

A. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and the New York State Historic Preservation Act (SHPA), this chapter considers the potential of the Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line and Expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation Project to affect historic resources. The Village underground option is also analyzed in this chapter.

Southampton was founded when settlers from Lynn, Massachusetts settled on land obtained from the Shinnecock Indian Nation in 1640. Several early roadways (including Montauk Highway, Scuttle Hole Road, North Sea Road, and others) and the historic resources adjacent to them reflect the colonial history of Southampton. Historic resources in the area also embody the village and rural growth that resulted from the agricultural and maritime economy in the 18th and 19th centuries, and the tourism economy that rose to the fore at the turn of the century. Officially recognized historic resources include resources previously listed on the State/National Register of Historic Places (S/NR) or determined eligible for such listing, National Historic Landmarks (NHLs), and locally designated resources. Potential historic resources, resources that appear to meet the S/NR eligibility criteria, were also identified and considered in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These potential resources have since been determined S/NR-eligible by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP).

B. METHODOLOGY**STUDY AREA DEFINITION**

In general, potential impacts to historic resources can include both direct physical impacts (e.g., demolition, alteration, or damage from construction on nearby sites) and indirect contextual impacts, such as the isolation of a property from its surrounding environment, or the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with a property or that alter its setting. Therefore, the study area for historic resources (shown in Appendix D, Figure D-1) has been defined to account for any potential impacts that may occur where proposed construction activities could physically alter architectural resources or be close enough to them to potentially cause physical damage and also to account for potential visual or contextual impacts. The study area for the Direct Route Alternative was drawn to extend a quarter mile on each side of the proposed transmission line and the Bridgehampton Substation expansion location. The study area for the Village underground option, in which the proposed transmission line would be below ground, was drawn to extend 90 feet on each side of the proposed transmission line to account for potential construction impacts.

**Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line
and Expansion of Bridgehampton Substation Project**

IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN THE STUDY AREA

The files of the OPRHP were consulted to identify S/NR-listed and eligible properties in the study area. The Town of Southampton and the Village of Southampton were also contacted for information on locally designated historic resources.

In order to provide a context for evaluating historic resources, documentary resources such as historic maps, local histories, newspaper articles, and historic photographs were consulted. A number of local repositories, including the Suffolk County Historical Society, the Southampton Library, the Bridgehampton Historical Society, the Sag Harbor Library, and the Society for the Protection of Long Island Antiquities were contacted and/or visited.

Resources (including individual structures and districts) that appear to meet the S/NR eligibility criteria were identified in the study area. Criteria for inclusion on the National Register are listed in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 63. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are eligible for the National Register if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- B. Are associated with significant people;
- C. Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, possess high artistic value, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. May yield archaeological information important in prehistory or history.

Properties that are less than 50 years of age are ordinarily not eligible, unless they have achieved exceptional significance. Determinations of eligibility are made by the OPRHP.

In addition to identifying officially recognized historic resources in the study area (S/NR-listed and S/NR-eligible properties, and locally designated historic resources), an inventory was compiled of other buildings that could warrant recognition as architectural resources (i.e., properties that could be eligible for S/NR listing) in compliance with SHPA and SEQRA guidelines (“Potential Architectural Resources”). For this project, potential historic resources were those that appeared to meet one or more of the National Register criteria (described above).

While only a small number of resources in the study area have been officially designated, either locally or by OPRHP, many structures in the study area have been identified in one of several previous historic resources surveys that have been completed for the area. The historic resources surveys, discussed in detail in the following section, identified structures with historic and/or aesthetic value. Since many of these structures had not previously been reviewed by OPRHP for S/NR eligibility, structures that were documented in these local surveys and that are located within the study area were identified in this report as potential historic resources¹ and have since been determined S/NR-eligible by OPRHP (as per a comment letter dated January 18, 2008; see Appendix D).

¹ In limited instances, where survey-documented resources appeared to have been demolished or extremely compromised, or where they could not be found or accessed, they were not included.

In addition to structures identified in previous cultural resources surveys, structures that were not documented in any known previous surveys but which appeared to meet the S/NR eligibility criteria were identified through a reconnaissance-level field survey of the study area by an historian that meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historians (36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A).

EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON HISTORIC RESOURCES

Once the historic resources in the study area were identified, the potential impacts of the Direct Route Alternative on those resources were assessed. Project impacts on architectural resources could include both direct (i.e., physical) and indirect (i.e., contextual) impacts. Direct effects could include physical destruction, demolition, damage, or alteration of a historic resource. Indirect effects, such as changes in the appearance of a historic resource or in its setting—including introduction of incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource's setting, or elimination of publicly accessible views to the resource—are also considered.

C. PREVIOUS SURVEYS

A number of documents, previously prepared separate from this historic resources analysis, have identified resources or areas with historic or aesthetic value in the study area. Documents that identified specific buildings with historic value in the study include the Town of Southampton Cultural Resources Survey (GAI 2000); and the Hamlet Center Plans for Bridgehampton (2004) and Water Mill (2003). The buildings identified in these surveys were taken into account in identifying potential historic resources in the project study area.¹ These documents are described in detail below, as is the Town of Southampton Comprehensive Plan Update (1999) which did not identify individual buildings of historic importance (beyond those officially designated by the Town), but did identify larger 'heritage areas' for future study.

TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE (1999)

The Town of Southampton's Comprehensive Plan Update, initiated in 1994 and completed in 1999, updates and builds upon the Town's Master Plan of 1970. Also known as "Southampton Tomorrow" the Comprehensive Plan Update outlines planning goals and objectives, including the protection of scenic and cultural resources. The Plan is considered a 'living' document; it is recommended that the Town update it yearly.

The Southampton Comprehensive Plan mandates the identification of historic resources throughout the town, as well as the creation of Hamlet Heritage Areas, where there are concentrations of historic resources. The Comprehensive Plan allows the function of the Hamlet Heritage Area designation to remain flexible: it "may be purely honorary, or it can have a limited regulatory capacity." Six Heritage Areas have been identified east of the Shinnecock Canal, including (within the study area) the village centers of Water Mill and Bridgehampton and immediately outlying areas. These heritage areas were taken into account in identifying potential historic resources for this project.

¹ As noted above, in limited instances, where survey-documented resources appeared to have been demolished or extremely compromised, or where they could not be found or accessed, they were not included.

**Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line
and Expansion of Bridgehampton Substation Project**

TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY (2000)

A Cultural Resources Survey was commissioned by the Town of Southampton and prepared in July 2000 by GAI Consultants of Monroeville, Pennsylvania, and its subconsultant Fanning, Phillips, & Molnar, of Ronkonkoma, New York (GAI 2000). The Cultural Resources Survey inventoried 300 historic structures in the 16 unincorporated hamlets of Southampton (Bridgehampton, East Quogue, Eastport, Flanders, Hampton Bays, North Sea, Northampton, Noyac, Quogue, Remsenburg-Speonk, Riverside, Sagaponack [incorporated in 2005], Shinnecock Hills, Tuckahoe, Water Mill, and Westhampton. The six incorporated villages of Southampton, Sag Harbor, North Haven, Westhampton Beach, Westhampton Dunes, and Quogue, and the Shinnecock Indian Reservation, were not included in the Cultural Resources Survey. Of the municipalities covered by the survey, those that overlap with the study area include North Sea, Bridgehampton, Water Mill, and small portions of Tuckahoe, Noyac, and Sagaponack. The only portion of the study area that was not included in the survey area is village of Southampton.

Three hundred (300) individual properties were identified, many of which were grouped into historic districts or multiple resource areas. The resources were evaluated based on the S/NR eligibility criteria, and were recommended for designation as local Town of Southampton historic structures or districts. However, to date, the Cultural Resources Survey has not been submitted to the OPRHP for review. Furthermore, the Survey has not been officially adopted by the Town of Southampton nor have the resources identified in the survey been officially designated by the Town of Southampton.

Resources identified by the Cultural Resources Survey and located in the project study area were identified as potential historic resources for this project (see D. "Existing Conditions").

A PLAN FOR BRIDGEHAMPTON HAMLET CENTER PLAN (ADOPTED 2004)

The Bridgehampton Hamlet Plan builds on the Town of Southampton Comprehensive Plan and makes further recommendations. The Hamlet Plan recommends that an additional level of identification and regulation be added to the Town of Southampton Historic District and Landmark Board's responsibilities: the identification of Special Character Areas, which would be applied to areas that do not rise to the level of a historic district but possess aesthetic or historic value worthy of protection. The Hamlet Plan recommends that the Town establish the laws and infrastructure to regulate development in these districts.

The study recommends 150 heritage resources in the hamlet of Bridgehampton. These resources are concentrated in the area bounded by Corwith Road, Railroad Avenue, and Lumber Lane north of Montauk Highway; and by Church Lane and Ocean Road south of Montauk Highway.

Those historic resources listed in the hamlet plan, not previously reviewed by the OPRHP, and located in the project study were identified in this chapter as potential historic resources, either individually or as part of a potential historic district (see D. "Existing Conditions").

WATER MILL HAMLET CENTER STRATEGY (ADOPTED 2003)

The Water Mill Hamlet Plan supports the Town of Southampton's Comprehensive Plan's creation of the Water Mill Center Heritage Area, and identifies seventeen individual properties that "help define the historic character of Water Mill." Thirteen of these properties are located within the Village Center and four others are located outside of the Village Center. Those

historic resources listed in the hamlet plan, not previously reviewed by the OPRHP, and located in the project study were identified as potential historic resources, either individually or as part of a potential historic district (see D. “Existing Conditions”).

NOYAC HAMLET CENTER STUDY (ADOPTED 2004)

The Noyac Hamlet Center Study identifies historically significant resources in Noyac, however, none of these resources are located within the project study area.

D. EXISTING CONDITIONS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES

Previously identified historic resources in the Direct Route Alternative study area, including S/NR-listed and eligible resources and properties designated by the Town and Village of Southampton are described below. The resources are also shown on Appendix D, Figure D-1 and are listed in Appendix D, Table D-1.

STATE/NATIONAL REGISTER LISTED AND ELIGIBLE HISTORIC RESOURCES

Two S/NR-listed historic districts are located in the study area for the Direct Route Alternative.

North Main Street Historic District (S/NR-Listed) is located in the northern central portion of Southampton Village, along North Main Street between Willow Street/Railroad Plaza and Route 39/27 (see Resource NMHD in Appendix D, Figure D-1a). The district contains residences dating from the mid-18th century through 1910, as well as the Southampton Railroad Station. A park and a small number of commercial buildings are also within the district, clustered adjacent to the railroad station. Architectural styles in the district vary, and include colonial and Federal-period vernacular architecture, Greek Revival-style structures, and multiple turn-of-the-century modes which reflect the growth of the area in that period. The railroad station, which has a cobblestone and oyster shell exterior, is of the latter period, as are an adjacent freight depot and commercial building.

Southampton Village Historic District & Expansion (S/NR-Listed) The original boundaries of the Southampton Village Historic District include 374 contributing buildings in the central and southern portions of Southampton Village, including portions of North Sea Road, Hill Street, South Main Street, and others (see Resource SHHD in Appendix D, Figure D-1a). The Historic District Expansion contains an additional 56 contributing buildings, and extends east, including portions of Lewis Street and others. A portion of the village’s central business district is included in the Historic District & Expansion, as well as the residential streets that surround it. Structures within the district range widely in date from early settlement-period homes to late 19th and early 20th century homes, and include an array of architectural styles including early vernacular, Greek Revival, Colonial Revival and others. Commercial and institutional buildings are clustered along Main Street and Jobs Lane. Many large summer residences are also included in the district, reflecting Southampton’s importance as a resort; these tend to be located further from the commercial districts.

LOCALLY DESIGNATED HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Town of Southampton has established a local Historic Landmarks and Documents Ordinance (Chapter 194 of the Southampton Town Code). Section 194-3 designates a

Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line and Expansion of Bridgehampton Substation Project

Landmarks Committee to consist of seven members and to act in an advisory capacity to the Town Board in identifying historic resources and making recommendations to the Planning Board regarding the potential for any land use action to impact historic resources. A separate board, the Design Review Board (formerly known as the Architectural Review Board) is mandated to regulate new development in historic districts. As presently written, the ordinance requires owner consent prior to designation of a local landmark.

To date, only a small number of structures have been officially designated in the Town of Southampton under the local Historic Landmarks and Documents Ordinance. None of these structures are located within the study area for the Direct Route Alternative.

The Village of Southampton also maintains a register of Village-designated properties, which are subject to village regulation. Southampton Village-designated resources located within the project study area include:

- *North Main Street Historic District* (S/NR-Listed) (described above); and
- *Southampton Village Historic District* (S/NR-Listed) (described above). The Southampton Village Historic District Expansion has not been designated by the Village of Southampton to date.

POTENTIAL HISTORIC RESOURCES

Forty-seven (47) individual potential historic resources, and one potential thematic grouping, were identified in the study area. In a comment letter dated January 18, 2008, OPRHP determined all of these potential historic resources to be S/NR-eligible (see Appendix D). Further information on these historic resources is provided in Appendix D, including a table listing the resources (Table D-2), a map showing the locations of the resources (Figure D-1), and photographs and brief descriptions of the resources (Figures D-4 through D-31). The potential thematic grouping (see resources marked with an asterisk in Table D-2) is described below:

POTATO BARN THEMATIC GROUPING

Potatoes became a staple in North American farming in the early 18th century, but it was not until the early 20th century that Long Island farmers began to cultivate them on a large scale. By mid-century, potatoes were Long Island's most important crop (Chamberlain 2006). As potato production became increasingly significant both to the region's and the nation's food supply, potato barns were constructed on farms specifically for the purpose of storing large quantities of potatoes (Visser 1997). Where farmers had formerly stored small potato harvests in basements or small underground structures, the modern potato barn came to the fore at the turn of the century.

Potato barns constructed from ca. 1900-1950 are typically banked structures, built into a berm or hillside. On Long Island, the lower portions of most potato barns are built of concrete, while the upper portions are wood-frame construction, clad in wood shingles or clapboard. In order to regulate heat and moisture, potato barns are typically built with few windows (often one or two windows, with shutters or shields, are placed at the gable end) and the barns have vents along the roof or at the gable end. The side walls of the barns, where exposed, are commonly reinforced by buttresses, and the barns often have a small brick side chimney. They are typically located at the side of roadways, for easy vehicular access, usually adjacent to the field on which the potatoes would have been grown. While often located on the same parcel as a farmhouse, potato barns were sometimes constructed on separate parcels a short distance away. Because large-scale

potato farming was generally a 20th century phenomenon, advances in vehicular transport enabled the farmer to engage in agricultural activities slightly further from home. While large-scale potato farming in Eastern Long Island and the town of Southampton persists today, there has been a dramatic shift in recent decades away from an agricultural economy, and towards a service economy.

Potato barns are an iconic Eastern Long Island building type and exemplify one of the region's most important historical industries. While individual potato barns may lack distinction and may not individually rise to the level of S/NR eligibility, as a building type still relatively well represented in the town of Southampton, potato barns do constitute an important grouping. Potato barns in the study area deemed to contribute to the ~~potential~~-thematic nomination are listed in Appendix D, Table D-2 (contributing resources are indicated with an asterisk); and photos and brief descriptions of the resources are also provided in Appendix D. Some of these potato barns are located on properties containing other buildings (houses, for example) that are also considered potential historic resources, while other contributing potato barns are not associated with other potential resources.

VILLAGE UNDERGROUND OPTION

One previously identified historic resource (the North Main Street Historic District, described above) and one potential historic resource (Potential Historic Resource TU-1 [see Appendix D], Table D-2, Figure D-1a, and Figure D-4) are located within the 90-foot study area for the Village underground option. The study area for the Direct Route Alternative using the Village underground option, contains one previously identified historic resource (the North Main Street Historic District), and a total of 33 potential historic resources, including one potential thematic grouping (the Potato Barn Thematic Grouping, described above). As stated above, in a comment letter dated January 18, 2008, OPRHP determined these potential historic resources to be S/NR-eligible (see Appendix D).

E. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section assesses the potential for the Direct Route Alternative to impact historic resources in the study area. Potential Direct Route Alternative impacts on historic resources could include both direct (i.e., physical) and indirect (i.e., contextual) impacts.

DIRECT IMPACTS

The Direct Route Alternative is not expected to directly impact historic resources. The proposed transmission line, if overhead, would run directly through the North Main Street Historic District (S/NR-Listed; Village of Southampton-designated) along the railroad right-of-way. In addition, multiple individual historic resources, another historic district, and a thematic nomination, are located in other portions of the study area. Installation of the new transmission line would not result in the demolition, physical destruction, or alteration of any historic resources. To ensure that construction activities associated with the installation of the transmission line would not cause inadvertent physical impacts to adjacent historic resources, LIPA would prepare and implement a construction protection plan (CPP) in consultation with OPRHP for any architectural resources in close proximity to Direct Route Alternative construction. The CPP would set forth the specific measures to be used, and specifications that would be applied, to protect architectural resources during the construction period for both overhead and underground, including the Village underground option, construction.

Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line and Expansion of Bridgehampton Substation Project

The construction of the Bridgehampton Substation Expansion would not have the potential to directly impact historic resources in the study area, as the historic resources are far removed from this proposed feature.

Consequently, it not expected that the Direct Route Alternative would result in significant adverse direct impacts to historic resources.

INDIRECT IMPACTS

Indirect effects, such as changes in the appearance of a historic resource or in its setting have also been considered. In configurations that would result in overhead transmission lines, the Direct Route Alternative would result in changes to the height, size, and appearance of the poles along the transmission line route. However, these changes are expected to be minimal. The proposed poles would replace existing poles and would be spaced at the same intervals as the existing poles. The new poles would be only 13-18 feet taller and 6 inches thicker in diameter at the base than the existing poles along roadways. These new poles would be constructed of the same material (wood) as the existing poles and would exist within the context of an area where overhead distribution lines presently exist. Furthermore, the taller and slightly wider poles would not cause a significant change in the visual character and the settings of the resources (Chapter 6, “Visual Resources”). Therefore, the Direct Route Alternative would not introduce visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource’s setting that would have a significant adverse impact.

The only locations where the new poles would be of a different material from the standard wood poles would be along the LIRR segment of the line in Southampton Village, where the poles would be of steel construction. However, because the poles would be located along a railroad line, where existing rail infrastructure features define the immediate visual landscape, the new poles would not be expected to represent a substantial new visual intrusion.

At the end of each underground cable segment, an underground to overhead transition riser pole would be installed where transitions are necessary. These wood riser poles are more obtrusive in appearance than the existing and proposed poles, and would require guy wires from the top of each riser pole, which would run to the ground, about 25 to 40 feet from the pole (see Chapter 6, “Visual Resources,” Figure 6-5). The proposed locations of these riser poles have not yet been identified. LIPA would consult with OPRHP and the Town and Village of Southampton, as appropriate, to identify sites, which would minimize and eliminate the potential for significant adverse impacts to historic resources from the riser poles.

The expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation is not expected to indirectly impact historic resources. No historic resources are located within sight of this proposed feature, and therefore, their settings and visibility would not be affected. Therefore, the Bridgehampton Substation Expansion would not have a significant adverse impact on the setting, views, or context of historic resources.

Consequently, it not expected that the Direct Route Alternative would result in significant adverse indirect impacts to historic resources. In a comment letter dated January 18, 2008, OPRHP concurred with this impacts assessment (see Appendix D). *