

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

October 6, 2022 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (881 8418 7356) - 6:00 P.M.

Members present (online): Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Liz Lyster, Jo Solet, Yuting Zhang, *Members*; Paula Paris, *Alternate Member*

Members absent: Chandra Harrington, Joseph Ferrara, Susannah Tobin, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies and Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate Members*

Staff present (online): Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*, Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*; Eric Hill, *Survey Director*

Public present (online): See attached list.

This meeting was held online with remote participation and was closed to in-person attendance, consistent with the provisions set forth in the Act Relative to Extending Certain State of Emergency Accommodations signed by Governor Baker on July 16, 2022. The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

With a quorum present, Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. He explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures, then introduced commissioners and staff. Ms. Burks noted her failure to start the Zoom webinar, and Mr. Irving repeated the meeting introductions and procedures. He explained the Consent Agenda procedure and asked if there were any objections to passing case 4853 per the Consent Agenda policy. There were no objections raised by the Commission, staff or public. He noted the arrival of Ms. Lyster to the meeting. He designated alternate member Paris to vote on all matters.

Case 4853: 1380 Massachusetts Ave., by 1834 Realty Inc., owner, o/b/o Blank Street Coffee, tenant. Replace round lit blade sign with square lit blade sign.

Dr. Solet moved to approve Case 4853 per the policy. Ms. Zhang seconded the motion. The motion passed in a roll call vote 4-0 with Ms. Lyster not voting. (Solet, Zhang, Irving, Paris).

Case 4856: 26 Plympton St./ 13-21 Bow St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Phase three restoration and rehabilitation of Adams House buildings.

Mr. Sullivan recommended that the Commission approve Case 4856 per the Consent Agenda Policy. He explained that this application was for phase three of a multi-year restoration of Adams House buildings. The exterior work was almost entirely restoration and not new construction. Dr. Solet asked about an extension to the building; Mr. Sullivan said that was located within an interior courtyard and would not be visible from a public way. Mr. Irving asked if there were any objections to including the matter under the Consent Agenda. No objections were raised.

Dr. Solet moved to approve Case 4856 per the policy. Ms. Paris seconded the motion, which passed 5-0 in a roll call vote. (Lyster, Solet, Zhang, Paris, Irving).

Public Hearings: Demolition Review

Case D-1619 (continuation): 12 Lake View Ave., by Jefferson M. Case and Elizabeth Green Case. Retroactive application to demolish house (1846).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building, as it was prior to demolition and the proposed design per the revised building permit drawings. In September 2022 the Commission had found

that the building was significant and had been demolished without prior authorization. The September hearing had been continued for the purpose of reviewing the proposed design for the completed house reconstruction.

James Rafferty, attorney for the owners, stated that the owners had been victims of the contractors' mistake. The full set of plans were not distributed to the Commission by staff last month but had been this month. He introduced the architects Steve Hart and Jennifer Lyford to present the proposed house design.

Ms. Lyford showed before and after plans and elevations for the house. She noted that the Stubbins House at 199 Brattle Street and changes to the driveway had obscured the visibility of the original front door. Very few visitors ever used that door. Mr. Hart said a main objective of the design for the clients was to re-orient the house to face Lake View and the interior plan had been re-organized accordingly. Ms. Lyford noted that areas of the house that were to be removed (shown in orange) and added (shown in yellow). The new roof ridge matched the roof ridge of the house prior to commencement of the project. All the previously existing details such as pilasters, windows, water table, clapboards, dormers, eaves, and cornice were to be matched. The copper gutters had not been original and would be replaced with fiberglass in a wood profile. The original granite foundation stones had been salvaged for re-use as cladding for the new foundation.

Jeff and Lisa Case, the owners, introduced themselves. Mr. Case said they regretted the situation but had followed the advice of their contractors and architects.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact from the Commission.

Dr. Solet asked if any original materials remained. Mr. Hart answered that the foundation stones remained. Mark Doughty of Thoughtforms Construction added that the gable on the west elevation was original. Dr. Solet asked about the new windows. Ms. Lyford said they would match the materials and muntins of the original. They would have insulated glass and weight-and-chain balances. Dr. Solet asked if a structural engineer had been consulted. Mr. Hart replied in the affirmative noting that the foundation and framing plans designed by the structural engineer had been included in the submittal. Mr. Rafferty noted that the contractors did not follow the plans.

Ms. Zhang asked if the extent of removal of original framing should have been anticipated given the design for altered and additional window openings. Mr. Hart agreed that the window placement required removal of more original wall framing. Ms. Zhang asked about the original roofing materials and proposed. Ms. Lyford answered that the original slate was a different color variation but the new slate would be North Country Black. The porch roofs and rear dormers would have copper roofing.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of fact.

Ted Killory of 151 Coolidge Hill asked if the removal of the front door and additions had been approved as part of the original building permit. Mr. Hart answered in the affirmative.

Kimberly Henry of 157 Brattle Street asked the role of the Commission in this case and what

were the possible outcomes. Mr. Sullivan explained that the demolition ordinance procedures had not been followed and the Commission was considering a retroactive application. Joseph Sanborn and Marie Saccoccio also asked procedural questions about the demolition review process.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said the design might have been approved if it had gone through the normal review process.

Devereaux McClatchey said the Cases had not intended to circumvent the rules. The design was in keeping with the neighborhood and the project should not be delayed for two years, which would be difficult for everyone in the neighborhood.

Richard Marx-Hartford of 33 Lexington Avenue said the design was well thought out and should be approved.

Melissa McGaughey of 97 Lake View Avenue spoke in support of the project moving forward.

Marc Kaufman of 209 Brattle Street said the Commission needed to take a strong stand in such cases to uphold the rules and regulations of the ordinance. He said the city should have interim inspections on large projects to prevent such a thing from happening again.

Ms. Henry said the previous structure was rotted and unsafe. She supported the application.

David Sculley of 4 Humboldt Street said the owners had already paid a significant penalty. Work had been stopped for several months. No negative precedent would be set by allowing work to move forward now.

Mr. Killory said the subdivision of the lot in the 1960s was an error. It would not serve the public interest now to change the design or delay the project further.

Ms. Saccoccio said she believed the owners were well intentioned and the persons at fault should be punished instead.

Mr. Sanborn said the design originally permitted would be built but with new sound wood. Further delay was not in the public interest.

Andrea Killory of 151 Coolidge Hill said the owners had been humiliated and punished enough.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan said the house could have been renovated without destruction. He explained the difference between the Magazine Street project, where the original frame had been taken down hastily to prevent a collapse, and this one, in which demolition proceeded incrementally and with deliberate intent. He referenced an unauthorized demolition on Kinnaird Street where the mitigation had been to require the owner to rebuild the house to its original appearance. In this case the public would benefit from restoration of the original facade. He said the changes to the Lake View elevation represented a natural evolution of the property, but the design choice to remove the original front entrance, portico, and fenestration had been gratuitously destructive. Restoration of that façade, even if the door was non-functional, would have the public benefit of preserving the original character of the house as it faced Brattle Street. He

recommended finding the building not preferably preserved within the context of the proposed design but contingent on restoring the south façade of the main block of the house.

Dr. Solet agreed that the changes on the south façade had a negative effect. She said the house might have qualified for landmark protection if the normal review procedures had been followed.

Ms. Lyster said the architects' design had shown respect for the original features and details of the building. She asked to see the proposed changes to the south elevation again. Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed the before and after elevations.

Mr. Rafferty said he had presented the staff suggestion to restore the south façade to the Cases but the interior layout had changed and it would be punitive to redesign the house now. He said the Magazine Street case was similar situation in that the fault was that of the contractor, not the owners. The proposed alterations and new cladding were aspects of the project that were allowed in Cambridge without a demolition permit. The demolition of the walls and roof framing was the violation, but those parts of the building would never be seen by the public. He said the design had integrity with a high level of attention to matching original details. He said the proposed restoration of the south elevation was a reasonable idea but would be so impactful to the plan of the house that it was not something the Cases could agree to do.

Mr. Sullivan said the house had been consciously destroyed and the original building was gone. The replacement design was flawed by the addition of a breakfast room that would replace the Brattle Street façade. He reiterated his suggestion that the south elevation with the door and windows be restored, even if it was a non-functioning door.

Ms. Zhang said it was an interesting idea worth considering. It would preserve the house's history as one of the south-facing Brattle Street estates.

Ms. Paris agreed it was something that could be considered and if the owners wanted to pursue it they could return to the Commission. Dr. Solet suggested the hearing could be continued. Ms. Lyster suggested the project could be accepted with the review of details and the south elevation delegated to staff. Mr. Sullivan agreed that it would not be necessary to return to the Commission if the plan was acceptable. Ms. Lyster said she did not object to the replacement design, as presented by the proponents.

Mark Doughty of Thoughtforms Construction accepted responsibility for the situation and volunteered to accept a two-year moratorium on his company pulling permits in Cambridge rather than requiring the homeowners to change the design of their home.

Mr. Irving said he was not interested in punishment. He said he could support the design as presented by the applicants. The addition on the south was allowed and permitted in the building permit but the matter was only before the Commission now because of the unauthorized demolition.

Dr. Solet said it wasn't punishment but possibly an improvement and encouraged the applicants to consider it.

Ms. Lyster moved to find the original house not preferably preserved in the context of the current proposal, thereby allowing the project to resume. Mr. Irving seconded the motion. In a roll call vote, the

motion failed 2-3 (Lyster and Irving in favor; Solet, Zhang and Paris opposed).

Dr. Solet moved to find the original house not preferably preserved in the context of the proposed plans with the condition that the original design of the south elevation be replicated and on the further condition that the review of plans and construction details be delegated to staff. Ms. Paris seconded the motion. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 4-1 (Solet, Paris, Lyster, Zhang in favor; Irving opposed).

Mr. Irving called for a brief recess at 8:14 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 8:24 P.M.

Case D-1631: 6 Brookline St. (2-10 Brookline St. and 468-480 Massachusetts Ave.), by Sater Realty, LLC o/b/o CSQ Realty, LLC. Demolish commercial building (1929).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and Mr. Hill summarized the staff report about the history and architecture of the building. The Middle East and associated music venues had been a cultural destination since it opened. The property was a contributing building in the Central Square National Register District and was thus automatically considered significant as defined in the Demolition Review Ordinance. Mr. Sullivan explained that under the terms of the Central Square zoning overlay district a project involving demolition of a preferably-preserved National Register-listed building would not be eligible for the development incentives of the overlay.

The proponent, Patrick Barrett, introduced himself and said he was working with the Sater family on re-imagining the site. Much of the original architectural ornament of the building had been removed over the years. He noted that other small music venues had closed in Central Square. He wanted to fuel Central Square as a destination for musical events. The Saters wanted to continue to operate the space as long as possible but couldn't do it forever. The hotel use was chosen because it was the only practical use that could be located above a music venue. He had been in conversation with the *Crosswinds* muralist and the Arts Council about commissioning a new mural to replace the one on the existing building. The primary significance of the property was cultural, not architectural. He described the proposed replacement design including floor plans and design inspirations. There would be three live music venues. Climate resilience planning for 2070 flood plain impacts was built into the design.

Ms. Lyster asked about noise passing from the venues to the hotel. Could the existing building form the base of the new building? Mr. Barrett said he had been working with MIT sound engineers about the sound attenuation. The ambient sound level was 60 dba. The design of the ground floor was to offer retail spaces that could open onto the sidewalk for seating or other activities.

Dr. Solet asked how the historical funkiness of Central Square could be present in the new building. Would murals or other design features contribute to that spirit? Mr. Barrett said he was looking at multiple locations for art on the new building.

Ms. Zhang asked about the proposed awning windows on the Mass. Ave. façade. Mr. Barrett said he liked the copper overhang of the nearby Kennedy Building but an overhang would count as FAR. He was instead planning for windows that could open up and act as a temporary overhang over the sidewalk patio space. He said the design focused active retail use on Mass Ave and away from Brookline Street.

Ms. Parish asked about shadow impacts on the lower buildings around the site. Mr. Barrett said

he hadn't done shadow studies yet but was mindful of the residential properties nearby.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of fact.

Su Almeida of 120 Blue Hills Parkway in Milton asked how traffic, parking and crowded streets would be managed. Mr. Barret said there would be no underground parking. The overlay allowed him to supply parking elsewhere in the district rather than onsite. He had commissioned a traffic study and would provide two loading zones.

Ms. Meyer asked about noise from the rooftop restaurant, artists, and hotel drop off. Mr. Barrett said the roof would have parapet walls and was above the level of nearby residences. He had a list of local artists to consider. There would be a drop-off area and beneficial changes to the bike lane.

Dan Totten of 54 Bishop Allen Drive asked about the architectural drawings and correspondence from the Arts Council. Could murals be preserved without a landmark study?

Mr. Sullivan read the letter from Jason Weeks, Executive Director of the Arts Council. Approval could contain conditions with regard to the art.

Mark Shea of 81 Highland Avenue spoke in support of the proposal because it would preserve the clubs and the fun of Central Square while boosting the quality of the architecture. He said Mr. Barrett's project at 907 Main Street had been done well.

Mr. Williamson questioned whether there was enough detail to make a decision.

Sammy Nabulsi, attorney at 1 Beacon Street, Boston, said he was representing Charlene Almeida of 185 Franklin St. He summarized a letter urging the commission to find the existing building preferably preserved due to the negative impacts of the proposal on neighboring properties.

Maria Antifonario of 20 Fainwood Circle spoke about the benefits of the project.

Sean Hope of 907 Mass. Ave. said he lived and worked in Central Square. He spoke in support of the project because it would maintain the uses in the building and looked to the future of Central Square and the Middle East.

Maxine Patwardham of 89 Norfolk Street spoke favorably about the design direction. She said she would like assurance that the art would be preserved.

Mr. Totten said he did not object to the height or design direction but indicated there wasn't enough specificity to determine whether the existing building should be found not preferably preserved. He suggested a continuance.

Lee Farris of 269 Norfolk Street said she appreciated that the music venues would carry on but asked for more detail about the design.

Michael Monestime of 4 George Street expressed support for the Sater family and the Middle East. He was confident the project could be successful.

Mr. Irving closed public comment. The commissioners discussed possible courses of action.

Mr. Sullivan said he was hearing a comfort among the commissioners about the proposed massing and the design direction. He suggested that the applicant return to the commission after making

progress on the planning and design in consultation with staff of other city departments.

Ms. Lyster moved to grant an indefinite continuance with the consent of the applicant to encourage him to return with more detail about the storefronts, murals, surrounding context in renderings and a shadow study. Ms. Paris seconded the motion, which passed 5-0 in a roll call vote. (Lyster, Paris, Solet, Zhang, Irving)

Public Hearings: Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case L-144: 10 Buckingham St., 4 and 6 Buckingham Pl., Buckingham, Browne & Nichols, owner. Consider whether to initiate a landmark study for the three buildings found significant and preferably preserved in demolition review cases D-1597, D-1598 and D-1599.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and reviewed the history of the demolition applications. The three buildings had been found significant and preferably preserved eleven months ago. The demolition delay would expire soon and it was the Commission's practice to hold a hearing prior to the expiration of the demo delay to determine if a landmark study was warranted.

Cynthia Westerman Project Manager for Buckingham Browne & Nichols School introduced the school representatives.

Dr. Tara Gohlmann, Chief Operating and Financial Officer, described the lower school and its teaching practices. She said the pandemic had heightened the needs for outdoor learning spaces.

Dr. Jen Price, Head of School, said the school valued its relationship with the city.

Ms. Westerman noted that twenty-two of twenty-eight BB&N buildings were over fifty years old. She described the thorough master planning process for the Lower School (ages 4-12). They had hoped to locate the sixth grade at the convent at the St. Peter's complex, but that building was no longer available.

Jean Caroon of Goody Clancy Architects described the needs for the Lower School, which included a large assembly space that they would build on the existing field, the only lot that had available FAR. The three buildings along Buckingham Place needed to be removed to support the school's needs. The new Markham building would support the sixth grade. She described the design and displayed renderings of the building. The Brick Building would also be renovated as part of the overall project.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact from the commission and the public.

Dr. Solet asked if there was potential for classrooms in the St. Anne's building, noting its large size. Dr. Price said she would not object to relocating but said the building would not lend itself to classroom conversion.

Maria Christopher of 38 Parker Street asked if the student population was increasing. Dr. Price said it was staying the same but that they needed more square footage per student. Ms. Christopher asked about the setback of the Meeting House from the property line. Ms. Carroon answered that it was 20 feet.

Ms. Meyer asked if any of the buildings could be moved or sold. Ms. Westerman said she hadn't seen any interest in the houses. Dr. Gohlmann said they would consider it if someone was interested.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Ms. Meyer said she understood the programming needs but was drawn to the Carey Studio

because of his significance to the Arts & Crafts Movement.

Ayal Naor of 38 Parker Street said the houses were irreplaceable. It was worth studying them for landmark status.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Mr. Sullivan said the institutional imperatives were understood but demolition would irreversibly change the neighborhood. The two smaller houses had changed less than Markham and retained their architectural integrity.

Ms. Lyster said keeping the buildings at the expense of the school wasn't necessarily the right thing to do.

Dr. Solet said a landmark study made sense. The design was still in development and the properties should be thoroughly documented.

Ms. Zhang and Ms. Paris expressed support for a study.

Mr. Irving did not agree. As a Cambridge citizen he would rather have a healthy school that could continue evolving. The buildings didn't rise to the level of a landmark study.

Dr. Solet noted the interesting feminist history of the Markham Building and the school's founder. She moved to initiate landmark study of the three significant and preferably preserved buildings.

Ms. Paris seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-2 in a roll call vote (Solet, Paris and Zhang in favor; Lyster and Irving opposed).

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4854: 170/172 Brattle St., by Brattle Street Nominee Trust. Demolish garage and one-story addition and construct new garage and two-story addition.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the history of the house. Built in 1852, it was relocated from Phillips Place in 1965. The garage was a later addition approved by the Commission.

Frank Shirley, architect, introduced architect Jonathan Miller and the owner representatives, Susan Shapiro Magdanz and Otto Magdanz. The family had owned the property since the 1970s. He described the goals of the proposed renovation and addition. The last major renovation was in the 1990s. The house would be preserved and adapted for modern living. There would be no changes to the fenestration on the two street facades of the main part of the house.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact from the Commission and then the public.

Dr. Solet asked about the depth of the porch at the garage and the single panel shutters on the rear elevation. Mr. Shirley said it was about 4.5' deep. Similar shutters could be seen elsewhere in Cambridge.

Ms. Zhang asked about the materials. Mr. Shirley said they would match the rest of the house. The garage door colors were not finalized.

Ms. Paris asked about the windows on the south elevation above the garage.

Suzy Palitz of 4 Channing Street asked how far the addition would be from the property line on the south side. Mr. Shirley said it would be 15.5 feet from the garage wall to the property line.

Ms. Meyer asked about the setback of the second floor over the garage.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Ms. Meyer said the massing of the garage looked strange.

Douglas Brown of 35 Standish Street asked why the house was listed for sale. Was the addition for the current family or a future owner? Otto Magdanz said any future buyer would want an addition and his family felt the responsibility to do it in a respectful way in order to preserve the character of the house.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan said the addition was quirky but not inappropriate to the district.

Ms. Lyster suggested the cornice of the gable wrap around the right side, the porch be pulled away from the windows, and skylights take the place of the windows on the south elevation. Dr. Solet agreed with those suggestions.

Ms. Paris moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with details delegated to staff. Dr. Solet asked if the motion could be modified to require the removal of the shutters on the south side. Ms. Paris accepted. Ms. Zhang seconded the motion which passed 5-0. (Paris, Zhang, Solet, Lyster, Irving)

Case 4855: 17 Fresh Pond Pkwy., by LeFebvre Brattle, LLC. Alter brick wall and fence; construct curb cut, driveway, wall and gate off Brattle Street.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the history of the property. The 1839 Wyeth farmhouse was purchased by Harvard President Charles Eliot who made additions and alterations in 1909. The house had been vacant for several years and had not been maintained for several decades. The serpentine wall dated to 1956 after the construction of the Eliot Bridge and changes to the parkway had increased traffic in the area. The wall was designed by Grace Kirkwood and modeled on Jefferson's design for a wall at the University of Virginia.

Gary Wolf, architect, noted that the last owner had subdivided the lot and proposed new construction close to Brattle Street. His client had purchased both lots and wanted to reconnect the historic house with Brattle Street with a curb cut and driveway.

Dale LeFebvre, the new owner, introduced himself. He said that his adult life began in Cambridge and he was happy to be returning.

Mr. Wolf displayed the plans for the driveway. He said the patio on the east end of the house was once a parking court with access to the carriage house with a driveway from Brattle Street that had later been closed off. The plan would route traffic onto the property from Brattle Street and exit from the Fresh Pond Parkway driveway. He described how the wall would be modified and said that the existing stockade fence would be removed. The gate would be dark green or black. The area to the east of the new driveway would be planted along Brattle Street. This application was the first step in a larger project that would come before the Commission next year.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact.

Ms. Lyster asked if the brick could be matched. Mr. Wolf answered in the affirmative noting that the wall had been repaired several times after cars had crashed into it.

Dr. Solet asked why two driveways were desired. Did the house ever have a Brattle Street

address? Mr. Wolf said that it had been numbered 219 Brattle Street for most of its history. Until 1909 the Brattle Street driveway was the only one.

Ms. Zhang asked if they had considered lowering the wall and integrating it with the landscape design. Mr. Wolf noted that Grace Kirkwood had designed a return of the wall on the other side of the property and staff had advised that the same treatment be used on this side.

Ms. Paris asked if the area of the wall that had been poorly patched would be repaired. Mr. LeFebvre said he wanted to do everything the right way in this project.

Mr. Brown asked if trees were to be removed. Mr. Wolf said no trees would be removed for the driveway. An arborist would look at the whole property and make recommendations.

Ms. Meyer asked why the gate was needed. Mr. LeFebvre noted other properties at the intersection had gates and it would help with security and privacy. He said he had no intention of building a second house on the property. He wanted to raise his family there, not to develop it.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment.

Mr. Brown said he was excited for the project. He recommended that the applicant keep the original loop at the top of the driveway.

Ms. Meyer noted the imminent construction of a two-way bike lane on the north side of Brattle Street. She suggested the corner of the wall's return be carefully designed. The gate was too gentrifying.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Ms. Paris moved to approve a certificate of appropriateness for the application as presented with details delegated to staff. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 5-0 in a roll call vote. (Paris, Solet, Lyster, Zhang, Irving)

Preservation Grants

Case IPG 23-3: 137 Allston St., by St. Augustine's A. O. Church (#3) \$75,000 for exterior restoration.

Ms. Paris recused herself because of her membership on the Black History in Action for Cambridgeport committee.

Mr. Sullivan described the application for an additional \$75,000 to complete the restoration of the church exterior.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the grant as proposed. Ms. Lyster seconded the motion, which passed 4-0 in a roll call vote. (Solet, Lyster, Zhang, Irving)

Ms. Lyster moved to adjourn and Ms. Paris seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a roll call vote. (Lyster, Paris, Solet, Zhang, Irving). The meeting adjourned at 1:55 A.M., October 7, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Present on the Zoom Webinar online, October 6, 2022**

Nate Rogers	Beyer Blinder Belle Architects
Alexandra Offiong	Harvard Planning Office
Joe Meldrim	Harvard House Renewal Program Manager
Gary Wolf	Gary Wolf Architects
Matt Kiefer	Goulston Storrs law offices
Dale LeFebvre	17 Fresh Pond Pkwy
Steve Hiserodt	DH Architects
Cynthia Westerman	BB&N School
Jean Carroon	Goody Clancy Architects
Patrick Barrett	41 Pleasant St
Steve Hart	Steve Hart Architects
Lisa Case	12 Lake View Ave
James Rafferty	Adams & Rafferty
Jennifer Lyford	Steve Hart Architects
Susan Shapiro	172 Brattle St
Frank Shirley	Frank Shirley Architects
Jonathan Miller	Frank Shirley Architects
Mark Doughty	Thoughtforms construction
Darren Baird	Goulston Storrs law offices
Dr. Tara Gohlmann	BB&N School
Dr. Jen Price	BB&N School
Daniel Chen	Goody Clancy Architects
Annie Murawski	172 Brattle St
Otto Magdanz	172 Brattle St
Tad Heuer	155 Seaport Blvd.
Maria Antifonario	20 Fainwood Cir
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Curt Paden	6 Theriault Ct
Robert Kinerk	21 Grozier Rd
Marc Kaufman	209 Brattle St
Erica Busa	411 Main St, Matthew Cunningham Lands. Design
Justin Corbett	10 Washington Ave
Maxine Patwardhan	89 Norfolk St, Apt 2
Gianna Cornacchini	28R Cherry Street, Apt 3
Devereaux McClatchey	127 Coolidge Hill
Maryam Garrett	74 Lake View Ave
Sarah Baker	175 Coolidge Hill
Kimberly Henry	157 Brattle St
Noah Gordon	85 N Whitney St, Amherst, MA 01002
Rhonda Davis	1197 N Garfield Ave, Pasadena, CA
Gerta Dhamo	38 Parker St. Apt. 11
Mark Shea	81 Highland Ave
Alexandra Klindienst	1 Beacon St 23rd Fl, Boston, MA 02108

Su Almeida	120 Blue Hills Pkwy
Douglass Lee	33 Lexington Ave
Ted Killory	151 Coolidge Hill
Andrea Killory	151 Coolidge Hill
Durjoy Ace Bhattacharjya	2 Larchmont Ln, Lexington MA
Richard & Leslie Marx-Hartford	33 Lexington Ave Apt 3
Luciano Cesta	61 Brighton Ave
Sammy Nabulsi	One Beacon Street, 23rd Fl, Boston, MA 02108
Marie Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Diana Paolitto	147 Lexington Ave
Maria Christopher	38 Parker St
Marc Levy	3 Potter Park #1
Olivia Huang	112 Rockview St, Apt 1R, Boston, MA 02130
Ryan Snider	216 Norfolk St
Andrew Karedes	99 Appleton St, Boston, MA 02116
Eleanor Hammill	14 William St
Michael Monestime	4 George St
Lucy Patton	333 Walden St
Greg Reeves	5 Lee St
Carol	3217 Main St Barnstable MA
Matthew Cunningham	411 Main St, Stoneham, MA 02180
Tim Nazzaro	25 Fox Dr, Dedham, MA
David Sculley	4 Humboldt St
Joseph Sanborn	20 Traill St
Christine Alaimo	25 Lakeview Ave
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St, 404
Marie Sheppard	2710 Foxhall Rd NW, Washington, DC
Claudia Zarazua	Mass Ave
Charlene Almeida	185 Franklin St
Shauna Reyburn	5 Lee St
Emily McClatchey	127 Coolidge Hill
Melissa McGaughey	97 Lake View Ave
Lee Farris	269 Norfolk St
Gerburg Wulf	4 Buckingham St
Ed Frankenberry	34 Parker St. #4
Delvin Kelly	11804 Giddings Dr, Frisco, TX
Jay Joeph	Cambridge
Robin Lapidus	23 Belvidere Ave
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Ayal Naor	38 Parker St
Jason Epstein	58 Lake View Ave
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl, Jefferson Park
Douglas Brown	35 Standish St
Suzy Palitz	4 Channing St
Frederick Soule	Littleton, MA
John DiGiovanni	50 Church St, 5th Fl

Jon Penterman	213 Brattle St
Sean Hope	907 Mass Ave
Scott Bourque	30 Park Ave
Robson Googins	30 Fresh Pond Pkwy
John Smith	Fresh Pond Pkwy
Danita Sanborn	20 Traill St
Leah Abrams	1 Park Ave, New York, NY 10016
Michael Wolfson	106 Reed St
Sarah M	4 Copley Pl
John Hawkinson	CambridgeDay.com
Dan Totten	54 Bishop Allen Dr.

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.