

1. Legal Ad For 6-10 And 6-17 Meetings.

Documents: [6-10, 17-15 LEGAL AD.PDF](#)

2. Agenda

Documents: [6-10-15 AGENDA.PDF](#)

3. 58 Fore Street

Documents: [HP MEMO - 58 FORE STREET.PDF](#)

**LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF PORTLAND
Public comments are taken at all meetings.**

On **Wednesday, June 10** and **continuing on Wednesday June 17, 2015** at 5:30 p.m., Room 209, 2nd Floor, City Hall, the Portland Historic Preservation Board will meet in Room 209, City Hall, to discuss the following item. (Public comments will be taken at this meeting):

1. WORKSHOP

- i. Preliminary Review of Proposed Historic District Designation of Portland Company Complex; 58 FORE STREET; District Nominated by Historic Preservation Board.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

Scott Benson, Chair
Bruce Wood, Vice Chair
Glenn Harmon
Ted Oldham
Penny Pollard
Julia Sheridan
John Turk

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD AGENDA
June 10, 2015, 5:30 p.m.
Room 209, 2nd Floor, City Hall
Public comment is taken at all meetings.

- 1. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM**
- 2. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS**
- 3. REPORT OF DECISIONS OF JUNE 3, 2015:**
 - i. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alterations to Existing Rooftop Penthouse and Addition of Roof Deck; 44 OAK STREET; Michael Keon, Applicant. *The Board voted 6-0 (Wood absent) to approve the application, subject to one condition.*
- 4. WORKSHOP**
 - i. Preliminary Review of Proposed Historic District Designation; PORTLAND COMPANY COMPLEX, 58 FORE STREET
- 5. CONSENT AGENDA**

Contact the Department of Planning and Urban Development, Planning Division, 874-8726 for further information. To access agenda materials on-line, please visit the following web address on or after the Friday preceding the meeting date: <http://www.portlandmaine.gov/historic.htm>

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE**

**WORKSHOP
PORTLAND COMPANY COMPLEX
58 FORE STREET**

TO: Chair Benson and Members of the Historic Preservation Board

FROM: Deborah Andrews, Historic Preservation Program Manager

DATE: June 4, 2015

RE: June 10, 2015 Workshop – Preliminary Review of Proposed Historic District Designation

Address: former Portland Company complex
 58 Fore Street

Property Owner: CPB2, represented by principals Jim Brady, Kevin Costello and Casey Prentice

Introduction

A workshop has been scheduled to begin preliminary Board deliberations on the nomination of the former Portland Company complex at 58 Fore Street as a local historic district. Wednesday's workshop follows three previous workshops as well as two site visits held over the last 9 months to familiarize Board members with the historical development and operations of the Portland Company complex, its place in industrial and transportation history at the local, state and national level, as well as the current condition of the extant structures within the complex. In its preliminary deliberations, the Board will be focusing on the ordinance's designation criteria which must be addressed in any recommendation forwarded to the Planning Board and City Council regarding historic designation.

Historic district designation criteria address the following factors:

- 1) the architectural, historic and/or cultural *significance* of the nominated district as a whole, as well as the relative significance of the individual structures and sites within it (Sec. 14-610 (a) and (b); and
- 2) the *integrity* of the nominated district as a whole, as well as the relative integrity of the individual structures and sites within it (Sec. 14-611)

The ordinance requires that a nominated district found to meet the ordinance's minimum criteria for designation--which relate to the question of significance--must *also* have sufficient

“integrity of location, design, condition, materials and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration”.

Once the Board has taken up the question of the significance and integrity of the overall Portland Company complex, the Board is required to evaluate each building or element within the complex for its relative “preservation value”, taking into consideration its contribution to one’s understanding or appreciation of the overall complex, as well as its level of integrity (including integrity of condition). Based on this evaluation, the Board is required to assign one of the following classifications to each structure: “landmark”, “contributing”, or “noncontributing”. (Definitions for these terms are included in the ordinance and provide further guidance in determining an appropriate classification.)

Following the building-by-building assessment, the Board will begin discussion of appropriate boundaries for the proposed historic district. Factors used in delineating boundaries of historic districts include consideration of the historical development of the nominated area, visual character, the presence of obvious physical boundaries, etc. Unlike some historic districts that are comprised of a fairly eclectic collection of historic resources in terms of building type, age, architectural style and use, the area in question is comprised of individual historic resources that share a strong and direct historical, functional and visual relationship to each other. This may make the question of delineating boundaries more straightforward. In considering the question of boundaries, the Board is encouraged to review *A Guide to Delineating the Edges of Historic District* prepared by the National Trust for Historic Preservation—enclosed as Attachment 2.

In preparation for Wednesday’s workshop, Board members are encouraged to review the designation criteria and other applicable provisions and definitions included in the historic preservation ordinance (attached) and to re-read both *The Portland Company: Historic Significance and Integrity*, prepared by Sutherland Conservation & Consulting and *Portland Company Complex General Building Condition Report, prepared by Resurgence Engineering and Preservation, Inc.* Board members are also encouraged to bring their copies of the reports to the meeting.

Attachments

1. Excerpts from Portland’s historic preservation ordinance (Article IX of the Land Use Code).
 - Sec. 14-610 Minimum Criteria for designation
 - Sec. 14-611 Integrity of landmarks and historic districts (*additional criterion that must be met*)
 - Division 4 Nomination, Consideration and Designation (*outlines process for deliberations*)
 - Sec. 14-617 Recommendation by Historic Preservation Board (*specifies the information that must be included in the Board’s recommendation to Planning Board and Council*)
 - Definitions for “contributing” and “noncontributing”
2. *A Guide to Delineating Edges of Historic Districts*, published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation

(s) To annually report to the council with following matters:

1. Survey work in progress or completed;
2. The number of projects reviewed (by type);
3. How many certificates of each type were issued.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90; Ord. No. 165-08/09, 3-16-09)

DIVISION 3. CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

Sec. 14-610. Minimum criteria for designation.

(a) The historic preservation board shall limit its consideration to the following criteria in making a determination on a proposed nomination of an area, site, structure or object for designation by ordinance as a landmark or district:

- (1) Its value as a significant example of the cultural, historic, architectural, archeological or related aspect of the heritage of the City of Portland, State of Maine, New England region, or the United States;
- (2) Its location as a site of a significant historic or prehistoric event or activity which may have taken place within or which involved the use of any existing structure on the property;
- (3) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archeological or related aspect of the development of the City of Portland, State of Maine, New England region, or the United States;
- (4) Its exemplification of a significant architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or overall quality of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship;
- (5) Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Portland, the State of Maine, the New England region, or the United States; or
- (6) Its representation of a significant cultural, historic,

architectural, archeological or related theme expressed through distinctive areas, sites, structures or objects that may or may not be contiguous.

(b) In the case of a nominated historic district, the historic preservation board shall also determine whether a substantial number of the properties, sites, structures or objects have a high degree of cultural, historic, architectural or archeological significance and integrity, many of which may qualify as landmarks, and which may also have within its boundaries other properties, sites, structures or objects which, while not of such cultural, historic, architectural or archeological significance to qualify as landmarks, nevertheless contribute to the overall visual characteristics of the significant properties, sites, structures or objects located within it.

(c) In the case of a nominated historic landscape district, the historic preservation board shall also consider its significance as a geologic, natural or man-made landscape feature associated with the development, heritage or culture of the City of Portland, State of Maine, New England region, or the United States.

(d) The planning board and council shall apply the criteria of subsections (a), (b) and (c) but shall also consider the effect of such designation on other aspects of the comprehensive plan of the city.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90)

Sec. 14-611. Integrity of landmarks and historic districts.

Any area, structure or object that meets the criteria in section 14-610 must also have sufficient integrity of location, design, condition, materials and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90)

Sec. 14-612. Designation of historic landscape districts.

An historic landscape district may be nominated and considered for designation only if the entire area of the district is owned by a unit of federal, state or local government, or any combination of such ownership.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90; Ord. No. 220-93, § 2, 5-17-93)

Sec. 14-613. Reserved.

DIVISION 4. NOMINATION, CONSIDERATION AND DESIGNATION

Sec. 14-614. Procedure.

The provision of this division shall govern the nomination, consideration and designation of landmarks and districts.
(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90)

Sec. 14-615. Initiation of nomination.

(a) Nomination of an area, site, structure or object for consideration of designation as a landmark, historic district or historic landscape district shall be submitted to the department, on a form provided by the department, by the following:

- (1) Any two (2) members of the historic preservation board on their own initiative, by written notice to the department; or
- (2) By written petition of any owner, in the case of a landmark; or
- (3) By written petition of one (1) or more owners of affected property in the case of a district; provided two (2) members of the historic preservation board must sponsor the petition.

(b) A nomination shall be completed and filed with the department with all required signatures and any fees specified therefore for the nomination to be pending.

(c) Upon nomination, the department shall notify the owner or owners of the nomination and shall transmit the nomination to the historic preservation board for its consideration at its next scheduled meeting, which in no event shall be held later than thirty (30) days following nomination.

(d) At any time after a complete nomination is filed for an historic district, the owner of a structure who seeks a permit for demolition may apply to the historic preservation board for a determination that the structure to be demolished is noncontributing and eligible for a demolition permit. The determination of the historic preservation board that the structure is eligible for a permit shall be conclusive.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90; Ord. No. 165-08/09, 3-16-09)

Sec. 14-616. Notification of nomination and public hearing.

(a) A public hearing on the nomination shall be held by the historic preservation board within thirty (30) days following the first scheduled meeting referred to in section 14-615(c), but in no event later than sixty (60) days following receipt of the completed nomination form by the department. Notice of the nomination and of the public hearing shall be in accordance with the procedures for public hearings before the planning board for site plan approval.

(b) The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with procedures adopted by the historic preservation board. The historic preservation board shall consider all testimony or evidence relating to the designation criteria in division 3 from any person who makes written submissions or appears at the public hearing. Historic preservation board members may also present testimony or make submissions. The owner of a nominated landmark or of property within a nominated district shall be allowed reasonable opportunity to present testimony or evidence concerning the applicability of the designation criteria in division 3.

(Ord. No. 235-90, 2-26-90)

Sec. 14-617. Recommendation by historic preservation board.

Within thirty (30) days following the close of the public hearing, the historic preservation board shall make recommendation to the council in the case of a landmark, or to the planning board in the case of a district, upon the evidence as to whether the nominated landmark or district meets the criteria for designation in division 3. Such recommendation shall be approved by at least four (4) members of the historic preservation board and shall be accompanied by a report to the council or planning board containing the following information:

- (a) Explanation of the significance or lack of significance of the nominated landmark or district as it relates to the criteria for designation.
- (b) Explanation of the integrity or lack of integrity of a nominated landmark or historic district.
- (c) Proposed design guidelines for review of alteration or construction. The specific design guidelines may provide explanation by text and/or schematic examples of visual compatibility for purposes of division 7.
- (d) Relationship of the nominated landmark or district to the ongoing effort by the committee to identify and nominate

department evidencing a determination that specific plans for alteration of a structure or new construction on a site do not require approval under this article.

Contributing: A classification applied to a site, structure or object within a historic district signifying that it contributes generally to the qualities that give the historic district cultural, historic, architectural or archeological significance as embodied in the criteria for designating an historic district, but without being itself a landmark.

Council: The city council.

Demolition: Any act or process that partially or totally destroys a structure or object.

Department: The department of planning and urban development.

Design guidelines: Any design standard specified for alteration or new construction which is unique to a particular landmark, historic district or historic landscape district.

Design manual: The historic resources design manual described in section 14-675.

District: An historic district or historic landscape district.

Historic district: An area designated as an "historic district" by the council.

Historic landscape district: An area designated as an "historic landscape district" by the council.

Landmark: A property, site, structure or object designated as a "landmark" by the council as having a high degree of historical, cultural and/or architectural significance.

Major development: As defined in article V of this chapter.

Minor development: As defined in article V of this chapter.

New construction: The adding to a structure by an addition; the erection or placement of any new structure on a lot or property; or the comprehensive redesign/renovation of an existing structure.

Noncontributing: A classification applied to a site, structure, object, or portion thereof, within a historic district signifying that 1) it does not contribute generally to the qualities that give the historic district cultural, historic, architectural or archaeological significance as embodied in the criteria for designating a historic district; 2) was built within 50 years of the date of district designation unless otherwise designated in the historic resources inventory; or 3) where the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship and association have been so altered or have so deteriorated that the overall integrity of the site, structure or object has been irretrievably lost. A portion of an otherwise contributing or landmark structure may be determined by the historic preservation board to be non-contributing if it meets one or more of the above conditions.

Object: Anything constructed, fabricated or created, the use of which does not require permanent or semi-permanent location on or in the ground.

Open space: Any park and any other area outside of a building open to the public.

Ordinary maintenance: Acts of maintenance or repair which do not include a change in the design, material or outer appearance of a structure, including without limitation repainting, replacement of materials or windows of the same scale, texture and color, and landscaping other than within an historic landscape district.

Owner: The person or persons holding record title to the building, site or property; provided, however, the last previous tax roll in the records of the city assessor's office may be relied upon as showing record ownership in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary.

Property: Land and improvements identified as a separate lot for purposes of subdivision, site plan, or zoning regulation.

Relocation: Any removal or relocation of a structure on its site or to another site.

Restoration: Any act which returns a structure or a feature of a structure to a prior state of historic significance.

Sign: As defined in section 14-47.

Site: The location of an event, activity, structure or object.

A GUIDE TO DELINEATING EDGES OF HISTORIC DISTRICTS

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Russell V. Keune, AIA
Project Coordinator

Russell Wright
Principal Project Consultant

John P. Conron, FAIA
W. Philip Cotton, Jr., AIA
Bernard Lemann
Robert B. Rettig
Consultants

THE PRESERVATION PRESS

3. Factors in Delineating Edges of Historic Districts

This section discusses the common factors used in delineating the edges of the 20 historic districts reviewed in this study. With the exception of museum-related districts, it is anticipated that the boundaries of most new historic districts can be determined by using a combination of these factors, refined and adapted to the existing situation. Following the discussion of each factor, the names of historic districts are provided where that particular factor played a major role in laying out the districts. The reader should refer to those case studies (found in section 5). Districts included as examples are listed alphabetically and in no way imply any ranking.

HISTORIC FACTORS

Boundaries of an original settlement or an early planned community. These are edges determined through historical research of early town plans and records. Edges related to this factor are often evidenced through a change in land use, building scale and materials, architectural periods and, in some cases, by abrupt changes in street patterns and widths. In some areas the edges may not be obvious, especially in communities that have experienced significant expansion and rebuilding, or when building forms have persisted and continue across historic boundaries. This type of edge, when adequately researched and presented as part of the historic evolution of a community, is a logical boundary line for historic districts, easily understood and enforceable. (Examples: Annapolis, College Hill, Harrisville, Pullman, San Juan, Santa Fe, Vieux Carré, Woodstock)

Concentrations of early buildings and sites. These are edges determined by historical research and documentation. They were used in delineating the edges of a number of early historic districts, but the value of this factor in satisfying current historic preservation objectives is limited. Edges based on the location of a community's oldest structures are often visually ambiguous and can prove difficult for the

uninitiated to comprehend. This method of drawing boundaries does not provide for protection of areas contiguous to the district. Unless complete, reliable and thorough documentation is available to ascertain the dates of construction of all buildings and structures in a community, edges drawn around concentrations of structures and sites that predate a specific date or period can be impractical to enforce. Also, problems related to the visual identity of a district occur because of the broad range of architectural styles that may exist in any area under consideration for protection. With few exceptions, these design styles were not restricted to specific dates and in most cases overlapped in popularity. The genius of many historic areas is the variety of visual experiences, provided in large part by the many styles that are present, graphically documenting an area's evolution, growth and continuous use. To adequately present this continuum of history, the entire spectrum should be considered for inclusion in any proposed historic district. The use of a specific year or period as a major factor in determining the district boundaries should be avoided.

It should be recognized, however, that this device of limiting a proposed district to major concentrations of early structures has been effectively utilized to introduce historic districting to areas new to such controls. Provisions for expanding the district at a later date, and for creating additional districts as required, should be included in the initial recommendations. (Examples: Charleston, College Hill, Jacksonville, Pioneer Square)

VISUAL FACTORS

Edges determined or influenced by architectural survey. Historic district edges drawn on the basis of an architectural or historic resources survey and map are especially valid when the survey is recognized as an official planning document and included by reference in the proposed district ordinance. Boundary lines should include a buffer zone around the building

considered of significance and should recognize the character of the contiguous areas. For ease in administration, a series of subdistricts might be delineated, based on concentrations of buildings of a similar architectural character. Historic districts based on this factor have been thoroughly tested in the courts and are well understood by property owners and public officials, especially when the results of the survey and map are made a public record.

As explained in section 2, an architectural or historic resources survey should be completed for all areas under study, and all areas of potential historic interest in a given community should be surveyed at the same time, to provide for consistency and assist in establishing priorities for preservation. (Examples: Charleston, College Hill, Galveston, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, Santa Fe)

Edges related to other changes in the visual character of an area. This factor usually occurs in a study area that has been developed in stages rather than in a continuum, resulting in obvious changes in building forms, materials, setbacks and design features. While many edges based on changes in visual character occur at street lines, it is preferable to draw the boundaries to include properties fronting on both sides of a street. (Examples: Beacon Hill, College Hill, German Village, Pioneer Square, Pullman, Santa Fe)

Edges based on topographical considerations. These edges are especially valid when much of the character or visual importance of a district is derived from its geographic location—on an urban hillside, in an open valley surrounded by hills or on a flat prairie-like landscape. Care should be exercised to include provisions for influencing development that might alter the three-dimensional character of the district through the coalescence of suburban sprawl and the control of building heights and massing to prevent the walling off of the district. Legal questions may result from the inclusion of predominantly open land or nonrelated developed areas in the district, and the reasons for so doing should be clearly set forth in the proposed ordinance. (Examples: Beacon Hill, College Hill, Elsay, Georgetown, San Xavier)

Edges drawn to include gateways, entrances and vistas to and from a district. These edges are a conscious attempt to control the experience of entering a unique

area or to provide unobstructed vistas to and from a historic district. Boundaries based on this factor are sometimes expanded beyond normal limits and include areas of little or no architectural or historic significance. While the control of approaches to a district is highly desirable, problems regarding enforcement of the nonhistoric areas under the guise of historic districting may require the setting up of separate zones, with regulations and restrictions based on the character of the specific area. The use of such devices can be of great benefit to establishing a sense of place and visual identity, especially when the boundaries reflect existing conditions and are in concert with development projects scheduled for the surrounding areas. Vistas of the district can be created in new construction projects and highways and new street patterns can be aligned to relate to a gateway or landmark structure in the district, and public expenditures for street and sidewalk planting, lighting and street furniture can be better coordinated as an introduction to the district. (Examples: German Village, San Xavier, Wethersfield)

PHYSICAL FACTORS

Railroads, expressways and major highways. These are obvious edges of a historic district, visually and psychologically as well as physically. This factor is especially valid when the railroad or expressway is elevated or below grade, or if the major highway carries a high volume of traffic. Such edges need not have a negative effect on the character of a district and can be used to define and structure areas otherwise lacking in visual identity. Because of the physical barrier presented by transportation facilities and since changes in land use and building forms often occur along these rights-of-way, there is usually limited opportunity for the benefits of historic districting to influence surrounding area development. To provide a mechanism for insuring proper maintenance and control over the appearance of such facilities, it is recommended that the district boundaries be drawn to include the railroad right-of-way, expressway or major highway. (Examples: Beacon Hill, Elsay, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, Pullman, Vieux Carré, Wethersfield, Woodstock)

Major open spaces. Parks, village greens, urban squares and cemeteries can form the edge of a historic district or serve as the

focus with
Open space
on a district
tection of
sion bear
to the por
of the edge
of the district

While
along the
part of a
buffer strip
all of the
the open
such as a
the boundary
include a
less of pro
vide for p
It should
spaces a
cemeteries
tended to
the open
mental re
Harrisville

Rivers, ma
tures. Nat
for potent
sual and p
result in t
nizable dis
tity, aidin
ment. How
can arise
opposite s
If feasible
opposite s
yond. If t
political ju
tend to the
cases this c
nel of a riv
tidal water
plete cont
dock or wh
ity. (Exam
sah, Pion
Carré, Wet

Major char
boundaries
shift in lan
change in
In some in
compatible
district, or
that it is
protective
fer zone p

focus with the district surrounding it. Open spaces usually have a positive effect on a district, but consideration for the protection of the open space itself has on occasion been lacking, especially with regard to the potential for improper development of the edge furthest away from the core area of the district.

While boundaries are often drawn along the edge fronting on the developed part of a district, sometimes including a buffer strip, it may be desirable to include all of the open space within the district. If the open space is the focus of a district, such as a village green or an urban square, the boundary lines should be extended to include all sides of the open space, regardless of present conditions or use, to provide for protection of the view from within. It should also be recognized that open spaces are not inviolate, including cemeteries. Every effort should be extended to provide continued protection of the open space as a historic and environmental resource. (Examples: Beacon Hill, Harrisville, Lafayette Square)

Rivers, marshlands and other natural features. Natural features are obvious edges for potential districts because of their visual and physical character. Their use can result in the delineation of an easily recognizable district with a strong sense of identity, aiding in its policing and enforcement. However, potential visual problems can arise with respect to the area on the opposite side of the river or natural feature. If feasible, the district should include the opposite shoreline and a strip of land beyond. If this is not possible because of political jurisdictions, the edge should extend to the municipal boundary (in many cases this occurs at the center line or channel of a river or at the low-water mark of a tidal watercourse), aiming to retain complete control over the shoreline and all dock or wharf areas within the municipality. (Examples: Annapolis, Charleston, Elsah, Pioneer Square, San Juan, Vieux Carré, Wethersfield)

Major changes in land use. Historic district boundaries can be drawn where a major shift in land use occurs that results in a change in the visual character of the area. In some instances the new use may be incompatible with the preservation of the district, or it may be of such a large scale that it is impractical to attempt to apply protective controls, but, if possible, a buffer zone parallel to the visual change

should be included. There is also the possibility of anomalous visual effects occurring at the edges of districts based on this factor, especially if the change in use is reflected in large-scale construction such as new housing, shopping centers or industrial parks that may overreact in a quaint or fake historic way to the features of the historic area. Edges based on changes in use are valid if the lines are carefully drawn since they are easily recognized and enforced. (Examples: Annapolis, Beacon Hill, College Hill, Elsah, Galveston, German Village, Heritage Hill, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, Pullman, San Juan, San Xavier, Vieux Carré)

Walls, embankments, fence lines. While providing good edges in a visual sense, lending definition to a district and assisting in enforcement problems, this factor must be considered marginal in value, in that these features are often temporary and may not coincide with property lines or other lines of record. (Examples: Annapolis, Lafayette Square, Pullman, San Juan, San Xavier, Wethersfield)

Limits of a settled area. These are edges determined by settlement patterns. This factor, usually limited to nonurban areas, is valid in delineating the edges of a potential district when most or all of a village or settlement is worth protecting. To protect the visual character of the district, as well as control the view from within, consideration should be given to providing a buffer zone to surround the settled area. Since excessively deep lots or large parcels of land may preclude rear property lines or other lines of convenience as boundaries in such areas, the use of this device may require a professional land survey to delineate and map the legal limits of the district for regulatory purposes. The expense and inconvenience in the enforcement of such edges as surveyed lines can be reduced if a constant setback line, related to some point of reference is specified in the proposed boundary description.

While the actual legal boundaries of an area determined in this manner may have little if any visual continuity, recognizing the developed portions of a community as an edge factor can result in a highly identifiable historic district. This visual identity contributes to acceptance of the district by property owners, public officials and visitors and greatly reduces potential problems of policing and enforcement. (Examples: Georgetown and Harrisville)

CONVENIENCE

Legally established boundary lines. This factor often results in the most arbitrary of all edges as far as a sense of place and concentrations of important buildings and sites are concerned. While it is recognized that such a solution may be required to facilitate enforcement of the district ordinance and controls, the convenience of specifying legally established and mapped boundaries as edges may be negated by the lack of concern for the visual continuity and the architectural or historical significance of the area in a contiguous town, city or state. The possibility of setting up a district that overlaps two or more political jurisdictions should be studied before delineating the boundary as an edge. While this will require an unusual degree of intracity or intrastate cooperation, precedents have been set in the naming of districts to the National Register of Historic Places. When it is the intent of the ordinance to provide a measure of control over an undeveloped or undistinguished area surrounding a district, established boundaries such as school districts, utility service areas and planning districts, as well as municipal boundaries, can be used to describe the maximum limits. (Examples: Elmhurst, Georgetown, San Juan, San Xavier, Wethersfield, Woodstock)

Streets and other local rights-of-way. These are lines of convenience that may prove unsatisfactory due to the lack of control over the opposite sides of the streets. This factor may be valid if there is a marked change in use, building style, scale or form, but it is preferable to draw the boundary line to include a buffer zone contiguous to the district. (Examples: College Hill, Heritage Hill, Jacksonville, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, Pullman, Santa Fe, Vieux Carré, Woodstock)

Property lines. Rear property lines have been used as valid edges to a district, especially when it is the intent of the ordinance to control the character of development on both sides of a boundary street. In some instances district lines have been drawn at the building edges but excluding the actual facades. While this affords control over improvements to the street and sidewalk, and possible sign control, it is ineffective in influencing the visual character of the buildings flanking the district boundaries. The use of rear property

lines as an edge has proven effective in many districts, and this device is recommended whenever lots are of a reasonable and fairly constant depth. (Examples: Annapolis, College Hill, Galveston, Heritage Hill, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, Santa Fe, Vieux Carré, Wethersfield)

Uniform setback lines. This factor is similar to the use of rear property lines as an edge factor, except that setbacks can be used effectively where lots are of varying depth or of an inordinant size. This factor also precludes the need for special surveys or mapping. The depth of the setback should be determined in the field and can be varied to insure that all of a worthy building is included in the district, or the line can be drawn to protect only the front facade; the latter is helpful in cases where the remainder of a structure is of no significance. (Examples: Beacon Hill, Jacksonville, Wethersfield)

Other lines of convenience. Use of lines of convenience other than those outlined here may be required on occasion—for example, connecting two points determined by other edge factors—but the convenience may outweigh the logic. In some cases, lines of convenience have been based on geometry, such as a circle of a given radius from a landmark or an area based on a certain number of city blocks. This factor can result, however, in the exclusion of deserving properties by "rounding off" the edges of a potential district. (Examples: Harrisville, San Xavier, Woodstock)

POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS

Political considerations. Anticipated opposition to a proposed historic district can result in boundary compromises to insure passage of the ordinance. Such opposition can emanate from a variety of sources, including the following:

Governments. Property owned by, or under the control of, federal, state or local governments may not be subject to historic district controls, depending on state enabling legislation, although in some instances such property has been voluntarily included. There is also the political necessity of recognizing programs of other city or state agencies in a historic district or contiguous to it, such as urban renewal activities, new highways, code enforce-

ment p
contest
be mac
trict in
to infi
plans.
Charles
Pioneer
Inst:
and oth
are ofte
tricting
proper
have be
tion wi
especia
cluded.
control.
Galvest
Priv
Certain
have bee
or citize
tion. A c
negative
passage
propert

ment programs and the like. Rather than contest all such programs, efforts should be made to draw the boundaries of a district in concert with ongoing projects and to influence decision-making in new plans. (Examples: Annapolis, Beacon Hill, Charleston, College Hill, Lafayette Square, Pioneer Square, San Xavier)

Institutions. Universities, hospitals and other large and influential institutions are often reluctant to allow historic districting to take place if it includes their property. In some cases, compromises have been effected, whereby the institution will permit a part of its holdings, especially if they are historic, to be included, with the remainder exempted from control. (Examples: College Hill, Elsay, Galveston, Heritage Hill)

Private citizens and property owners. Certain areas in proposed historic districts have been excluded when property owners or citizens have contested district designation. A compromise at best, this is usually a negative edge factor used to insure swift passage of an ordinance. The resident, property owner or merchant in the

excluded area benefits from the positive effects of the district without being subject to its controls. Therefore, this device should be avoided. (Examples: Annapolis, Harrisville, Jacksonville, Pioneer Square)

Socioeconomic factors. Significant variations in the socioeconomic levels of residents in a potential historic district can influence edge decisions. The ability of residents to pay for improvements and anticipated property-tax increases and to otherwise conform to district regulations is often considered in delineating a district. Conversely, some district boundaries have been drawn to reflect prestigious neighborhoods, where the residents insisted on complete control, without outside intervention. Regardless of the reasons for excluding an area on the basis of socioeconomic factors, the resulting district is inconsistent in coverage and causes undue problems in enforcement and identification. (Examples: Beacon Hill, Galveston, Heritage Hill, San Juan, Santa Fe, Woodstock)