



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

GEORGE J. PROAKIS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

SARAH LEWIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
SARAH WHITE, *PLANNER & PRESERVATION PLANNER*
ALEX MELLO, *PLANNER*
MONIQUE BALDWIN, *ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT*

Case #: ZBA 2018-166
Date: December 12, 2018

Recommendation:
Deny Administrative Appeal & Uphold ISD Decision

ZBA STAFF REPORT

Site: 118-124 College Avenue

Applicant Name: Havurat Shalom
Community Seminary, Inc. with
Meredith Porter as Agent

Applicant Address: 113 College
Avenue, Somerville, MA 02144

Agent: Meredith Porter

Agent Address: 104 Josephine
Avenue, Somerville, MA 02144

Alderman: Lance Davis



Legal Notice: Applicant, Havurat Shalom Community Seminary, Inc., through their representative, Meredith Porter, seeks an Administrative Appeal per SZO §3.1.9, §3.2, and §3.2.3 of building permit No. B18-001184 issued by the Inspectional Services Department (ISD). The property for which the building permit was issued is owned by LaCourt Realty, LLC. RB zone. Ward 6.

Dates of Public Hearing: December 12, 2018 - ZBA

STAFF NOTE: It is important for Staff to note at the outset of this report to the ZBA that the Appellant's allegations in their appeal filing are moot. The points that the Appellant puts forth are not

grounds upon which the issuance of a building permit can be challenged. The claims the Appellant puts forth are those under which the ZBA decision to grant the SPSR could be appealed in court. However, the Appellant failed to file an appeal in Court (Superior or Land) within the 20-day appeal period that is allowed by M.G.L. Chapter 40A after a ZBA decision is filed with the City Clerk.

The law (state and local) does not provide a mechanism for an aggrieved party to challenge a ZBA decision after this 20-day appeal period in any fashion, and certainly not through an Administrative Appeal process which is provided for the appeal of a Building Permit.

The time for the Appellant to challenge the ZBA's decision in this case, and on the bases presented via the Administrative Appeal that is currently before the Board, ended at the close of business on **May 22, 2018**. Therefore, the entire appeal application is invalid.

Despite the invalidity of the appeal, Staff will briefly go through the claims made by the Appellant as Staff surmises that the ZBA may have general questions related to each claim.

I. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

Havurat Shalom Community Seminary, Inc. is an abutter to the property at 118-124 College Avenue. Meredith Porter is their authorized agent representing the Seminary. Hereafter, both parties shall be referred to as the "Appellant." The property at 118-124 College Avenue owned by Lacourt Realty, LLC, is the subject of the appeal.

The Appellant alleges that Building Permit No. B18-001184 issued by the Inspectional Services Department (ISD) on October 2, 2018, was wrongly granted and should be revoked. The Appellant contends that there are multiple reasons for which the building permit should be denied. The allegations are enumerated in section III "Appeal" of this staff report. Staff responses to these allegations will be brief and are included only to counter erroneous claims. As Staff stated earlier in this report, the Appellant's allegations are moot as the appeal period of the ZBA's decision passed several months ago.

As an abutter to the property, the Appellant has standing to file this Administrative Appeal. However, as Staff noted earlier in this report, the Appellant's claims are not those under which a building permit can be appealed. These claims by the Appellant had validity for appeal within the 20-day appeal period after the ZBA decision was filed with the City Clerk. This appeal period ended at the close of business on **May 22, 2018**. Staff does not find that the Appellant's appeal is properly before the Board.

II. BACKGROUND

Subject Property

The subject property presents one structure that is comprised of two formerly independent residential structures that are now connected on the ground level with an office space. The property currently contains one commercial space and four residential dwelling units. The property is an 11,326 square foot parcel located in the RB zone.

History

The property owner, Lacourt Realty, LLC, submitted an application to increase the number of dwelling units on this site from four (4) to seven (7). The hearing for this project was continued numerous times to

allow for neighborhood meetings, changes to plans, or updating of information regarding the proposal. Public hearings were scheduled for the following dates, most of which resulted in continuances to later hearing dates. Briefly, the general activity timeline for this project is as follows:

August 6, 2017 – Lacourt Realty, LLC submits zoning relief application to City Clerk’s office

September 6, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

September 19, 2017 – Lance Davis, Ward 6 alderman, sponsors a neighborhood meeting.

September 27, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

October 4, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

October 18, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

November 8, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

November 29, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

December 13, 2017 – ZBA hearing scheduled

January 17, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

January 31, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

February 14, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

March 6, 2018 – Alderman Davis sponsors a second neighborhood meeting.

March 7, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

March 21, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

April 4, 2018 – ZBA hearing scheduled

April 18, 2018 – ZBA renders decision of Conditional Approval for SPSR

May 2, 2018 – ZBA decision filed with City Clerk

May 22, 2018 – 20-day appeal period of ZBA decision ends at close-of-business

November 1, 2018 – Havurat Shalom Community Seminary, Inc. with Meredith Porter as agent, submits Administrative Appeal to City Clerk’s office.

III. APPEAL

1. Role of the ZBA: In an Administrative Appeal hearing, the ZBA hears appeals of the decision of the Superintendent of Inspectional Services. The process for such appeals is set out in MGL 40A, Section 8 and Section 3.2 of the SZO. An appeal may be taken by any person aggrieved by an order or decision of the Superintendent of Inspectional Services. The ZBA must determine whether to affirm the ISD decision or overturn it and why.

Staff believes that the Appellant has status as (an) aggrieved party in this circumstance due to their being a direct abutter or an abutter to an abutter of the project site as per M.G.L. Chapter 40A and as upheld by the Massachusetts Land Court in the spring of 2018 in the case *Claudia Murrow vs. Esh Circus Arts, LLC, & others*. The Appellant has submitted their Administrative Appeal to the City Clerk within the timeframe required (30 days) after the issuance of a building permit.

However, as stated earlier, Staff does **not** believe that this Administrative Appeal is properly before the Board. This is due to the fact that the Appellant has submitted an appeal that challenges the ZBA decision itself that was rendered on April 18, 2018. As Staff noted earlier in this report, the timeframe for the Appellant to have appealed the ZBA decision expired at the close of business day on May 22, 2018. Further, the appeal of the ZBA decision is required to be a court appeal filed either in Land Court or Superior Court, not via an Administrative Appeal with the ZBA.

2. Analysis of the Appeal

OSPCD staff has reviewed:

- 1) the Administrative Appeal application from Havurat Shalom Community Seminary, Inc. with Meredith Porter as Agent;
- 2) the file for the property at Inspectional Services;
- 3) the zoning relief file for the original case ZBA 2017-88 for 118-124 College Avenue

In their appeal, the Appellant has put forth four (4) main arguments and myriad sub-claims. These arguments and sub-claims are discussed below. Due to the length of the statements submitted by the Appellant, the Staff responses to each of these arguments and sub-claims is addressed in red text within the body of the Appellant's claims enumerated below.

1 – The Appellant alleges that: Regarding 118-124 College Ave, Building Permit B18-001184, issued October 2, 2018, cites the ZBA Decision in Case #ZBA 2017-88 in giving Approval to add 3 units to the building and to renovate one pre-existing unit as per plans.

The permit is invalid since it violates provisions of the Somerville Zoning Ordinance and was issued in error on the basis of incorrect, inaccurate and incomplete information. The list below provides some examples of this. The permit should be suspended or revoked in accordance with 780 CMR 105.4 (Validity of Permit) and 780 CMR 105.6 (Suspension or Revocation).¹

¹ At this point in their appeal statement, the Appellant cites the SZO as follows: “SZO Section 7.3 (Maximum Dwelling Units Per Lot) states: *In Residence A districts, the maximum number of dwelling units per lot shall be two (2) units, except where conversion for up to three (3) dwelling units is authorized by special permit under Section 7.11. In Residence B districts, the maximum number of dwelling units per lot shall be three (3) units.*”

Staff Response: Planning Staff found, at the time case # ZBA 2017-88 was before the ZBA for review and finds now that the information provided was sufficient in terms of plans and recommendations for the ZBA to make its determination in accordance with the SZO.

The Appellant continues as follows:

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Payment Omitted. The ZBA Decision in Case #ZBA 2017-88 states: Section 7.3 states that in Residence A and Residence B districts, where developments include a minimum of twelve and a half percent (12.5%) affordable housing units on-site, but in no case less than one (1) affordable unit, as defined by Section 2.2.4, the above standards may be waived by the SPGA through application for special permit with site plan review.

The Board finds that the Applicant meets the requirement of providing a minimum of one affordable unit as required by Section 7.3 of the SZO when proposing an increase in the number of units on a property beyond that which is typically allowed by zoning.

The Appellant further continues: Note that this citation of SZO §7.3 is incorrect. The “minimum of twelve and a half percent (12.5%) was changed to “minimum of twenty percent (20%) by Ordinance No 2017-06, approved by the Board of Aldermen on June 8, 2017.

Staff Response: The Appellant is correct only in that the citation of 12.5% is inaccurate. The citation should read 20%. However, the fact remains that, the owner of 118-124 College Avenue is providing the required number of affordable units on-site (one unit). The misquoted percentage in the Board decision does not change the fact that the proper number of affordable units (one) is being provided on-site.

The owner of 118-124 College Avenue was also required to work with the Housing Office to complete the requirements for affordable housing prior to the issuance of the building permit and/or Certificate of Occupancy. These requirements are covered by Conditions # 3, 4, and 5² of the ZBA decision.

In addition to the appeal period of these points having expired on May 22, 2018, a misquote of a percentage does not constitute grounds for a building permit to be withdrawn so long as the proper percentage or number of units of affordable housing is provided.

The Appellant further continues: Compare this with the ZBA Decision in Case #ZBA 2018-64 on July 23, 2018 in the matter of 32 Glen St:

Also, 20% of the proposed seven units is 1.4; therefore the proposal includes one affordable housing unit and a payment of 0.4 units to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

In Residence A and Residence B districts, where developments include a minimum of twenty percent (20%) affordable housing units on-site, but in no case less than one (1) affordable unit, as defined by Section 2.2.3, the above standards may be waived by the SPGA through application for special permit with site plan review. In all cases, the minimum lot size, the minimum lot area per dwelling unit and other dimensional and parking requirements of Article 8 and Article 9 shall be met. No incentives for provision of additional affordable housing units as set forth under Article 13, Section 13.5, shall be available for those applications requiring a special permit with site plan review under this section.” (Ord. No 2006-07, 1-26-2006; Ord. No. 2017-06, 6-8-2017)

² **Condition #3:** The Affordable housing Implementation Plan (AHIP) must be approved by the OSPCD Housing Division and executed prior to issuance of Building Permit. The affordable unit shall be provided on-site.

Condition #4: Written certification of the creation of affordable housing units, any fractional payment required, or alternative methods of compliance, must be obtained from the OSPCD Housing Division before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.). No C.O. shall be issued until the OSPCD Housing Division has confirmed that the Affordable Housing Restriction has been approved and recorded and the developer has provided the promised affordable units on-site.

Condition #5: No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued until the OSPCD Housing Division has confirmed that: (for Condominium Projects) the Condominium Documents have been approved and the Developer has agreed to a form of Deed Rider for the Affordable Unit(s), or (for Rental Project) the Developer has agreed to and executed a Memorandum of Understanding for Monitoring of the Affordable Unit(s).

In this case as in that case, a payment of 0.4 units to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund must be required in addition to the one affordable housing unit.

Staff Response: Staff has made clear to the Board and to the public before that every case that comes before the ZBA is taken individually on its own merits. Simply because the ZBA ruled one way in a particular case does not mean the ZBA will rule the same way in another (32 Glen Street).

Moreover, 32 Glen Street was an entirely different type of case than 118-124 College Avenue. 32 Glen Street started with one dwelling unit on the site and six (6) additional units developed. 118-124 College Avenue started off as non-conforming with four residential units on an RB lot (the RB zone allows a maximum of three (3) units).

Further, it is unclear to Staff why the Appellant asserts that a fractional payment is required. The updated version of §7.3 does not state that a fractional payment is required. §7.3 states that 20% of the units must be affordable when density is increased beyond the typically allowable limit in the RA and RB zones. §7.3 goes on to state that *no less than one affordable* unit in any case shall be provided. §7.3 has no requirement for a fractional payment to be provided, only that a minimum of one affordable unit be provided.

Article 13 of the SZO, Somerville’s inclusionary zoning amendment, also does not require a fractional payment to be made for a development containing seven (7) units. Instead, the table in §13.3.4A of the SZO states that when seven (7) units are to be provided in a development reviewed under an SPSR, the requirement is that ONE affordable unit be provided OR a fractional payment for 0.6 units be made, as illustrated below:

The percentage shall be as established in the Table 13.3.4.A, below:

Table 13.3.4.A: Required Inclusionary Units	
Total Number of Units	Required Inclusionary Units
0 to 5 units	No inclusionary requirement
6 units	1 on-site unit OR fractional payment for 0.4 units
7 units	1 on-site unit OR fractional payment for 0.6 units
8 to 17 units	17.5%
18 or more units	20%

As Staff noted above, Conditions #3, 4, and 5 are what govern housing affordability in the case of 118-124 College Avenue. These conditions are managed and implemented by the OSPCD Housing Office. These conditions cover questions of number of affordable units and fractional payments.

In sum, neither §7.3 nor Article 13 of the SZO require a fractional payment to be made for a 7-unit development. By providing the one on-site affordable unit required by the SZO, Staff finds that the owner of 118-124 College Avenue has met the requirements of the ordinance.

Staff also notes that the owner/agent for 118-124 College Avenue completed the AHIP (affordable housing and inclusionary payment) requirement for the affordable unit on September 20, 2018, prior to the issuance of the building permit, as per the conditions attached to the ZBA approval.

2 – The Appellant alleges that: Landscaping and Permeability Not Adequately Addressed

The ZBA Decision in Case #ZBA 2017-88 relies on this provision of SZO Section 7.3:

...the above standards may be waived by the SPGA through application for special permit with site plan review. In all cases, the minimum lot size, the minimum lot area per dwelling unit and other dimensional and parking requirements of Article 8 and Article 9 shall be met.

Under this provision, the requirements must be met “in all cases.” There is no exemption here for pre-existing non-conformity.

Staff Response: The Appellant misunderstands this portion of the SZO and manner in which non-conformities and special permits function. When there is a pre-existing non-conformity, an Applicant does not have to eliminate that non-conformity, even when applying for a Special Permit. Nor, for that matter, is an Applicant required to improve the existing non-conformity; it could, theoretically, maintain the same level of non-conformity. There is no requirement for the owner of 118-124 College Avenue to eliminate the non-conformities that exist with respect to pervious area or landscaping.

In the public hearings regarding this case, we expressed our concerns about the inadequacy of landscaping on the site. As we noted at the hearing on April 18, 2018, SZO Section 8.5 requires a minimum landscaped area of 25% of the lot, while the application showed landscaped areas at the site of 13% existing and 16% proposed, with numerous significant errors in the latter calculation and incomplete and incorrect landscaping plans:

The large amount of asphalt on this site is not addressed. [There is no] mention of the applicant considering replacement of any asphalt with pavers.

Staff response: Note the Staff response immediately above regarding existing non-conformities. The owner of 118-124 College Avenue had noted that one of the current tenants in the commercial space is a podiatrist. Therefore, pavers in the parking and walking areas of the site would make ambulatory access to the office challenging.

The Appellant continues: I believe these plans should be considered preliminary since none of them are stamped except for the plot plan.

Staff response: An Applicant is not required by law to provide landscaping plans by a professional, landscape architect nor to have any landscaping plans they provide be stamped by a professional.

The Appellant continues: The plans were not prepared by a landscape architect, and it's unclear as to who prepared them.

Staff response: See Staff's response above. Again, there is no legal requirement for a landscape architect to provide landscaping plans. Further, there is no requirement for any Applicant to have the individual(s) preparing their landscaping plans to identify themselves. The ZBA will remember that individual homeowners often seek zoning relief and have been known to draw landscaping plans themselves.

The Appellant continues: The landscaped area does not meet the 25% required by SZO Section 8.5 without exceptions, which must be met in any case according to SZO Section 7.3

The pervious area does not meet the 25% required by SZO Section 8.5 and no provision has been made for a waiver.

Staff response: See Staff's response above regarding non-conformities.

The Appellant continues: Most of the area shown as landscaped on the existing plans is not landscaped per definition. The 222 sq. ft. of crushed stone and heat pumps on the left side of the building is obviously not landscaping, nor is the rubbish and dirt in the back of the building. There is a concrete apron around part of the building which, although covered with dirt, is clearly not permeable, Existing large trees, inside and outside the landscaped area, are not shown. Will any of those be removed? At least one tree should be addressed according to SZO Section 10.2.2.

Staff response: Staff reiterates once again that the time for appealing questions of landscaping and pervious area expired on May 22, 2018. The time to question the removal of trees passed during the public testimony portion of this case – in either verbal or written form. These are not points upon which a building permit can be appealed. The owner of 118-124 College Avenue must comply with the conditions of their special permit including landscaping. The outcomes of special permit cases are negotiated outcomes between a municipality and an applicant.

Section 10.2.2, cited by the Appellant, calls for trees to be planted on pre-existing, non-conforming sites and reads as follows:

10.2.2. Application to Existing Nonconforming Sites. Lawfully existing sites developed with uses and structures prior to enactment of this Ordinance, where such sites are nonconforming with respect to this [Article 10](#), may continue to be used in such present condition provided there is no decrease in the amount of landscaped area, landscaping, screening, and trees from that existing as of this Ordinance's enactment. However, any expansion in gross floor area to uses and structures on such sites shall require the planting of at least one (1) tree under the guidelines of Section 10.6.2 herein, and shall require compliance with the parking lot landscaping and screening requirements of this Article (Sections 10.4 and [10.5](#)) for any parking areas and access ways required to accommodate the expansion of the use and/or structure on such site.

The proposal for 118-124 College Avenue did not include an increase in the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the buildings. Therefore, the suggestion that at least one tree must be planted is moot.

As a point of note, if the City were to take the Appellant's literal interpretation of 10.2.2 then, based on the following portion of this section of the ordinance, any small homeowner who added even 100 square feet of space to their house in the form of an addition, would no longer retain the residential use of their property if they didn't provide additional landscaping somewhere on their site:

Lawfully existing sites developed with uses and structures prior to enactment of this Ordinance, where such sites are nonconforming with respect to this [Article 10](#), may continue to be used in such present condition provided there is no decrease in the amount of landscaped area, landscaping, screening, and trees from that existing as of this Ordinance's enactment.

Staff contends that this is not the intent of this portion of the ordinance and, consequently, does not interpret it as such.

The Appellant continues: The only new conditions in the area are a modification to #20 calling for a review of landscaping by [sic] Planning staff and to #21 calling for compliance with American Nurserymen's Association standards. As far as I can tell, those standards only provide common terminology and establish some techniques regarding measurements but they don't provide any assurance of adequacy of landscaping.

Staff response: Staff reiterates once again that the time for appealing questions of landscaping and pervious area expired on May 22, 2018.

Condition #20 requiring Staff review of all hardscaping and planting to be used on the site is a standard condition written into nearly all zoning approvals. Condition #21 regarding Nurserymen's standards is for installation and maintenance of landscaping, not for design or type of vegetation planted.

The Appellant continues: The current conditions don't address landscaped area, pervious area, and so on. The deleted condition #18 [which was included in the original Staff Report] also required that implementation would be perpetual rather than relying only on a review before installation.

Staff response: Disagreement with a condition applied to a zoning approval is not a basis on which a building permit can be appealed. It is not uncommon for Staff to update conditions (add and eliminate) as a project morphs. It is an iterative process and if the Staff Planners do reassess and find that a condition fails to meet the tests of rational nexus or rough proportionality, then Staff can alter those conditions accordingly prior to the ZBA making a determination on a case.

The Appellant continues: The ZBA proceeded to approve the applicant's request without any consideration of these points, many of which had not been addressed previously.

Staff response: The meaning of the Appellant's statement of "...these points, many of which had not been addressed previously" is unclear to Staff. Regardless, the ZBA discussed landscaping and pervious versus impervious area during their hearings on this matter. That the ZBA was satisfied with their discussion is their right as a Board. That the Appellant wishes they had spent more time discussing this matter is not a point on which an appeal of a building permit can be made.

3. The Appellant alleges:

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

As we noted at the hearing on April 18, 2018: No plan has been provided for the basement. One reason why that's relevant is that existing areas claimed are significantly less than those shown on assessors [sic] records, and from the plans provided, it's unclear whether the project exceeds the FAR limit of 1.0 [the maximum allowed in the RB District under SZO Section 8.5].

The ZBA proceeded to approve the applicant's request without any consideration of this point, which had not been addressed previously.

Staff response: Staff reiterates once again that the time for appealing the ZBA decision, including this on FAR, expired on May 22, 2018. Further,

4. The Appellant alleges:

The Legal Notice as published and as cited in the ZBA Decision and the Zoning District/Ward field in the ZBA Decision indicate Ward 4. The property is located in Ward 6.

Staff response: The Appellant's point is taken that the legal notice and decision contain the incorrect ward number. The purpose of a legal notice is to provide adequate information to the public about a proposed project. The legal notice includes the correct street address. It was upon this street address that abutters received the legal notification of the project proposal. The abutter list is attached.

Further, the Ward 6 alderman, Lance Davis, held neighborhood meetings on this project. These neighborhood meetings are called out in the "History" section of this staff report. It is clear that, in light of the neighborhood meetings, the attached abutter's list, and the presence of abutters at the ZBA hearings that they were properly noticed. The scrivener's error regarding the incorrect ward number included in the ZBA decision can be corrected with a memo to the City Clerk's office. However, the incorrect ward number does not constitute a grounds for revocation of a building permit.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

- After review of the issues raised in the appeal, Planning Staff concludes that, due to the fact that the time for appealing the ZBA's decision on the grounds stated by the Appellant expired on May 22, 2018, the Appellant's Administrative Appeal is moot. The Appellant should have filed an appeal with either Superior or Land Court within the 20-day appeal period allowed after the filing of a ZBA decision.
- Moreover, as explained throughout this staff report, the allegations put forth by the Appellant have do not constitute a basis for overturning the decision from ISD.
- Planning staff recommends that the ZBA **DENY** the Appellant's administrative appeal and **UPHOLD** the issuance of the building permit by ISD.

MBLU	Location	Owner Name	Co-Owner Name	Address 1	Address 2	City, State, Zip
15/ C/ 16/ /	14 POWDER HOUSE	BARSENAULT ROBERT J & JEAN M		14 POWDER HOUSE BLVD		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144-1306
15/ C/ 19/ /	855 BROADWAY	DOHERTY MARY & NERI NANCY D ET AL TRS	THE GEORGE L DOHERTY JR 1999 TRUST	855 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ C/ 20/ /	865 BROADWAY	DOHERTY M, DOHERTY -NERI NANCY ETAL TRS	THE GEORGE L DOHERTY JR 1999 TRUST	C/O DOHERTY-NERI NANCY	855 BROADWAY	SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ C/ 21/ /	1 WALKER ST	AGRI SARA TRUSTEE	AGRI FAMILY TRUST	33 STEVIN DRIVE		WOBBURN, MA 01801
15/ C/ 22/ /	5 WALKER ST	LACOURT FOUNDATION LLC		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ C/ 23/ /	9 WALKER ST	RICE BRETT A & SARAH E		9 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ C/ 24/ /	15 WALKER ST	WISHON TRACY MK & DAVID		15 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ C/ 25/ /	19 WALKER ST	DRISCOLL THOMAS C JR		21 BLACKBURNIAN RD		LINCOLN, MA 01773
15/ C/ 26/ 1/	21 WALKER ST #1	KETCHEN BEVERLY	LIPSON HARRY	37 BRANTWOOD RD		ARLINGTON, MA 02476
15/ C/ 26/ 2/	21 WALKER ST #2	RAJAPPAN GOWRI	YU LAI YANG	21 WALKER ST #2		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 10/ /	26 WALKER ST	KRUPKA ERIC J & SCHUUR ARAH		26 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 11/ /	18 WALKER ST	62 COLLEGE AVE TRUST LLC		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 12/ /	881 BROADWAY	VERI PIO & JACQUELINE F		PO BOX 441226		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 13/ /	889 BROADWAY	LACOURT REALTY LLC		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 14/ /	893 BROADWAY	893 BROADWAY LLC		7 MANSELL PKWY		SALEM, MA 01970
15/ D/ 15/ /	897 BROADWAY	DAVIDIAN JAMES C TRUSTEE	S/O DAVIDIAN JAMES C	34 THOREAU RD		CONCORD, MA 01742
15/ D/ 16/ /	901 BROADWAY	POIRIER LEONARD J & LINDA		901 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 17/ /	905 BROADWAY	DOHERTY MICHAEL E & CRISTINA M		4 GINN RD		WINCHESTER, MA 01890
15/ D/ 18/ /	911 BROADWAY	SWARTZ GORDON E & DOYLE DEBORAH C	C/O DANIEL SWARTZ	81 BENTON RD		SOMERVILLE, MA 02143
15/ D/ 19/ /	915 BROADWAY	KELLY FRANCIS JR		915 BROADWAY #1		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 20/ /	921 BROADWAY	DAMHAVE COSCIA KRISTINE	COSCIA DENNIS	P.O. BOX 8305		WAKEFIELD, MA 01880
15/ D/ 6/ 38/	38 WALKER ST	MYCYNK STEVEN V & RIMA C MYCYNK		38 WALKER ST #38		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 6/ 40/	40 WALKER ST	COLLINS CLAIRE L		31 SOUTH GATE PK		NEWTON, MA 02465
15/ D/ 7/ /	36 WALKER ST	FLACO MICHAEL J & ANNA L FOR LIFE	BUCKLEY GRACE A TR FALCO IRREV FAM TR	36 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 8/ /	32 WALKER ST	DIPERNA DORIS M TRUSTEE	DIPERNA FAMILY TRUST	32 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ D/ 9/ /	28 WALKER ST	BASS FREDERICK M & DIANE ME		28 WALKER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144-1623
15/ E/ 1/ /	898 BROADWAY	SIUDA AMANDA M	S/O SIUDA PETER & AMANDA M	898 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 10/ /	118 COLLEGE AVE	LACOURT REALTY LLC		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 12/ /	116 COLLEGE AVE	RIZKALLAH MOUHA		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 13/ /	18 KENWOOD ST	RIZKALLAH MOUHA	S/O LACOURT ENTERPRISES LLC	30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 14/ /	16 KENWOOD ST	RIZKALLAH MOUHA	S/O LACOURT ENTERPRISES LLC	30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 15/ /	14 KENWOOD ST	RIZKALLAH MOUHA	S/O LACOURT ENTERPRISES LLC	30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 16/ /	8 KENWOOD ST	RIZKALLAH MOUHA	S/O LACOURT ENTERPRISES LLC	30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 17/ /	2 KENWOOD ST	62 COLLEGE AVE TRUST LLC		30 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 2/ /	894 BROADWAY	HILL JR ROBERT F		350 MASSACHUSETTS AVE #253		ARLINGTON, MA 02474
15/ E/ 3/ /	890 BROADWAY	62 COLLEGE TRUST LLC		34 ARLINGTON ST		WINCHESTER, MA 01890
15/ E/ 4/ /	884 BROADWAY	DINJIAN DERAN SARKIS TRUSTEE	DINJIAN DERAN REALTY TRUST	54 LONGMEADOW RD		BELMONT, MA 02478
15/ E/ 5/ /	872 BROADWAY	MINGHETTI PIER L & ELEANOR		872 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
15/ E/ 6/ /	852 BROADWAY	BECKATE LLC	C/O KOSTOPOULAS CHARLES P	4055 LOSILLIAS DRIVE		SARASOTA, FL 34238
15/ E/ 7/ /	130 COLLEGE AVE	BRAUNSTEIN EDWIN P		147 STRATFORD ST		WEST ROXBURY, MA 02132
15/ E/ 8/ /	126 COLLEGE AVE	MARSHALL PETER C & BARBARA J &	MACPHEE SPIKE & VIRGINIA & AL	126 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 10/ /	916 BROADWAY	HERTIG POLLY LAURELCHILD		916 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 12/ /	906 BROADWAY	BAO YI & HE SIYUAN		32 ST JAMES AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 13/ /	28 BILLINGHAM ST	BETHEL DOROTHY & STACKE DENIS & DENISE		28 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 14/ /	26 BILLINGHAM ST	TRAHAN ROBERT & KAREN TRUSTEES	ROBERT & KAREN TRAHAN TRUST	26 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 15/ /	22 BILLINGHAM ST	CRAWFORD LUCILLE P		22 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 16/ /	18 BILLINGHAM ST	WELSH JAMIE L & DYLAN S		18 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 17/ /	14 BILLINGHAM ST	KENNEDY JOSEPH P & NANCY G		14 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 6/ /	81 CHANDLER ST	MOKOID THOMAS	ULBRICHT CATHERINE	81 CHANDLER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 7/ /	85 CHANDLER ST	FELTS GEORGE E & JEAN M		85 CHANDLER ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 8/ /	87 CHANDLER ST	YANG SHU XIAN & TIAN QUAN LI		PO BOX 440073		WEST SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
16/ D/ 9/ /	922 BROADWAY	MYNATT LARRY	HERTIG POLLY L	922 BROADWAY		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
19/ F/ 1/ /	838 BROADWAY	CITY OF SOMERVILLE	POWDERHOUSE OFFICE	93 HIGHLAND AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ D/ 3/ /	18 SUMMIT ST	ROSE AMY & SHARYN R		18 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ D/ 4/ /	16 SUMMIT ST	STREET MARIN		PO BOX 1032		VINEYARD HAVEN, MA 02568
20/ D/ 5/ /	12 SUMMIT ST	BESIN LISA A & PETER D		12 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ D/ 6/ /	96 COLLEGE AVE	SARKISIAN JACK NICHOLAS		96 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 1/ /	17 SUMMIT ST	GALVIN JOSEPH J JR	GALVIN P JEAN	17 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 10/ /	102 COLLEGE AVE	PARRELLA ANTHONY P		102 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 11/ /	9 SUMMIT ST	SMITH MEREDITH W	CARTON ROBIN E	9 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 12/ /	11 SUMMIT ST	BURNETT NORMA		11 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 13/ /	15 SUMMIT ST	GALVIN JOSEPH J JR	& PHYLLIS JEAN	15 SUMMIT ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 2/ /	23 BILLINGHAM ST	RIPPLE MICHAEL	BERGER SUZANNE E	23 BILLINGHAM ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 3/ /	1 KENWOOD ST	DOHERTY JOSEPH M & BARBARA ANN		1 KENWOOD ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 4/ 1/	5 KENWOOD ST #1	TING YVONNE		5 KENWOOD ST #1		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 4/ 2/	5 KENWOOD ST #2	NARINSKY ALEXANDER		5 KENWOOD ST #2		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 4/ 3/	5 KENWOOD ST #3	NARINSKY ALEXANDER		5 KENWOOD ST #3		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 5/ /	7 KENWOOD ST	RYAN JUDITH & PETER F		7 KENWOOD ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 6/ 11/	11 KENWOOD ST	MARRA PAUL		11 KENWOOD ST		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 6/ 15/	15 KENWOOD ST	PANGARO GIAN	ABDER STACY M	370A GRAND AVE #1		BROOKLYN, NY 11238
20/ E/ 7/ /	110 COLLEGE AVE	LILLEY DAVID J & KAREN S		44 CLOVER ST		BELMONT, MA 02478
20/ E/ 8/ /	108 COLLEGE AVE	CACIOPPO CHRISTOPHER M		108 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 9/ 1F/	106 COLLEGE AVE	NOWELL JUSTIN R		33 BEAVER AVE		LYNNFIELD, MA 01940
20/ E/ 9/ 1R/	106 COLLEGE AVE	GABRIEL JOHN		106 COLLEGE AVE #1R		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 9/ 2/	106 COLLEGE AVE	SCHULTZ ANGELINA W & JON N		106 COLLEGE AVE #2		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ E/ 9/ 3/	106 COLLEGE AVE	McGINNESS KATHLEEN E		106 COLLEGE AVE #3		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 1/ /	103 COLLEGE AVE	O'DONOVAN JAMES		103 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 10/ /	12 POWDER HOUSE	T MAYBURY-LEWIS ELSEBET TRUSTEE	S/O MAYBURY-LEWIS ALAN BJORN	12-14 POWDERHOUSE TERRACE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 11/ /	10 POWDER HOUSE	T 10 POWDER HOUSE TERRACE LLC		19 OLDFHAM ROAD		ARLINGTON, MA 02474
20/ F/ 12/ 26/	26 KIDDER AVE	MARTIN JOSEPH A & KATHLEEN C		26 KIDDER AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 12/ 26A/	26A KIDDER AVE	NEDDU PAOLA		26A KIDDER AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 12/ 28/	28 KIDDER AVE	BASKETT RALPH G III TRUSTEE	RALPH G BASKETT III LIVING TRUST	222 GLENCOE RD		COLUMBUS, OH 43124
20/ F/ 13/ 1/	22 KIDDER AVE #1	GLOVER KEITH & HILL LENORE		15 LINDEN AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02143
20/ F/ 13/ 2/	22 KIDDER AVE #2	JAMES CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH	JAMES EMILY GRACE	22 KIDDER AVE #2		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 13/ 3/	22 KIDDER AVE #3	GOETZEL ERICH		22 KIDDER AVE #3		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 14/ /	16 KIDDER AVE	JOST GROUP LLC		351 POPE RD		CONCORD, MA 01742
20/ F/ 15/ /	14 KIDDER AVE	HECHT ALICE & BURCK RICHARD		14 KIDDER AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 2/ /	107 COLLEGE AVE	FERRAR LOUIS E		7 ASHLAND ST		MELROSE, MA 02176
20/ F/ 3/ /	109 COLLEGE AVE	109 COLLEGE AVE LLC		109 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 4/ /	113 COLLEGE AVE	HAVURAT SHALOM COM. SEM. INC	C/O CAROLYN EDESSL-VETTER, TREASURER	598 A MAIN ST		MEDFORD, MA 02155
20/ F/ 5/ /	115 COLLEGE AVE	SHAPLYKO NICHOLAS &	SOROKINA EKATERINA	115 COLLEGE AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 6/ /	119 COLLEGE AVE	SANDTAIL LLC		15 ELMER ST		CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138
20/ F/ 7/ 1/	24 POWDER HOUSE	LIEBERMAN DAVID &	SCHAUER JESSICA M	24 POWDER HOUSE TERR UNIT 1		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 7/ 2/	24 POWDER HOUSE	1TURCOTTE JULIE C	S/O LAURING MARIA T	24 POWDER HOUSE TERR #2		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 7/ 3/	24 POWDER HOUSE	1CHAU YAN & HASSON SAMUEL		24 POWDER HOUSE TERR #3		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 8/ /	20 POWDER HOUSE	1SILVERI GINO & CONCETTA FOR LIFE	G J A & J SILVERI REMAINDER	22 POWDER HOUSE TERR		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ F/ 9/ /	16 POWDER HOUSE	TRENshaw LAURA R		16 POWDER HOUSE TERR		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144
20/ H/ 3/ /	97 COLLEGE AVE	97 COLLEGE AVENUE LLC	C/O CHARLES AGGOURAS, GFC DEV. INC.	PO BOX 261		WESTON, MA 02493
20/ H/ 4/ /	9 KIDDER AVE	AMARAL JOHN		9 KIDDER AVE		SOMERVILLE, MA 02144