Vt. Div. for Historic Preservation
DATE RECORDED:
7/80
POOR QUALITY
ORIGINAL
The meeting was called to order by Chair, Peter Mallary at 10:00 in the Asa Bloomer Building in Rutland, Vermont.

I.  Schedule - The Advisory Council meeting for January 5th to be held in Woodstock, February 15th meeting (HP Grant Review) to be in Montpelier, and a meeting was scheduled for March 29th (Barn Grant Review).

II.  Minutes - The minutes from the October 26, 2000 meeting were approved with no changes made.

IV.  National Register - Preliminary Review

A.  Hamilton House, Danville - Ms. Pritchett represented Nancy Hogue, Hamilton House owner. The Council had previously been sent materials on this project and were able to view color photos at this meeting. Ms. Pritchett felt the house is eligible for the National Register because of its historical significance. The house originally was a bank that served the Danville community. She stated that the house has remained quite intact, has
great integrity and local significance. The Council agreed that the project was worthy of pursuing an NR nomination.

B. The Townsend Church, Townsend - The Council had previously received materials on the Church. Mr. Andres stated that project was a mix of gothic and other revival details that indicate the church had been remodeled at some time. There was a question as to whether the Church could be a part of a historic district and Ms. Boone said the Town had been somewhat reluctant in pursuing NR status as a historic district. The Council gave a nod for the project to proceed.

C. Valley Stock Farm, Orwell - The Council reviewed photographs (limited exterior), and historic information. They agreed the project should proceed.

III. Old Business

B. AOT Manual

The Council noted that they want to ensure their ability to attend the Annual Evaluation meeting.

V. SHPO Report

Emily reported there have been many staff changes within the Division. Elsa Gilbertson, National Register Specialist has moved into a Regional Administrator position for Historic Sites and Sue Jamele, Environmental Review Coordinator, will replace her in the NR Specialist position. Judith Ehrlich has been hired to fill Sue’s vacated position. Curtis Johnson has left the Rehabilitation Tax Reviewer position and Chris Cochran will replace him. David Provost, a recent graduate of the University of Vermont Historic Preservation Program has been hired to fill a limited, part-time Downtown Program Assistant position. Division staff will attend an upcoming AC meeting in order to introduce new staff to the Council and familiarize them with who does what within the Division.

Ms. Wadhams gave an update on the United States Postal Service issues. She stated that many communities are complaining about the USPS and the way they are handling new projects or the relocation of established offices. One top concern for communities is that they feel like nobody is listening to them and their needs are not being met. The USPS states they are doing projects within the perimeters and they are doing all they can to accommodate the needs of the community affected by changes that are occurring. Ms. Wadhams states that a letter, signed by Senator Jeffords, Senator Leahy and Congressman Sanders, was sent to the Post Office General stating their concerns and they did receive a response from a public relations representative. The Congressional Delegation felt they would prefer to work with the top-level folks and relayed that to the PR representative. Ms. Wadhams said there is a booklet being written now by Jessica Oski on how communities can better deal with the USPS over critical issues. The booklet should be nearing completion by the end of February.
III. Old Business

A. DHP Rules - Public Comment

Ms. Boone gave an overview of the public comments received by the Division. The most controversial issue seems to be who should be paying for the archeology study if one is required. One comment sent in by Mr. Liam Murphy, an attorney, suggests that it is the Division’s burden of proof and not the applicant. Ms. Boone stated that the new rules would continue to keep the burden of proof on the applicant.

Mr. Bill Burke and Ms. Mimi Baird, District Coordinators in the Rutland area were present to discuss the concerns they have. Mr. Burke stated that when he is reviewing Act 250 applications, there is a lack of information on potential historic resources. He felt that Coordinators need to know if there is a potential historic resource and need a trigger so they can deem an application incomplete until further investigation is completed. As it is now, they have no way of knowing if there are historic resources unless the applicant has included such information in the Act 250 application. The Council agreed there should be an easier way for coordinators to review projects and make independent judgements on each application pertaining to potential historic archeological resources.

Ms. Wadhams stated that there is a review form to be used by the coordinators and it should make the review process easier. She said that when the new rules are adopted, the Division would be writing guidelines and provide training to the District offices. It was agreed by all that a comprehensive survey of all historic resources would be very helpful in the permitting process.

III. Old Business

Rule 10 - The Council favors retaining NR preliminary review. It is a good opportunity for conversation between applicant, staff and Council.

Rule 12 - Ms. Boone stated nothing had changed in the rule since the last time they had discussed this rule. She stated that AOT wanted clarity in Rule 12.9.6. The Council agreed that the last phrase should be deleted, “through the adoption of a federal review policy”.

VI. Archeology Report

No report, Mr. Petersen absent from meeting.

Mr. Donath made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Andres. The vote was unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 2:00. The Council left for a tour of the Paramount Theater, which was given by Director Don Hirsch.
Emily E. Wadhams, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Vermont Division for Historic Preservation  
National Life Building, Drawer 20  
Montpelier, Vermont 05620

Re: Request for Preliminary Determination of National Register Eligibility  
Hamilton House, Danville, Vermont

Dear Ms. Wadhams,

This letter requests that the Vermont Advisory Council on Historic Preservation review the enclosed material and make a preliminary determination of the National Register (NR) eligibility for the Hamilton House, a vernacular structure built as a bank in 1884 on Park Street on the west side of the Danville Green in Danville, Vermont. The structure is being rehabilitated for use as a bed and breakfast by its current owner, Nancy Hogue. Ms. Hogue intends to use the Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit as part of the funding of her project. The property appears eligible for the National Register under local significance as an individual building with historic and architectural merit.

The Hamilton House is listed in the State Register as a contributing building (site no. 19) in the Danville Green Historic District (see attached). On April 30, 1985, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation made the preliminary determination that the Danville Village Historic District is eligible for the National Register as an historic district.

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

The Hamilton House, built in 1884, is a vernacular building that retains most of the distinguishing stylistic architectural features it had when it was listed on the State Register. The two and one-half story, gable roof, eavesfront building has a contemporaneous one and one-half story rear ell and attached carriage barn. The structure has clapboard siding, asphalt roofing shingles, interior brick chimneys, original two-over-two windows (some windows have new one-over-one replacement sash), and original six-over six windows in the barn. A Gothic wall dormer is located on the north side of the ell (a porch across this side of the ell has been removed since the building was listed on the SR). Historic trim details include molded cornice caps over windows and doors, cornice boards, returning box cornice, and frieze and architrave boards below the cornice.

The most distinguishing stylistic exterior feature is the c. 1915 Colonial Revival style wrap around porch, which is prominently located on the south gable end of the main block. The porch has half-
height Tuscan columns that rest on a clapboard apron, beaded board paneling on the interior face of the apron and the ceiling, and window inserts that can be removed during warm months. A Craftsman style door is located on the south gable end of the main block for access to the porch.

The main entrance on the east façade was altered c. 1955. At this time a new door, sidelights and fluted entry pilasters were installed. The one-bay, gable roof, front entrance porch was added in recent years and did not exist when the building was entered on the SR.

The western half of the ell and the carriage barn remain unfinished inside with an exposed frame visible on both first and second floors. A carriage bay remains on the south side of the ell and on the east gable front of the barn. The carriage bays appear to have been modified somewhat and are now used as automobile garages. Vertical board hay doors remain on both gable ends of the carriage barn at the second floor level.

The interior of the building remains highly intact. The floorplan, front and rear stairs and overall circulation patterns appear overall original. Built as a bank, the large lobby across the length of the main block retains its pressed metal ceiling, hardwood flooring and bank vault. The fireplace and shelving in the lobby dates from the 1950s. Other significant interior features include Craftsman style built-in cabinets in the parlor/ dining room; a front stair system with Colonial Revival style paneled, square newel posts and turned balusters; plaster walls and ceilings; and an intact floor plan on the second floor.

Despite modifications to the front entrance, the building overall remains a good example of a vernacular, late nineteenth century building with a significant Colonial Revival style porch. The structure retains integrity of location, setting, workmanship, materials, design, feeling and association.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Hamilton House appears eligible under Criterion A for its local significance as first a bank and later as a veterinarian's office. Located between the Pope Library and the Methodist Church on the west side of Danville Green the building was constructed to replace the Caledonia Bank building that burned in 1884. The original Bank of Caledonia first opened on this site on March 13, 1826, when Danville was nearing the height of its prosperity (Clifford, Village in the Hills, A History of Danville, Vermont 1786-1995, p. 64). It was rebuilt after a fire in 1855 and burned again in 1884 when it was rebuilt for the second time. The bank occupied the existing building until 1925 when it moved to a new location in town. In 1925 Dr. Hamilton purchased the property from the bank and remained in the structure for forty-three years, operating his veterinary business out of the rear ell and barn. Prior to the purchase of the property by the current owner, Nancy Hogue, former owners John and Letha Sawyer ran an insurance agency from the main block of the building. The property will continue in commercial use, soon to be operated as a bed and breakfast. The Hamilton House is a good example of a building with
substantial local significance for the various commercial enterprises that operated from this site. Visual reminders of the bank are particularly evident in the intact lobby with pressed metal ceiling, wood flooring and bank vault. No visual reminders are evident from the period when the building was a veterinarian’s office, although the carriage barn was well-suited for this purpose, and the building remains known locally as the Hamilton House after the veterinarian who operated his business here for many years. Under Criterion C, the Hamilton House is a good example of a vernacular, late nineteenth century building that has retained numerous stylistic features such as its Colonial Revival porch, original windows, wood trim details such as cornice caps and returning box cornice, an attached carriage barn with haydoors and carriage bays, an original floor plan with front lobby and bank vault, built in cabinets, paneled doors, and historic finishes such as plaster walls and ceilings and hardwood floors.

Despite its rather modest appearance, the Hamilton House is a good candidate for nomination to the National Register under local significance for its contributions to Danville history and its embodiment as a well-preserved, late nineteenth century, vernacular building that has served various commercial purposes.

Thank you for your review of the Hamilton House.

Sincerely,

Liz Pritchett
Consultant

enclosures:
photographs
State Register forms
Top: View looking SW, Hamilton House, right.
Center: View looking S.
Bottom: View looking NW.
Top: North side of rear ell
Center: North side of main block
Bottom: View looking E of rear ell and barn
Top: Front of barn
Bottom: Rear and south side of barn
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Top: View of Colonial Revival porch
Center: Interior of porch
Bottom: Craftsman door to porch
Top: Main entrance on front façade
Center: Lobby in main block
Bottom: Detail of bank vault in lobby
Top: View from lobby to parlor/dining room
Center: Parlor/dining room looking to N wall and stairs.
Bottom: Stairs to second floor.
Top: Second floor bedroom
Bottom: Work in progress in Second floor bedroom; stripping Wallpaper to reveal plaster
Top: Second floor of barn
Bottom: Second floor of ell looking SW to Barn (left) and rear stairs (right).
STATE OF VERMONT  
Division for Historic Preservation  
Montpelier, VT 05602  

HISTORIC SITES & STRUCTURES SURVEY  
District □ Complex □ Survey Form  

COUNTY: Caledonia  
TOWN: Danville  

LOCATION: On the north and south sides of U.S. Route 2 clustering around the Danville Green  

NAME OF DISTRICT: Danville Green Historic District  

TYPE OF DISTRICT:  

PHYSICAL CONDITION OF STRUCTURES:  
Excellent 15%  Good 83%  
Fair  8%  Poor  1%  

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE:  
Local □  State □  National □  

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:  
The Danville Green Historic District is a collection of buildings located around the Danville Green and adjoining roads. There is a pleasant mixture of styles and forms, predominantly of woodframe construction. There are several good examples of the early Cape type located on Hill Street. Many of the houses also feature Greek Revival details and provide excellent examples of that popular style. The churches and public buildings are primarily turn-of-the-century structures on the north side of the Green, rebuilt from earlier buildings destroyed by fire in 1884.  
The Danville Green was deeded by Messrs. Hartshorn and Dow in 1796 to enable the town to become the county seat. This commenced a period of prosperity and a boom in commercial and residential development with the county public buildings constructed around the Green during this early time. The county seat was moved to St. Johnsbury in 1855 after which there was a decline until the railroad came through in 1870.  

THREAT TO STRUCTURES:  
No Threat □  Zoning □  Roads □  
Development □  Deterioration □  
Alteration □  Other:  

LOCAL ATTITUDES:  
Positive □  Negative □  
Mixed □  Other:
MAP: (1. Indicate NORTH in circle. 2. Represent each structure as an open box. 3. Number each structure inside of its box.)

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION:
See Continuation Sheet.

REFERENCES:

RECORDED BY: Deborah Noble and N. Gail Byers
ORGANIZATION: Pres. Trust of Vt./DHP
DATE RECORDED: 11/80, 2/82
### OUTSTANDING COMPONENTS OF DISTRICT

(Include individual survey number ONLY if surveyed individually.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE BUILT</th>
<th>SURVEY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>0303-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTIONAL TYPE:** House  
**COMMON NAME:** Balivet Place  
**DESCRIPTION:** Federal and Greek Revival styling is combined in this impressive 4 x 5 bay, 2½ story brick house. The gable end is fully pedimented. Splayed granite lintels top the windows. The entry in the left bay is topped by a semi-elliptical, tracery window with a keystone above. There is a Palladian window in the gable peak with louvered sidelights and half-round arch. A central additional entrance on the eaves side is topped by a glazed transom. This building was once used to house the Masons. The property was owned by J. S. H. Weeks in 1858 and 1875.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE BUILT</th>
<th>SURVEY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>0303-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTIONAL TYPE:** Church  
**COMMON NAME:** Methodist Church  
**DESCRIPTION:** This woodframe church is built in the vernacular Victorian Gothic style. Stylistic features include the Gothic peaked windows of which there are four on each side and a group of three in the center of the gable end. The tower appended to the southwest corner is supported by mock buttresses. The bell tower section has a turned balustrade and paired Gothic arches. The hipped roof is clad in polychrome slate shingles and is topped by a paneled square cap. The buttresses continue as freestanding spires above each corner of the belfry. Terminating in gable peaks, they are incised with a trefoil motif. The original church was destroyed by fire in 1884. The present structure was rebuilt by contractor Matthew J. Caldbeck.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE BUILT</th>
<th>SURVEY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>0303-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTIONAL TYPE:** House  
**COMMON NAME:** Hamilton House  
**DESCRIPTION:** Simple Greek Revival details such as boxed cornice returns, a raking frieze and cornerboards outline this 2½ story, 3 x 2 bay house. The entry is flanked by full-length sidelights and paneled pilasters and is crowned by a dentil cornice. Tuscan columns support an enclosed porch on the south gable end. A 1½ story ell extends to the rear; it has a steeply pitched wall dormer and open porch supported by Tuscan columns on the north facade. This building originally housed the Caledonia National Bank. The original structure on the site was built for the bank in 1826. It was rebuilt after a fire in 1855 and burned again in 1884.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE BUILT</th>
<th>SURVEY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>0303-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTIONAL TYPE:** Library  
**COMMON NAME:** Pope Library  
**DESCRIPTION:** The north gable end of this cruciform plan building is rounded and banked by windows with delicate Ionic pilasters (some paired) between each window. Plain pilasters flank the central entry and there is a half-round fanlight with radiating mullions above the door. A dentil cornice and entablature go around the entire building. On the east gable front there is a Palladian window also trimmed with Ionic pilasters and above there is an oval window with wood keystones in the gable peak. Marshall Morrill of Brooklyn, New York, was the architect and Matthew J. Caldbeck was the contractor.
Dear Mr. Gilbertson:

The board of Elders have voted to allow The Townshend Church to be placed in nomination for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1790 the church was built to serve as a meeting place as well as for public worship. The town voted to relinquish its interest in the old meeting house in 1908 and has been devoted to religious use ever since.

The church has become one of the most photographed buildings in Vermont due to its location on the common, which is the juncture of highly traveled Routes 30 and 35. The postal delivery designation is 34 Common Rd. and the mailing address is P.O. Box 273, Townshend, VT 05353.

The church parsonage shares the rear portion of the property and was built in 1837. There is no historic district which could effect our eligibility. The exterior of the church has not been altered in any way from the original construction.

We feel that The Townshend Church is eminently worthy of listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Sincerely,

Frank McCarthy
November 28, 2000

Frank McCarthy
The Townshend Church
P.O. Box 273
Townshend VT 05353

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

Thank you for your letter of November 17 regarding National Register listing for the Townshend Church.

The next step in the process is to take your request to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for preliminary review. This is an informal process to give the Council an opportunity to review the eligibility of a building prior to the work and expense of completing the National Register form. Your building will be taken to the Council for the preliminary review on December 14, 2000. You do not need to appear or send further information.

I am also enclosing some information sheets on the National Register. If you have any questions please call me at 802-828-3043.

Thank you for your interest in preserving Vermont’s historic buildings.

Sincerely

VERMONT DIVISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Eric Gilbertson,
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer