

## Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

August 3, 2017 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Joseph Ferrara, Chandra Harrington, Jo M. Solet, *Members*

Members absent: Robert Crocker *Member*; Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate*

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

Public present: See attached list.

Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:08 P.M. He made introductions, reviewed hearing procedures, and dispensed with the consent agenda procedure. [Ms. Harrington arrived].

### Public Hearing: Alterations to Designated Properties and Properties Under Study for Designation

**Case 3779: 40 Cottage St., by Robin Chase & Roy Russell.** Alter front of the house, renovate and construct an addition to the ell, replace foundation, demolish garage.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and reviewed the fact that the property was under study for Landmark designation and therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness was needed for the proposed changes.

Mark Boyes-Watson, the architect, presented the plans for renovations, construction of an addition, removal of the garage, and replacement of the foundation. The single-family house would become a two-family. Zoning required two parking spaces, but they would seek a special permit to have only one. He noted the removal of the existing rear porch, the shape of the addition, and new PV solar on the ell. The windows on the front and left side of the front block of the house would be lengthened, in keeping with the Greek Revival style. If a special permit was denied, the windows on the right side would remain as they are.

Ms. Harrington asked about the basement windows on the rear elevation. Mr. Boyes-Watson explained that there would be a stairwell down to a basement door on the rear elevation.

Dr. Solet asked about the structure extending from the addition. Mr. Boyes-Watson said that it was a wood trellis for vines. The ell would have a slight setback from the corner of the front part of the house. The cornerboard would not be covered by the ell.

Mr. Boyes-Watson noted that there were no original windows left and the energy retrofit would include new ones. Mr. Barry asked if he had studied the cost of keeping the existing foundation vs. a new one. Mr. Boyes-Watson said that it would be more expensive to retrofit the existing foundation and it was the owners' preference to replace it. Mr. Irving asked about the exterior treatment of the foundation. Mr. Boyes-Watson said the existing was parged but they were considering brick.

Dr. Solet asked about the walkway to the rear unit. Mr. Boyes-Watson indicated its location on the site plan.

Mr. Irving asked about the roof planes of the addition and the front block and whether they would align. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied that they were intended to align. Mr. Irving asked where things stood with the Board of Zoning Appeal. Mr. Boyes-Watson said that the previous proposal had stalled in the

variance process with the BZA. The existing proposal would not need a variance but needed a special permit for certain window changes and additions as called out on the drawings.

Mr. Barry asked how the materials would compare for the front and back units. Mr. Boyes-Watson said there would not be a dramatic difference in the appearance of the materials. The windows would be of a different style on the rear unit.

Dr. Solet referred to a letter from the next door neighbors. She asked how the work on the foundation would be performed since it was only 3' away from the property line. Mr. Boyes-Watson answered that they did not yet have a contractor for the job, but it might be done with lifts.

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

Dave Fenchel of 36 Fairmont Street asked if the basement slab would be lowered. How would the chimney be protected? Mr. Boyes-Watson answered that the walls would be underpinned and the chimney would be supported. Mr. Fenchel also asked about the dimension of the corner boards and the extension of the ridge line at the very back of the house.

Mr. Irving asked for comments from the public.

Mr. Fenchel said it was the third hearing about this property he had attended. He said he appreciated the changes made to the proposal but that it still fell a little short in expressing the Greek Revival details of the original building. The roof deck was out of character. The edge of the soffit was very strong. The trellis was ambiguous. The lowered window wells were welcoming but the use of casements at the rear was jarring. He did not oppose the application but it could be made better.

Mr. Sullivan summarized a letter from the Elvings at 36 Cottage Street. They hoped to see only one parking space and a lighter material for the railing on the roof deck. Charlie Allen and Karen Parmenter at 44 Cottage Street wrote to suggest a different plan for the rear unit and the roof deck and discouraging replacement of the foundation. Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet asked if there was precedent for this type of addition. Mr. Boyes-Watson answered that it was intended as a garden room. The owners loved gardening and that was an important quality of the property. Dr. Solet encouraged him to look at the garden room at 8 Berkeley Street.

Mr. Barry noted that it was important to preserve the integrity of the front house and to differentiate the rear unit. Parking forward of the front wall plane of the house would be inappropriate.

Ms. Burks asked about the front door and sidelights and whether they were original. She asked what exterior materials would be preserved. Mr. Russell indicated that the door and the sidelights were not original. Mr. Boyes-Watson said there would not be exterior insulation board. The architrave would be maintained and other areas of the trim.

Mr. Ferrara said the addition worked in plan and massing. The panels under the double hung windows of the garden room were odd. The ell should set back from the front block a bit more.

Ms. Harrington asked that the amendments come back to the full commission. She asked for more detail on the windows of the garden room and recommended eliminating the trellis.

Mr. Sullivan offered a suggestion for wording of a certificate of appropriateness in principle for the massing of the addition on the condition that the following items be further developed and returned for approval to the commission: foundations, window type and pattern, setback of ell, exterior materials and details, railing design, and site plan and parking. Mr. Barry so moved with the consent of the owners to continue the hearing. Ms. Harrington seconded. Dr. Solet said the engineering of the foundation needed further investigation. The motion passed 6-0.

**Case 3826: 71 Mt. Auburn St., by Harvard Student Agencies, owner, o/b/o Zambrero restaurant, tenant.** Install an internally illuminated blade sign.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the storefront, formerly occupied by another Mexican restaurant.

Wendy Regan of Mandeville Sign explained the restaurant's mission and described the proposed blade sign. She reported that the Harvard Square Advisory Committee had asked Zambrero to stay open later at night and to provide more light on the exterior space, which led to the proposal for an illuminated blade sign. The LED lights were the lowest brightness available. The overall lumens would be 760, less bright than a 60 watt incandescent.

Ms. Burks explained that the zoning overlay allowed for a blade sign, but the internal illumination needed a certificate from the Historical Commission.

Mr. Barry and Ms. Regan discussed the access point for power and how to best minimize the conduit on the exterior of the building. Dr. Solet suggested a battery and a wireless switch.

There were no questions or comments from members of the public.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application, with details as described by Ms. Regan to minimize the conduit and keep the exterior detailing uncluttered. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Landmark Designation Proceedings

**Case L-120: 851-855 Cambridge St. Cambridge Hunting Street Realty Trust, owner.** Consider draft landmark designation report and make recommendation to city council.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized his report about the history and architecture of the combined buildings. A common façade had joined two buildings in 1989 and now comprised the bulk of their visible features. The property was associated with the successive immigrant groups that populated East Cambridge, but were not unlike many other buildings in that way. He advised that the property did not rise to the level of significance necessary for landmark designation. The buildings would still be subject to demolition review should the owner decide to take them down.

Mr. Barry asked about the proponent's claim of significance. Mr. Sullivan read the petition, which referred to it as being one of the original buildings on Cambridge Street.

There were no questions or comments from members of the public.

Dr. Solet said that her initial vote in favor of a landmark study had been because of the combination of the social history of the buildings and their owners. She was satisfied by Mr. Sullivan's assurance that the buildings would come to the Commission for review if a demolition permit were to be requested.

Mr. Ferrara moved to accept the staff recommendation to allow the landmark study to lapse with no further action. Mr. Barry seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

### Minutes

#### **Case D-1457: 29 Bellis Circle, by Nicole Barna & Dudley Wyman. Demolish house (1856).**

Ms. Burks showed slides and reported that the Commission's first hearing in July had resulted in a determination that the house was significant and preferably preserved and requested that the applicants investigate the details of the site drainage issues and engineering before returning for reconsideration. Dr. Solet and Mr. Ferrara noted that they had not been present at the previous hearing.

Tagore Hernandez, the architect for the project, reported that they had submitted a soils study. Water was present at 42" below grade. A layer of clay was also present above that. A structural engineer had been consulted and the foundation for the proposed new house redesigned as a result.

Evan Hankin, the structural engineer, explained that his concerns in designing the foundation were the water and the clay. The new foundations would have wide spread footings that would have a load of only 700 pounds per square foot. The current foundation was bearing 2900 pounds per square foot. He said he was comfortable that the new foundation would allow better soil bearing.

Mr. Hernandez showed slides to document the condition of the foundation and framing. There had been damage due to movement and water. Beams were cracked and needed replacement. A retrofit of the foundation would be complicated and costly. Plans for the appearance of the house had not changed, but the footings and drainage had been redesigned as a result of the soils report and engineering study.

Mr. Irving asked about the reasoning for not wanting foam insulation. Mr. Hernandez explained that spray foams created off-gassing vapors that could cause respiratory problems and eye irritation for some people. The only way to adequately insulate in the narrow walls of the existing house would be to use spray foam. Foam also did not allow a building's walls to breathe. The proposed method of house construction would allow for water vapor to pass in both directions. The materials would be mineral wool, recycled paper products, and plywood.

Dudley Wyman, an owner, said his family had moved to Bellis Circle in 2004 and loved the neighborhood. Though they had initially considered renovating, it quickly became complicated. The family's goals were to expand the basement, improve drainage, construct a new foundation, and have a bedroom for each of three daughters and a master bedroom. He described the proposed materials and the desire for optimal energy conservation. The neighbors had attended open houses to discuss the project and some were here to convey their support.

Mr. Barry asked why the existing building could not be rehabbed. Mr. Hernandez said the beams were all compromised. The owners wanted an open floor plan. The existing balloon frame did not allow for an open plan and new stairway. The amount of reinforcement needed would reduce the efficiency of the walls. Mr. Hankin confirmed that the cracks in the beams compromised their structural integrity.

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

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Street noted that a nearby condominium had been renovated with new piers and exterior drainage. Had they considered that approach? Mr. Hankin, through the chair, answered that the piers did not work with an open floor plan. Wider footings were needed.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Judy Hunt of 40 Bellis Circle spoke in support of the application. She said the proposed passive house was state of the art, exciting, and forward-thinking. It could become a historic house itself one day. The owners were friends and wonderful neighbors.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said she supported net zero construction for new houses, but not where an existing house would be demolished. A lot of energy got expended in demolition and disposal. The window arrangement looked like a barracks.

Michael Siegell of 33 Bellis Circle said he was a longtime resident and president of the neighborhood association. He said he had written a letter of support before the July hearing but had been unable to attend. There were many new houses on the street and everyone was motivated to preserve the quality of the neighborhood. He had not heard any opposition from neighbors. He urged the Commission to allow it to go forward so that the neighborhood would be less disrupted with winter construction.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Ms. Harrington said it was the Historical Commission's role to protect historic buildings. This one, built in 1856, was a perfectly good house. Mr. Irving he agreed. Although the passive house model was very good, it was unreasonable to impose a 21<sup>st</sup> century performance standard on a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century house. He said he remained conflicted.

Mr. Barry said the program did not seem to fit the resource. There were few open sites to buy in Cambridge to build a new home of this type. He said he might be convinced it was a worthwhile tradeoff.

Dr. Solet said she found the argument compelling. The first floor having three different levels was an added complication for a rehab. She agreed about the fortress-like quality of the high windows.

Ms. Tobin said she too was conflicted. The concern she had was not for these owners but the broader question of efficiency vs. historic homes. If the house was not a candidate for landmark status, the Commission's action was limited to a six-month delay.

Mr. Barry noted that the Commission's role was not detailed design review but to discern the greater public interest. He admired the quality of the design with his only critical comment being how it seemed to turn its back on the street. The public interest reflected by the opinions expressed at the hearing

was important. The open plan was a private interest. The idea of sustainable design for new construction was admirable. The existing house was not a rare, exemplary example of its type or age, but it was a very nice contributing building. The new house would not result in a loss of character in the neighborhood. He leaned toward allowing it because of the level of support voiced by the neighbors.

Mr. Ferrara agreed that the neighborhood supported the energy-efficient new house. The engineering report was convincing regarding the need to rebuild the foundation.

Dr. Solet saw no benefit in making the neighborhood wait for the start of construction. The design was not likely to evolve any further, though she hoped they would modify the front windows. The applicants had delivered the additional information that had been requested by the Commission.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the intent of the ordinance was to make applicants and people at large think twice before demolishing a significant building.

Ms. Harrington moved to confirm the previous finding of significant and preferably preserved. There was not a second to the motion.

Mr. Barry moved to suspend the remainder of the demolition delay to allow this proposed replacement design at this location, effective at such time that the permit approvals for the replacement were in place. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1 with Ms. Harrington opposed.

**Case D-1460: 64 Pearl St., by 64 Pearl Street LLC c/o Mahmood Firouzbakht.** Substantially demolish house (1827).

Ms. Burks showed slides and summarized the staff report about the architecture and history of the house, one of the oldest remaining houses on Pearl Street. The house had been altered with later cladding materials and by the removal of the original porch columns, but retained the 1½ story massing and small dormers on the front block. The garage was not considered significant.

Sean Hope, attorney for the owner, explained that the house was non-conforming due to the front and left setbacks; therefore, any additions above 10% would require zoning relief. The rear of the lot was currently paved and used for parking. The proposal would change much of the lot to permeable yard space with a 20' rear setback. The market demand was for larger units of three to four bedrooms. The proposed replacement design was of quality construction and materials, consistent with the neighborhood.

Jai Khalsa, the architect, presented the proposed replacement design - a 2½ story house with gabled roof, clapboard siding and traditional trim, dentilled cornice, trellised porch, and center entrance. The sidewall and part of the rear wall would be maintained but the front wall and other side wall were being removed. He showed the site plan for the lot, which included two houses of similar size.

Mr. Irving asked why the partial walls were to be retained. Mr. Khalsa replied that the existing curb cut was non-conforming but could be grandfathered if it was not a completely new building. Mr. Hope added that there was a previous demolition permit for just the back part of the house signed by staff.

A building permit had been issued for the new rear structure. Then the proposal for the front house changed to include additional demolition, which triggered the hearing requirement.

Ms. Harrington asked if they had considered rehabilitating the existing house. Mr. Khalsa replied that the development team did not find it to be a viable option.

Dr. Solet asked if any of the original features remained on the inside. It was a nearly 200 year old home and she said it could be made beautiful for someone. Mr. Hope answered that it had been butchered on the inside as a rental property and that not much care had been taken of it. Original materials had been replaced with low quality ones.

Mr. Sullivan said it was a locally rare house type. Ironically, there was a similar one on Prospect Street that Mr. Firouzbakht had moved and was restoring.

Beaver Spooner asked if there would be a basement. Mr. Firouzbakht said the basement would not be a separate unit, but would be living space for the house.

Mr. Sullivan reported on letters received. A letter from M. Alex Kats of Pearl Street objected to the demolition and indicated that the notice board had not been posted on time. Paul Cammarata of 80 Pearl Street wrote that the location was perfect for multi-unit housing near Central Square. Daryl Janes of Linnaean Street wrote in opposition of demolition of buildings in general.

Mr. Hope explained that the notice board had been moved from the fence to the front of a house within the last few days, but that it had been posted per the requirements.

Mr. Barry asked if dormers had been considered rather than the much taller roof. He could tell that some homage was being paid, but the new design was not consistent with the details of the old house. He said it would be better to build what was needed than to try to mimic aspects of historic design. Mr. Khalsa said they had considered a more contemporary, flat-roofed style but determined that a more traditional language would fit in better with the neighborhood. A similar project was being constructed nearby.

Dr. Solet asked if the trellis was used over the porch for zoning compliance. Mr. Khalsa answered that it was about the front setback, not the FAR.

Mr. Irving recommended trying a contemporary design, not one that tried to look historic but extended and distended the original massing. He would rather see a fresh piece of architecture on the street.

Dr. Solet moved to find the existing house significant for the reasons in the staff report. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Mr. Irving said the public interest would be served in having a family-sized single-family house. He was inclined to find the existing not preferably preserved.

Dr. Solet encouraged a renovation of the existing house for single-floor living for a senior.

Mr. Ferrara said it was worth the effort to examine reuse of the existing house. A six-month delay would allow time for that. Mr. Hope noted that the ell could not be retained and have the new house in the back that was already permitted. The front block of the front house was not large enough to be usable. A

one to two bedroom house was not a viable project economically. The site was two blocks from Central Square and there was a high demand for housing.

Mr. Barry said he had seen no studies for keeping the existing and building an addition. Mr. Khalsa said they had looked at additions, but to achieve zoning conformity, the front and sidewalls had to be pulled back. The volume and footprints worked for the site. A 1½-story house did not work. The skin could be more modern. He asked if such design amendments could be delegated to staff for approval.

Mr. Irving said the 1827 house was more or less gone already. It wasn't enough there to be restored. Dr. Solet disagreed and favored restoration.

Mr. Barry moved to find the existing house preferably preserved in the context of the current proposal and urged the applicants to return with more information and possibly with a more modern design. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

**Case D-1461: 207 Cambridge St., by Mark Lechmere LLC.** Demolish mixed-use building (1857) for revised replacement project.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described several other projects for this site that had been presented to the Commission in the past. The most recent design for a housing and retail mix needed a zoning amendment but that the petition had expired without a vote of the city council. He recommended finding the existing building significant, as before, for the reasons described in the written report.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Dennis Fevrick of 25 Gore Street said he had collected over 100 signatures in opposition to the previous proposal and in support of a CVS store as now proposed.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet moved to find the building significant for the reasons stated in the staff report. Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion passed 5-1 with Mr. Barry opposed.

Attorney Sean Hope said he was representing the case in the absence of James Rafferty, who was the lead attorney. He reported that there had been over a dozen meetings with the East Cambridge Planning Team and its subcommittee. The initial proposal for a CVS and demolition of both 227 and 207 Cambridge Street was met with opposition, so the mixed-use project that retained 227 Cambridge had been put forward to the city council with a zoning petition, but that had failed to pass. So now the owners returned to the original CVS idea but with a new design with varying roof heights on the façade and retention of the bank building. He noted that the Commission had found 207 Cambridge Street to be not preferably preserved in the context of the mixed-use replacement proposal last year.

Kevin Paton, principal at BKA Architects, presented the proposed replacement. The bank building would take center stage and would be the street-side entrance for the CVS store. There would be another entrance on the parking lot side off Third Street. The Cambridge Street façade was designed to incorporate the bank and three other apparent storefronts of about 30-35' width and with varied heights, but



with the bank being the tallest at 30'. Each storefront had a center-entrance design, but only the bank entrance was operable. The existing bank blade sign would be refaced and wall signs added to that.

Dr. Solet asked if the stores had separate or combined space inside. Mr. Paton explained that it was all one open store inside.

Mr. Barry asked about the width of the bank. Mr. Paton answered that it was about 35' wide. Mr. Barry said he was surprised the mixed-use proposal did not get support. He asked what had been found under the siding of 207 Cambridge Street. Mr. Paton said it had been documented and photographed. There was no evidence of the old trim. The quoins were gone.

Dr. Solet asked if the second floor of 207 could be used for another commercial use like a yoga studio. Robert Korff of Mark Lechmere LLC said multiple uses would need additional parking and the abutters would not support below grade parking.

Mr. Barry asked if the documentation report for 207 was available to the Commission. It was important information to help make their decision about whether it was preferably preserved. Could the building be kept and still have the CVS? Mr. Korff answered that there would not be enough space left to get CVS to sign on. The retention of 207 would require 10' setbacks between buildings and would greatly reduce the size of the CVS space.

Mr. Irving asked for comments from the public.

Charles Poirier of 18 Gore Street spoke in favor and asked the Commission to approve it.

Rose Ann Poirer of 18 Gore Street also spoke in support. She was excited to have a CVS in the neighborhood. Housing at the site would have made parking harder and would have probably meant more college kids partying.

Marie Elena Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street spoke in support of the project. She recalled the days when East Cambridge had four pharmacies and lots of other shops. It was not possible to prohibit franchises or chain stores under zoning. Cambridge Street was mostly restaurants and offices now, with not much retail for the residents. The previous mixed-use proposal with underground parking would have meant excavation 3' away from an abutter. She showed examples of other bank buildings that CVS had renovated successfully.

Betty Lee Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street said she also supported the current proposal.

Audrey Cunningham of 49 Gore Street said the housing would not have been affordable for people already living in the neighborhood. It would bring in more people and more cars.

Steve Lombardi, a lifelong resident, said there was already lots of new residential construction going on at North Point and those people would need a CVS too.

Anne Marie Dattero of 38 Gore Street testified that East Cambridge residents wanted to age in place. The CVS would be a walkable amenity. She didn't want the larger mixed-use building because it would limit visibility on the roads and sidewalks and cause more accidents.

Heather Hoffman of Hurley Street said she was not in support of the current proposal. The faux storefront facades were too much like Disneyland. She agreed with the other members of the public that the mixed-use proposal was too big for the site.

Dr. Solet said she was sympathetic to the argument for aging in place but she said she would like to see more entrances to the CVS. Mr. Korff said the building could be divided up into separate stores in the future if CVS left and other stores wanted to use it that way.

Mr. Sullivan asked why a proposal showed to him in June that would have saved both buildings did not go forward. Mr. Korff said CVS would not approve it because it meant less space for them. He noted it would also cost more to build. Mr. Hope added that the proposal did not pass Inspectional Services review because 207 Cambridge Street sits on a separate lot and the plan did not have 10' setbacks between buildings.

Ms. Harrington said the public support for the CVS was clear, but she was concerned about the blank wall and false front to the Cambridge Street façade.

Mr. Irving noted that 207 had been found not preferably preserved in the context of the mixed-use project and the current proposal was clearly beneficial to the neighborhood residents.

Mr. Ferrara said the Commission had asked for a building with more articulation and they got it. The proposed building could be retrofitted in the future to allow for multiple smaller stores.

Ms. Harrington moved to find the building not preferably preserved in the context of the current proposal. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion. Dr. Solet said she hoped that documentation of the building during the demolition process would be submitted for the Commission's records. The motion passed 6-0 and the members of the public broke out into applause.

#### Director's Report

John Hawkinson of *Cambridge Day* offered a correction. He noted that the city council vote to designate 66-68 Otis Street had taken place on August 7, not July 7. He also offered congratulations to Mr. Ferrara on his appointment as a full member of the Commission.

Dr. Solet noted that 168 Brattle Street was for sale and the Commission had previously made a decision that the statuary on the property would have to be removed when ownership changed. Mr. Sullivan said he had discussed this with the Realtor.

Mr. Barry moved to adjourn. Ms. Tobin seconded. The motion passed 6-0, and the meeting adjourned at 11:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public  
Who Signed the Attendance List on August 3, 2017**

Wendy Regan	676 George Washington Highway, Lincoln, RI 02865
Steven Anderson	25 Ann Mary Brown, Warwick, RI 02888
Rose Ann Poirier	18 Gore St
Charles Poirier	18 Gore St
Anne Marie Dattero	38 Gore St
Stephen Dattero	5 Collings Cir, Medford 02155
Betty Lee Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Bill Dines	69 Otis St
John Hawkinson	<a href="mailto:jhawk@mit.edu">jhawk@mit.edu</a>
Dave Fenchel	36 Fairmont St, #2
Audrey Cunningham	49 Gore St
Stephen Lombardi	48 Warren St
Beaver Spooner	329 Walden St
Aimee Reveno	47 Cottage
Marie Elena Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Dennis Fevrick	25 Gore St
Rose Marie Rosenberger	335 Hurley St
Lucille Ribello	330 Hurley St
Sean D. Hope	675 Mass Ave
Tagore Hernandez	30 Quincy St, Somerville 02143
Judy Hunt	40 Bellis Cir
Nicole Barna	39C Bellis Cir
Lakshini Mudunuri	33 Bellis Cir
Michael Siegell	33 Bellis Cir
Damien Chaniano	119 Chandler St, Boston

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.