

Minutes of the Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission

May 7, 2012 - 6:00 P.M. – 344 Broadway, City Hall Annex/McCusker Center, 4th Floor

Commission Members Present: Tony Hsiao, *Vice Chair*; Lestra Litchfield, Carole Perrault, Charles Redmon, *Members*; Sue-Ellen Myers, Monika Pauli, *Alternates*

Commission Members Absent: Nancy Goodwin, *Chair*

Staff: Eiliesh Tuffy

Members of the Public: See attached sign-in sheet

With a quorum present Mr. Hsiao, acting as chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

MC-3922 (cont'd): 14 Dana St., by Highland Development. Amendments to approved plans; review of exterior mechanicals and landscape details.

Commissioners Pauli and Perrault, as abutters to the property under review, recused themselves from deliberations.

The project architect, Peter Quinn, reviewed the proposed changes to the previously approved permit plans, which were approved by staff in early November, 2011. Those changes that are publicly visible included preserving original flush board siding on the front Mansard building and building a new, open front porch in keeping with the period of the building rather than rebuilding the enclosed vestibule which was a later addition to the original house. In addition, a new basement-level light well at the front corner of the house along the driveway side was proposed in order to meet egress requirements for that level of the building. The well would be constructed using granite and it would be screened by landscaping in the front yard.

Other changes that were pointed out by staff included the doubling of exterior condenser units from 3 to 6 condensers, 4 of which were proposed to be grouped in one location along the rear elevation facing a Harvard Street abutter.

General landscape plans were submitted for the site which the developer, Ben Rogan, said were still being worked out for specific species and detailing. Fencing was proposed to be solid wood along the north and rear elevations at a height agreed upon by the abutters, the south elevation facing 10 Dana would have a 6' wood, lattice-topped fence towards the rear of the lot and step down to a 42-48" open picket style iron fence along the length of the driveway to ensure that shadows are not cast on the 10 Dana basement units. Two gates were proposed, one along each side yard, to create a secure rear yard area.

Mr. Redmon asked what the material for the front stair would be. Mr. Rogan, said they would build it in wood, perhaps mahogany. The architect said he had kept the porch ornament fairly simple so as not to compete with the rest of the building. Mr. Hsiao said the plans for the porch needed further development which could be reviewed by staff. Mr. Redmon asked if the boarded-up entrance was originally a single or double door. Mr. Rogan said it was a double door that was being restored for reinstallation.

DRAFT MINUTES

Questions were received from the public.

Ken Reeves of 340 Harvard Street asked if the sightlines from Harvard Street had been taken into consideration during the Commission's initial review of the old stable demolition and new construction proposal, because he felt the impact of the height and massing of the new construction was very detrimental. Staff answered that photographs of all publicly visible angles of the site, including those Harvard Street, were presented as part of the earlier public hearings.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked about the missing brackets under the window sills. Staff said that the plan included fabricating new sill brackets based on similar designs from the same period of this house, to restore those elements on the building.

Comments were received from the public.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said that, in consideration of the 1st floor abutters at 10 Dana, perhaps the 4' iron fence could be raised to 5' for increased screening. She also suggested finding ways to minimize the impact of the 4 condensers at the rear of the property.

Ken Reeves of 340 Harvard Street spoke out in strong opposition to the overall project, stating that he was unable to attend the previous hearings in August and September of 2011 due to work conflicts and felt that the information that he had received about the new construction was misleading. Of particular concern was the variation in height between the former carriage house on the site which was demolished and the ridge height of the new rear structure which was felt to be too tall. The historic carriage house was unoccupied space that was sited so as not to have much of an impact on the property owners at 340 Harvard Street. With the original layout, he could see all the way through to Dana Street from his property. By contrast, it was pointed out that the new addition has placed a 2-1/2 story, 2-family house directly in their back yard when the owners believed the project simply involved rebuilding the historic carriage house. He found objection with the large picture windows along the rear elevation and the 2nd floor balcony above the rear window bay. Nothing about the new project, he felt, reflects a carriage house.

Mr. Reeves took issue with the Commission's decision to approve the project, noting that both 340 Harvard Street and the abutting property to the north of 14 Dana hold great architectural and historic significance at both the city and national level. He felt the information provided about this case was a huge deception in terms of how the rear addition was represented and mentioned that he was unable to get a copy of the permit drawing set at ISD. Hearing this, staff produced a copy of the approved elevations from the building permit set for Mr. Reeves from the Historical Commission's case file.

Staff asked Mr. Reeves what elements of the existing proposal were crucial points of consideration in order to minimize the impact of the approved construction on the owners of 340 Harvard Street, to which he listed three items:

1. The air conditioning units were felt to be numerous and that measures should be taken to ensure that the mechanicals meet the city's limitations on noise decibel levels.

DRAFT MINUTES

2. Landscaping using dense plantings of tall trees, such as Hemlock trees, should be worked out to shield 340 Harvard entirely from the new construction. The landscaping should also be something that is low-maintenance.
3. Despite the usual 6' height limit for fences in the district, if the abutters can agree to something taller along the rear property line, he wished to have a much taller fence in that location.

He asked that the Commission postpone their ruling on the landscape and fencing elements of the current proposal for final approval once the stated issues had been addressed.

Mr. Redmon acknowledged that the footprint of the new structure provides a much greater, 15' rear yard setback than where the historic carriage house once stood directly on the property line. Conversely, the new building was also shifted approximately 15' to the north, which is why this is so visible from the rear yard of 340 Harvard Street.

The development team disagreed that they had misrepresented the project in any way, saying that they had held numerous meetings with the neighbors outside of the city's required public hearing process in order to discuss the initial proposal with the community members and address their questions and concerns. They said that architectural plans were delivered to Mr. Reeves prior to the public hearing, but they heard no response from him. Mr. Rogan said that the top ridge height of the new addition as built was only 4' higher than that of the original carriage house.

Mr. Reeves pointed out that the dimensions of the plans are deceiving, as they are heights derived from the finished interior floor height rather than as compared to the original height of the historic carriage house.

Mr. Redmon asked if the developers were willing to increase the number of trees at the rear property line and that, if Mr. Reeves was amenable to the idea, they should try to work with him on an agreeable landscaping plan.

Linda DeHart of 10 Dana said that she owns a unit on the 2nd floor of that building. She felt that the developers had been very cooperative with the surrounding owners during the process. Her primary concern was maintaining the air flow to her unit and that she remained concerned about fumes from cars at 14 Dana Street not being properly dispersed. She did feel that they now had a much more pleasant view from their windows and hoped the developer would continue to maintain good communication with the neighbors.

Mr. Rogan explained that the link between the front and rear structures would have two enclosed parking spaces in a 1st floor garage.

Ms. DeHart suggested that the condominium documents for the completed units include a provision that there should be no idling cars in the driveway.

Ms. Litchfield asked about details for the design of the new front porch and asked if the developers had looked at others in the area. Mr. Rogan said that there was a very comparable building around the corner on Harvard that bore many similarities to architectural details they had found at 14 Dana, and that staff had provided them with photographs of period-appropriate porch examples within the Mid Cambridge district as well as flush board and quoin details.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Redmon moved to approve the application for proposed changes to the previously approved plans with the condition that the following design details be submitted for staff review:

- Front Porch: reconstruction of a period-appropriate open front porch was approved, with details such as the cornice and handrail ornament to be further developed
- Flush board Siding: restoration of the existing flush board siding on the two elevations of the Main House that are still in good condition; details of the corner board treatment to be further developed
- Site Plan Features:
 - o Fencing as proposed was felt to be appropriate in both materials and design; the final height of the rear fence was subject to further discussions with abutting neighbors
 - o Mechanical equipment such as air conditioning compressors should be buffered with natural screening to minimize the impact on surrounding neighbors while also adhering to the municipal noise ordinance limitations for maximum decibel levels
 - o Landscaping plans require further development and should come back for review by either staff or the Architects' Committee

Ms. Litchfield seconded the motion, which passed 4-0.

MC-4073: 1707 Cambridge St., by David Dobrin and Susan Arnott. Screened porch addition.

The building under review is one of a pair of matching houses built on adjacent lots for Royal Richardson in 1845. Both houses are 2-1/2 story frame Colonials with pedimented roof dormers and front porches supported by Doric columns that span the entire façade along the 1st floor. The condition of the buildings is excellent and they were listed collectively on the National Register of Historic Places in 1983. Because of the property's National Register designation, the review of publicly visible exterior changes is binding on the applicant. The increase in F.A.R. will also require a zoning variance from the city's Board of Zoning Appeals.

The proposed screened porch is designed to fit within an existing recess behind the main block of the house. The exterior wall of the porch would be pulled back from the corner of the original house to provide a return and a clearer separation between the old and new elements on the building. The setback of the design, along with the screening provided by an existing fence in front of the area of the proposed porch, greatly reduces the public visibility of the proposed addition. The project architect stated that Clearvue screens were selected for maximum transparency and the trim on the new screened porch would match the trim on the house. The only change on the existing house would be the removal of several courses of clapboards to accommodate the new porch roof.

Mr. Redmon asked if the new porch would create a dark space, and the architect noted that three skylights are also proposed for the porch roof for day lighting.

There were no questions or comments received from the public.

Ms. Perrault appreciated that the design of the new porch is reversible, which is the standard typically applied to National Register-listed properties.

DRAFT MINUTES

Ms. Perrault moved to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Redmon seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

MC-4030: 13 Bigelow St., by Pierre and Marie Humblet. Review application for Certificate of Hardship to create a new driveway.

The property under review is a two-family residence constructed in 1873. This 2-1/2 story Mansard building is located at the south end of Bigelow on the west side of the street. This lot, like several others at the south end of the street, is bounded at the front sidewalk by a retaining wall of dressed granite. The current proposal for a curb cut and 17'Wx32'D driveway would impact the historic granite wall along with a set of granite stairs and alter the grade of the side yard to make way for 2 parking spaces. The cars are proposed to be parked behind the front face of the building to minimize their impact on the streetscape.

In addition to falling within the boundaries of the local conservation district, this property is part of the Bigelow Street National Register District. In cases where National Register properties are involved, the Mid Cambridge Commission has binding review authority over publicly visible changes to the property.

The previous denial of the application by the Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission (NCDC) was appealed by the property owner. The Cambridge Historical Commission (CHC), which handles appeals, determined that the NCDC was not capricious in its ruling but did point out a procedural point outlined in the enabling legislation. If an application subject to binding review is denied, then consideration for hardship should also be part of the Commission's full deliberation. During the owner's presentation to the CHC it was disclosed that an adjacent property owner at 15 Bigelow had filed a restraining order which prevents shared access to the driveway. There is also a pending land court case which was filed to resolve the question of access. Because the issue of hardship had not been considered at the initial NCDC hearing, the CHC directed the case back to the Mid Cambridge Commission for such a review.

Staff outlined the request for the Commission to revisit the case as a potential hardship, read the relevant portions of the district order and Massachusetts General Laws, Ch. 40C pertaining to issues of hardship as well as the goals and purposes of the Mid Cambridge District. The restraining order and pending land court case were also shared as part of the staff's summary of the appeal process.

Ten years after the Mid Cambridge district was enacted, the original order was amended with support from property owners. One of the key goals of those revisions was to strengthen the Commission's review authority from non-binding to binding in all cases involving National Register-designated properties.

The owner's attorney made several points in support of a hardship, including:

- The age of the owners is such that they could need a clearer, more direct entrance to the house, particularly if mobility becomes limited with age. A driveway next to their house would accomplish that.
- No part of the historic granite retaining wall would be lost as part of the driveway proposal, since they will be incorporated in the new design.

DRAFT MINUTES

- A neighbor who is a landscape architect assisted in the design so that it works in harmony with the context of the district.
- The driveway would result in a net parking gain for Bigelow Street, since it will create 2 new parking spaces where just 1 vehicle could park along the curb.
- This is the only lot on the street with the yard space to create a driveway
- Letters of support from the abutters were submitted to the Historical Commission

Francis Spinks, landscape architect residing at 17 Bigelow Street, spoke in support of the application. Mr. Spinks said he moved to Bigelow Street in 1971 and did not have a parking space on his lot. He created a driveway on that lot after purchasing a strip of land from the abutting neighbor. He explained his design to mimic the historic wall and emphasized that it would be of high quality and would preserve the look of the street, since he saw the pattern of the street as being reliant upon the strong verticals of the granite posts rather than the horizontal span of granite. He added that he believes it is a hardship trying to find parking on the street and he supports the owner's request to create a driveway.

Mr. Pierre Humblet, the owner, added that he is currently unable to park in the space at the rear of his own property because of the restraining order. He also brought up that just 10 years after the street was laid out people had started adding driveways to their properties.

Ms. Perrault asked when the owners purchased the property. Mr. Humblet said 1983. She then asked if the nature of the hardship was that the owners have room for a driveway and that everyone else has one.

Mr. Panico, the applicant's attorney, said that the owners had been living at the property for 30 years with access to a parking spot at the rear of the house, but that the restraining order forbidding access had created a hardship. Ms. Myers asked if that case had been resolved, to which the applicant stated he anticipated an August hearing in land court.

The Commission asked if there had recently been a change in ownership at 15 Bigelow. There were new owners in the property as of July 2011. The building is a condominium with multiple units. Because of this, there are many vehicles parking behind 15 Bigelow and along the driveway.

Ms. Myers said it seemed as though the Commission should wait for resolution of that case before deliberating on the issue of hardship.

Mr. Panico said the judge was not optimistic that the Humblets would win the right to shared access of the neighboring driveway, and that the judge was not bothered by them creating their own driveway on the property. Ms. Litchfield said that the fact that the local preservation commission denied the application should sway in the Humblets' favor that they may not have any other option. Ms. Myers added that it would seem that the duration of the shared access would legally establish some sort of standing, but that she felt the Commission would need to hear from the court on that matter first.

Mr. Panico said the problem may lie with the issue of credibility, and that the credibility of the conservation district commission's ruling could be questioned. Staff pointed out the state and local laws that charge local historical commissions with protecting designated resources.

Comments were accepted from the public.

DRAFT MINUTES

Doug Gesler of 16 Bigelow Street said that they've always known the Humblets to have access to the 15 Bigelow driveway and that pending the judge's ruling they could be denied that use. He felt that the owners would do a beautiful job but that the best outcome would probably be if the use of 15 Bigelow's driveway is grandfathered in.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said she realizes this is a complicated case and that there are many houses in Cambridge that do not have parking. The existing curb cuts and driveways used as precedents in the application appear to have been created prior to the amended district order and without the need for NCDC review. Just because everyone has a driveway doesn't necessarily mean you should be allowed one. She did not view it as a hardship and thought it would destroy one of the last raised yards at this high end of the street.

Ms. Perrault agreed that she didn't think the Commission had enough information at this point to assess if there will be a long-standing hardship. She also said it was unclear at this point if the owners will be living at the property should a time come when their mobility is compromised.

Scott Slate of 10 Bigelow spoke to the issue of access for people with disabilities, commenting that his son is in a wheelchair and that they had to make special accommodations for him to get into their house. He also mentioned that at this point it would be against the law for the Humblets to trespass onto the 15 Bigelow driveway. He noted that by 1pm on Friday, when nearby city offices are closed for the weekend, cars along Bigelow Street clear out but that otherwise during the week it is very difficult to find street parking. He said he used to rent a parking space behind 15 Bigelow and the driveway was always blocked. He does feel the current lack of a driveway at 13 Bigelow would be a hardship for anyone elderly or in a wheelchair.

Staff mentioned that expedited permitting is the current practice for properties needing alterations to accommodate the Americans with Disabilities Act. With regard to current hardship considerations, it seems that the access restriction may be a temporary hardship, pending the outcome of the land court case this summer and that, if the judge rules in favor of the Humblets, this could be resolved in a few months. Mr. Hsiao agreed that due to the pending litigation the Commission was unable to rule on the nature of the Hardship.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to deny the Certificate of Hardship on the grounds that the property is located within a National Register district that the Commission is charged with preserving and the nature of the hardship – no longer having access to the existing rear parking spot – is unresolved so the Commission is unable to make a fully informed decision at this time. Given that the owners are also not infirmed, it was not felt that this situation required increased accessibility.

Mr. Panico asked if the motion was to continue the case, but the Commission informed the applicants that this was a denial of the application as presented and that the applicant was welcome to re-apply when more information becomes available regarding the shared driveway in question.

Mr. Redmon moved to deny the application for a Certificate of Hardship based on the reasons stated in Ms. Litchfield's initial motion.

Ms. Perrault seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

DRAFT MINUTES

MC-4078: 7 Ware St., by President and Fellows of Harvard College. Replace windows to replicate historic design.

The 2-1/2 story frame building under review was originally constructed in 1881, but has undergone several alterations over the years that have removed original features such as the front porch and many of the original windows. At some point the Mansard roof was modified to add a higher hip roof and multiple dormers.

The property currently houses the offices of Harvard Magazine and the proposed work is part of the college's campus-wide energy conservation improvements. Historical Commission survey photos from the 1960s along with physical remnants of muntins found during an inspection of the window frames provided information about the original glazing patterns, which the architects used to create a window replacement schedule that also restores the historic appearance of the windows. The proposed replacement units would have insulated glazing with low-e coating and applied exterior muntins. Architect Henry Moss with Bruner/Cott said that the low-e coatings currently available have improved in appearance, are almost clear in color and have been approved by the National Park Service on federal tax credit projects. The schedule of work would have to occur during off hours when the offices are closed to minimize disruption in the building.

Ms. Perrault asked if the windows would be black on the exterior. Mr. Moss said that both the window frames and sashes would be black. Storms will also be retained and they will be black in color as well.

Questions and comments were accepted from the public.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if there were any original windows left in the building. Mr. Cott said they found two original windows where the openings weren't shaved.

Mr. Redmon made a motion to accept the application as submitted. Ms. Myers seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

MC-3976: 24 Maple Ave., by 24 Maple Avenue Condominium Association. Review application for Certificate of Hardship to partially retain existing fence.

The applicants are returning before the Commission for a hardship request following an earlier ruling to correct the design of the fence on the site, which was installed without the approval of the Mid Cambridge NCDC or the required building permits for fences exceeding 6 feet in height. When the fence was brought for retroactive review, complaints from abutters along with the Commission's finding that the height and design of the fence was incongruous with the district placed the onus on the applicants to correct the fence to a design that was later approved at the staff level.

The costs that would be incurred by flipping the fence panels on the north elevation abutting 26 Maple Ave. were felt to be a financial hardship. The case for hardship was the subject of the current review.

The applicants said that, despite lengthy conversations with a property owner at 26 Maple to seek approval in advance for the desired fence design, after the fence's installation they received objections from property owners at that same address. The installation practice of placing the finished, or "kind

DRAFT MINUTES

side” of the fence outward towards the neighboring property was not something known to the applicants or expressed to them by the fence installation company. In fact, they took their cue on the design from the existing fence at 22 Maple Avenue, which has the structural side facing 24 Maple Ave.

The owners at 24 Maple Avenue will now have to spend \$18,000 to lower the height of the rear fence section to meet building permit requirements. On what was initially budgeted as a \$10,000 project, flipping these panels on the north section of the fence was felt to be cost prohibitive for what was essentially an aesthetic judgement call.

Questions and comments were received from the public.

Sara Mae Berman of 21-23 Fayette Street said that jagged metal posts remain on their property following the initial installation of the tall rear fence and wanted to know how quickly this project would be resolved.

Joe McCarren, speaking on behalf of the owners at 26 Maple Avenue, said that, while the applicant spoke with one property owner at length about the project that the fence design had not been shared with the other owners at 26 Maple Avenue.

Ms. Myers said that the applicants had brought this situation on themselves by not following the guidelines for review that are the responsibility of property owners in the Mid Cambridge district. Therefore she did not find adequate grounds for a hardship consideration. Ms. Pauli agreed with this summation.

Ms. Myers moved to deny the hardship application as the contentious design elements and costs required to remediate the impact of the fence on the abutters are a direct result of the owners’ failure to adhere to mandatory permit procedures and conservation district guidelines for project review.

Mr. Redmon seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Ms. Perrault added that, as a general rule for the district as a whole, the tall wood fences that are becoming popular with property owners in recent years are historically inappropriate and not in keeping with the period of significance of the district. She suggested that these types of fences be reviewed with greater scrutiny as to their appropriateness within the district.

MC-4079: 58 Kirkland St., #2, by Fort Family Holding. Replace original window sashes.

The applicant’s property is one unit in a larger grouping of attached, 3-story brick row houses that span the block from 50-60 Kirkland Street. Designed by architect Frank Shepard, the Irving Terrace row houses were completed in 1890. The existing condition of the windows varies greatly throughout the row, with few original windows remaining. The replacement windows are inconsistent in size and materials, detracting from the integrity of the original architecture. At #58 Kirkland, the applicant’s property is the only one that still retains its historic wood windows.

There were no parties present to speak on behalf of the property owner.
No questions and comments were received from the public.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Redmon moved to deny the application, since the Commission encourages the retention of original, old-growth wood windows when their repair is still feasible. Ms. Litchfield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

MC-4080: 31-33 Fayette St., by Adam Siegel. Complete exterior and interior rehabilitation, including chimney removal, new dormer, skylights and alterations to rear ell.

Constructed in 1846, this 2-story Greek Revival house was developed by Isaac Fay, for whom the street is named, and was first occupied by Benjamin E. Colley. Colley is listed in historic city directories as a “piano forte maker” and was employed at T. Gilbert & Co. in what is now Downtown Crossing, Boston. A wraparound porch added the 1870s was removed at a later date. Records show that the house was moved to this location from an adjacent lot in 1900, placed on a new foundation and listed as a 2-family residence. Currently, the building is clad in aluminum siding but many of the original trim details appear to be intact.

The current proposal would involve removing the artificial siding to determine the condition of the underlying material. Preservation of the historic siding is being considered, depending on what removal of the aluminum reveals. The rest of the project would be a gut renovation that includes removal of the brick chimneys and all existing windows. The project team has been in consultation with staff leading up to the public hearing with archival research and preservation options the focus of those discussions. The review of this case is non-binding.

The project architect, Campbell Ellsworth, said that the house had last been used as a 3-family, and this project would reduce it to a duplex. New additions to the building would primarily be at the rear of the property and not publicly visible. A proposed dormer addition on the south slope of the roof would be visible.

Removal of the siding to this point had revealed 2-foot wide corner boards, shiplap siding on the 1st floor and cedar shingles on the 2nd. The walls of the house are 14” deep and the windows are elongated with the sill height close to the floor level. Mr. Ellsworth said that a considerable amount of settling had occurred in the building. The owner, Adam Siegel, said that his intention was to restore the shiplap where possible. Details for the choice of siding on the upper floor and gable end were still being worked out.

Ms. Perrault said she was not crazy about the design of the new dormer, since the proportions of the gable roof do not correspond with this style of house.

Ms. Pauli asked if the owner might consider replacing the windows in the north dormer with more appropriate double-hung windows.

The Commission asked what material the replacement windows would be, and the owner stated he planned to install wood windows w/ exterior cladding.

Questions were received from the public.

DRAFT MINUTES

Sara Mae Berman of 23 Fayette Street said the project appeared to be a fine job and that she eagerly looked forward to the building's renovation. She asked about the paved area in the front yard and any proposed fencing on the site.

The owner said that they were unclear if the existing parking could be retained according to zoning and that any fencing would be submitted to Historical staff for consultation. Mr. Hsiao directed the owner to come back to staff when a site plan had been drawn up for a subsequent review and encouraged him to think about an appropriate paint color for the house, perhaps looking to the Historical Commission's paint consultant for assistance.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- The applicant was encouraged to continue working with staff throughout the process to address any design questions as they arise
- Site plan details, once developed, are to be reviewed by staff for compliance with district guidelines and application for subsequent review by the Commission if needed
- Paint colors that are historically appropriate should be explored, with the assistance of staff

Ms. Litchfield moved to accept the application as submitted with the comments of the Commission attached as conditions for the certificate. Mr. Redmon seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Eiliesh Tuffy
Preservation Administrator

DRAFT MINUTES

Members of the Public Who Signed Attendance Sheet 5/7/12

Mark Donohoe	44 Brook St., Manchester, MA 01944
Ben Rogan	14 Dana St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Fangzhe Gu	4 Hamlet St., Somerville, MA 02143
Deborah Ewings	872 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02139
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St., Cambridge, MA 02138
J. Swartwood	19 Centre St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Linda DeHart	10 Dana St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Margaret McMahon	14 Highland Ave., Cambridge, MA 02139
Henry Moss	130 Prospect St., Cambridge, MA 02139
David Dobrin	1707 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Jason Roan	626 Main St., Concord 01742
J. McCarron	26 Maple Ave., Cambridge, MA 02139
P. Humblet	13 Bigelow St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Peter Quinn	14 Dana St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Francis Fox-Spinks	17-B Bigelow St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Bhupesh Patel	3 Bowdoin St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Marie Humblet	13 Bigelow St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Scott Slater	10 Bigelow St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Vincent Panico	2343 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02140
Larry Peterson	24 Maple Ave., Cambridge, MA 02139
Kenneth Reeves	340 Harvard St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Campbell Ellsworth	267 Norfolk St., Cambridge, MA 02139