

MSLD Study Committee Notes #15

May 20, 2026, 6:30 pm

Zoom <https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1605268195>

Study Committee Attendees:

Ameeth Deenanath
Jeffrey Gonyeau
Kirsten Hoffman
Nancy Johnsen (Chair)
Lindsey Mac-Jones
Linda Neshamkin
Ian Urquhart

Staff:

Gabriela Amore
Elizabeth Sherva
Jennifer Gaugler

Members of the Public:

Elizabeth Fowkes
Chris Hennessey
Eileen Mahoney

Absent: Crystal Galvin, Julie Hall, Intiya Ambrogi Isaza, Senam Kumahia, Fadi Samaha

Action/follow-up items for staff are highlighted in yellow.

I. REVIEW AND VOTE ON MINUTES FROM LAST PUBLIC MEETING

- A. **Kirsten Hoffman** motions to approve meeting minutes from May 13, 2026. **Ameeth Deenanath** seconds the motion. Meeting minutes approved unanimously.

II. PUBLIC FEEDBACK SINCE LAST MEETING

- A. Feedback received by staff:

1. **Johanna Hynes** requested that the recording and minutes from the July 26, 2022 Boston Landmarks Commission hearing at which the Commission voted to accept the petition for the Monument Square Landmark District for further study be posted on the committee's webpage. This has been done by staff.
 - a) Johanna also submitted a comment that the study committee should include the Battle of Bunker Hill in its study of the proposed district.
2. **John Dannemiller** asked the committee to reconsider the inclusion of the properties on Wallace Court in the proposed Landmark District because it is a private way.
 - a) **Nancy Johnsen** inquired about the legality of regulating a private way.

(1) Staff to follow up.

- B. Feedback received by study committee members:

1. None reported.

III. REVIEW PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLANS

- A. No concern about potential dates for next community engagement event in September from Study Committee members.

1. Staff to follow up with Memorial Hall regarding the availability of the hall on those potential dates.

IV. REVIEW STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

- A. Porches and stoops:

1. **Nancy**: Important to retain historic materiality - for example, granite stairs, cheek walls, and landings; iron guard rails. Also historic ornamentation.

- a) **Gabriela Amore:** Standards can provide flexibility to allow for handrails to be added where they don't exist without destroying historic architectural features. (i.e. in a minimally invasive manner).
 2. **Gabriela:** Consider recommending the retaining of historic coal chute covers, etc., in the ground.
 3. **Jeff Gonyeau:** If adding something that brings site up to code allows you to keep the historic original materials in place, then it should be allowed.
 4. **Jeff:** More important to regulate and/or recommend appropriate coating materials (so as not to damage existing historic materials) than it is to regulate color. Always a good idea to assess what is original and what is not.
 5. **Nancy:** What could the standards say about basing changes on what was there historically?
 - a) Staff provides some example language of a recommendation: "When replacement of existing materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence."
- B. [Note: 7:35pm Linda Neshamkin arrived.]
- C. Additions:
1. Staff presents example language from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:
 - a) "9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment."
 - b) "10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
 2. **Jeff:** Consider explaining the standards on the previous slide in the study report so that everyone can understand what is being recommended.
 3. **Nancy:** What is commonly regulated regarding additions adjacent to a historic structure?
 - a) Staff: The height of the addition is often required to be lower than the height of the historic roofline. Sometimes a setback from the front facade is required. (These guidelines don't necessarily need to be specifically stated in the standards and criteria because the language in standards 9 and 10 on the previous slide would allow for this to be addressed.)
 4. Staff comment: [Showing an example from 58-60 Winthrop Street] This addition is set back enough to preserve the visual curving form of the historic building in the streetscape.
 5. Committee agrees it is OK to fill in between dormers if retaining the form and shape of the original dormers.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- A. No members of the public were in attendance during the public comment period.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 7:58 PM

- A. **Linda** motions to adjourn, **Kirsten** seconds. Unanimous vote to adjourn.