

## Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

October 6, 2016 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, Jo Solet, *Members*; Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate*

Members absent: William Barry, Shary Berg, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*; Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:06 P.M. He made introductions, noting that the same commissioners were present as had been present at the September meeting. Mr. King explained hearing procedures and dispensed with the consent agenda procedure.

### Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 3688: 8 Berkeley Pl., by Mary Sutherland.** To construct dormer on west elevation, alter bay, install two new windows, rebuild entry stair and add iron hand railings.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the application.

Matthew Simitis, the architect, projected the project plans and described the location of the house in a heavily wooded corner lot on a private way. He described the proposed work including rebuilding the front stairs, adding hand railings, changing select window openings, and constructing a dormer on the rear plane of the roof.

Dr. Solet asked about shutters on the new windows. Mr. Simitis said the new windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the rear elevation would not have shutters. Dr. Solet noted that the French door replacing the sliding door was an improvement. She asked if a railing was required at the deck. Mr. Simitis said the deck wasn't being altered, but if required by the inspector, they could add a railing.

Mr. Sheffield asked how wide the dormer would be. Mr. Simitis answered that it would be about 15' wide. He noted that the attic would be used for storage, but the dormer would increase the storage space and add windows for light. It was not habitable because of the low head height. It would not require a variance. Mr. Sheffield asked about the notation for alternative skylights. Mr. Simitis explained that if a dormer was not approved or if cost became an issue, the applicant would like to add skylights to illuminate the attic space.

Mr. King asked if there were questions of fact from the public.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked how much space would be lost if the dormer were brought below the ridge height. Mr. Simitis answered that the headroom under the ridge was 6'4". If the dormer's roof angle was any shallower, he would not be able to match the roofing material.

There was no comment from the public.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application, as submitted, delegating review of skylights to staff if that alternative was pursued as well as approval of a deck railing, if required. Mr. Crocker seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

**Case 3444 (amendment): 14 Craigie St., by Carol S. Green.** Consider modified plans for construction of conservatory at rear of property.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and noted the location of the proposed conservatory. He noted that the new garage had been framed but was not yet completed.

Matthew Simitis, the architect, said he and the client had re-worked the design of the conservatory based on the comments ~~of~~ at the last hearing. The roof would be 2.5' lower. He showed photos of the proposed location and pointed out the stakes in the ground to mark its visibility from several points. He described the proposed construction method and noted that the noisy part of the work would be minimized. He noted the submission of a letter of support from Hilary Wodlinger of 10 Craigie Street, who had previously objected.

Dr. Solet asked about the change in grade. Mr. Simitis noted that the existing condition was the rough grade, but the finish grade and the driveway paving were not yet completed. The installation of a water retention structure had required a lot of digging. The grade dropped down from the sidewalk toward the garage then leveled out. Dr. Solet asked if the glass conservatory would not be too hot. Mr. Simitis explained that the conservatory would have operable skylights with screens and two pairs of doors that would allow for air flow.

Virginia Coleman of 2 Berkeley Place asked about the reflectivity of the glass roof. Mr. Simitis said it would be standard window glass so there would be some reflection. He noted that it was a heavily planted lot and the reflections would likely not affect the neighboring houses. Ms. Coleman reported that she had met with the applicant and reviewed the plans, but unfortunately she could not support the application. She said she was not aware of other glass boxes in the historic district. It would not fit the style of the house.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked about the number of structures allowed on the lot. Mr. Simitis explained that zoning requirements for size and setbacks of accessory structures would be met.

Ken Taylor of 2 Craigie Street/23 Berkeley Street said glass structures were built during the Victorian period. The proposed conservatory would be innocuous, was well designed, and he saw no reason it should not be approved.

Dr. Solet asked if the applicant had considered enclosing her deck. Carol Green, the applicant, said she had considered it, but the deck was very high and lacked privacy.

Ms. Harrington complimented the proponents on the work done to minimize the height of the structure. It was an improved design. She moved to approve the application to amend the previously-issued certificate of appropriateness to allow for the construction of the conservatory, as presented and to find that the design is not incongruous to the district. Dr. Solet asked if it would be a precedent to amend vs. reviewing it as a new application. Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. The motion was seconded by Mr. Irving and passed 5-0. Dr. Solet abstained.

**Case 3678 (continued): 1-7 & 9-11 JFK St. and 18-20 Brattle St., by Harvard Collection LLC c/o James J. Rafferty, Esq.** To renovate buildings, alter storefronts, and construct upper story additions.

Marilee Meyer asked the chair if the hearing on this matter could be ~~taken out of order~~delayed and heard after the Pearl Street case listed on the agenda. Mr. King asked the public who would be inconvenienced by the delay and many hands were raised. Mr. King announced that the hearings would take place in the order published on the agenda.

Mr. Sullivan gave a review of his slide presentation of the September hearing describing the evolution of building, owners, and uses on the block. He reviewed the Harvard Square Conservation District guidelines and factors to be considered by the Historical Commission in hearing applications for alterations and additions.

Mark Eclipse, of Prellwitz Chilinski Architects (PCA), quickly reviewed the design proposal. He noted that all four walls of 18-24 Brattle Street would remain and the exterior façade would be restored. He noted that the storefront detailing had not been worked out yet, but each building would have its own style. The design approach to the additions of third and fourth floors was to keep the addition quiet and simple so as not to compete with the architecture of the existing buildings. He showed renderings.

Mr. King noted that at the September meeting the Commission had heard questions of fact and started public comment. He asked if there were additional questions of fact.

Dr. Solet asked for a description of the mechanicals. Mr. Eclipse identified the location of the proposed mechanical area on the fourth floor and the screen that would hide the mechanical units.

Ms. Harrington asked if the proponents had studied a proposal without a fourth floor addition. Mr. Eclipse answered affirmatively; they had looked at lots of different floor numbers and heights.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was a minimum square footage threshold that they were trying to meet. William Brown of Equity One, the owner, answered that zoning allowed 4.0 FAR. The existing buildings had almost 3.6 FAR including 12,000 sf in the basement. He said the proposal was to decommission the basement floor area and close the sidewalk vaults. The net addition would be approximately 9,000 sf. The application would build the site out to the 4.0 FAR.

A member of the public asked if the first floor would be one space or divided up. Mr. Brown said they didn't know yet, but it was unlikely that a single tenant would occupy it all. He displayed several possible layouts of the retail space. He noted that Urban Outfitters was on five different levels now. The leasing plan would evolve.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked about the original height of the retail windows (above grade) at the corner. Mr. Brown said the bottom of the glazing appeared to be about 2' above the sidewalk in the 1909 photograph. They would lower the glazing as much as possible. Mr. Williamson asked the distance of the fourth floor addition from the corner. Mr. Eclipse answered that the setback was about 55-60'. He noted that the rendering photo was taken from a few feet in front of the kiosk.

Ken Taylor of 23 Berkeley Street asked for an explanation of the floor levels in section and elevation. Mr. Brown explained that the existing third floor of the Abbott Building would be removed, making a 22' high second story and 12' third story. Mr. Taylor asked if the architects would render the proposal from further away, such as in front of Lehman Hall.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place asked about light impacts and suggested a study be done to document.

Carol O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked the height of the glass walls. Mr. Eclipse said the third floor would be 22' high and the fourth floor was 10' high to the eave. Ms. O'Hare asked about the area of glass and whether other materials were studied. Mr. Brown said other options were studied but they looked very busy given the three existing buildings each with their own fenestration patterns and masonry detailing. The proposal showed the addition as the void and the existing buildings as the positive.

Ms. Meyer asked about the roof decks. Mr. Brown indicated the locations on the fourth floor plan. Ms. Meyer asked about entry door locations and signs. Could there be smaller retail spaces? Mr. Brown said there would be no interior mall and each retailer would have an exterior door. Yes, there could be smaller stores. There was opportunity for multiple tenants.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked if earlier design studies could be shared. Mr. Brown said he would leave that to the Historical Commission to request. Mr. Brandon requested renderings of night views and daytime reflections. He asked if the upper floors could be set back further.

Brad Bellows of 87 Howard Street, asked why a double height first floor was important, noting that it was a major intervention to remove the third floor of the Abbott Building. The floor area recovered was being replaced in the addition. He noted that he was happy the project was being proposed and wanted it to be successful. Mr. Brown said that retail stores were looking for 20'+ high space these days. Mr. Bellows suggested that ~~may~~-office use ~~would~~-might allow more existing space to be used with a smaller addition.

Several members of the public asked for more information about the use, tenancy, and arrangement of interior spaces.

Fred Meyer of 83 Hammond Street asked if extending the masonry of the Abbott building across over the former stable would work as a design.

Harvey Baumann of 19 Bay Street asked how much more expensive the leasing prices would be after renovation.

Susan Corcoran of 5 Brattle Street asked to see the shadow studies. Mr. Eclipse explained the different colors on the study maps. Ms. Corcoran asked how construction would affect the neighboring businesses, deliveries, sidewalks. How would negative impacts be mitigated? Mr. Brown indicated that construction would take about two years. Barricades would block the construction side at about the curb line.

Carole Perrault of 9 Dana Street asked about zoning compliance and signs. James Rafferty, attorney for the applicant, replied that no variances were requested for the building project but it would need a special permit from the Planning Board.

Olga Palensky of 108 Kinnaird Street asked about impacts on the sunlight in Brattle Square and the street life of the square. What would be the loading impacts on JFK Street, which was very narrow?

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street asked about the light from the glass addition on people who live in the vicinity.

Carole O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked if signs would comply with zoning. Mr. Rafferty answered that tenants had not yet been determined so it was premature to answer specifics about signs.

Dr. Solet asked if some of the mechanicals could be located in the basement instead of the roof. Mr. Rafferty answered that the basement would contain mechanical equipment.

Mr. King opened the public comment period.

Jason Porter of 25 Prescott Street remarked on his son's love for the Curious George Store and the loss of a toy store in Harvard Square. He said history was being destroyed.

Ms. Blier said the height of the additions would destroy the center of the square. The mechanicals would be visible.

DMr. Baumann said construction would last longer than expected and would create hell all around the square. He urged the Commission not to approve the application.

Mr. Williamson said the development of a mall-like building would do damage to Harvard Square. He said he was troubled by the corner entry to second floor retail. The original size of the Abbott Building's first floor glazing should not be exceeded. The scale of the glass addition was too big and not consistent with the guidelines. The Abbott Building should be protected from damage. He asked the Commission to err on the side of being conservative in their reading of the guidelines.

Ms. Kuelzer said this type of large building had not performed well in Harvard Square, citing 1 Brattle Square as an example. It was homogenous and not a successful retail pattern. Failure of upper floor retail could negatively impact other businesses. Harvard Square did not have to have 20' high retail spaces.

Mr. Taylor said the scale of Harvard Square was not large. The proposal was for approximately 4,000 square feet of glass curtain wall, largely unarticulated. He said he had designed a 25-story glass tower in Boston so he knew about the character of glass buildings. All views both day and night needed to be considered as well as the use and type of interior lighting.

Mr. Brandon thanked the Commission for its patience in involving the public. He hoped the Commission would ask for many more renderings. The top floor could be set back further. The Commission should get a clear idea of the sign package. Most people want small stores in the square.

Ms. Meyer said the building did not have to be tall in the center of Harvard Square. The context was incredibly important. She cited other oncoming projects at the Harvard Square theater site and parking lot on Church Street as reasons why the city needed a new study of the Harvard Square Conservation District.

Ms. O'Hare suggested that the Commission require compliant signs. She cautioned against the impact of light trespass from the glass addition.

Ms. Perrault said the owner had no ties to the community. She opposed the application as submitted. The view-shed of [these](#) buildings was one of the most significant in the city. The glass addition was incongruous. The district guidelines encourage streetwall design. The rooftop pavilion was the most egregious element. [It](#) would cast shadows and looked like an industrial warehouse. The storefronts looked homogenous. The design would erode community character and spirit of place.

City Councillor Nadeem Mazen of 1720 Massachusetts Avenue said it was an unpopular design. He cautioned that developers shouldn't jam things through the permitting process but should reach out to stake-holders before they buy big parcels as part of due diligence. The proposal was not good enough.

City Councillor Jan Devereaux said she had heard from many people who thought the proposal was a bad idea. It was the flagship building in Harvard Square and should not become merely a stage front with a new building behind.

Ms. Hoffman said the project was an example of the community being taken over by people who know the price of everything but the value of nothing.

Ms. Donahue said Harvard Square was an urban village. The proposal would have impacts on the rest of the Harvard Square community. The top floor addition would dominate the square. Retailers are a community and the existing buildings reflected that. People come to the square for small businesses not chain stores. She expressed concern that the construction [activity](#) would put other businesses at risk and mitigation measures needed to be enormous because of the enormous risk.

Ms. Palensky remarked that the removal of Au Bon Pain at Holyoke Center had been very disorienting to her experience of the square.

Ms. Corcoran said she wasn't against something new but found she found it ironic that the developers bought into the caché of Harvard Square and would end up destroying it.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet suggested using limestone instead of glass.

Mr. Sheffield thanked the proponents for a clear presentation. The contextual nature of the infill project needed more study. What was the best way to bridge the gap between the two end buildings? He suggested abandoning the glass and revisiting the window pattern of the Corcoran's building. The atrium level seemed unnecessary. Existing space could be re-allocated. Start from the inside out to find a better

circulation pattern. Being distinctive was important to Harvard Square but a smaller humanistic scale had been consistent. It was a daunting task, but if approached from a local perspective, it would get better.

Mr. Crocker said the design reminded him of a cruise ship. He said he would like to see an alternative material to glass for the addition.

Mr. Irving said the buildings needed to be treated appropriately. A new floor on top would be very hard to support unless it was invisible. It was chilling to hear that retail wants 20' heights per floor. He noted that there had been no positive feedback to the proposed use of the corner entrance for a second floor space. The proposal was too big and glass was not inevitable.

Mr. King said he was initially impressed with the architect's design intention to preserve as much as possible and treat each building separately in its exterior design. But he was concerned about the use of glass as a material and its effects should be studied. The renderings should show some sign alternatives. How would the upper story spaces be signed? Limits to signs and limits on light were important. He said the proposal was well presented and clear. The need to update the building and its systems was understandable. He expressed concern about multiple large projects being under construction at the same time. Things do change and the city survives.

Dr. Solet moved to continue the hearing until such time ~~that~~as the applicant gives notice to staff in time for adequate public notice, if the owner consents to waive a decision within 45 days. Mr. Rafferty agreed to a continuance. He noted that an outreach effort had begun. They hoped to return soon. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

#### Public Hearing: Landmark Designation Proceedings

**Case L-119 (continued): 135 Western Ave., Bluepower LLC, owner.** Consider draft study report for designation. *Written request received to continue study for two months.*

Mr. King recommended accepting the request of the owner to continue the hearing to December on the understanding and condition that the interim protection period of the landmark study would also be extended by the owner. Mr. Irving so moved. Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

#### Public Hearing: Demolition Review

**Case D-1402 (amendment): 146-148 Pearl St., by Campbell H. Ellsworth.** Demolish house (1855). Consider revised replacement project plans.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the case history. The Commission had found the existing house to be significant and preferably preserved in the context of the original replacement design proposal. The applicant was back with a modified proposal for the Commission's consideration.

Campbell Ellsworth introduced himself and his wife Natalia Bard. He described the shape of the lot, a previous proposal for two houses on the lot, then explained why they wanted to have an attached two-family and a larger yard for the best use of the lot for his family and business. The front unit was a small apartment attached to a larger family unit. Parking would be accommodated on the lot, hopefully with a tandem arrangement to preserve as much yard space as possible. He described the context of the

surrounding buildings. He described the changes they had made to the design proposal based on feedback from the first hearing. The entrance at the front was emphasized with a welcoming angled façade, a covered entry door, and a metal band over the doorway. The driveway would be ~~a conforming zoning compliant~~ at 10' wide. He described the materials as clean and articulated. The energy efficient features would include 12-13" thick walls, solar panels, capture of rain water, and Passive House building methods. He described the outreach efforts he made to the neighbors and the large number of letters of support received and forwarded to the Commission. Ms. Burks noted one additional letter that arrived too late to copy and distribute. This letter of support was from Christine Bulman of 23 and 23A Valentine Street.

Mr. King asked how the green roof would be supported. Mr. Ellsworth explained that green roofs are supported by adequate framing and the planting area is lined to be waterproof and drainage designed carefully.

Dr. Solet commended the applicant on the changes made to the windows so that there would be more natural daylight in the house.

Mr. Irving said the new design sings, except for the small kitchen window on the left. He suggested enlarging that window a bit. He asked about the finish of the wood. Mr. Ellsworth said he would probably use bleaching oil. Mr. Irving concurred, adding that clear coat finishes don't last.

Mr. King asked for public questions of fact.

Heather Hoffman asked if containers could be used on the roof deck instead of a green roof. Mr. Ellsworth replied it was a possible alternative. Ms. Hoffman noted that Boston Properties was using containers.

Marilee Meyer asked if the roof deck railing could be larger to balance the verticality of the house and play on the wide belt course of the building next door. Mr. Ellsworth noted the design suggestions.

Mr. King opened the public comment period.

Andrew Farrar of 4 Lawrence Street expressed his strong support for the replacement project's design. While the history of the existing house was appreciated, he did not support preserving it.

Chris Walsh of 26 Decatur Street echoed those remarks.

Christine Bulman of Valentine Street said she was a long-time resident and really liked the proposed design.

Carole Perrault of Dana Street said the owner had not adequately explored preservation of the existing house ~~and building~~ new construction behind it. The house had survived in its original configuration for over 160 years and was the only one of five that had remained relatively unchanged in its form. She asked how the Commission defines the public and the public interest when reviewing demolition applications. She spoke in opposition to the demolition of a significant and preferably preserved vernacular cottage. The city's heritage would be lost for private gain. The rhythm of the street would be lost. How could demolition be justified? She submitted her written remarks to the commission staff.

Ms. Harrington asked for a review of why the existing house could not be renovated. Mr. Ellsworth said he had explored it and revisited it since the first hearing. Unlike the successful design of a rear addition on Norfolk Street by Bill Boehm, an addition could not be hidden behind this little cottage. He noted that they had studied other ways to alter the existing house but it swelled and didn't retain the character of the historic house.

James Williamson noted a small house on Salem Street that had been torn down without a demolition permit and was required to be rebuilt. He also noted a house on Decatur Street that was renovated.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the home office, client parking, signage, and usable open space. Mr. Ellsworth answered that clients didn't come to his home office much because he usually went to them. Only 2 or 3 people worked with him in his office. The usable open space was open yard and garden, not paving.

Ms. Bulman remarked that the proposed replacement would not just benefit ~~just~~ the applicants' family but the preserved greenspace in the back yard would be valuable to many people that live around the lot. There were trees, birds, rabbits, and she was excited that a family would move there that would love that green space.

Mr. King closed public comment.

Ms. Harrington said she still considered the existing house to be preferably preserved.

Dr. Solet noted that the ~~review~~ building was not within the historic district. After a six month delay, would the existing house qualify for a landmark study? Mr. Sullivan answered that it probably did not rise to that level of significance. The applicant had made a good effort to humanize and soften the design. One factor was the difficulty of young families to find homes they can afford in Cambridge today. The house was not in sustainable condition now. It was home to a hoarder for many years. While any wood building can be recovered, it may not be a feasible prospect for this case. Dr. Solet asked if it could be moved. Mr. Sullivan answered that he did not think that was likely. There was not a lot available for a building such as this.

Mr. King said the Commission served the public well by having made the owner take a second look at all possible options. The design had been much improved and hopefully would be a model for a net zero house that was family friendly. If the Commission chose not to approve the new design, the applicant could do whatever he wanted when the delay expired in three months. Ms. Harrington agreed that the applicant had studied the options.

Mr. Irving moved to waive the remainder of the demolition delay at such time ~~that as~~ the applicant receives the necessary departmental approvals for the construction of the replacement design. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

#### Preservation Grants

**Case PG 17-1: 15 Carlisle St.**, by Just A Start, \$50,000. Strip, re-side, windows, porch.

**Case IPG 15-3: 580 Mt. Auburn St.,** by Mount Auburn Cemetery, \$50,000. Gate and fence restoration.  
**Case IPG 17-1: 5 Callender St.,** by Cambridge Community Center, \$100,000. Exterior restoration.  
**Case IPG 17-2: 1 Follen St.,** by Longy School (#4), \$100,000. Windows and masonry.  
**Case IPG 17-3: 134 Norfolk St.,** by St. Mary's Church (#5), \$75,000. Masonry repairs of rectory.  
**Case IPG 17-4: 11 Garden St.,** by First Church in Cambridge, \$100,000. Masonry and roof.

Mr. Sullivan reported on the FY17 grant fund balance of \$625,795. He showed slides and described the six applications, the scope of work for each, and made recommendations. He noted that the Cambridge Community Center had gotten a grant approved for \$100,000 in 2008 but didn't follow through and then again in 2013 for \$55,000 which was not used and was later rescinded also. They were back and he thought they could find the support they needed to complete the project this time.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the grants in the amounts recommended as follows, PG 17-1: \$50,000; IPG 15-3: \$50,000; IPG 17-1: up to \$100,000, good for one year; IPG 17-2: \$100,000; IPG 17-3: \$50,000; and IPG 17-4: \$100,000. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

#### Minutes

Mr. King made a correction to the time of adjournment on page 14. Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the September minutes, as corrected. Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

#### New Business: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 3694: 30 Elmwood Ave., by Anne MacFarlane.** Change exterior paint colors.

Mr. Sullivan described the proposed change of paint color. Mr. Irving moved to approve the application, subject to the ten day notice procedures. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

#### Director's Report

The Commission had no questions and dispensed with the Director's Report.

Ms. Harrington moved to adjourn, Mr. Irving seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:32 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public  
Who Signed the Attendance List on October 6, 2016**

Matt Simitis	21 Parker St	Susan Corcoran	356 Broadway
Virginia Coleman	2 Berkeley Pl	Campbell Ellsworth	267 Norfolk St
Geoffrey Rowley	11 Berkeley Pl	Gordon Moore	9 Rutland St
Susan Rowley	11 Berkeley Pl	Charlotte Moore	9 Rutland St
Mary Sutherland	8 Berkeley Pl	James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
Jeremy Silverman	8 Berkeley Pl	Caroline James	114R Beacon St, Somerville
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl	John Hawkinson	cambridgeday.com
Adam Hirsch	1 JFK St	Ken Taylor	23 Berkeley St
Craig Appel	11 Gerry St	Fred Meyer	83 Hammond St
Susan Labandibar	8 Brewer St	Hanna Walters	20 Pleasant Ave Somerville
K Gross	19 Arlington St	Jason Kurta	95 Prescott St
L Frazier	14 Arlington St	Melissa Kurta	95 Prescott St
Eleanor (Nell) Beram	70 Putnam Ave	Dr. Harvey Baumann	19 Bay St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana Street	Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Brad Bellows	87 Howard St	Andrew Farrar	4 Lawrence St
Dominick Jones	6 Hurlbut St	Carole Perrault	9 Dana St
Rosalind Michahelles	6 Hurlbut St	Chris Walsh	24 Decatur St
Paula Turnbull	POB 590179, Newton	Laura Donohue	90 Putnam Ave #1
Christin Bulman	23A Valentine St	Keri Kuelzer	19 Copley St
Chip Gaby	90 Mt Auburn St	Robert Than	9 Magazine St
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine St	Harlan Lieberman-Bey	66 Adams St Somerville

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.