

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

September 4, 2025 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (849 1178 9739) - 6:00 P.M.

Present: Chandra Harrington, *Chair*; Liz Lyster, *Vice Chair*; Gavin Kleespies, Paula Paris, Kyle Sheffield, *Members*; Florrie Darwin, Scott Kyle, Michael Rogove, *Alternates*

Absent: Joseph Ferrara, Yuting Zhang, *Members*

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

Public present: See attached list.

This meeting was held online with remote participation pursuant to Ch. 2 of the Acts of 2023.

The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

With a quorum present, Chair Harrington called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. She explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures. She dispensed with the consent agenda and noted that public questions and comments would be combined and limited to three minutes.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 5326: 17 Story St. (aka 127 Mt. Auburn St.) and 129 Mt. Auburn St., by 17 Story Street LLC. Relocate and restore house (17 Story). Demolish 3-decker (129 Mt. Auburn). Construct hotel and residential building.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the hearing had been continued from August 14, 2025 at which time the Commission had heard the presentation and taken public questions and comments, then paused the hearing. He said the Commission had also considered a landmark study petition on August 14. The Commission accepted the petition and initiated a landmark study process for the entire property. Review would commence as if it were already a designated landmark, per the ordinance. He read the Harvard Square Conservation District goals and guidelines for demolition, alterations and new construction and recommended that they be used for the project. The consideration of the applicants' design proposal would resume in this continued hearing. Any further continuances would also need applicant consent.

Patrick Barrett, attorney representing the applicant, introduced his client, Janet Jiang.

Ms. Jiang described her background, when she came to this country, and to Cambridge and how she built her business, family and friendships here. She said she wants the Harriet Jacobs house to be a place where people can come and learn about Jacobs. The project before the commission was the result of over five years of work with the city, the Legacy Committee, and various other Cambridge people. She asked for the Commission's and neighbors' support.

Mr. Barrett said they were open to a constructive conversation and while they couldn't make all the changes that some people may want but they would do what they could. He described the new information provided at the Commission's request including an economic summary, house moving feasibility, and a zoning summary. He noted a letter of support from the Jacobs Legacy Committee and listed several city councillors who were supportive of the project.

Tim Mansfield of Cambridge Seven shared his screen and presented the project plans, elevations and renderings. He described the materials including a terra cotta panel system for the façade. He noted

canted corners used to articulate the façade and step backs on the higher stories. He presented viewshed shadow studies.

Ms. Harrington asked for questions of fact from members of the Commission.

Ms. Lyster asked about the viewshed study and noted that views from private spaces were not in the Commission's purview.

Mr. Kyle asked about the terracotta panels. Mr. Mansfield said the fired clay product was a warmer than white color, not shiny, honed finish, and through color not a glazed surface. Mr. Kyle said he looked forward to seeing a sample and noted that slate on the roof would be a welcome feature. He asked if the café would remain facing Story Street. Mr. Barrett answered that ADA access was needed and worked best on Story Street. Business uses in residential districts were allowed in the Harvard Square Overlay District zoning but only on certain streets, Mount Auburn Street being one of them.

Mr. Rogove asked questions about the treatment of the house. Did it have enough space around it, why did the transition of the new building appear higher on the Story Street side? Mr. Mansfield described the approach from the west and the relationship of the third floor of the new building to the eave of the Jacobs house.

Ms. Harrington asked if the new building could be set back further from the Hilliard Street abutters. Mr. Barrett said they were pushing back in several areas on that side, but the priority was given to the Jacobs house and pushing the new construction as far away from that as possible. Many massing studies were considered, a number of which had been shown to staff. This was the best option.

Ms. Harrington opened the public question and comment period.

James Williamson of Churchill Avenue remarked that it was a scheme that only this huge project could save the Jacobs house. What about grants or fundraising? The proposed project was a travesty and enormous in scale. It is inappropriately out of scale with the residential neighbors.

Anita Patterson of 14 Hilliard Street asked if the extra bulk could be moved onto Story Street and away from the smaller buildings. She commented that the café was beautiful.

Orlando Patterson of 14 Hilliard Street noted that the Hilliard Street homes are townhomes, with all the living spaces in the back.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place expressed concern about traffic, loading, lighting, green spaces, sustainability. This would be the second largest building in the square.

Omar Garcia Portalatin of 7 Peabody Terrace spoke in support of the proposal because it would help with housing supply.

Nicole Bryant of 18 Hilliard Street said it didn't have to be the maximum size to be a viable project. She asked for views from the driveway on Hilliard Street.

Noah Nathan of 12 Hilliard Street agreed. The Commission could require a reduction in size.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said it was a very interesting project. She noted that the Legacy Committee had focused its support on the preservation of the house. She suggested that the café elevation

be more historic than modern in its design. The massing of the new building should move toward Story Street. She asked about the financial difference between six and eight stories. Mr. Barrett said it would be a loss of \$10-12M in value per story.

Sean Hart of 2036 Massachusetts Avenue said it was a great project. He said there had been a good conversation about materials but most of the comments had been about the new building, not the Jacobs house.

Kartik Sahni of 1590 Cambridge Street said he had difficulty finding housing twice. He expressed his support for the project but respected the concerns voiced by the neighbors. He noted that there are very few places that pay homage to persons of color, and he was glad to see that this would.

Denise Jillson expressed her ongoing support for the project. She said she had seen many of the potential designs. It would be good for the square to have people living in the square. The last residential project to have been built in the square was Raj Dhanda's project on Massachusetts Avenue.

Jessica Sheehan of 86 Plymouth Street said she supports the project. There had been time to find an alternative solution that would save the house, but it had not happened. The additional housing would help hundreds of people. Massachusetts was a good place to live, and more people would be coming for the freedoms it protects.

Nicola Williams of 8 Brewer Street noted she is an office tenant in the Jacobs house and started the Legacy Committee. She had witnessed Ms. Jiang survive four auctions of the property and said she had been receptive to the committee's mission. A hotel would introduce many people to Jacobs' story.

Ron Heifetz of 20 Hilliard Street said it was not a binary choice. The location was at a transitional point between the commercial and residential areas but the design did not reflect that.

Chris Mackin of 48 JFK Street noted he was a tenant in the Jacobs house. He explained the objective of the Legacy Committee was for people to have access to the building where they could learn more about Jacobs. The site would be developed with something. The current project was by-right under the current zoning. The developer understands the committee's desire for public uses in the building. An entirely private development without public access would not meet the mission.

Don Ware of 16 Hilliard Street said the Commission could consider the size of the building. It was premature to approve the project. The layout and number of residences was not known yet. Would they have kitchens? They could be purchased by international investors and not provide the wanted housing for Cambridge residents. They might be short-term rentals.

Rev. Dan Smith of the Legacy Committee spoke to the good faith effort of Ms. Jiang to work with the committee. He said he had compassion for the neighbors but at some point, the parcel would be developed.

Justin Saif of 259 Hurley Street said the proposal did a good job preserving the Jacobs boarding house and would make it a desirable destination in the square. It would provide at least 50 new homes, 10 of which would be affordable. He asked about carrying costs or cost for the city to purchase it. Mr. Barrett

said the revenue in taxes to the city would be many times what it is now. To acquire the building would cost the city more than \$17M.

[Mr. Sheffield arrived].

James Zall of 203 Pemberton Street said discrimination was still a problem today. The project would both preserve the Jacobs house and provide badly needed housing.

Nancy Berliner of 545 Franklin Street said was glad to learn of the project and about Jacobs. What was the purpose of the one-story addition on the right side? Mr. Barrett said it would provide accessibility and replace an existing addition.

Ned Melanson offered support for the project. It was a good balance of historic preservation and new construction. People would experience Cambridge for the first time at this hotel.

Serap Kantarci, noted she rents a parking space at the property. She said Ms. Jiang had been working hard to make something work. People will learn the history through this project.

Sam Burgess of 165 Main Street expressed support. It was a cool-looking project and the preservation was a great thing.

Mai Hassan of 12 Hilliard Street said she supported the project, in principle, but the new building would dwarf the Jacobs house and the neighboring houses.

Lily Ma of 35 Hilliard St said the project combined housing and preservation. The Legacy Committee's desire for public spaces would be met. Other buyers had passed on the property. The project should go forward to achieve a restoration of the house in a timely manner.

Robin Young of 10R Hilliard Street noted there would be no parking in the building. The project would destroy her investment in her home for only a handful of affordable units. The building should be lower; it overwhelms the Jacobs house.

Zion Sherin asked why the landmark study could not be completed first. Mr. Sullivan answered that a landmark study does not put a moratorium on the project. The applicant had a right to a decision within 45 days.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street said she had faith that the Historical Commission's process would get a good result. She said there had been a housing crisis in Cambridge for many decades. Everyone needed light and air and green space.

Louise Venden of 10 Rogers Street said she liked living in a tall building. She said there really was a housing crisis. Not even middle-income earners could afford to live here. Developers should not be demonized. They can't build at a loss.

Lance Greene commended the developers. The project was very inviting. It had been a long time since something of this scale had been built.

Ms. Harrington closed the public comment period and called for a five-minute recess. She reconvened the meeting at 8:42.

Ms. Darwin said her response to the project was overall positive, especially the efforts to preserve

and restore the house. The relocation would benefit the house. Public access to the house was a big plus. The curtain quality of the new building was appealing. She thanked the applicant for providing the additional information that had been requested. The height seemed too much for Story Street. The design met the goal for creative contemporary design but the size was not beneficial to the immediate neighbors.

Mr. Kleespies said that as long as more people work in Cambridge than live in Cambridge there would be a housing crisis. The design was very interesting. It would extend the commercial sector and change the character of the block. Harvard Square has always been changing. He compared it to the Liberty Hotel in Boston with a historic building and a new tower. Setting back the upper floors would make a good project event better.

Ms. Paris agreed with those comments. She noted that Story Street was already very dark. She asked if the privacy of the neighbors could be protected with some changes to the building.

Ms. Lyster asked about the potential of the site with no existing buildings. Mr. Barrett answered that 1/3 of the floor area is lost in preserving the house. The lot had the potential for 90,000 sf per zoning and 65,000 sf was proposed. Ms. Lyster noted the abrupt change in density from this site to the residential lots next door. Could the rear wall be pulled back? Mr. Barrett said that was the same issue they had been dealing with. For every 5' the building would lose 5-6,000 sf and 10,200 sf per story. He said they could look at step backs on the upper floors. He asked for direction on how to mitigate issues.

Ms. Harrington read through the project goals for the Harvard Square Conservation District and recommended the project be approved in principle.

Mr. Sullivan drafted language for a motion. He noted the importance of the freestanding nature of the Jacobs house in this proposal, saying he had seen other proposals where it was a raisin the pudding.

Mr. Kyle moved to find that the project, including the demolition of 129 Mt. Auburn Street, the relocation and restoration of 17 Story Street, and the construction of a residence/hotel, conforms in general to the Harvard Square Conservation District goals and guidelines, adopted in lieu of guidelines for the restoration of 17 Story Street, which will be completed during the landmark designation study, and approves, in principle, the project as proposed in the design presented September 4, 2025 and with a continuance of the hearing, with the applicants' consent, to October 9. Mr. Rogove seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Lyster, Kleespies, Paris, Harrington, Darwin, Kyle, Rogove) Ms. Harrington called for a recess and reconvened the meeting at 9:24 P.M.

Public Hearings: Demolition Review

Case D-1742: 122 Western Ave., by Erik Demaine. Demolish house (1855).

Case D-1743: 124-132 Western Ave., by Anthony Spears, Artis Spears, & Andrea Spears Jackson. Demolish funeral home structures (1856/1860 with later additions).

Mr. Sullivan reported that at the August 7 meeting, the Commission found the existing buildings to be significant but had not yet voted on the matter of whether they are preferably preserved in the context of the replacement building. The Commission had offered suggestions for how the design could be improved.

Patrick Barrett, representing DND Homes and the Spears family, said he had hosted two meetings since August 7 with the neighbors. The feedback had related mostly to concern about height and setbacks. He introduced the architect, Dan Anderson of Anderson Porter Design.

Mr. Anderson shared his screen and presented the amended design drawings. He described the materials and summarized the changes made to setbacks, materials, height, and bay locations. The side and rear setbacks were increased overall with generous insets midday on each side of more than 10 feet from the property line. The building footprint at the rear had been simplified, allowing for more open space. The front bays had been reduced from four to two. The materials on the upper floors are proposed as standing seam metal and the cladding below was still proposed to be natural stone, but different coursing has been studied.

The chair apologized for an interruption in the presentation to take care of another item of business.

Mr. Sullivan explained that due to the late hour, he approached the applicant for the next case, D-1753: 73 Kirkland Street, and he had agreed to a postponement until September 11.

Ms. Darwin moved to continue the hearing, with the applicant's consent, to September 11, 2025 at 6:00 P.M. on Zoom. Ms. Paris seconded the motion. The Zoom details would be shared on the Commission website and city calendar. The motion passed 5 in favor and 2 abstentions in a roll call vote. (Paris, Harrington, Darwin, Kyle, Rogove in favor; none opposed; Kleespies and Sheffield abstained due to inability to attend on Sept. 11.)

Mr. Anderson resumed his presentation for Western Avenue. He described the roof level changes including a landscaped roof deck for residents.

Ms. Harrington asked for questions of fact from the commissioners.

Ms. Darwin asked the distance to 138 Western Avenue, noting there would be loss of privacy to that home that had a front door facing the proposed new building. Mr. Anderson answered that the closest point to the property line was 6.2 feet. The balconies were located beyond the rear wall of 138 Western.

Mr. Kleespies acknowledged several improvements to the design. He asked if they would consider a gesture of a setback or design element at the fourth story to relate to the cornice line of 114 Western Avenue. Mr. Anderson answered that they had studied dropping the bays to the fourth floor but it did not look well organized. A step back would impact the unit depth. Mr. Kleespies asked if the unit leases would prevent units from being used as short-term rentals. Mr. Barrett noted that only a third of short-term rentals in Cambridge are registered and compliant with the city's ordinance. It was a difficult thing to regulate. But the owner could put a clause in the leases disallowing it.

Mr. Sheffield thanked the team for the design work they had done. He explained that it was hard to understand why certain decisions were made when the floorplans were not included. How did you come to the decisions about what to change? Mr. Barrett said it was his decision not to show floorplans because it's not within the Commission's jurisdiction and because he didn't want his clients to be locked into certain arrangements. He said no units would be located in the basement. The basement would have

amenities and bicycle parking. Mr. Anderson assured him that they were looking to tighten up the efficiency of the layout all the time. The floor-to-floor height was 11'. The parapet was approximately 12 inches. Enough to contain the green roof system.

Ms. Harrington opened the public question and comment period.

Kathi Bennet of 39 Pleasant Street asked about the rear setback change, number of rear windows, ceiling heights, and maintenance of the rooftop. Mr. Anderson set the smallest setback was 5' but it had been increased at the other two projecting corners. The reduction in the zig zags resulted in larger areas of open space. There were 72 windows on the rear elevation. Ceiling heights were 8.5 to 9'. The building management would be responsible for maintenance of the roof. Ms. Bennett said Cambridge couldn't solve the world's problems. The developer wants to shove the building down the neighbors' throats. The Coast was a forgotten district.

Marilee Meyer commented that the changes were a great step in the right direction. Stepping back the top three stories would look top heavy. She asked if the back doors were to individual units or shared egress. Mr. Anderson said they provide direct access for the garden level units.

Thomas Goreau of 37 Pleasant Street said his home was in the greatest shadow of the building; it would kill his garden. He expressed concerns about storm runoff, infiltration, flooding of his property and fire threat to the neighborhood. He said replacing 200 year-old houses was not a sustainable practice.

Allison Crump of 9 Kinnaird Street said she was disappointed to see the insignificant tweaks to the setbacks. She encouraged the Commission to find the existing buildings preferably preserved and to delay demolition for a year.

Nancy Carpenter of 27 Kinnaird Street said the size, lack of parking, and congestion were all at odds with the character of the neighborhood. It was the same massive structure as before.

Marina Atlas of 37 Pleasant Street was granted extra time. She asked about risk assessment, hazards and toxins. She said she needed to know if her neighbors and child would be safe or if they would be dusted with carcinogens. Many health impacts were possible. How many people would be looking at her child in her own back yard. How many studies had been requested?

Jennifer Brill of 138 Western Avenue said she was a social worker and supported affordable housing but she felt as if she were being squeezed out of her house by the proposed new building. Most of the windows in her house faced the new building.

Brendan Hickey of Concord Avenue asked how many sf had been lost to the increased setbacks. Mr. Anderson said the project still targeted 64,000-66,000 sf. Mr. Hickey asked if it represented the size of one unit? Mr. Anderson indicated in the affirmative. Mr. Hickey noted the loss of income and noted that the circulation had been tightened up.

Justin Saif said he supported the project and letting the Spears move forward with their lives.

Margaret Goreau of 37 Pleasant Street asked about the balconies. She said she expected a compromise but was very sad that they would no longer be able to see the sky. She begged for the project not

to go forward. Mr. Anderson answered that zoning allowed the balconies to be as close as 3.5 feet from the property line.

Carol Greenwood of 10 Kinnaird Street said the overall size, scale, and massing had nothing to do with the character of the neighborhood. The existing large buildings on Soden and Western were mitigated by the generous setbacks and parking. The project would negatively impact the neighborhood.

Sean Hart spoke in support of the project. The Commission does important work but the result of the upzoning was that the board was being expected to litigate issues that weren't in its purview.

James Zall said people were constantly being priced out of their homes. Creating more housing was very important.

Ms. Harrington closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan noted that there were many dimensions to the public benefit. Promoting historic preservation was one but adding housing units was another.

Ms. Harrington said it was a difficult case. She thanked the applicants for the changes made to the plan and design.

Mr. Kyle said he was uncomfortable with the project. It did not seem appropriate.

Mr. Kleespies said that as a neighbor he hates the project, but reminded himself that its purview was not what he likes or hates. The demolition of three significant buildings was to be regretted. The reality was that another developer would proposed something similar. This commission should not be the only venue for people to voice their concerns about the density and character of new developments.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the loss of 1000 square feet would be spread over five stories and the perimeter of the building. Mr. Anderson agreed. Mr. Sheffield said the increased setbacks would not result in the loss of a unit but would be spread out over the whole building. Western Avenue was a major artery and not an inappropriate place for increased density. He thanked the architect for the extra detail of the green roof, changes to balconies, and the parapet at the fifth floor.

Ms. Darwin appreciated the efforts of the proponents to tweak the design. Greater setbacks and fewer balconies would be better for the neighbors.

Mr. Sheffield said the Commission could not control the zoning code. But it could ask questions and nudge the design to make small improvements.

Mr. Rogove suggested that a historic marker be installed to document the history of the site and the contributions of the Spears family to the community.

Ms. Harrington noted that oral histories with Anthony and Artis Spears had been recorded. That history could be promoted. She said it was her view that the existing buildings were not preferably preserved in the context of the new units of housing that would be created here. Any developer would proposed a project similar to this. She did not see a benefit to a demolition delay.

Ms. Paris noted that the oral histories were completed and would be archived at the public library. She said the complex issues of zoning, housing, and community impacts had been conflated and placed at

the feet of the commission. This is the first such demo case at the full scale of the new zoning. The issues were not binary.

Mr. Kleespies moved to find the existing buildings not preferably preserved in the context of the amended design proposal described at this hearing. Mr. Rogove seconded the motion, which passed 6-1 in a roll call vote. (Paris, Kleespies, Sheffield, Harrington, Darwin, Rogove in favor; Kyle opposed)

Mr. Sheffield moved to adjourn. Ms. Darwin seconded and the motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Paris, Kleespies, Sheffield, Harrington, Darwin, Rogove, Kyle) The meeting adjourned at 11:42 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks

Sarah L. Burks, Preservation Planner

Members of the Public Present on September 4, 2025

Martin Cafasso	73 Kirkland St.
Dan Anderson	Anderson Porter Design
Mariana Ibanez	73 Kirkland St.
Patrick Barrett	for 17 Story St.
Tim Mansfield	Cambridge Seven
Erik Demaine	122 Western Ave.
Janet Jiang	17 Story St.
Anthony J. Spears	124-132 Western Ave.
Ender Saricay	DND Homes, Burlington, MA
Paul Toner	City Council
Cathie Zusy	City Council
Ayesha Wilson	City Council
Nancy Berliner	545 Franklin St.
Beth Carroll-Horrocks	11A Brewer St.
Carole Wells	1, 3, 4 and 5 Sedgwick Rd.
Neal Carney	77 Kirkland St.
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Place
Elizabeth	9 Washington Ave., Unit 1
Catherine Benedict	11 Story St Apt. 2
Anita Patterson	14 Hilliard St.
Allison Crump	9 Kinnaird St.
Lucy Engels	47 Wendell St., Apt 1
Lily Ma	35 Willard St.
Alex Bob	344 Broadway
James Zall	203 Pemberton St.
Rayshauna Gray	4 Mt. Auburn St.
Victoria Wang	130 Mount Auburn St.
Ann Lambert	130 Mt Auburn St.
Jamie Gordon	84 Fitchburg St., Watertown, MA
Daniel Toner	
Nancy Carpenter	27 Kinnaird St., Unit 1
Carol Ross	3 Soden St.
Carol Greenwood	10 Kinnaird St.
Beth Hedges	610 7th St., Santa Monica CA
Marina Atlas	37 Pleasant St.
Margaret Goreau	37 Pleasant St.
Thomas Goreau	37 Pleasant St.
Yongjoo Kim	20 University Rd.
Ted Achtem	18 Hilliard St.
Justin Saif	259 Hurley St.
Louise Venden	10 Rogers St.
Noah Nathan	12 Hilliard St.
Raine Figueroa	9 Hilliard St.
Kathryn Heifetz	20 Hilliard St.
Jennifer Brill	138 Western Ave.
Ronald Heifetz	20 Hilliard St.
Matt Martin	16 Acorn St.
Jimena Bermejo	13 Pleasant Pl. #2
Kathi Bennett	39 Pleasant St.
Adam Wolfberg	5 Kinnaird St. Unit 1
Mark Lax	109 River St., 1A
Richard Boudreau	39 Pleasant St.

Francis Burns	305 Broadway
Summer Rose	14 Plympton St.
Linda Neshamkin	5 Monument Sq.
Sam B	165 Main St.
Sean Hart	2036 Massachusetts Ave.
Arlyne Jackson	369 Franklin St., Apt. 402
Zion Sherin	401 Washington St. Apt. 3R
Carol Pieper	55 Kirkland St.
Mai Hassan	12 Hilliard St.
Arlene Miller	75 Richdale Ave., Ste. 10
Jessica Sheehan	Plymouth St.
R Pina	Soden Street
Chris McHugh	PO Box 107 Billerica, MA
Kartik Sahni	1590 Cambridge St.
Eugenia Tseng	1082 Commonwealth Ave.
Don Ware	16 Hilliard St.
Omar Garcia Portalatin	7 Peabody Ter.
Stephen Ortega	41 Aberdeen Ave.
Marc Levy	3 Potter Pk., #1
Yassien Youssef	100 Sudbury St., Boston, MA
Christopher Mackin	48 John F. Kennedy St.
Robin Young	10 Hilliard St.
Sherman Starr	9 Hilliard St.
Helen Walker	43 Linnaean St.
Daniel Smith	HJMC
Laurel Shugart	984 Memorial Dr.
Erika Pereira	5 Chester St.
Nicola Williams	8 Brewer St.
Anna Tayag	24 Harvard Way
Mark Asuncion	34 Caswell Ave
Alex Steinbergh	3 Clinton St. Apt 3
Lucy Patton	333 Walden St.
Cathy Uy	6 Grant St.
Charade Puno	4 University Rd.
Peter McLaughlin	50 Regent Circle
Satrick Uy	6 Grant St.
Gavin Colbert	16 Marie Ave, Apt 1
Lucy Wells	158 Glendale Ave.
Eric Chan	77 Kirkland St.
Caleb & Christine Daniloff	33 Pleasant St., Unit A
Andrea Spears Jackson	124 Western Ave.
Serap Kantarci	129 Mt. Auburn St.
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St.
Catherine Forde-Augustine	28 Suffolk St.
Melissa Peters	7 Greenough Ave.
Ozan Dokmecioglu	6 Burnham Road, Lexington, MA
Brendan Hickey	54 Concord Ave.
John, Jessica & Jocelyn et al. Walker	150-152 Whittemore Ave.
Nancy Seidman	9 Cleveland St.
Neil Miller	425 Massachusetts Ave.
Greene Lance	19 Golden Ave.
Luis Mejias	18 Plymouth St.
James Williamson	30 Churchill Ave.
Sean Kelly	1654 Massachusetts Ave.

Yuyang Liu	3 Linnaean St.
Ned Melanson	163 Allston St.
Andrea Landman	246 Walnut St., Ste 201
Samuel Polzin	31 Garfield St.
Timothy Johnson	907 Main St.
Zelma Evelyn	345 Washington St.
Celestine Heywood	301 Walden St.
John DiGiovanni	50 Church St.
Kate Hainer	38 Valentine St.
David Hattis	393 Broadway
John Hawkinson	Cambridge
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St.

Note: See <https://www.cambridgema.gov/historic/permitsApplications/projectplansandstaffreports> for a link to the Zoom meeting recording.