

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

April 2, 2015 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Robert Crocker, Jo M. Solet, *Members*; Shary Page Berg, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Members absent: Chandra Harrington, *Member*; Joseph Ferrara, *Alternate*

Staff present: Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:06 P.M. He made introductions, reviewed hearing procedures, and dispensed with the consent agenda. He designated alternates Berg and Tobin to vote on all matters.

Public Hearing: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3392: 1350 Massachusetts Ave., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Repair and restore all facades.

Ms. Tobin recused herself from the case because of her status as an employee of Harvard Law School.

Ms. Burks explained that the property was located in the Harvard Square Conservation District. The mid-century modern building was designed by José Luis Sert, then the Dean of the Graduate School of Design at Harvard. She briefly described the zoning code of 1962 which allowed for the 10-story building to be built by right in the heart of Harvard Square. She explained how the block had been cleared and the H-plan shaped building with central arcade and projecting wings (pavilions) was originally constructed in two phases (Mount Auburn street phase first and Mass. Ave. side as the second phase). She reported that she and Charles Sullivan had met several times with Harvard Planning staff and the project architects from Bruner/Cott Associates to view existing conditions and discuss the scope of repairs and approaches for cleaning and masonry restoration.

Gary Hammer of Harvard Planning and Project Management introduced the project and indicated that they would be happy to continue working with staff on construction details as the project moved forward. He introduced Henry Moss, of Bruner/Cott Associates. Mr. Moss made a detailed presentation about the building and its construction materials and methods. He explained that it was a highly technical restoration challenge because of the specialty glazing, pre-cast concrete panels, and cast-in-place concrete of Sert's design. The building had been surveyed to identify the areas needing repair and replacement. He described the restoration approach including replacement of all sealant (over 30 miles), restoration of Sert's colored scale bars on the windows, window repair and selective replacement, replacement of solar films and translucent panels, and replacement of the rooftop concrete coping. He indicated that they had tested 37 different cleaning techniques and products in order to find the best methods for the different types of concrete to be cleaned. He briefly explained the effects of carbonation on the building structure and how to address it.

Mr. King asked if Holyoke Center was constructed before the Carpenter Center, Peabody Terrace and Gund Hall. Mr. Moss replied affirmatively, adding that Harkness Commons was built much earlier. Mr. King asked how long the restoration would take and how much disruption it would cause. Mr. Moss answered that the logistics of the project had been studied since 2009. The project would proceed one floor at a time in one part of the building at a time. The noise would be governed by city ordinance. The building occupants, especially the health services, were very sensitive to construction impacts so it was all being handled as carefully as possible. It would not have a big impact on street life. The project would take three years to complete.

Mr. Barry asked about the translucent glazing panels. Mr. Moss explained that they were made of loose plies of wispy fiberglass between two layers of glass in aluminum window frames. There were about 450 failures out of 1800 panels.

Dr. Solet asked if there was an acoustical engineer working on the project. Mr. Moss replied that Acentech had conducted tests for vibration and sound. Dr. Solet asked if the construction would occur on the weekends and if there would be ongoing monitoring of vibrations. Mr. Moss replied that he did not know the answer yet, but the contractor, Consigli Construction, was preparing the work plan.

Mr. Barry asked about the anticipated life span of the new sealants. Mr. Moss estimated 5-7 years. He asked about remediation of unacceptable materials that could have leached into the concrete over time. Mr. Moss said the building was being monitored and that same issues had been dealt with at Peabody Terrace. Concrete would not have to be removed for that reason; contamination could be remediated with new sealants. Mr. Barry asked about the window films' life span. Mr. Moss answered that they would last about 10-15 years.

Mr. King asked for public questions of fact.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked about the scope of the project and any changes to window openings. Mr. Moss said the scope included the entire exterior that was not otherwise being impacted by the renovation project (case 3393). No new windows or closure of windows were proposed.

~~James~~Mr. Williamson asked how adjustments to the design plans would be handled between the two different projects. Mr. Moss said they would be recorded and coordinated in consultation with CHC staff. Mr. Williamson asked how much the restoration would cost. Mr. Moss indicated that cost information was not his area to report on.

Mr. King asked for comments from the public. There were none. He closed the public comment period and noted receipt of written correspondence ~~received~~ to the record about the two projects, none objecting to the façade restoration project.

Tom Lucey of Harvard University described open houses and meetings with different constituent groups to describe the design of the restoration and Smith Campus Center renovation project.

Dr. Solet asked about the panel banners along the Dunster Street pavilion. Mr. Moss said they were engaging and colorful, but not part of Sert's original design. They had been added in the 1990s.

Mr. Barry moved to approve the façade restoration project, as presented, with the condition that samples, mock ups, and design details be delegated to CHC staff for review and approval. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case 3393: 1350 Massachusetts Ave., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Renovate building including selective demolition, improve Holyoke and Dunster Street pavilions, and construct welcome center addition at Massachusetts Avenue façade and courtyard and addition at 10th floor roofscape.

Ms. Tobin remained recused for case 3393.

Mr. Hammer said the goals for the renovation of the campus center included fostering collaboration and building community among students. The center would be a vibrant, welcoming entrance to the university with a comfortable living-room type of environment. More commercial food venues would be provided. The university wanted the design to contribute to the dynamic urban environment and respect Sert's original architecture. He described meetings they had with the Harvard Square Business Association, city officials, a Community Development Department design workshop, Sert scholars and persons who had worked in Sert's design office. He described the program areas on the 1st, 2nd, and 10th floors.

Mr. Moss discussed Sert's career. He talked about the design influences of his native Spain, LeCorbusier, and his artist friends. He noted that the overpass over Cambridge Street had been one of Sert's design initiatives. He described the urban planning ideas behind Sert's design for Holyoke Center including the H-plan that allowed light to reach the street, the height and massing concentrated at the center of the block, while the lower scale parts of the building engaged the pedestrian. He demonstrated how the original transparency of the first two floors created the appearance of a mass floating over the ground plane. He noted the large roof forms that were irregularly placed at the 10th floor. Changes that had occurred over time to the building improved accessibility and responded to program needs. He explained that the arcade was originally open to the weather but Harvard had begun to enclose it in the 1990s to thermally control the space and to animate it with new uses. He introduced the project architects for the renovations, Hopkins Architects of London.

Andrew Barnett of Hopkins Architects reviewed the seven key design strategies of the project, including activating the street level and maximizing transparency, integrating and improving daylight and landscape, and enhancing connectivity and circulation on the 1st and 2nd floors. He described some of Sert's key design elements, including scattered towers, lower pavilions, and courtyards to control mass and sunlight, and a variety of fenestration to meet interior needs and relate to surrounding context. The new construction included new pavilions and new green spaces. He compared the existing and proposed section views of the building, noting that the design would open up spaces and bring light and landscape

inside. He described the changes made over time on the Massachusetts Avenue elevation and the design of the new welcome pavilion. It would be consistent with Sert's original concept of transparency at the 1st and 2nd floors. The interior stair at the corner would extend the public space to the second floor.

Landscape architect Michael Van Valkenburgh described the existing conditions at Forbes plaza with inaccessible seating on a non-original platform and the compromised condition of the existing trees. He described the addition of light to the north-facing plaza by changing the tree species to London Plane trees, mixing granite pavers with the brick to lighten the pavement, creating a fully accessible plaza and a more open approach to the plaza from the Square.

Sophie Twohig of Hopkins Architects displayed a photo of a 1960s architectural model of the building to demonstrate the importance of the 10th floor roof forms. Sert wanted the roof forms to be noticed, playful, and relate to the skyline of Cambridge. She described the proposed new projecting bay on the 10th floor, adding that it would represent the campus center function of the building and be like a beacon, visible from a long distance away. The bay would be visible from Sert's Science Center building on an axis through Harvard Yard. She described the other proposed elevations including a new Holyoke pavilion on the east side.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh described a redesign of the Mount Auburn Street plaza to eliminate the stairs, add diagonal inclined paths, and discourage midblock street crossing. The black oak would remain. Additional trees would have high canopies to keep views of the building open.

Mr. Barnett described changes on the Dunster Street elevation including a roof garden, removal of mechanical equipment, café seating, new glazing, and higher canopy trees. Mr. Van Valkenburgh described the views of the outdoor landscape from inside the building. There would also be green walls with living plants on the inside.

Mr. Hammer reviewed some benefits of the project including a 60% increase in space for public use, double the seating capacity, more public restrooms, 13 new trees, 30% increase in bike parking and an increase in commercial food space.

Mr. King called for a five minute recess. He called the meeting back to order at 8:20 P.M., apologizing to the public attending for the 29 Highland Street case for the long wait. He asked for questions of fact from the Commission.

Dr. Solet complimented the accessibility improvements. She asked for clarification about the location of the entrance into the welcome pavilion. Mr. Barnett noted that the entrance to the arcade would be emphasized by pushing it out from the plane of the rest of the welcome pavilion.

Mr. Crocker asked if there would be interior shades or screens. Mr. Barnett replied that they were not needed on the north side facing Forbes Plaza, but some would be present on the south side on the upper floors.

Mr. Barry asked about the granite pavers to be mixed with the brick pavers. How many shades would there be in the plaza? Emily Mueller De Celis of Van Valkenburgh Associates said the details were still being studied. She noted that the rendering showed two shades of granite. Mr. Barry asked if translucent panels would be used in the new pavilions. Mr. Barnett replied in the negative, explaining that Sert only used the translucent panels in floors 3-9. Mr. Barry said the 10th floor lantern was interesting but a jarring part of the proposal. He asked for more information on the program for that space. Ms. Twohig indicated that it was the same width as the other bays at that level. It would face Harvard Yard and be the front face of the campus center, serving as a lantern or beacon.

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

Mr. Williamson asked what Sert's vision for the plaza was. He asked if community access meant it would be open to everyone all the time. Tanya Iatridis, Director of Harvard Planning & Project Management, said the indoor public space would increase by 60%. Anyone could visit and would not have to buy food or drink to be there. In the evening, the central arcade would be locked (as was the current practice) but the welcome pavilion would be open until late at night (as Au Bon Pain was now, closing at approximately 1 or 2 in the morning).

Toby Fairbank of 221 Mt. Auburn Street was disappointed to lose open space in the plaza.

Ken Taylor of 23 Berkeley Street asked how wide the sliding doors could open on the north wall of the welcome pavilion. Mr. Barnett demonstrated the extent on the rendering.

Ms. Meyer asked the square footage of the additional arcade space. Mr. King asked that questions about programming space or use be reserved for the zoning hearing. He opened the floor to public comment. Ms. Meyer said the public used the plaza. She was concerned about the dominion of the university spilling out into the public area. She said it would not be inviting to local residents. She said the topic was huge and suggested the Commission continue the hearing.

Mr. Williamson agreed. He noted that the plaza was an important site of protest. He was concerned that the pavilion would take a big bite out of the plaza and the reduction of trees. The new planter would act like a barrier. Why did the ramps on the south side have to be placed diagonally?

Hugh Russell of 1 Corliss Place said he had worked in Sert's office during the design and construction of the Science Center. The Holyoke Center arcade knit together pieces of the building, and Hopkins' was building on that in a positive way. Change was constant in Sert's office. Sert experimented and learned from those experiments. His thinking would have evolved over the last fifty years.

Mr. Taylor complemented Harvard staff on soliciting comments from the community. He suggested the commission ask for more information on the arcade and trees on Mount Auburn Street side. The same paving should extend into the sidewalk, not be different from the public sidewalk. He said he was not happy with the placement of the 10th floor box. The project was important and needed more time.

Nila Devanath of 1585 Massachusetts Avenue spoke on behalf of the Harvard Graduate & Professional Student Government, noting that they were part of the community and the university. It was an exciting project and the Smith Campus Center would be a place where Harvard met the community.

Mike Mann of 84 Brattle Street agreed. Graduate students were often isolated in different schools but the Campus Center would be a good place to interface with the larger community of Cambridge. He said he had met with the design team about the specifics of accessibility improvements.

Pebble Gifford said her group had two meetings with the Harvard team but didn't get a copy of the plans submitted to the Commission. She said 50% of the plaza would be converted into inside private space. She was concerned about the location of the chess tables and the minimization of the arcade. The south elevation and plaza needed revision; it was the best side of the building.

Denise Jillson of the Harvard Square Business Association submitted a letter of endorsement. The new design would be warm and welcoming while the existing building was like a fortress.

John DiGiovanni of 50 Church Street noted that Harvard Square was a conservation district rather than a historic district. The goal was to guide change. He was concerned to hear so much about use rather than design. The proposed renovation was not offensive to Sert's design. He was surprised at how much more space would be open to the public. The second floor spaces would have a passive library feeling rather than retail. He suggested not continuing the hearing.

Ms. Meyer said she had more comments, but felt rushed and had not been given enough time.

Adrienne Lamson, no address provided, said the design had an amazingly bigger and lighter feeling; it would bring the same magic touch as at the Science Center plaza. She noted that the sidewalk on Holyoke Street was very slippery and water pooled there.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Ms. Berg commended Mr. Moss for a compelling and thorough presentation about the history and preservation of the building. She said the Commission's focus should be on preservation issues, not issues that should be addressed by the Planning Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals. She expressed confidence that Mr. Moss and Charles Sullivan could deal with the technical aspects of the building. She moved to approve the project in principle, on the condition that the design details continue to be reviewed by CHC staff during the permitting process of the other boards and that staff be authorized to approve design development or to return the case to the full commission if it determines that the design has substantively changed. Mr. Barry seconded the motion.

Dr. Solet said she could not support the motion. The presentation had been helpful and instructive, but the project was very large. She said there were still issues to work out and the matter needed more time. She said she still needed clarification about the entrance to the welcome pavilion.

Mr. Barry agreed it was a very important project and warranted further design development, but he was comfortable delegating that to the staff in coordination with the permitting process for the other

boards and departments. He was satisfied about the appropriateness of the changes to the building; it wasn't necessary for him to approve every little thing in the proposal.

Mr. King reviewed the goals of the Harvard Square Conservation District order and instructed that they be considered in framing a motion. He commented on several of goals that he considered relevant. He recommended a finding that a majority of the objectives of the district were satisfied by the project. Ms. Berg amended her motion to include the finding as basis for the approval of a certificate of appropriateness. Mr. Barry agreed to the amendment.

Dr. Solet noted that the public was very engaged. She asked Harvard if they would meet with the public again on the project specifics. Mr. Lucey agreed and said he had already committed to meeting with Ms. Meyer.

Mr. King suggested that any members of the public having specific design recommendations or concerns write them in the form of a letter to the staff so that they would be part of the record and could be addressed by staff in its ongoing design review process.

The amended motion passed 5-1, with Dr. Solet opposed.

Public Hearings: Demolition Review

Case D-1356 (Amendment): 29 Highland St., by Highland Street Cambridge LLC. Selective demolition and relocation of 1922 house on the lot; construction of addition.

Mr. Irving recused himself because of a former business relationship with the owners of the property, who had consulted him before purchasing it. He left the table and sat with the public.

Ms. Burks showed slides of the house, carriage house, and surrounding context. She reported that the staff had met with the architects several times since the January hearing of the Commission at which the commission found the house a preferably preserved significant building. She also noted the receipt on April 2 of a petition to study the property for landmark designation. She said she had forwarded the petition to the Election Commission for verification of the signatures, but did not yet know if it was a valid petition.

Susan Denny, an owner, explained that after the January hearing, they had gone back to the drawing board to rethink the design. She noted that she and her husband had sent a letter to over 30 neighbors with links to the new plans. They held an open house to answer questions. She said the majority of feedback she had received was supportive. Some concerns had to do with the curb cut on Appleton Street and views of the addition from Highland Street. She noted that the city was going to create a speed table to calm traffic on Appleton Street.

David Stern of Stern McCafferty Architecture & Interiors presented the new proposal. He compared existing and proposed site plans to demonstrate where the house would be moved on the lot, reoriented to face Appleton Street. The formal entry would face the street and the family entry would be

at the back off the driveway between the front house and the carriage house. He described the benefits of the new design, including preservation of two buildings, not one, taking better advantage of the very large site, and creation of a better relationship between the house and the carriage house. He explained that the goal of the design of the addition was for the main house to be front and center and the addition to sit deferentially behind it, further from the street, and behind plantings. The materials of the existing house would remain the same and the addition would be stained wood siding and metal. It would be muted and soft, not shiny and reflective. He projected a video rendering of the house and addition, with views from around the perimeter of the property. He noted that plantings would obscure views of the addition. He explained that there was an 8' change in grade on the property. Low retaining walls would terrace the property. Some of the large existing plantings would be preserved. He said the proposal was a win-win because it would preserve the house but also give his clients the residence they wanted.

Ms. Berg asked if a fence along Appleton Street might be a more traditional look near the main house than a stone wall. She said she had no objection to the retaining walls in the south yard.

Dr. Solet asked about setbacks and how the amount of paving compared with the previous design. Mr. Stern replied that the paving near the carriage house had been reduced.

Mr. Barry asked why the porches and the right bay were to be removed. Mr. Stern replied that the house movers had indicated that it would make the moving easier. He noted that the porch was in poor condition with a lot of rot. The right bay had a different roof form from the main block of the house. He explained that they did not want an oversized house and thought the appendages could go.

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

Karin Weller of 12 Humboldt Street asked if the quoins were existing on the house. Mr. Stern replied in the affirmative. Ms. Weller asked what the paving material would be. Mr. Stern answered that it wasn't finalized, but probably a stone paver. She said that demolition of the two wings would destroy the charm of the house and would leave it looking ordinary. The addition was too large.

Philip de Normandy, no address given, explained that the Baxters and the Hubbards had been friends of his family. The house had not always been successful for the Hubbards. The house was dark inside, though appealing from the outside. The current proposal would go a long way to correcting some of those problems. It would allow more light inside the house, preserve it for the neighborhood, and provide a great solution for the new family.

Len Ederly of 165 Mount Auburn Street introduced himself as the son of William and Lois Ederly. They had had to go home, but had asked him to read their statement opposing the application. They indicated it would undermine the neighborhood character and the loss of the house would negatively affect the entire area.

Leslie Jeng of 43 Appleton Street spoke in support of the proposal. The changes and addition would enhance the property and were a good compromise.

Jonathan Cole of 15 Hemlock Road said his house was behind the carriage house. He had supported the original application for demolition, but could also support this design as a good compromise. He urged the Commission to act so that there would be forward motion on the project. The property was deteriorating. The neighborhood had seen a lot of changes and the current proposal was not out of place. He referenced the modern addition at 88 Appleton Street.

Linda Kaboolian of 23 Highland Street noted that her home had been substantially modified in 1922 when 29 Highland Street was constructed. She said the current proposal took the same approach as 88 Appleton Street to construct a modern addition onto the back of a traditional house. Having a beautiful garden on Highland Street would be a lovely thing. The house would be preserved, it would just be visible from a different perspective. She urged the Commission to accept the proposal as a good compromise.

Annette LaMond of 7 Riedesel Avenue said it was wonderful that part of the house would be preserved. She indicated she would prefer to leave the house in its current location and have the modern addition added onto the back of it. The garden could be on the north side. Could the house stay in its current location or be moved forward toward Highland?

Toby Fairbank of 221 Mount Auburn Street said that the owners, Chris Nolen and Susan Denny, had done an incredible job of responding to the concerns of the Commission and their neighbors. The elephant in the room was the modern style of the addition. He noted that the addition would be shielded by plantings. A glimpse of a modern house was okay.

Charles Pieper of 24 Highland Street said the revised proposal was acceptable. It would preserve the front of the house and reduce hardscape. He noted that he and his wife had restored their Victorian house completely. He said it seemed that some people just wanted to preserve the familiar even though the proposal was in keeping with other modern changes and additions in the neighborhood.

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He commented that he had been struck by a comment made in a letter from Brian Pfeiffer about the importance of siting to the significance of a building. He remarked that the addition looked like the dominant part of the house rather than the reverse. The house would be the smallest of the four at the corner of Highland and Appleton. He asked the proponents if they had considered moving the house closer to Highland Street and placing the addition on the north side of the house. Mr. Stern answered that there were a lot of ways that the composition could be arranged but his goals had been to make better use of the site, improve the relationship of the house to the carriage house, and keep the addition deferential to the main house by making it lower, set back, screened by the landscape. The volume of the addition was only about 40% of the total.

Dr. Solet asked if the carriage house was grandfathered as a separate unit. Mr. Stern replied that it was zoned as a separate unit. He proposed no change to the footprint of the carriage house.

Mr. Barry said the removal of the porches and the right wing would substantially diminish the house. He admired the effort to preserve the house and find a compromise but the addition did not clearly relate to the existing house in its massing or materials. He said he was not comfortable moving forward with the new design considering that a landmark petition had been received for the house.

Dr. Solet agreed that the relationship between house and addition wasn't clear in either fenestration or materials. The design could be improved. Mr. Stern responded, through the chair, that it had been difficult to decide how much to keep and how much to take away. The staff had also raised the point about the right (kitchen) wing. The addition was distinct and he had not tried to weave it together with the main house. The design focused more on circulation and the new spaces being created, but he was open to considering the questions raised by the Commission.

Mr. Barry asked if the chimney was to be expressed on the outside wall. Mr. Stern replied affirmatively.

Mr. King said the question as to why the Old Cambridge Historic District did not include the south side of Reservoir Hill was worth considering, no matter what happens with 29 Highland Street.

Ms. Burks offered her recommendation that district expansion was worth studying, but denying the request to move the house and build a modern addition did not have to be a punitive reaction if the question was broader than just what to do with this property. The applicants had made a significant concession and were preserving a large portion of the house, not just a fragment. This seemed to be a solution under the goals of the demolition delay ordinance.

Mr. Barry recommended not rescinding the preferably preserved status of the house in the context of the current design proposal.

Mr. King asked whether any member of the Commission wished to move that the house was no longer preferably preserved in the context of the current design proposal, and not such motion was made.

Dr. Solet said that opening up views to the carriage house was a public benefit of the proposal. She was less concerned about the diminished size of the house than in seeing a relationship between the main house and the new addition.

Mr. King asked that consideration be given to putting the addition further to the north. He commended the applicants for trying to save as much as possible of the house.

[Mr. Irving left the meeting].

Preservation Award Nominations

Ms. Burks showed slides of all the nominated projects and identified the staff recommendations. She asked the Commission to select 10-12 projects.

The Commission identified their top eight projects but did not agree with all of the staff recommendations. Ms. Burks said she would consult with the Director when he returned from ~~vacation~~Europe.

Mr. Crocker moved to adjourn. Mr. Barry seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:05 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on April 2, 2015**

Henry Moss	130 Prospect St
Andrew Barnett	Hopkins Architects, London, UK
Sophy Twohig	Hopkins Architects, London, UK
Gary Hammer	1350 Massachusetts Ave
William Edgerly	32 Highland St
Lois S. Edgerly	32 Highland St
Noah Delwiche	Harvard College, Harvard Crimson
Emily Mueller De Celis	231 Concord Ave, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, Inc.
Lee Cott	130 Prospect St
Supratik Bose	17 Lee St
Richard Fryberger	20 Sumner St
Joanna Scott	11 Highland St
Annette LaMond	7 Riedesel Ave
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St., #404
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl.
Janna Coleman	86 Wendell St #2
Denise Jillson	2203 Massachusetts Ave
John Sanzone	540 Memorial Dr.
Kevin Crane	27 Norris St
Giles Moore	1350 Massachusetts Ave
Susan Viglione	100 Memorial Dr
Hugh Russell	1 Corliss Pl
Alexandra Offiong	1350 Massachusetts Ave
Sandra Saccone	950 Massachusetts Ave #212
Liz Whitbeck	1 Fitchburg St B450, Somerville
Sudipta Devanath	1585 Massachusetts Ave #199
Jack Bardy	13 Brattle St
Chris Taylor	23 Decatur St
Susan Morgan	16 Regent St
Kenneth Guditiz	130 Prospect St
Lawrence Cheng	130 Prospect St
Peter Gearhart	23 Plymouth Rd, Wellesley
Timothy Moore	26 W. Cedar St, Boston
Linda Kaboolian	23 Highland St

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.