

THE WRITTEN MINUTES ARE A SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING. MOTIONS ARE AS STATED BY THE MOTION MAKER. MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO CORRECTION BY THE SHELburne HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION. CHANGES, IF ANY, WILL BE RECORDED IN THE MINUTES OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION.

**SHELburne HISTORIC PRESERVATION &
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**
January 10, 2019
Minutes

Members Attending:

Fritz Horton, Tom Koerner, Ann Milovsoroff, Dorothea Penar, Marc Vincent, Eileen Warner, David Webster

Staff Attending:

Dean Pierce, Susan Cannizzaro, Ravi Venkataraman, Lee Krohn

Others Attending:

Cathy Townsend, Brian Precourt, Ann Cousins

Call to Order:

Fritz Horton called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes:

Dorothea Penar made a motion to approve the minutes of November 29, 2018. Eileen Warner seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Library Mock-up at Town Hall:

The Commission members and staff went on a site visit at the Town Hall to view a mock-up of the exterior materials for the new library. The mock-up consisted of samples of the slate siding, as well as two colors of cement board clapboard siding, a window, and trim. David Webster questioned the window trim. A representative from Neagley & Chase stated the window trim will be as shown on the mock-up with a possible drip edge along the top. Dorothea Penar stated the HP&DRC will need to review the trim once a decision is made regarding the drip edge. David Webster expressed concern over the strength of the window trim and commented that he does not want to see it bend or buckle over time. Regarding the clapboard siding, the members prefer the light gray color option.

The members discussed the new front steps. David Webster stated they appear to be different (steeper) than the original steps. Cathy Townsend replied that there was no change unless it was due to code requirements. She added that the steps will be covered with brick and the original railings, which have been retrofitted, will be placed back on either side of the steps and an additional railing will be added in the center to meet code. She also pointed out that the repaired columns have been put back in place.

Eileen Warner asked what is happening with the portico light fixture. Cathy Townsend replied that new wiring is being installed in the building, but not to the fixture. She added that the fixture is broken and would need to be restored. In addition, some of the

front wall and brickwork would have to be removed in order to access the fixture. Eileen responded that perhaps the fixture could be retrofitted to be battery operated.

Cathy Townsend and Lee Krohn departed. The meeting reconvened at the Town Offices at 9:05 a.m.

Design Review Application DR18-19 (Continued) – St. Catherine of Siena Parish, 92 Church Street:

Dorothea Penar recused herself and left the room.

Brian Precourt and Ann Cousins arrived and were present for the discussion. Brian explained that according to the comments received at the previous meeting, transom windows have been added above the entry doors on the east and west elevations and the proposed columns have been removed. There was a brief discussion about the color of the shingle siding. Brian commented that a color has not yet been chosen, but it will most likely be a gray tone. There was also some discussion regarding the flat roof area between the church and the new addition. Brian stated that a minimal pitch might be added to avoid having to have internal draining.

David Webster moved to recommend that:

- 1) The DRB approve:
 - a. The planned demolition of the St. Catherine of Siena Parish's Parish Hall, and
 - b. The submitted "Progress Plans" for the construction of an expansion to the existing Church, dated 12/12/18; and further that
- 2) Pursuant to Section 1540.3.A.2, the DRB find that the proposed redevelopment of the site after demolition will provide a clear and substantial benefit to the community as a whole; and further that
- 3) Pursuant to Sections 1540.3.A.3 through 1540.3.A.5:
 - a. The DRB finds demolition and redevelopment proposal mitigates, to the greatest extent practicable, any impact on historic structures on the subject property or adjacent properties;
 - b. The DRB finds that all historically and architecturally important design features, etc. will be properly documented, and
 - c. The DRB finds that the applicant's redevelopment plan will provide replacement structures that are compatible with the historic integrity and the architectural character of the surrounding area; and further that
- 4) Approval of the project should be conditioned upon:
 - a. Adherence to the cited plans and construction plans fully consistent with the cited plans, and
 - b. Preparation of a documentation report prepared using applicable standards of the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation

“Photographic Documentation Requirements for Historic Resources” (copy attached to the minutes of this meeting), a digital copy of which shall be submitted as part of any building permit application seeking final authorization to initiate implementation of the project.

Ann Milovsoroff seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Brian Precourt and Ann Cousins left the meeting, and Dorothea Penar rejoined the meeting.

Library Mock-Up (Discussion Resumed):

The members resumed their discussion on the Town Hall stairs. David Webster stated he remembers the architect describing the stairs as having brick risers with bluestone treads and landing. Other members recall that as well; however, there is no mention of it in past minutes or any indication of bluestone material on any of the plans in the file. Dorothea Penar commented that brick treads and landing will be a maintenance nightmare.

Fritz Horton will talk with Al DiPietro about the materials being planned for the stairs. He will also draft a letter to the Town Manager asking for clarification of the following items:

- a) The material(s) for the new Town Hall stairs,
- b) The color of the clapboard for the library;
- c) The trim and drip edge detail for the library windows.

Opportunity to Comment on “Programmatic Agreement” Between VDHP and VTrans:

Dean Pierce reported that he had received a notification relating to a draft “Programmatic Agreement” between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), and the Vermont State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)/Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Dean explained that such agreements spell out the process by which the SHPO/ACHP may provide comment on federally funded transportation projects (beyond what is specified in federal law). The previous draft “Programmatic Agreement” expired a few years ago. This item was included on the agenda so HPDRC members could indicate whether they are interested in tracking changes to the draft “Programmatic Agreement.” Some members expressed concern about potential negative impacts resulting from changes to the “Programmatic Agreement” between the parties. [None were suggested by staff but general concerns were still expressed.] Members briefly discussed the possibility of adopting a motion relating to the topic but in the end agreed the meeting minutes should reflect the group’s strongly held opinion that the ability of Certified Local Governments (CLGs) to comment on transportation projects should not be reduced or curtailed in any way.

New DHP Grant Program for Historic Resources:

Dean Pierce then offered a few comments on a new grant program being initiated by the National Park Service. Known as the Historic Revitalization Subgrant Program (HRSP), it is intended to “support... the rehabilitation of historic properties and foster economic development of rural communities.” Dean wanted Commissioners to be aware of the program, as it might be a source of substantial funding but would also be highly competitive. He also indicated the program is structured around the idea that grantees (i.e., those who apply for and receive the funding) would work with subgrantees to whom the funding is passed; subgrantees would carry out the project(s). Dean noted that finding qualified subgrantees for local projects might be a challenge. Dorothea Penar suggested Dean contact Devin Colman for advice; Dorothea recalls that a speaker at a statewide historic preservation conference a year or two ago (which Devin also attended) is part of an organization that might be an appropriate subgrantee. Dean indicated he would follow up.

Upcoming Planning Commission Agenda Items:

Dean Pierce reported that the Planning Commission will be discussing Form Based Zoning at tonight’s meeting. The Town Plan has been forwarded on to the Selectboard.

Other Business:

Dean Pierce reported that a meeting for property owners in the Shelburne Falls District has been scheduled for January 31st at 6:00 p.m. This will provide an opportunity to explain the National Register Nomination project and answer questions that property owners may have. A public meeting will be held in February, with the Historical Society working on public relations materials and a presentation on the history of the Shelburne Falls District.

Adjournment:

David Webster made a motion to adjourn the meeting. David Webster seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Cannizzaro

Photographic Documentation Requirements for Historic Resources

What is a Historic Resource Documentation Package?

Despite our best efforts, sometimes a historic resource cannot be saved. The following guidelines identify the process by which a historic resource should be documented prior to demolition or removal. Preparation of a Historic Resource Documentation Package (HRDP) is one method of collecting important information about a historic resource and serves as a final record after the resource itself is gone. The HRDP must fully convey, in both text and photographs, the significant features, context and history of the historic resource. All materials must be prepared and submitted digitally. Printed materials will not be accepted.

The federal Historic American Building Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) programs offer excellent guidance on documenting historic buildings, structures and sites, respectively. There are instances, however, when the level of detail and cost required to meet HABS/HAER/HALS guidelines is not feasible. The Division for Historic Preservation (the "Division") has developed the HRDP requirements as a cost-effective alternative for projects in Vermont that may need documentation under local, state or federal regulations.

Each HRDP submitted to the Division must meet the guidelines described below. Incomplete packages will be returned for revision and re-submittal. The Division must be allowed up to thirty (30) days to review the HRDP, and demolition or removal cannot begin until the Division has formally accepted the HRDP. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, please include adequate time in your project planning to allow for the Division's review and approval of the HRDP.

Unless otherwise approved by the Division, the HRDP should be prepared by an architectural historian with substantial experience in photographing and researching historic resources. The history and significance of the resource should be studied prior to photographing the resource in order to fully understand its significance and unique features.

For additional guidance on photographic documentation standards, please see:

- [National Register Bulletin #23: How to Improve the Quality of Photographs for National Register Nominations](#)
- [HABS/HAER/HALS Photography Guidelines](#)
- [National Register Photo Policy Factsheet \(Updated 5/15/2013\)](#)

Preparing a Historic Resource Documentation Package

A HRDP contains three primary components, each of which is described in detail below:

- Written Documentation
- Location Maps, Site Plans and Architectural Plans (if available)
- Photographic Documentation

Written Documentation

- **Cover Page:** stating the project name, location, date, project sponsor, property owner and author
- **Project Summary:** one to three paragraphs describing the history of the project and the process by which demolition of the building was determined to be acceptable
- **Physical Description:** one to three paragraphs describing the physical features, design and construction of the resource
- **Statement of Significance:** one to three paragraphs describing the historic significance of the resource within a local, state and/or national context
- **Photograph Index:** a numbered index to the sketch map and photographs

Location Maps, Site Plans and Architectural Plans

- **Location Map:** A map with the location of the property clearly indicated
- **Sketch Plan:** a site plan of the property showing all structures and significant landscape features (keyed by number to photographs and the Photograph Index)
- **Architectural Plans:** Include floor plans, elevations or other documentation of the resource if these materials are available. These can be historic and/or contemporary documents.

Photographic Documentation

Types of Images:

- Present day views of the historic resource and surrounding area
- Digital scans of historic photographs, drawings, and/or paintings (if available).

Coverage

Photographs should be taken of the overall property and the exterior and interior (if historically important) of each resource on the property, including old and new outbuildings. The number of interior and detail views will depend on the significance of those aspects of the resource(s).

The following photographs should be taken to document the property:

Setting

- Views of the overall setting of the historic resource(s), e.g. fields and forest surrounding a farm complex, a streetscape of buildings in a village, etc.
- Views of the historic resource in its immediate surroundings, showing the relationship of the resource to neighboring resources
- Aerial views when available (an adjacent hill or tall building may provide an aerial vantage point, or a Google Earth view)
- Views of significant landscape features, e.g. tree-lined approaches, stone walls, formal gardens, etc.

Exterior Views

- Full views of each side of the historic resource
- Views of important details, e.g. cupolas, steeples, porches, doors, decorative brickwork etc.

Interior Views

- Overall views of important interior rooms, e.g. courtrooms, formal parlors, historic kitchens, etc.
- Views of important interior features, e.g. staircases, fireplaces, ceiling medallions, exposed structural framing, etc.
- Views of significant interior details, e.g. door hardware, light fixtures, industrial machinery, hand-grained trim, etc.
- Views of people using the building.

Photographic Formats

All photographs must be prepared in accordance with the following guidelines, which are based on the [National Register Photo Policy Fact Sheet \(Updated 5/15/2013\)](#).

Digital Camera

- Digital single lens reflex (DSLR) camera with a non-distorting lens
- Filters that reduce glare and sharpen contrast are encouraged
- Camera phones are not acceptable

Taking the Picture

- Set the camera for its highest image quality
- TIFF or RAW formats are best; JPEGs may be converted to TIFFs by a computer conversion process

Digital Image Requirement

- Save as .TIFF files in RGB color format
- Minimum pixel depth or dimension of 3000 x 2000
- Minimum 300 dpi
- Do not insert text into the images. Name each image file as follows:
 - ResourceName_001, _002, _003, etc.
 - The number of each image must correspond to the photo index and sketch map

Submitting the HRDP

- Save the Written Documentation as a PDF
- Save the location map(s), sketch maps(s), and architectural plans as a PDF
- Save each digital image as an individual .TIFF file. Do not insert images into a PDF or Word document.
- Burn all of the above materials onto a CD or DVD, and label the CD or DVD as "Historic Resource Documentation Package" with the name of the resource and project. Mail or deliver the CD or DVD to the Division at the following address:

Vermont Division for Historic Preservation
One National Life Drive
Davis Building, Floor 6
Montpelier, VT 05620

One complete Historic Resource Documentation Package should be provided to the Division. Upon review and approval, the Division will upload the materials to the [Online Resource Center](#) for public access.

Jamie Duggan, Historic Preservation Review Coordinator
802-477-2288

Scott Dillon, Survey Archaeologist
802- 272-7358

Yvonne Benney Basque, Historic Resources Specialist
802-828-1381