

## Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

February 16, 2017 - 795 Massachusetts Avenue, City Hall - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, Jo Solet, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Kyle Sheffield, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Members absent: none

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

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:03 P.M., made introductions, and explained the hearing procedures. He announced the resignation of member Shary Berg.

Dr. Solet moved to go into executive session to discuss *Gifford v. Cambridge Historical Commission and Harvard Collection, LLC*, a matter currently in litigation. Mr. Irving seconded the motion. Mr. King read the roll of those present and the vote on the motion was 8-0, with King, Irving, Barry, Crocker, Harrington, Solet, Sheffield, and Tobin voting in the affirmative.

The Commission left the Sullivan Chamber to meet the City Solicitor in the Ackermann Room.

At 6:45 P.M. the Commission returned to the Sullivan Chamber and Mr. King reconvened the open session [Alternate member Mr. Ferrara arrived during the executive session.] He delegated alternates Susannah Tobin, Kyle Sheffield, and Joseph Ferrara to vote in that order.

### Public Hearing: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 3678 (continued and amended): 1-7 & 9-11 JFK St. and 18-20 Brattle St, by Harvard Collection LLC c/o James J. Rafferty, Esq.** Renovate 1-7 JFK St and 18-20 Brattle St. Demolish building at 9-11 JFK St. (with frontage also on Brattle St.) and construct new infill building, alter storefronts, and construct upper story addition.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the previous hearings on this case in September, October, and December 2016. He read the vote taken at the December meeting approving in principle the demolition of the Corcoran's/Urban Outfitter's building (9-11 JFK St.) at the center of the three buildings.

William Brown of the applicant, Equity One, introduced his team.

David Chilinski, the architect, showed slides that included an historic image and the original architectural plans for the Abbot Building. He also described the changes that were made to the building in subsequent years. He looked forward to working with staff or the architects committee on the details of restoration. He showed slides of the proposed design for the two historic buildings and the new infill building. He noted that the rooftop penthouse (or pavilion) had been reduced in size; the corners had been softened and rounded, and the front pulled further away from the corner of JFK and Brattle streets. He

described the evolution of the design of the infill building, which had been simplified in its ornamentation, cornice design, etc. so that it would be subsidiary to the historic buildings. Additional perspective renderings included nighttime views. He described the proposed new storefronts, noting some individuality in the infill storefronts.

Dr. Solet asked about the rendering of retail goods in the corner space of the Abbot Building. Mr. Brown replied that it had always been designed to contain some retail display space, but it had now been enlarged to 1,100 sf of ground floor merchandise space. Attorney Rafferty indicated that the elevator and stairs had been moved further back.

Mr. Irving asked about the lighting in the penthouse pavilion. Mr. Chilinski answered that it was envisioned as a restaurant, which would have lower lighting levels than retail or office uses.

Mr. Barry noted that the number of stores could impact the exterior character of the building. Mr. Brown said they would work toward having smaller retail spaces. Mr. Barry asked about the height of the pavilion. Mr. Chilinski said that it would be 16' high at its highest point, but would be considerably lower at the eaves. Mr. Barry asked about the material of the roof of the pavilion. Mr. Chilinski answered that it would be light in color and a high quality metal material. Mr. Sheffield asked about the top 12" of the roof, and Mr. Chilinski answered that it would include the deck, insulation, and green-roof trays.

Mr. King asked about the sidewalk width. Mr. Chilinski estimated it was 8-10' wide. When repaired, the grades would be improved along Brattle Street. Mr. Rafferty said the basement vaults would be filled in.

Dr. Solet asked about servicing the buildings. Mr. Chilinski indicated the location of the service doors on JFK Street. Trash would be kept internally and would be picked up from JFK Street. Mr. Ferrara asked about mechanical equipment. Mr. Chilinski said the intent was that the mechanical area at the back would extend above the peak of the roof only a couple of feet. The bulk of it would be recessed in a well at the back of the building.

Mr. Barry noted that the corner details of the historic building would be preserved and visible. He asked how the floor-to-floor height between the second and third floors in the Abbot Building had been established. Mr. Brown said the second and fourth floor heights were the same as the existing, but the third floor would be removed. Mr. Sheffield asked if the rear wall of the Abbot Building would remain. Mark Eclipse, architect, answered that a portion of that wall would remain and would be visible through the glass from the JFK side.

Mr. King opened the floor to questions of fact from the public.

Michael Brandon of Seven Pines Avenue asked about the appearance of the loading doors and Mr. Chilinski described them in more detail. Mr. Brandon asked about the scheme that would have kept the Corcoran Building. Mr. Rafferty answered that the original plans presented in September and October

kept all three buildings with a glass addition above. Mr. Brandon asked about a later design referenced in the December minutes that was discussed with staff. Mr. Brown said there had been lots of ideas and that design was an iterative process. The plans presented to the Historical Commission as part of the application had all been made available.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked if the glass at the Abbot Building's corner would be curved and if the door would be brought forward to engage with the columns. Mr. Brown answered affirmatively. The intent was to restore it to its 1909 appearance.

Mr. Williamson asked if the signs on the rendering were part of the application. Mr. Brown replied that they were generic examples. Mr. King said he expected signs would come back for review unless they were zoning compliant. Mr. Williamson asked about the individuality of storefront designs. Mr. King said that there would be a future discussion about these types of details and asked that the discussion focus on the new construction.

Mr. Williamson asked about the retail space on the second floor. Mr. Brown said the goal was to attract a single tenant there. He asked about a note on the plans: "63,400 – basement or mezzanine." Mr. Brown said that the figure referred to the allowable square footage with a 4.0 FAR. They had a surplus of 3,000 or 4,000 square feet that could be allocated to the basement or the mezzanine. He told Mr. Williamson that the basement had about 16,000 square feet. Mr. King noted that the Commission did not review interior space. Mr. Williamson stated that reducing space in the basement and third floor was driving the addition of the pavilion and asked if the Commission would approve a plan that was not specific about the number of stores or doorways? Mr. Chilinski said they would return to discuss those details.

Mr. Williamson asked about railings, plantings, and other features of the pavilion. Mr. Chilinski displayed a rooftop view. He indicated that the railing would be combined with a planter.

Susan Miller-Havens of 18 Brattle Street asked if the Commission would be discussing both the pavilion and the infill. Mr. King said the Commission could separate the issues, understanding from the correspondence that the pavilion was controversial.

Lisa Berkman asked if the Commission had considered not allowing the top floor. Mr. King noted that this had not been presented as an option.

Pebble Gifford of 15 Hilliard Street asked about entrances and circulation inside the building. Mr. Chilinski said there would be an entry at 18 Brattle with an elevator to access the upper floors of 18 Brattle and the third floor of the infill building and the Abbot Building. A second elevator would access the penthouse. There would be entrances to the stores around the building. The corner entry to the Abbot Building would lead to ground floor retail space and to the second level.

Carol O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked if the pavilion level would have dimmer lighting than the retail levels. Mr. Brown said that was the intent; they wanted the space to be occupied by a restaurant.

If it did not end up being a restaurant he would return with a photometric study. Ms. O'Hare asked about lighting on the terrace. Mr. Brown said it hadn't been designed yet. He agreed to return with a lighting plan.

Nancy Gold of 12 Hubbard Ave. said the Abbot Building would be destroyed by the project. The December vote shouldn't have happened because of inadequate notice. Mr. King ruled her comments out of order.

Beth Ramsey of 14 Walker Street asked how the Commission could vote on an application without complete plans.

Olga Pellansky of 108 Kinnaird Street asked if there would be extra traffic and trucks on JFK Street. Mr. King said the traffic impacts would be addressed at the Planning Board. Ms. Pellansky asked about construction time and impacts. Mr. Brown estimated that the construction would take 27 months. The heavy construction portion would be approximately 18 months. She asked about the impact of the new building on the north side of Brattle Street. Mr. Chilinski described the previous shadow study, and noted that the impacts would be less because the pavilion had been reduced in size.

Abra Berkowitz of 253½ Broadway asked how the new structure with the pavilion could be considered subservient to the Abbot Building. Mr. Chilinski cited the simplified cornice of the new building, and said the pavilion would not be very visible in relation to the Abbot Building due to its setbacks.

Judith Singer of 14 Walker Street asked about parking. Mr. Rafferty explained that the Planning Board did not encourage new parking in the overlay district and allowed developers to pay into a parking fund, probably at the rate of 8-10 spaces for the new retail space. Ms. Singer asked if there would be a valet stand for the restaurant; Mr. Rafferty replied that the south side of the street would not be conducive to this. He cited the valet parking available for customers of restaurants on Winthrop Street, but said that many restaurants got along without it. Mr. King thanked Ms. Singer but said that parking was not relevant to the Commission's jurisdiction.

Ms. Singer asked about conflicting information about lighting in retail and restaurant spaces; would it be brighter or subdued? Mr. Brown agreed he had made both statements. He was committed to returning to the Commission if the pavilion was not used as a restaurant

Tim Shaw of 147 Mt. Auburn Street asked about the division of interior spaces shown on the plans. Option A seemed less efficient than Option B; did that mean B would be preferred? Mr. Brown said that retail tenants were used to odd configurations in the 600-1000 sf range. Mr. Shaw asked about the construction of the green roof. Would the structure be sufficient for the weight of the soil? Mr. Chilinski explained that about 4" of soil in shallow trays was needed for a green roof planted with sedum. Mr. Shaw asked about the grease trap pump-out location. Mr. Brown said that it had not yet been determined; wet trash would be held inside until it could be picked up.

Laura Donohue of 90 Putnam Avenue asked about how lights from the building would affect tenants in the apartments across JFK Street. Mr. King said that would be an issue for the Planning Board; the Commission's jurisdiction extended only to features visible from a public way.

Kathy Richman of 31 Jay Street asked about the light impacts on Brattle Street from the pavilion. Mr. Chilinski showed a rendering. Mr. Brown said he did not have a night rendering from that direction.

Mr. King called a recess at 8:47. The Commission reconvened at 9:02. During the recess Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of the goals for the Harvard Square Conservation District.

Mr. King asked for public comment. He announced a three-minute limit per speaker and described the Commission's jurisdiction, noting that it did not include matters of use, tenancy, noise, or lighting.

Tim Mudarri of 112 Fayerweather Street presented a Powerpoint prepared by Suzanne Blier who asked him to present it for her. He also presented a video viewshed analysis by Paul Cote of the Harvard Graduate School of Design. He said the pavilion would be more visible than indicated in the architectural renderings especially if the patio were lit, and that it would be an inappropriate addition to the square. Mr. Barry asked what the data was based on. Mr. Mudarri replied the January 10, 2017 drawings.

Carole Perrault of Dana Street said she felt the application as amended was incongruous with the character and context of Harvard Square. She felt it was a violation of the Conservation District goals as it razed the Corcoran Building and would diminish the façades of two other structures. She expressed concern over the internal programming affecting the exterior treatment, making three distinct buildings become one. She stated concern over the homogenization of cornice lines. The project reflected a conflict between human values and profit. She reminded the Commission that it had power to impose dimensional requirements beyond the zoning regulations. She recommended eliminating the pavilion.

Francis Donovan of 42 Irving Street stated that the Abbot Building was the most recognized structure in Harvard Square and making all three buildings the same height would diminish it. He asked why the infill had to make all the buildings the same height, and said it was to support the pavilion. He hoped the Commission would limit the height. He expressed concern about maxing out the FAR for the site and doubted that could be of any benefit to the Conservation District.

Adriane Landsman showed historic photos and said that use of the Abbot building for a mall was a bad idea and would fail Harvard Square. She referenced 1105 Massachusetts Avenue and its failing stores on two levels. She said that the Curious George Store was on a human scale and changing that space to a lobby would leave the space feeling barren.

A member of the audience read a letter from Jan Devereux, who was unable to attend. Mr. King noted that her letter had been received and made part of the record.

Michael Brandon thanked the Commission for its willingness to encourage input. He expressed

disappointment in the Commission's December approval of the demolition of the Corcoran's building; he had hoped it would be reused. He expressed concern that the size of the infill would diminish the prominence of the Abbot Building and that the pavilion was completely inappropriate for Harvard Square. He hoped that if the project received approval the Commission would impose strict conditions requiring the applicant to come back for storefronts, signage, awnings and lighting, but he hoped it would be denied with the recommendation to lower the infill height.

Pebble Gifford said in her opinion as a real estate professional there was a bubble in Harvard Square. She felt concerned with the large demands of this project and that if it were approved other developers would be similarly emboldened. The pavilion was the tail wagging the dog, creating an expensive Harvard Square that would separate the rich from the poor.

James Williamson noted that two notices were sent by Equity One for their January 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. The first one mistakenly said this meeting would be at the Senior Center. A second notice was also incorrect. He was concerned that this casual sloppiness would foretell what to expect from the project's construction. He read a quote from James Winthrop to the effect that private interests "cannot subsist on the ruin of the public." He said that the project needed to be fair to the people of Cambridge, especially as everyone was opposed to it. He emphasized that the review criteria should include the project's effect on sidewalks and impact on retail and that it would be disgraceful if the pavilion were approved.

Connor O'Donnell of Ware Street said that many residents of Cambridge were very pleased with the proposal and that many had come to the public forums. He lauded the rooftop landscaping. He noted that he was a current tenant and that the new owners had done a good job of helping him to find a new space and deal with the logistics of moving.

Susan Miller-Havens of 18 Brattle Street said that it was really about architecture – noting that when she looked above Urban Outfitters it looked like a tooth was missing and felt that filling it in was driven by financial considerations. She felt that the second floor and pavilion spaces were there to help pay for the project. Filling in the basement pushed FAR to the pavilion. She noted that if windows were added in the basement it could be better utilized. Cambridge's first flatiron building would be diminished by this project. She asked the Commission to stop the homogenization of the square.

City Councillor Dennis Carlone expressed concern about removing a floor from the Abbot Building. He said that changes to the design had been positive, and that he was impressed with its massing. He felt that the spandrel glass deadened the façade and questioned the choice; the glass would be dark during the day, although the elevations depicted it as blue. He suggested "neutering" the infill so the historic buildings would "pop" and recommended making the second floor fenestration richer. He commended the architects on their solution to the rooftop mechanicals said the project was handsome.

Abra Berkowitz said the Commissioners were the keepers of the Square and because the building

had not been landmarked it was on them to protect it. She said it was important that the Commission discuss the impact of the proposal on the first flat iron building in Cambridge. She noted that the kiosk was landmarked and that the city was turning it into a public space. She said the project would set a precedent for the Square and should not be approved.

Olga Pellansky noted that the first paragraph of the goals of the Conservation District was important. She noted a recent article in the *Boston Globe* that discussed the pressures on Harvard Square. She was concerned that the project would impact the intimacy of the square and its community life, cafes, and musicians.

Tim Shaw said he was opposed to the project. He felt it was too large and demolished an important building. He did not think the modifications were suitable for the square and urged the Commission to reject the proposal.

Carol O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street said that she was informed that the Commission would treat the Abbot Building as if it were landmarked, and asked if infill would be permitted around the building if it had been designated. The proposal detracted from the Abbot Building and would prevent it from standing out. She said that a lower height infill building might work but that the project felt like facadism, where one kept the outside but changed its spirit.

Abhishek Syal of 29 Park Drive, Boston, introduced himself as the secretary of Our Harvard Square. He felt that the proposal was inconsistent with the goals of the district, as it had a single roofline versus keeping all three buildings separate. He urged the Commissioners not to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chris Macken of 48 JFK Street noted that the public's comments had been shaped by fact and felt that the process favored proponents. He thought the video was startling and wondered how accurate it was.

Mr. King closed public comment. He noted the receipt of many letters and emails from the public that were also part of the records of the case.

Mr. Donovan asked if the Commission had the option to defer action to a future hearing since new evidence had been presented and needed further study. Mr. King replied that in his opinion the video presented a questionable perspective, and he did not see anything misleading about the application. The further back one was from a building the more one would see.

Mr. Sullivan noted that in each of the past three hearings he had read the Conservation District's Goals and Guidelines, but for this hearing he had printed out a version with the relevant goals highlighted. He urged the Commissioners to review them, as the question before them was whether or not the proposal was incongruous to the Harvard Square Conservation District.

Dr. Solet said that she did not hate the pavilion; it was appealing and green, but maybe it could be

smaller. She could understand what some were saying, that the individuality of the district would go away. It was important to keep the vibrancy of the Square and that substantial reassurances would be needed in that regard.

Ms. Harrington said that the public testimony got through to her. She did not object to the glass addition as it was clearly distinct from the original and that the guideline was to preserve significant buildings including how they looked in context. She said that the pavilion was still a question mark.

Mr. Irving disagreed. He bristled at the hyperbole. The Commission had already had multiple hearings and had spent 16-20 hours reviewing the project. The Commission had taken it very seriously. He did not feel that the proposal would obliterate the freestanding nature of the Abbot Building. The infill was recessive and did not need to be neutered. The video did not work as intended in regard to the pavilion, which would not be bright pink in reality. He remembered Fred Meyer's testimony about how excited he was that other people would get to experience his views of the Square when his office was there. He recommended pulling the pavilion in a few feet as a symbolic concession to the public. He agreed with Mr. Carlone that the proposal was much improved.

Mr. Barry agreed. He said that the Commission had heard a few specific concerns but much of the testimony was hyperbolic. From a zoning point of view, the project could be much bigger. He said the applicant's dedication to preserving the returns of the Abbot Building and restoring its facade, along with retaining and preserving 18 Brattle Street, showed a creative, energetic approach. The video showed him that the pavilion was not looming; it was new but not deleterious. The project could not be expected to be invisible. Option A for retail would have a larger impact on the street. The building would be an outward facing ship, not a mall. The pavilion did not present a negative impact, but rather it energized and activated the roofscape. He suggested that the applicant pull the pavilion back and not have it curve as the flatiron building did. He wanted the details of the infill to come back.

Mr. Sheffield was unsure about the sunshades and the spandrel glass. He thought that the metal panels at the storefronts could be improved with better materials. The sidewalk/street edge should hold at that edge, but then be recessed to preserve the cornice returns of the Abbot Building and 18 Brattle Street. He suggested the applicant look into making the building LEED certified. He agreed with Mr. Irving's comments on being able to experience Harvard Square in a new way with the proposed pavilion, but said the pavilion could be a little smaller. The brick did not have to be monochromatic.

Ms. Tobin thanked the members of the public who spoke; it was clear to see that everyone loved Cambridge and cared about the proposed changes. She agreed with Ms. Harrington and would like to see the Abbot Building more strongly protected. Making everything the same height to allow the pavilion might not be worth it, so she was inclined to eliminate the pavilion. The Commission should do everything it could to encourage small retail spaces.



Mr. Crocker agreed that pushing the pavilion back a few feet on all sides could make a difference.

Mr. Ferrara stated his preference that the Abbot Building storefronts be consistent and not varied. He agreed with the other Commissioners who wanted the pavilion pulled back on all sides because as proposed it competed with the Abbot Building and created a shadow along Brattle Street. He suggested that the cornice of the infill could be lowered and still allow three floors.

Mr. King said the back of the Abbot Building was a party wall with a window. He asked what was proposed for the third floor of the infill and if it could be lowered by a foot or so.

Mr. Sheffield noted that the alignment of the three buildings helped the pavilion disappear. Stepping it back further would be good, but the even height was a good edge to hold for that reason.

MsDr. Solet concurred with Mr. Sheffield's comment regarding the street experience and noted that an animated rendering might help the Commission to see the pavilion better; possibly a view from the pavilion would be useful.

Mr. King said that the infill building design was a vast improvement over the glass addition initially proposed. The Commission should have confirmation of the storefront locations and details. He respected Mr. Carlone's opinion, and added that he would not mind seeing the infill pulled back a foot or so on both sides. He was delighted that the mechanicals would be incorporated in the pavilion.

Mr. King reviewed the relevant goals of the District and gave his opinion of the project's response to them:

Goal #1: "Preserve historically or architecturally significant buildings and structures as well as those that contribute to the distinctive visual character or historical significance of the District."

Preserving the Abbot Building would accomplish this; removal of the Corcoran's building had already been decided.

Goal #2: "Sustain the vitality of the commercial environment by preserving architecturally-significant or original building fabric where it currently exists. When this is not possible, support creative, contemporary design for storefront alterations and additions."

This would be accomplished by the project.

Goal #3: "Support creative, contemporary design for new construction that complements and contributes to its immediate neighbors and the character of the District. Recognize and respect creativity of design during the review process and mitigate the functional impacts of development on adjacent areas."

The infill project demonstrated creative, contemporary design. He was concerned with the impact of the project of adjacent areas; construction mitigation would be important.

Goal #4: "Build on and sustain the diversity of existing building form, scale and material. Preserve and encourage flowers, green yards and courtyards and small, free-standing and wood-frame build-

ings where that character prevails. Encourage streetwall buildings where that character has been set. Encourage ground-level, small-scale storefronts to preserve the vitality and character of the streets.”

The project accomplished streetwall construction and could have small scale storefronts.

Goal #8: “Encourage projects that will maintain a wide diversity of uses serving the needs of surrounding neighborhoods, students, and visitors from around the world.”

Mr. King agreed that the project would accommodate multiple uses, but he was not sure the city needed the major tenant’s second floor space.

Mr. Sullivan mentioned that a motion could include the points just mentioned, plus conditions such as setting back the pavilion, requiring a study of the lighting, and asking for an alternative to the spandrel glass. He noted that multiple entrances could be required, but enforcing their use was problematic; many times multiple entrances had gone unused, such as at One Brattle Square and the Read Block. However the Commission could require multiple entrances as shown in scheme A.

Mr. Barry moved to approve the project in principle with the conditions that the footprint of the pavilion be reduced; that details of the infill building be further developed; that the plan encourage small retail; that lighting be further studied; and that the spandrel material be reconsidered.

Mr. Sheffield said he did not want to vote yet as too many pieces needed to come back. Ms. Solet said she liked the curved roof pavilion but asked if the proponents could show an alternative.

Mr. Barry’s motion was not seconded and died on the floor.

Mr. Barry moved to continue the hearing.

Mr. King asked the Commission to give more direction to the applicant. Mr. Irving said that in ~~principal~~ principle the Commission supported infill but that it was subject to further refinement.

MsDr. Solet asked if the applicant would agree to a continuation. Mr. Rafferty agreed and asked if the Commission concurred with Mr. Sullivan’s list of items to be reconsidered.

Ms. Burks asked the Commission to clarify for the record that the details of restoration, storefronts, and signs would come back for further consideration. Mr. Sullivan recounted Mr. King’s charge that the Commission’s immediate focus would be on the infill and the pavilion. The applicant would return with restoration and storefront details.

Mr. Brown added that they had to have massing settled before they could return with details of storefronts and signage.

MsDr. Solet seconded Mr. Barry’s motion to continue the hearing. The motion was approved 7-0, with Ms. Tobin voting as an alternate.

### Petitions

Mr. Irving moved to acknowledge the receipt of three citizen petitions and to schedule a hearing

on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0 with Mr. Sheffield voting as an alternate.

The Commission discussed the minutes from the January 5, 2017 hearing and provided edits. Mr. Irving made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. ~~Ms~~Dr. Solet seconded, and the motion was approved 7-0 with Mr. Ferrara voting.

Mr. Irving moved to adjourn, Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks, Preservation Planner  
Charles Sullivan, Executive Director

**Members of the Public  
Who Signed the Attendance List on February 16, 2017**

Francis Donovan	42 Irving Street
Susan Miller-Havens	18 Brattle Street
Sylvia Parsons	22 Hancock Street
Conor Walsh	472 Broadway
Anna Rowe Dennis	472 Broadway
Alana DeTone	8 Riverside Street, Watertown
Mikaela Batista	15 Main St. #11, Watertown
Graciela Galup	36 Copley Street
Ian Kendrick	991 Massachusetts Avenue
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine Street
Tim Shaw	147 Mt. Auburn Street
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Place
Nancy Gold	12 Hubbard Ave
Susan Corcoran	356 Broadway
David Matthews	5 Arlington Street
A.L. West	5 Crawford Street
Carole J. Perrault	9 Dana Street #41
Steve Tanner	56 Dane Street, Somerville
Charlotte Moore	9 Rutland Street
Patricia Bull	399 Broadway
Erica Lindamood	26 Chatham Street
Scott Korner	289 Garden Street
Abishek Syal	29 Park Drive, Boston
Judith Saryan	30 Hancock Street
Nancy Partek	14 Gerry Street
Joshua Fay	55 Garfield Street
John Gorman	14 Fayette Street
Adriane Landsman	no address listed
Kathy Richman	31-B Jay Street
Tim Mudarri	42 Fayerweather Street
Dennis Carlone	9 Washington Avenue
Pebble Gifford	15 Hilliard Street
Mariann Good	45 Laurel Street, Somerville
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Avenue
Levering White	9 Chauncy Street
Christopher Mackin	48 John F. Kennedy Street
Olga Pellansky	108 Kinnaird Street
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley Street
Hannah Walters	20 Pleasant Avenue, Somerville
Brad Bellows	87 Howard Street
Abra Berkowitz	253½ Broadway