

MSLD Study Committee Notes #17

July 15, 2026, 6:38 pm

Zoom <https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1601557886>

Study Committee Attendees:

Ameeth Deenanath
Julie Hall
Intiya Ambrogi Isaza
Nancy Johnsen (Chair)
Lindsey Mac-Jones
Linda Neshamkin

Staff:

Gabriela Amore
Jennifer Gaugler

Members of the Public:

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

I. REVIEW AND VOTE ON MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING

- A. **Linda** motions to approve meeting minutes from June 3, 2026. **Ameeth** seconds the motion. Meeting minutes approved unanimously.

II. PUBLIC FEEDBACK SINCE LAST MEETING

A. Feedback received by staff:

1. Informational request received via email from Jeff Zotter, a property owner in the proposed Protection Area. Staff responded.
2. Comments from the Mayor's Coffee Hour on 7/13:
 - a) Charles Disston supports the creation of the District and Protection Area but is also concerned about the production of new housing. He suggests a smaller protection area which excludes Main Street, west of Green Street, and east of Chestnut Street due to the higher presence of commercial and institutional buildings and modern infill in these areas.
 - b) Paul and Kate Lazdowski (Soley St.) are strongly in favor of including Soley St. in the Landmark District.
 - c) Dan Jaffee is in support of the district and mentioned that it is important to hear from a variety of community members.
 - d) Dan Kovacevic would like to attend meetings in person.
3. Erin Woods sent an updated letter of opposition to the Landmarks Commission; this letter was previously received and saved to the record but Erin wanted to let us know that it now has 46 signatures.
 - a) Staff notes that it is helpful to hear these concerns so the committee can work to address them.
 - b) **Intiya** asked for clarification regarding the point on directing taxpayer money to wealthier parts of the neighborhood. **Jennifer** clarified that the creation of a Landmark District does not directly result in the flow of any public investment dollars into that district. However, if the district's standards and criteria address elements in the public realm such as street furniture or gas lamps, and if the standards and criteria require those elements to be held to a higher standard of quality, then their replacement might potentially be more expensive.

B. Feedback received by study committee members:

1. **Julie** mentions that in casual conversations she's heard some concerns about the district being overly restrictive (i.e. specifying paint colors) which is not what is happening, so there is still misunderstanding that needs to be addressed.
2. **Nancy** suggests an FAQ for the website and to hand out to people. **Staff agrees and will work on this. It should help to explain to local residents "Why would I want this?"**

III. REVIEW PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLANS

- A. As the last meeting was skipped due to lack of quorum, the committee may have to add an additional meeting for reviewing the working draft, with the goal of having three meetings to review it. **Staff will share a working draft by 7/22.**
 1. **Nancy** requests sufficient time for the committee to do a final read-through and convey approval of the working draft in between the third meeting and the release of the draft. Staff agrees.
 2. **Nancy** also suggests a meeting before and a meeting after the community engagement event in the fall (first to prep and then to debrief).

IV. REVIEW STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

- A. Protection Area:
 1. Demolition
 - a) The Study Committee proposed adding an additional criteria for the evaluation of an application for demolition in the proposed Protection Area which reads as follows: "Architectural or historic contribution to the character of the Protection Area."
 - b) The Study Committee discussed whether these criteria "shall" or "may" be used for evaluation, as "shall" might be too limiting. The Study Committee agreed to return back to this at a later date.
 2. Land Coverage
 - a) The Study Committee had no suggested changes.
 3. Height of Structures
 - a) The Study Committee suggested the addition of the following language: "In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the standards and criteria of this Protection Area and the Boston Zoning Code, the more restrictive regulation or requirement shall apply."
 4. Topography
 - a) The Study Committee suggested the addition of the language indicated in italics: "No major changes in topography shall be allowed within the Protection Area *except for changes which need to be made for flood protection.*"
 5. Landscape
 - a) The Study Committee suggested the addition of the language indicated in italics: "In general, landscape changes within the Protection Area (*including on roof decks*) shall not obstruct public views of the Bunker Hill Monument from any *public* ways in the Protection Area."
 6. Archaeological resources
 - a) The Study Committee suggested the addition of the following language: "This review will run concurrently with review by the Boston Landmarks Commission and/or Commission staff and will not extend the timeline of review for any project."

b) Staff will check with the City Archaeologist as to whether it is necessary to require a permit for any archaeological work and who would fund any mitigation.

B. The discussion of the Protection Area boundary will be tabled until the next meeting.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

A. None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 8:35 PM

A. **Intiya** motions to adjourn, **Lindsey** seconds. Unanimous vote to adjourn.