

Approved 3/4/10

## Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

January 7, 2010 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: Chair King; Vice Chair Irving; Dr. Solet; Mss. Berg, Harrington, and Tobin; Messrs. Bibbins, Crocker, and Ferrara

Staff present: Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Burks

Public present: See attached list.

---

With a quorum present, Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. and introduced the commissioners and staff. He designated the alternates to vote in turn, starting with Ms. Berg. Mr. King described the consent agenda procedure and asked if there were any cases that a member of the public, commission, or staff would recommend for approval per the consent agenda and for which it was not necessary to have a full hearing.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the following case per the consent agenda procedures.

**Case 2456: 25 Mt. Auburn St., by Dowse, Inc., BBC Trust.** To replace garage bay door.

Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Ms. Berg voting as alternate.

### Public Hearings: Continued Cases

**Case D-1182 (continued): 136 Fayerweather St./56 Saville St., by 136 Fayerweather LLC, Merek Franklin, Tr.** Demolish house (1926).

Mr. King reviewed the decision of the last hearing to find the building significant and preferably preserved. The Commission had visited the site to inspect existing conditions on January 6, 2010 but no votes were taken. A revised proposal was before the Commission, which should determine whether to terminate the demolition delay based on the new design. He said he had considered the first replacement project to be inconsistent with the neighborhood, but the new proposal was more contextual.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and reviewed his earlier memo. He noted that during the site visit the Commission had observed that the foundation had tilted significantly toward the back of the house, but was not itself seriously degraded. There was one major crack which had been filled some time ago and had not reopened.

Mr. Ferrara said the frame of the building had probably been compromised because of the settlement of the foundation and ineffective efforts to level the house. Mr. Irving noted that there was little original detail left.

Dan Webb, an engineer at Webb Structural Services, said all the structural members were undersized and would have to be replaced if the building were renovated. The roof was sagging and was pushing out the walls. The house was built on "unsuitable" fill materials. The foundation would need to be taken out and a new foundation built on proper bearing soil.

Scott Kenton, a co-owner and the designer, reviewed the new design. It was 4 feet further from the neighbor's house. He displayed the site plan and elevations. The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor deck had been eliminated. The doors and windows facing the nearest abutter were in the same location as the existing house. The project would require a variance because of the irregularities of the lot.

Commissioners asked questions about the entry on Saville Street, the retention of trees, lack of a chimney, operability of the dormer windows, and location of the HVAC units. Mr. Kenton answered that the formal en-

trance to the living room was on the Saville Street side, the two large trees would be retained, there was no masonry chimney proposed, the dormer windows would be operable, and the A/C would be in the fenced back yard.

William Shawcross, of 1105 Massachusetts Avenue, asked about the depth of undisturbed soil. Mr. Webb answered that there was glacial till at 20'-23' deep.

Marilee Meyer, of 10 Dana Street, commented that the dormers were large and extended up to the ridge. Mr. Kenton noted that lowering the bottom of the dormers would cause an increase in FAR.

William Cobham, of 131 Fayerweather Street, said the new design was much better than the first and more in character with the neighborhood.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Mr. Ferrara made several design suggestions: lower the top of the dormer, use a shed roofed dormer, make the Saville Street entrance more formal with a pediment, and add a window over that entrance.

Mr. Irving agreed, but advised the proponent not to go too far with ornament and trim. He noted that the proponents had done a good job of responding to the Commission's initial comments. The new design fit better with the neighborhood.

Mr. Sullivan addressed the engineer's comments about modern codes and the construction methods of the house. Though the soil on which the house was sited was obviously inadequate, it would be hard to say that the foundation itself was inadequate. It had not broken up, despite the shifting soil conditions. Any house of the period contained framing that would not meet current codes. Demolition decisions should always be made on a case by case basis, because hundreds of Cambridge buildings were built on former clay pits and situations in each case were unique.

Ms. Harrington moved to authorize the staff to write a letter of preliminary support for the design to the Board of Zoning Appeal indicating that the Commission was inclined to grant the request to terminate the remainder of the delay but that it had concerns about the design of the dormers and entrance. She further moved to continue the hearing and invite the proponents to return next month with further refinements. The motion passed 7-0 with Ms. Berg and Mr. Ferrara voting as alternates and Mr. Bibbins and Ms. Tobin not voting on the matter because they had been absent from the previous hearing.

**Case 2431 (continued): 2-4 Longfellow Pk., by Corp. of the Pres. Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.** Review remaining details of project to repair church damaged by fire including new roof, sloped walkway and ramp, egress door, expand areaways, enlarge door, add door, expand window wells.

Mr. King noted that this was a new hearing for matters not yet approved at the November hearing. Any commissioners present could vote.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized status of the church; the roof had burned off and the interior gutted. He showed views of the building from the surrounding streets and park. The details of the dormers, elevator override, steeple, air conditioning units, access ramp, and materials were the subject of the hearing.

James Rafferty, attorney for the applicants, noted that further study had been done of geothermal heating/cooling and the accessible hardscape.

Erik Mollo Christensen, architect of Tsoi/Kobus & Associates, reported that open and closed loop geothermal systems had been rejected due to factors such as the cost payback schedule. He displayed the site plan and described the proposed placement of air conditioning condensers: 5 units at the northeast corner below grade and 5 units in the corner of the roof. The units used in an air source heat pump system would be quieter than typical condensers. A second acoustic review determined expected noise levels. He described the proposed accessible path to the front doors. Handrails would only be necessary at the steps, not on the path. The landscaping would be such that there would be no visible cheek walls. He described the proposed materials including wood windows, doors, roof trim, and portico elements. The windows would be replaced in kind with new wood sash. The ones that could be repaired would be, maybe changing to insulated glass where that was possible. Interior storms could be used elsewhere. The vertical surfaces of the dormers and roof screen would be Hardiplank painted to match the asphalt roof shingles. He noted that the steel frame of the steeple had been damaged. He proposed to reconstruct the steeple and clad the upper spire with a pre-patinated copper. Below the spire would be clad with a Kynar coated aluminum rather than wood.

Dr. Solet asked about the proposed air source heat pump system and the acoustical report. She noted that the zoning code required that noise not exceed 50 decibels all day on Sundays, not just at night.

William Appleton, of 11 Hawthorn Street said he was concerned about the appearance and noise of the 5 condensers proposed for his side of the building. He objected to the church retaining the same footprint on which it had been built in 1951. He said the project qualified as new construction because more than 50% of the structure was destroyed. He said the building was too big with very little grass around it; there was too much noise.

Lindy Hess, of 11 Hawthorn Street, said the construction was causing rodent problems in the neighborhood. She objected to the five condensers at the roof.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet noted the Commission was not in charge of regulating compliance with the noise ordinance but it was a topic of interest and discussion at hearings. She asked if the Kynar coated aluminum could be washed. Mr. Mollo Christensen replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Berg noted that a good maintenance plan would be necessary for the landscape.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Commission wanted to protect the impact of the condensers on the public at the public way, but there could be some flexibility about the distribution of units between the two locations. Similar units had been used at the Cronkite Center and the results were satisfactory to the neighbors. He said it was important to maintain the existing width of the sidewalk on Longfellow Park.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the details submitted with the authority delegated to the staff to approve remaining construction details, the sidewalk accessibility issues, and to allow flexibility to move one condenser. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 7-0, with Ms. Tobin voting.

[Ms. Tobin left].

**Case 2445 (continued): 1991 Massachusetts Ave., by Saint James Episcopal Church.** Demolish parish house (1884) and additions of the minister's study (1912) and classrooms (1958); construct a new parish house and resi-

dential structure, in coordination with Oaktree Development, on a combined site with 2013 Mass. Ave. and a portion of the Knight's Garden.

Mr. Bibbins recused himself due to a former professional relationship with the church and left the table.

Mr. King noted that seven members and alternates were present, four of whom had been present at the December hearing. He asked that the proposal for the development of the site be fully presented by the proponents for the benefit of the public and all the commission members. The members had received the minutes of the December hearing. He noted the submittal of a three-dimensional model and a financial plan.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the history of the church, its architecture, and the evolution of the site. He outlined the jurisdictions of the Cambridge Historical Commission (CHC) and the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). He described the development criteria provided in the memorandum of agreement between the church and the CHC. He described the timeline of events since Oaktree purchased the car wash lot next door in 2008. He reviewed the MHC letter of finding from December 2009.

Gwen Noyes of Oaktree Development referred to the model and noted that the height of the new building was 2' below the ridge of the church. The height had been lowered a total of 4' from the first proposal.

Rev. Holly Antolini, rector of St. James's Episcopal Church, described the church's obligation to maintain the church, the garden, and the parish hall. A \$600,000 campaign to restore the bell tower and boilers had been completed, but the church was falling behind on maintenance. The stained glass windows needed restoration, the roof was leaking, and the wood was deteriorating. She said the partnership with Oaktree was an opportunity to create funds for the future maintenance of the church. She reviewed her letter to the Commission describing future maintenance needs and budget goals.

Ricardo Dumont, a principal at Sasaki Associates, displayed the animated rendering, which used the massing study from June 2009. He reviewed the chronology of the site development from the original tavern and stables to the existing conditions. He pointed out the tight 6' spacing between the original sanctuary building (1871) and the existing sanctuary (1888). The original building stood on what was now the parking lot and served as the chapel until it was demolished in the 1950s. He showed other Boston area examples of 4-5 story buildings constructed around a courtyard with a church. He displayed elevation views of the proposed new building. The fourth floor was set back 35' from the abutting properties. He reviewed the history of the Knight's Garden, reporting that no detailed landscape plan by Nolen had yet been found. He displayed a proposal for a new garden plan with an herb garden off Beech Street, birch trees at Massachusetts Avenue, a meditation garden near the new chapel, birch or ginkgo trees at the rear buffer zone, a children's play garden, and a labyrinth in the center courtyard, which would be publicly accessible. He described the historical purposes of labyrinths in church contexts. He displayed perspective views of the proposed conditions.

The Commission asked about the roof deck at the fourth floor and the screening of mechanicals. Mr. Dumont answered that the deck would be set back from the parapet and the mechanicals would be fully screened.

Ms. Berg suggested that clues to Nolen's design might be found in documentation of his other designs from the same period. They had been studying plants that had been historically used for ceremonial purposes in

Christian churches. Dr. Solet suggested that photographs from weddings performed in the garden might help document the garden.

Mr. King asked for questions from the public.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked what kind of commitment would be made to ensure public access to the garden. Rev. Antolini said it had always been open to the public and would continue to be so.

Marilyn Wellons of 353 Green Street asked about mechanicals, and Mr. Dumont replied that they would be at the 4<sup>th</sup> floor level, about 30” high, set back from the wall. Gwen Noyes added that there would be no head house on the elevator.

Kathy Podgers of 148 Pearl Street asked if a wildlife habitat ecologist had been consulted to determine what types of wildlife would be impacted by the project. She also asked about solar panels. Mr. Dumont said there was an ecologist on staff at Sasaki. The trees on the carwash site would be replicated. The new building would have the potential for flat solar panels on the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> floor roofs.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if there would be access from the residences to the garden. Mr. Dumont answered that it was being considered.

Karen Klinger of Beech Street suggested that Shady Hill Square might be informative about Nolen’s design. Mr. Dumont noted that they would look at that design.

James Freeman of 25A Hillside Avenue asked about traffic and parking impacts. Mr. Dumont answered that the Traffic & Parking Department had determined that there would be no adverse effect.

Patty Armstrong of 36 Orchard Street noted that the new building would alter views of the church building from Orchard Street and other places in the neighborhood.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Road noted the garden fence had recently been locked. He asked if the church would sign a binding agreement to ensure public access. Mark Yoder, the warden at St. James’s, explained that the police had advised the church to lock the gate at night to address the problem of homeless people living in the garden. It did not work well with volunteers responsible for locking and unlocking the gate. Needles and bottles found in the garden were dangerous. The new plan would allow the church to keep the garden safely. It was the church’s desire that it be open to the public. Mr. Brandon asked if the model could be updated to include surrounding buildings. He said the size of the new building would overwhelm the church.

Mr. King asked for public comment.

Mr. Williamson noted that the condo owners’ demands about the garden could impact public access. Gwen Noyes noted that the residential eyes on the garden would have a positive effect on safety.

Dr. Solet asked for explanation of whether the land would be leased or sold to the condominium owners.

Ms. Meyer noted that the old chapel had been 40’ only at the peak, not all the way around. The perspective drawings inaccurately showed the siting of the fire house. She asked for a deeper setback off Beech Street.

Jessica Pratt of 11 Beech Street and Costanza Eggers of 47 Porter Road made a presentation about the church and garden. Ms. Eggers said that the Nolen concept was for a bucolic, natural space to provide balance to the urban environment. Ms. Pratt said that the garden, as the largest open space in the area, was an oasis in the

city. She said the existing non-built square footage was 28,713 on the three lots. The current garden and play yard were 15,952 square feet. Two-thirds of the garden space would be lost due to encroachment of the new building. Ms. Eggers said that views of the church and fire house would be lost from points on Massachusetts Avenue. Ms. Pratt suggested reducing the square footage of church space on the first floor in order to eliminate the 4<sup>th</sup> floor. Ms. Eggers suggested use of Community Preservation Act funds to help with the garden design.

Ms. Podgers spoke about preserving urban wilds. Students could maintain the gardens. A natural landscape would not need fertilizers and herbicides.

Michael Salib of 19 Hunting Street said he was a parishioner of the church and an engineer. He spoke of the environmental benefits of urban density. Reductions to the number of residential units would contribute to global warming and had real life costs in developing countries.

Ms. Wellons objected to cutting down of existing trees and asked for protection of the garden.

John Armstrong of 36 Orchard Street objected to the proposed on-grade parking spaces off Beech Street.

Preston Gralla of 19 Beech Street expressed doubt that there would be enough money to maintain the church. He wanted a guarantee that the money would go toward an endowment fund for the maintenance of the church. He said the spreadsheet was outdated.

Richard Clarey of 15 Brookford Street said the public interest was not represented in the current proposal. He suggested that a public trustee be appointed and that the endowment should be created before construction begins. He said the 1872 lots were to be used only for church purposes and the Attorney General was awaiting the church's explanation.

Mr. Brandon noted that significant public funds had been given to the church as grants. The project was inappropriate because of its size, impingement of views, and trashing of the Nolen garden. There should be an inventory of immediate maintenance needs of the church and the endowment should go immediately toward those needs. A trust fund should be put towards long term preservation.

Jan Corash of 84 Orchard Street said the development would rob the church of its setting.

Ruth Ryals of 115 Upland Road said the garden was a challenge. A new garden would be easier.

Ms. Noyes said a four-story building could be built on the car wash site as of right. The amount of open space in the existing garden was very close to the same area as the proposed unpaved and green space of the new garden. The total caliper of trees would be increased. They were required to provide as many parking spaces as the church currently had, including room for an ADA van which would not fit in the garage. Multi-family residential construction is twice as efficient as single family construction per person. The church needed a garden that functioned well. The church's needs had changed since Nolen designed the garden.

Mr. King closed public testimony.

Mr. Sullivan reported that the Planning Board had issued a conditional special permit providing for staff approval of several aspects of the design, including materials and the garden design.

Mr. King said the preservation of the main church building should be the primary focus, though the garden was part of the complex. The opportunity for the church to have its own endowment was attractive. Porter

Square was not a static place and had undergone a lot of change since the T station was built there. His goal was to preserve but not freeze the church site. The proposal should work economically. He suggested that the church provide an assurance of its financial ability to maintain the building.

Ms. Berg said it was a complex process, but it was coming together. The financial and legal issues were a big piece of the puzzle along with the design issues.

Dr. Solet said the new building encroached on the garden but the problem was not unsolvable.

Mr. King said the garden was of secondary interest to the sanctuary building. He asked for affirmation that the garden would be open to the public. The finances should be secure.

Mr. Ferrara agreed the preservation focus should be on the sanctuary. The design had been skillfully altered since the previous month.

Mr. Sullivan suggested continuing the discussion about building materials and instead considering whether a conditional approval could be approved. He suggested that the Commission approve the application for the demolition of the parish house, minister's study, and classroom wing and construction of a new parish house/residential condominium on the premises in principle as to the general location and size of the proposed new building, but with certain conditions recognizing that the compelling public interest in allowing this project to proceed was the financial support that had been promised to maintain St. James's historic church building. The church should outline the current and proposed changes in ownership of their current property and the financial arrangements between the church and Oaktree, including income and expenses projected over time. Also, they should provide an explanation of the current projected capital needs of the historic building and commit that its capital needs as well as the needed expenses of regular maintenance would continue to be met. The church should also provide a commitment to assure public access to the proposed garden; a landscape master plan for the entire property; and further information on the exterior design.

Mr. Irving made the motion outlined by Mr. Sullivan, noting the expectation that there would be refinement and sensitivity as the design evolved. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion.

Dr. Solet asked for clarification of the future ownership of the property. Rev. Antolini explained that the draft memorandum of understanding between the church and Oaktree said that there would be a ground lease from the church to Oaktree during construction. Upon receipt of the keys to the new parish house, ownership would transfer to the condominium owners, of which the church was a major percentage holder.

The Commission voted 7-0 to pass Mr. Irving's motion, with Ms. Berg and Mr. Ferrara voting.

Mr. King called for a brief recess. Mr. Bibbins returned to the Commission table, and Mr. King reconvened the meeting at 11:00 P.M.

#### Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 2455: 1 Follen St., by The Longy School of Music, Inc.** Demolish entry vestibule and build new vestibule; repair door; install new lighting.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the history of the Abbott House and Pickman Hall.

Howard Levy, the CFO of The Longy School of Music, said the school had received a matching grant to improve acoustics, lighting, accessibility, and safety.

Gary Wolf, the architect, described the context of the building and the small “hyphen” which connected the Abbott House to Pickman Hall. The proposal was to add 108 square feet to the non-compliant vestibule, which would require zoning relief. He showed an elevation. An abstraction of the musical scale designed in stained glass would decorate the new vestibule. The roof of the vestibule would cantilever in two directions.

The Commission asked about the connection to the Abbott House, accessibility, and materials. Mr. Wolf answered that neither the glass walls nor the cantilevered roof would touch the Abbott House; the accessible parking and entrance were on the other side of the building; he described the glass wall system.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the roof pitch and likelihood of snow and ice buildup. Mr. Wolf said the roof would have a slight pitch and a recessed gutter. The flashing against Pickman Hall would be approximately two brick courses high. He described the proposed lighting on the site, including lighting behind the brick wall that would wash the walls at night.

There were no public questions or comments.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted, with review of how the vestibule tied into the existing buildings and approval of any changes delegated to the Executive Director. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Ms. Berg voting.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

**Case D-1187: 1075 Massachusetts Ave., by Brighton Allston Properties, LLC.** Demolish one-story retail building (1925).

Mr. King explained the demolition delay ordinance and review procedures.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the history of the site and architecture of the building. It was a stripped-down version of the neoclassical style with a cornice and medallions over each pier. The original tenants had been largely automotive-related. Bowl & Board, the most recent tenant, had started in just the corner space and expanded over time to fill the entire building. The other sites at Putnam Square had been redeveloped more recently and this site was now anomalous.

Andrew Bram, attorney for the owner, explained that the project needed a special permit from the Planning Board.

Peter Quinn, the architect, said there was very little street activity except at the entrances to furniture stores in the area. The new storefronts would have a similar rhythm to the existing. He described the proposed materials of clear glass walls with aluminum trim. The residential entry would be located at the center. There would be 20 units in 4 stories. The glazing on the ground floor would be clear and the glazing above would be tinted, but not mirrored. Spandrel glass would be used at the stairs. A green roof would be constructed between the new building and 1100 Massachusetts Avenue. The residential units would have integrated curtain panels at the outside walls.



Ms. Meyer said there was a disconnect between the shops and the lighter materials above. There was too much glass and not enough substance. Had he considered building on top of the existing building? Mr. Quinn answered that it was a deliberate design decision to have the upper floors floating above the ground floor. They had considered building above the existing building, but it was not possible because the structure would not support it. A new foundation would be needed.

Bill Shawcross, chair of the board of trustees at 1105 Massachusetts Avenue, reported that Mr. Quinn and the owner had answered the concerns of the owners of 1105 Massachusetts Avenue as much as possible. The board was satisfied with the current proposal.

Sandy Sherwood of 12-14 Trowbridge Street said the building would be a huge change in Putnam Square. The Victorian buildings on Trowbridge Street were very different from the proposed modern glass building. She was shocked at the choice of material and of the development in general. She said she had been told that the new owner would not build above the first floor. She asked for a light and shadow study to be verified because it would impact the properties on Trowbridge Street.

Mr. Shawcross said the owner had put money into a renovation of the existing building then discovered foundation problems and reconsidered.

Mr. Irving moved to find the existing building significant as defined in the ordinance and for the reasons set forth in the staff report. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion, which passed 7-0, with Mr. Ferrara voting.

Mr. Irving moved to find the existing building not preferably preserved in the context of the proposed replacement project. The design echoed the original with the more solid base and would be an improvement to the urban design of the square. The Commission passed the motion in a vote of 7-0, with Mr. Ferrara voting.

#### Preservation Grants

**IPG 05-4, 55 Bishop Allen Drive, by Massasoit Lodge.** Permission to waive matching requirement to spend \$6,700 (from a remaining balance of \$7,472) for emergency roof drain repair.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the request to use unexpended money from the original grant of \$50,000 to repair a leaking roof drain.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the use of funds and to waive a requirement for matching funds. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Ms. Berg voting as alternate.

#### Minutes

Mr. King said the word "and" should be inserted on page 2 in the eighth paragraph.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the corrected minutes. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Mr. Ferrara voting as alternate.

Mr. Ferrara moved to adjourn, Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion passed unanimously at 11:54 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public  
Who Signed Attendance Sheet 1/7/10**

Gwen Noyes	175 Richdale Ave
Ricardo Dumont	26 Blossom St, Lexington 02421
Michael Salib	19 Hunting St #2
Mark Yoder	21 Haskell St, Allston 02134
Alan Aukeman	90 Inman St #2
John Armstrong	36 Orchard St
Patricia Armstrong	36 Orchard St
Sarah Farrington	18 Frost St
Richard Clarey	15 Brookford St
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St
Jacqueline Kelley	P.O. Box 441164 Somerville 02144
William Cobham	131 Fayerweather St
Jan Corash	84 Orchard St
Holly Antolini	1991 Massachusetts Ave
Ruth Ryals	115 Upland Rd
Ben Rogan	121 Mystic Ave
William Shawcross	1105 Mass Ave#7A
James Green	25 Mt Auburn St, #106
Juliet Green	25 Mt Auburn St, #106
Daniel Webb	291 Pearl St, Reading 01867
Merek Franklin	20 Walnut St, Lexington 02421
Scott Kenton	152 Vassal St
Levering White	113 Brattle St
Howard Levy	1 Follen St
Gary Wolf	7 Marshall St, Boston 02108
Margaret Wray	7 Marshall St, Boston 02108
Denis Cycin	1 Follen St
Sandy Sherwood	12-14 Trowbridge St
Nanci Anderson	11 Trowbridge St
Greg Luongo	1 Brattle Sq
Daniel DeCelles	84 High St, #A-1
Erik Mollo Christensen	1 Brattle Sq
John Bezzant	236 Birnam Rd, Northfield, 01360
Andrew Bram	43 Thorndike St
William Truslow	4 Hawthorn St
Preston Gralla	19 Beech St
Andrea Wilder	12 Arlington St
Ann Freeman	25A Hillside Ave
James Freeman	25A Hillside Ave
William Appleton	11 Hawthorn St
Linda Ann Hess	11 Hawthorn St
Phil Aertzis	129 Mt Auburn St
Arthur Klipfel	129 Mt Auburn St
Leslie Baden	12 Saginaw Ave
Judy Clark	81 Orchard St
Jessica Pratt	11 Beech St
Jean Kellog	14 Allen St
Diane Carr	14 Beech St
Costanza Eggers	47 Porter Rd

Ruth Ryals	115 Upland Rd
Daniel DeCelles	84 High St
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
Raj Dhanda	1239 Beacon St, Brookline 02446

Town is Cambridge unless otherwise indicated.