

HARVARD HISTORICAL COMMISSION

13 AYER ROAD • HARVARD, MASSACHUSETTS 01451



The Harvard Historical Commission is chartered "...to preserve and protect the historic assets of Harvard, its buildings, structures, places, sites, and surrounding settings of historical or architectural significance."

Those wishing to record any or all of the meeting must alert the chair prior to the start of the meeting and the chair will make an announcement, in accordance with The Massachusetts Open Meeting Law.

Following are the **minutes** of a special meeting and public hearing of the Harvard Historical Commission, held via Zoom, on **Wednesday, June 23, 2021 at 7 pm.**

Submitted by George Triantaris, Secretary.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Pam Marston (Chair)
Steve Nigzus (Vice Chair)
George Triantaris (Secretary)
Emanuel Lindo
Richard Cabelus
Brandon Loughery
Matthew McRae

MEMBERS IN ABSENTIA: None

AUDIENCE:

In addition to applicant, John and Mary Ann Boynton, Pat Jennings, Seth Trutz

TOPICS:

CALL TO ORDER:

7:04 pm

PUBLIC HEARING:

5 Old Littleton Road – Nick Boynton – Dormer, Barn, Sheds

Public Hearing opened at 7:14

Presentation opened

Presentation of application

Nick Boynton presented his application discussing the proposed removal of the barn shed first. Nick showed pictures of the construction of the shed which reveal that it is much later than the historic post and beam barn. The shed has no foundation and rests on wooden posts which have failed. It is sagging and pulling down the historic barn (the supports on the back wall of the barn were cut out to add the shed). Matt asked Nick about his plans if the shed were removed. Nick plans to reuse the existing cedar shake siding if possible or replace it with new shakes. He will install one 6 over 6 window in the same spot where the existing window is located on the shed. He will reinstall posts to support the barn. George asked if the original stone foundation of the barn survived. It is still in place. Nick next discussed the proposed dormer. He will use the 6 over 6 approved windows rather than those shown in the plans. He then discussed the proposed addition of two sheds which he would like to relocate to the property. Shed #1 between the barn and the old library and shed #2 behind the barn where the failing shed is located.

Presentation closed

Public Presentation opened

Public comments in favor:



Pat Jennings felt that Nick was making good changes to the building and that it would be safer as a result. Seth Trutz agreed and felt the improvements would make the house safer.

Public comments against:

None

Public Participation closed

Commissioners' Deliberation and Vote

The commissioners considered each change separately.

The proposed dormer

Richard noted that the town has voted to replace the roof of the old library (a significant investment and indication of interest in that structure) and that the rooflines around the library including this structure are important. He had concerns about the dormer impacting the rooflines. George observed that this house has evolved over time starting as a one-story structure, then a 1.5 story structure and now a full 2 floors. It is not architecturally "pure" and further evolution would not detract from its visual impact. The proposed dormer, although visible, is on the back of the structure. Matt thought the dormer was well designed and compatible and that these houses need to evolve to be viable. Steve thought the dormer would make the house look unbalanced and that the massing was too large compared with the existing house. Manny thought it would look like part of the organic growth of the house and that houses need to evolve to be livable. Pam was comfortable with this change. A motion to approve the dormer as shown on the plans changing the windows to 6 over 6 (as approved in the previous application) was approved by the commissioners by a vote of 6 for and 1 against (Steve).

Removal of the barn shed

Matt understood the struggle of restoring historic structures and felt this structure should be removed if the barn would be restored. Manny felt the this shed was not integral to the original barn. George pointed out that the commission is charged with preventing the demolition of structures. This shed is a part of the history of the structures on the property and its agricultural and vernacular history and the fact that it is failing is not evidence that it should be demolished, many failing structures are restored. He stated that after visiting the site and seeing that the addition is much later than the barn and that it is causing damage to the much older and more significant structure that he was comfortable with removing it, especially if it meant saving the barn. Steve asked what the barn would look like when it was finished. Brandon appreciated that the barn would be returned to its original footprint. A motion to approve the demolition of the barn shed and the reconstruction of the original wall with one 6 over 6 window was approved by unanimous vote.

Sheds

Brandon felt that the sheds would not have a large impact as they are removable. George was concerned about the location of shed #1 as it was very close to the library and would be visible. Adding two new structures to such a small lot was a concern. Matt had concerns about the design of shed #1 and stated that if the applicant had brought this design for approval to be constructed, he would not have approved it. Steve asked whether shed #1 could be resided (it is batten board) and changed to clapboards. Nick did not think this was possible. Steve stated that a neighbor who was reluctant to appear publicly had expressed his/her objection to shed #1. Richard stated he would not approve the design for shed #1 if it had been presented. He was also concerned about the tight spot. Brandon had concerns about the design and the location. George asked for clarification of the size of the structures. Pam stated that although one shed on a lot has been approved two had not.

A motion to approve shed #1 to be sited as shown was unanimously defeated.

A motion to approve shed #2 to be sited as shown was unanimously approved.

Public Hearing closed 7:46

PUBLIC COMMENTARY: None



MEETING ADJOURNED:

7:48 pm

DOCUMENTS:

Application dated March 31, 2021
Dormer plans
Revised Application