

1. Legal Ad

Documents:

[10-17-18 LEGAL AD.PDF](#)

2. Agenda

Documents:

[10-17-18 AGENDA.PDF](#)

3. 33-37 Montreal Street

Documents:

[HP MEMO - 33-37 MONTREAL STREET.PDF](#)

3.I. Additional Public Comment Received

Documents:

[BETH SNYDER 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[CAROL CONNOR 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[DEBBY MURRAY 10-16-18.PDF](#)
[GREATER PORTLAND LANDMARKS 10-16-18.PDF](#)
[PETER MURRAY 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[JIM COLE 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[TOM MCGOVERN 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[BARBARA VESTAL 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[ELIZABETH STREETER 10-17-18.PDF](#)
[NINI MCMANAMY 10-17-18.PDF](#)

**LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF PORTLAND**

The Portland Historic Preservation Board will hold a meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2018, Room 209, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 389 Congress Street. Public comments will be taken for each item on the agenda during the estimated allotted time and written comments should be submitted to hp@portlandmaine.gov

1. PUBLIC HEARING - 5:30 p.m. (** Please note change in start time **)
 - i. Determination of Conformance with Historic Preservation Ordinance New Construction Standards under Demolition Ordinance, Preliminary Assessment of Conformance with R-6 Alternative Design Review Requirements; New Construction at 33-37 MONTREAL STREET; 33 Montreal LLC., Applicant
2. CONSENT AGENDA

3CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

Julia Sheridan, Chair
Bruce Wood, Vice Chair
Ian Jacob
Robert O'Brien
Penny Pollard
Julia Tate
John Turk

AGENDA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

The Historic Preservation Board will hold a meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2018, Room 209, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 389 Congress Street. Public comments will be taken for each item on the agenda during the estimated allotted time and written comments should be submitted to hp@portlandmaine.gov

PUBLIC HEARING – 5:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

3. REPORT OF DECISIONS AT THE MEETING HELD ON 10-3-18:

- i. Certificate of Appropriateness for Exterior Siding Replacement; 562 CONGRESS STREET; Terbax Realty, Inc., Applicant. *The Board voted 7-0 to approve the application subject to conditions.*
- ii. Certificate of Appropriateness for Building Additions, Exterior Alterations and Site Alterations; 84 COMMERCIAL STREET; 84 Commercial Street LLC, Applicant. *The Board voted 7-0 to approve the application subject to conditions.*

4. NEW BUSINESS

- i. Determination of Conformance with Historic Preservation Ordinance New Construction Standards under Demolition Ordinance, Preliminary Assessment of Conformance with R-6 Alternative Design Review Requirements; New Construction at 33-37 MONTREAL STREET; 33 Montreal LLC., Applicant

5. CONSENT AGENDA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE

PUBLIC HEARING
33-37 MONTREAL STREET

TO: Chair Sheridan and Members of the Historic Preservation Board
FROM: Deb Andrews, Historic Preservation Program Manager
Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer
DATE: October 10, 2018
RE: October 17, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING

Proposal for: Construction of 15-Unit Residential Development, which calls for demolition of 'preferably preserved' structure. Applicant is requesting that the applicable demolition stay be lifted, subject to compliance with demolition ordinance requirements.

Board Actions: 1) Determination of Conformance with Historic Preservation Ordinance New Construction Standards under Demolition Ordinance applicable in Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation District (14-140.5(e))
2) *Preliminary* Determination of Conformance with R-6 Zone's Alternative Design Review Requirements (14-140.5(d)2)

Address: 33-37 Montreal Street, Munjoy Hill
northeast corner of Montreal and Willis Street

Applicant: 33 Montreal LLC, represented by Tim Wells

Project Architect: Jesse Thompson and Richard Lo
Kaplan Thompson Architects

Introduction

Following two preliminary workshop sessions, representatives of 33 Montreal LLC are returning for a public hearing and final deliberations on their proposal for a new 15-unit residential structure at the northeast corner of Montreal and Willis streets on Munjoy Hill.

A modified proposal has been prepared in response to comments and concerns expressed at the Board's most recent workshop, held on September 5th—ATTACHMENT 2. The applicant and project architects have also submitted a detailed written narrative to accompany the latest drawings (ATTACHMENT 1). The narrative begins with a general argument for the project's compatibility with its surrounding context, followed by a written

response to each of the design principle statements set forth in the *R-6 Infill Development Design Principles & Standards* and each of the historic preservation ordinance's New Construction Standards.

For reference purposes, the project architects have included in their submission the Montreal Street and Willis Street elevations as presented at the last workshop. These elevations are followed by the current revised elevations. A number of additional renderings and plans have been provided with this submission, including a roof plan and a rendering of the Montreal Street entrance as viewed from directly across the street.

Note that sketch-quality elevations have been provided for the northeast (Eastern Prom-facing) elevation and the northwest (Walnut Street-facing) elevation. As the treatment of these elevations is largely consistent with that of the principal facades and as the submission requirements for this type of review are not as explicit as those for new construction projects in historic districts seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness, staff has determined that the representational elevations for these two sides of the building is adequate for present purposes.

Nature of Review, Required Actions by the Historic Preservation Board

Board members will recall that this project is being reviewed under the provisions of the recently-adopted ordinance establishing the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation District. Under the new ordinance, the Historic Preservation Board has been assigned a number of specific responsibilities separate from those associated with the historic preservation ordinance. These responsibilities were described in detail by Planning & Urban Development Director Jeff Levine during a July 25 workshop and summarized in the August 15th staff memo introducing this project.

This application is before the Historic Preservation Board because the project calls for the demolition of a residential structure at 37 Montreal that the Planning Authority has determined to be a 'preferably preserved' building. (Two other residential structures will be removed as well, but they do not meet the 'preferably preserved' criteria.) The new ordinance establishes a review process and specific requirements for such demolitions, including imposition of a 12-month demolition delay period. As provided under the new regulations, an applicant may seek Historic Preservation Board review of their proposal for replacement construction during the demolition delay period. If the Historic Preservation Board finds that the design of the proposed infill structure is consistent with the historic preservation ordinance's new construction standards, the Planning Authority may elect to lift the demolition stay.

The project is also before the Board because the applicant will ultimately be seeking "Alternative Design Review" of the project, as provided in the *R-6 Small Infill Development Design Certification Program*. Under Alternative Design Review (ADR), a proposed design

need not meet each and every one of the R-6 zone's design standards (which are fairly prescriptive), but must be consistent with *all* of the R-6 design principle statements and a *majority* of the design standards. The Historic Preservation Board has been assigned the role of review authority for Alternative Design Reviews of projects within the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation District. Accordingly, at such time the project moves forward and the developer submits a site plan application for review, the Historic Preservation Board will have an opportunity to review the project again in more detail.

At this time, the Board is being asked to make a determination as to whether the proposed development is consistent with the new construction standards of the historic preservation ordinance. A positive determination is required in order for the Planning Authority to lift the demolition stay on the “preferably preserved” structure at 37 Montreal under the recently-adopted demolition ordinance. The applicant has requested that the stay be lifted and the process for such outlined in the demolition ordinance is being followed.

A formal finding of conformance with the Alternative Design Review (ADR) requirements is not required at this time, as the project is not yet under site plan review. Knowing that the project will ultimately need to meet the ADR requirements, however, the applicant and staff are requesting a preliminary finding from the Board. As noted above, the Historic Preservation Board will be the design review authority for the ADR review. At that time, the Board will confirm whether the design is consistent with the Board's original approval.

As staff noted at the 8/15 and 9/5 preliminary workshop sessions, the R-6 Infill Development Design Principles and Standards and the Historic Preservation Ordinance's Standards for New Construction address the same general compatibility factors, which include the broad considerations of scale and form, composition of principal facades and relationship to the street. The intent of both sets of standards is to ensure that the infill development relates to and is compatible with the predominant character-defining features of its surrounding context. The two sets of standards are organized and written slightly differently, but substantively they are the same. As such, a positive or negative finding as regards conformance with the HP ordinance design standards would likely lead to the same finding under the R-6 Alternative Design Review requirements.

Relationship of Zoning's Dimensional Standards and Applicable Design Standards

During the preliminary workshops, several Board members asked for clarification as to the relationship between the dimensional standards established by zoning and applicable design standards. The question was largely prompted by the issue of building height. Board members wanted to know whether one set of standards “trumped” another in their review. Although Mr. Levine responded to this question in the workshops, staff has enclosed a memo prepared by Associate Corporation Counsel Jennifer Thompson last May that describes the interplay of the various standards--see ATTACHMENT 3.

Project Context

The project site is located at the northeast corner of Montreal and Willis streets, near the northeast edge of the more densely developed portion of Munjoy Hill. Just a block away, on the east side of Walnut Street, the traditional development pattern ends abruptly with the Promenade East development and Island View Apartments. In this respect the general context of the project is transitional in nature. The specific Montreal Street block on which the new building is proposed is also somewhat anomalous for Munjoy Hill. The eastern end of the block is occupied by the MacArthur Gardens Apartments, which were built circa 1947. Not only do the brick buildings differ architecturally from most buildings in the area, they occupy a larger footprint, are set back from the street, are surrounded by green space, feature perimeter parking at the sidewalk and generally read as an independent, self-contained complex. Immediately across Montreal Street from the project site, at the southeast corner of Montreal and Willis, is a large open side yard for a house that faces Willis.

While the portion of the project's context described above is eclectic and somewhat anomalous for the Hill in terms of building scale, massing and architectural character, much of the immediate surrounding context is entirely consistent with the historic development pattern that characterizes most of Munjoy Hill. This prevailing development pattern is evident on the west side of Willis Street opposite the project site. Buildings are closely spaced, occupy small footprints, are set close to the street, range from one-and-a-half to two stories and are wood-frame construction with clapboard exteriors. On the Montreal Street blocks west of the project site and immediately across from the development site on Montreal (just beyond the open side yard at the corner), the buildings are also typical of the Munjoy Hill neighborhood. The buildings are predominantly vernacular expressions of the Italianate and Second Empire styles popular in the last quarter of the 19th century, but included in the mix is an earlier Greek Revival residence, a bungalow, and an early 20th century triple decker building. Buildings range in height from one-and-a-half to three stories. While the front-end gable is the predominant roof form, examples of mansard, flat, hip and side gable roofs are also present. Most houses are two or three bays wide, often with a projecting bay or front porch, with ground floor living space raised above a brick foundation. Entrances are generally located on the street façade, although there are examples of primary entrances on the side elevation. Parking, where provided, is accommodated in narrow driveways to the side of the dwelling.

General Project Description

The proposed four-story, multi-family building is situated on the corner of Willis and Montreal streets and is a hybrid of rowhouse and multi-family building types. The design and corner condition create principal facades on two streets which is unique and anomalous (traditionally, corner buildings have a clear primary façade and side façade). Three "rowhouses" with individual stoops face Willis Street with a strong cornice above the third story. Projecting bays add articulation to this façade. In the latest design iteration, a fourth floor (which is set at the same plane as the lower floors) is contained

within a mansard roof form. A series of paired windows within shallow projecting dormers punctuate the roof.

The Montreal Street façade transitions to an apartment building with a mid-block common entry. The entire Montreal St. façade is set back from the street and the entry bay is recessed from the facades of the eastern and western blocks. The height of the recessed entry bay is also slightly lower than the two building masses flanking it. Under the revised proposal, the entry stairs and ramp lead directly to the street. (Planters and ramp railings shown in previous plans have been eliminated.) The mansard roof form of the western rowhouse block is repeated on eastern block. Unlike the western block, however, this roof form is truncated, as the fourth floor is set back several feet (measurement not provided) from the eastern edge of the building.

Garage space for 17-18 vehicles is provided underneath the residential structure, with most of the space located below grade. In the latest iteration, the garage entry is located at the eastern end of the ground floor.

The proposed material palette calls for white or light brick for the exterior of the two principal blocks and shiplap siding for the recessed entry bay. Large-scale wood panels are proposed for the projecting bays. Zinc shingles are proposed for the mansard roofs.

Summary of Board Comments at September 5 Workshop:

Following questions from Board members for clarification purposes and a public comment period during which 9 individuals spoke, individual Board members offered their observations and concerns about the latest design iteration. (The designs presented on September 5th are included with the applicant's latest proposal for reference purposes.)

There was broad consensus among Board members that massing and scale are key compatibility factors to be considered in this neighborhood setting and that, as presented, the overall scale was not compatible with the development's immediate context. While acknowledging that the site's broader context includes some taller, larger-footprint buildings as well as other anomalous developments, Board members argued that most of the project's immediate context is typical of Munjoy Hill's prevailing development pattern of small scale, small footprint structures and that this immediate and more typical streetscape context should be the primary point of departure in considering scale, form and massing. Board members' comments suggested that it was the *combination* of the proposed development's building height, overall footprint, massing and roof form that contributed to their finding that the overall scale was not compatible with the project's context and therefore did not yet meet the historic preservation ordinance or R-6 design standards.

With respect to building height, some Board members suggested that the proposed height, taken alone, was less of a concern and could be found acceptable if the overall massing was improved. The architects were encouraged to consider eliminating a floor or stepping the building down at its eastern end, especially as this end is already elevated by virtue of the grade change. In order to satisfactorily address the concern about the project's overall mass and scale, the applicant was advised that the program might need to be modified or reduced.

With respect to the roof form, Board members found that the butterfly roof had the effect of accentuating the height of the two building masses. Also, the two roofs being set at opposing angles--like wings--had the effect of visually unifying the building into a single form, especially as viewed from a distance. This effect ran counter to the Board's desire to see the overall massing of the development broken down. The Board expressed the view that the rowhouse block and apartment block needed to be visually separated and differentiated to the extent possible.

The other major concern of the Board was the treatment of the building's Montreal Street entrance and access ramp. The Board found the entrance's relationship to the street to be at odds with the prevailing development pattern where direct access is provided from the sidewalk to the house. The elevated position of the main entrance, the circuitous access route from the sidewalk and the presence of a retaining wall and railing along most of the Montreal Street frontage served to remove the development from the life of the street and create a sense of private enclave in an area noteworthy for its sense of approachability. Board members offered a few suggestions that might be explored to address this concern, including lowering the overall ground floor, thereby lowering the entry and perhaps eliminating the need for extensive retaining wall. Moving the garage to the easternmost bay of the building might also address this issue and help break down the scale of the tallest portion of the building foundation along Montreal.

Other identified concerns included the width of the Willis Street bays, which were found to be too wide to read as secondary façade elements. Board members also commented that the color/material palette still read as institutional or more fitting for a mixed-use commercial corridor. Board members noted that a modified material and color palette could help make the building more contextual and appropriate for a vernacular neighborhood setting.

Final Design Proposal

The applicant has provided a detailed written narrative that itemizes the revisions made since the last workshop—see ATTACHMENT 1. As such, there is no need to repeat the information here.

Staff wishes to make one correction to the applicant's written narrative (ATTACHMENT 1). In paragraph 2, the applicant states that the height of the building on the Willis Street side

has been lowered by one foot and on the Eastern Promenade side by two feet. The overall height of the entire development has been lowered by one foot. On the Eastern Promenade side, the ground floor and parking level have been lowered an additional foot to provide direct access to the building entry. Above the ground floor level, the height is adjusted so that the upper floors are level across the entire width of the building.

Staff Comments, Analysis of Current Proposal's Conformance with HP Standards

A review of the latest design proposal was conducted by HP Program Manager Deb Andrews and Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer. This section of the report will focus on the project's consistency with the historic preservation ordinance's standards, as this is the formal determination the Board is being asked to make at this time. Ms. Cameron has provided a separate memo that addresses the current proposal's conformance with the design principle statements in the R-6 design. (See ATTACHMENT 4). While the formatting of the respective comments is different, Board members will note that the conclusions are the same.

General Comment

The most recent design revisions significantly improve the design with respect to some of the issues previously identified. By lowering the overall building by a foot and the ground floor level of the eastern block by two feet, direct access from the main entrance to Montreal Street is provided, the height of the retaining wall at the building's east end is lower and the retaining wall is eliminated altogether at the west of the building. Handicap access has been simplified and the railing removed. Moving the garage to the eastern end of the foundation also helps break up and reduce the apparent scale of the foundation. The abandonment of the butterfly roof form that accentuated the building height is also appreciated.

Scale and Massing

In staff's view, the issue of overall massing and scale has been partially addressed in the current proposal. Modifications have been made that move the project in the right direction, but they are not yet sufficient to mitigate the building's scale. Scale/massing is a key compatibility factor, particularly in a neighborhood setting, and the project's immediate context is characterized by individual buildings of a smaller footprint and scale. Recognizing that the development occupies a large parcel, allowing for a large footprint and recognizing that a taller building is allowed under zoning for multi-family developments, effective strategies must be employed to mitigate or reduce the height and mass to make the development reasonably compatible with the context.

Following are specific aspects of the proposed design solution that contribute to this finding. In an effort to be constructive and move the review process forward, staff has offered some specific suggestions to address the review standards not yet met. These potential design strategies are also illustrated in an annotated sketch prepared by Caitlin

Cameron—see ATTACHMENT 5. In staff's view, the design modifications described below and illustrated in ATTACHMENT 5 are relatively modest and reasonable. Collectively, these modifications would likely materially improve real and perceived issues of scale, massing and form and bring the project into conformance with the applicable review standards.

* By maintaining a consistent overall height across the entire width of the Montreal Street frontage, the building presents itself as five stories as viewed from the east and does not respond to the change in grade. To mitigate this concern, staff recommends lowering the height of this eastern block so that the roofline of this block is level with the roofline of the recessed connector. This could be achieved by reducing the floor height of the eastern block's top floor and/or splitting the floor plates at the upper floor levels, just as they are on the lower levels. Staff also suggests that the applicant consider setting back the Montreal Street face of the eastern block's top floor slightly. This would help address the scale issue and further differentiate the two masses.

* Related to this change staff recommends replacing the mansard roof form on the eastern block to a flat roof. This change would allow the cornice line of the connector to continue across the eastern block and make the top floor more visually recessive. A change in roof form would further differentiate the two building masses. It would also address the visually awkward termination of the mansard roof where it is cut back at the eastern edge.

* As viewed from Montreal Street, the eastern block of the development is significantly wider than the western block, making it less compatible with the form and scale of area structures. To mitigate this width, staff suggests introducing decks at the southeast corner at the upper floor levels. Note that the original proposal, called for decks at this corner.

Composition of Principal Facades, Materials

The proposal's regular fenestration pattern, window proportions, inclusion of projecting bays and recessed entries, and introduction of a strong cornice above the third-floor level are all responsive to the surrounding context. The composition of the Willis Street façade is particularly successful as the townhouse form breaks down the scale and relates comfortably to the rhythm of individual houses across the street. Staff has identified a few outstanding concerns, however, with respect to this compatibility category, based on the latest drawings:

* The width of the bays on Willis Street makes them read less as bays (which are secondary elements to the principal façade) and more like a principal wall surface. Currently, they are not in proportion to the overall façade. (This concern was raised during workshop sessions, but the width remains essentially unchanged. Staff recommends reducing the width of the Willis Street bays.

* On the townhouse block (Montreal Street elevation), the roof dormer treatment at the east end appears over-sized, visually distracting, and does not relate to the corner windows below. Staff suggests that a smaller corner dormer—one that relates to the size and treatment of the corner windows below—be explored.

*Staff finds that the white brick depicted in the renderings is stark, without precedent in the neighborhood, and appears more urban or institutional in character. Staff suggests consideration of a warmer color brick, such as buff, brown, light grey or traditional red.

* The large-scale wood panel treatment on the bays exaggerates their scale and is not consistent with the finer-grain materials found in this vernacular residential setting. Staff suggests using the same shiplap on the bays as is used on the connector. This would also reduce and simplify the material palette.

* To further differentiate the multi-family block from the townhouse block, staff suggests cladding the top floor of the multi-family block in shiplap siding as well.

* Staff finds the Montreal Street entry treatment, while greatly improved with respect to its relationship to the street, still institutional in character. The rendering (not the elevation) suggests broad steps with planters incorporated within the steps and a wide landing. This important design element should be explored further to provide a more domestic scale and character in keeping with the residential neighborhood.

As noted above, Ms. Cameron has prepared a sketch that illustrates the visual impact of the specific design and material revisions that historic preservation and urban design staff members are suggesting for consideration. (ATTACHMENT 5)

Staff Conclusion

While there are likely other design strategies to address the concerns identified, staff has concluded that the project could incorporate the additional design revisions described in staff's analysis and illustrated in ATTACHMENT 5—and/or other revisions that the Board determines would better address identified concerns—and satisfy the requirements of the applicable ordinances. Accordingly, the draft motion at the end of this report includes a potential condition of approval that ensures further revisions, should the Board determine that the project is within reasonable reach of conforming with the historic preservation ordinance's new construction standards and elect to vote on the matter at this meeting.

Given the fact that the project will be reviewed again under the site plan review process and that the immediate decision before the Board is whether it would be acceptable to lift the demolition stay, staff feels it is appropriate to move forward with a conditional approval. This would lift the stay subject to issuance of permits for a building substantially as designed in the current proposal and as *modified* consistent with staff and Board recommendations.

Applicable Review Standards

I. Historic Preservation Ordinance Standards for Review of New Construction

A. Scale and Form

1. Height. In addition to the applicable requirements of articles III (zoning), IV (subdivision) and V (site plan) of this chapter, the proposed height shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures when viewed from any street or open space and in compliance with any design guidelines.
[Note: The design guidelines for new construction included in Chapter 5 of the Historic Resources Design Manual are specifically referenced in ordinance.]
2. Width. The width of a building shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures when viewed from any street or open space and in compliance with any design guidelines.
3. Proportion of principal facades. The relationship of the width to the height of the principal elevations shall be visually compatible with structures, public ways and open spaces to which it is visually related.
4. Roof shapes. The roof shape of a structure shall be visual compatible with the structures to which it is visually related.
5. Scale of a structure. The size and mass of structures in relation to open spaces, windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which they are visually related.

B. Composition of Principal Facades

1. Proportion of openings. The relationship of the width to height of windows and doors shall be visually compatible with structures, public ways and places to which the building is visually related.
2. Rhythm of solids to voids in facades. The relationship of solids to voids in the façade of a structure shall be visually compatible with structures, public ways and places to which the building is visually related.
3. Rhythm of entrance porch and other projections. The relationship of entrances and other projections to sidewalks shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which the building is visually related.
4. Relationship of materials, texture and color. The relationship of the color and texture of materials (other than paint color) of the façade shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the structures to which they are visually related.
5. Signs. (*not applicable*)

C. Relationship to the street

1. Walls of continuity. Facades and site structures, such as masonry walls, fences and landscape masses shall, when it is a characteristic of the area, form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street to ensure visual compatibility with the structures, public ways and places to which such elements are visually related.
2. Rhythm of spacing and structures on streets. The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects shall be visually compatible with the structures, objects, public ways and places to which it is visually related.
3. Directional expression of principal elevations. A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character or non-directional character.
4. Streetscape, pedestrian improvements (*not applicable*)

II. R-6 Infill Development Design Principle Statements

A. Overall Context

A building design shall contribute to and be compatible with the predominant character-defining architectural features of the neighborhood.

- A-1 Scale and Form: Relate the scale and form of the new building to those found in residential buildings within a two-block radius of the site, that contribute to and are compatible with the predominant character-defining architectural features of the neighborhood. Special attention shall be given to the existing building forms on both sides of the street within the block of the proposed site.
- A-2 Composition of Principal Facades: Relate the composition of the new building façade, including rhythm, size, orientation and proportion of window and door openings, to the facades of residential buildings within a two-block radius of the site that contribute to and are compatible with the predominant character-defining architectural features of the neighborhood. Special attention shall be given to the existing facades on both sides of the street within the block of the proposed site.
- A-3 Relationship to the Street: Respect the rhythm, spacing, and orientation of residential structures along a street within a two-block radius of the site that contribute to and are compatible with the predominant character-defining architectural features of the neighborhood. Special attention shall be given to the existing streetscape on both sides of the street within the block of the proposed site.

B. Massing

The massing of the building reflects and reinforces the traditional building character of the neighborhood through a well-composed form, shape, and volume.

C. Orientation to the Street

The building's façade shall reinforce a sense of the public realm of the sidewalk while providing a sense of transition into the private realm of the home.

D. Proportion and Scale

Building proportions must be harmonious and individual building elements shall be human-scaled.

E. Balance

The building's façade elements must create a sense of balance by employing local or overall symmetry and by appropriate alignment of building forms, features, and elements.

F. Articulation

The design of the building is articulated to create a visually interesting and well-composed residential façade.

G. Materials

Building facades shall utilize appropriate building materials that are harmonious with the character-defining materials and architectural features of the neighborhood.

Motions for Consideration:

1. On the basis of plans and elevations submitted by the applicant for the October 17, 2018 public hearing and information included in the accompanying staff report, and in accordance with the Historic Preservation Board's responsibilities under the ordinance establishing the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation District, the Board finds that, ***(subject to the applicant satisfying the specific concerns and suggestions identified in the 10/17/18 staff report)***, the preliminary proposal for new construction at 33-37 MONTREAL STREET ***is (is not)*** consistent with the historic preservation ordinance's Standards for Review of Construction. This finding would allow the Planning Authority to lift the stay on demolition if a project substantially consistent with these approved plans and modifications seeks a building permit.
2. On the basis of plans and elevations submitted by the applicant for the October 17, 2018 public hearing and information included in the accompanying staff report, and in accordance with the Historic Preservation Board's responsibilities under the ordinance establishing the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation District, the Board finds that, ***(subject to the applicant satisfying the specific concerns and recommendations identified in the 10/17/18 staff report)***, the preliminary proposal for new construction at 33-37 MONTREAL STREET ***is (likely) (not likely) to meet*** the R-6 Small Infill Development Design Principles & Standards for Alternative Design Review at such time a site plan application is submitted for review and approval.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Applicant memo summarizing design revisions and addressing applicable review standards
2. Context photos, elevations, plans and renderings
3. 5/18 memo from Corporation Counsel addressing relationship of zoning and design standards
4. Summary of staff analysis re: conformance with R-6 Alternative Design Review requirements
5. Sketch illustrating staff suggestions for additional design modifications
6. Public comment

33 Montreal LLC
33 Montreal Street
Portland, Maine 04101

October 5, 2018

City of Portland
Historic Preservation Board
Planning and Development
389 Congress Street Portland, Maine 04101

RE: Alternative Design Review Certification and Demolition Permit Approval Preliminary Submission (37 and 33 Montreal Street) 33 Montreal LLC - Workshop #3

To whom it may concern:

33 Montreal Street LLC is pleased to submit revisions to the initial and subsequent submissions for 37 and 33 Montreal Street in response to feedback received from the Historic Preservation Board and the community at the two previous public workshop meetings and from further meetings with the Planning Department staff on September 14, 2018.

The development team agreed to significant changes in design that greatly alters many aspects of the project. The most substantive changes are the adoption of a mansard roof form and lowering the height of the building on the Willis Street side by one foot and on the Eastern Promenade side by two feet. Secondly, the Montreal Street side entry to the building has been totally re-designed according to direct input from the HP Board and the Planning Department staff to accomplish three main goals:

1. Make the entrance and facade more contextual to examples within a two block radius.
2. Make the entrance translate as more residential versus institutional.
3. Improve the approachability of the homes and mitigate the urban feel.

These changes also led to a total re-design of the landscape design which has been simplified as suggested by the HP Board and staff.

The last major change breaks up the mass significantly by changing the middle materials and form to more clearly break the mass into two separate, distinct pieces. This gives the perception of two buildings by breaking up the roof line and facade.

Kaplan Thompson Architects has updated the design documentation to this submission to assist the Board in their Design Review. New materials include:

1. Revised exterior elevations of all four sides of the building.
2. Revised landscape design Site Plan.
3. New first person street level perspective views on Montreal Street looking towards the building entrances.
4. Revised view along Willis Street towards the townhouse entrances.

33 Montreal LLC
37-33 Montreal Street
Portland, Maine 04101

5. Revised first person street level perspective view looking up Montreal St towards the building.
6. Context photographs of the existing conditions of the opposite side of Montreal St from the proposed project.

These proposed changes directly address the stated concerns about the butterfly roof form. While we appreciated the way the previous roof design provided an alternative to a “boxy” building and provided lightness and visual interest to the top of the building it was recommended to be changed by both the Planning Board and Planning Staff. The proposed Mansard roof is a common and historical technique to mitigate the perception of mass and height in buildings. It is used across Portland and common on many properties on Munjoy Hill, especially within the two block radius. In addition, the cornice along the third floor is now more prominent and the fourth floor, on the downward side, is recessed across the whole side elevation. These changes mean the building will present as a three story building for people walking alongside or approaching from below it on Montreal Street. The height on the downward side Montreal corner will be diminished as well due to the overall lowering of the building by two feet.

There are numerous examples of similar height (or taller) buildings on Munjoy Hill within a two block radius as shown in our graphic submission. Some of the oldest buildings on the Hill are of similar mass and height and don't benefit, as this project does, from the separation created by the immediate block fabric and the large corner site. These buildings are not looked upon by the community as out of place, out of context or creating non-approachable buildings. They don't drown out their neighbors or create a sense of looming over them. They don't hurt their neighbors property values or quality of life. In fact, they have proven to be good, quiet, upstanding neighbors for over a century.

If age, quality of design and construction are part of what makes a building considered historic or worth preserving, several of these buildings would have to be at the top of the list to represent what is contextual on Munjoy Hill. These buildings fit in so well that people don't even realize they have 4 floors and are 45' or higher. They never paid attention to them because 45' is an appropriate height for residential buildings on Munjoy Hill. The ability to build to 45' and even higher has existed since homes started to be built on this land. We think it wasn't until the 1980s that height limits were actually reduced to 45'. This particular lot is well suited for a building of this height and mass. It will not be out of place and is not out of context. The impact on neighbor's views and shadows was taken into consideration from the very inception of this project.

The current project is only a 3' and 4' height increase over the existing structure across the street at 37 Montreal. It is a similar increase over the height of the multi-unit home sitting across Montreal on the adjacent corner lot. We acknowledge that it is not a gable roof structure and as such there is more mass associated with the height but as clearly and strongly demonstrated by the two buildings on Morning Street this is simply not out of context or perceived by residents to be overwhelming or of inappropriate height for Munjoy Hill. It is so normal that it is imperceptible to almost all but the most astute observers and this building will similarly blend in

33 Montreal LLC
33 Montreal Street
Portland, Maine 04101

and become imperceptible as the neighborhood becomes accustomed to its' presence. It will become a welcome addition to the neighborhood over time because the quality of its design and construction will sink in and become recognized.

This particular area of Munjoy Hill, represented within both a 1 and 2 block radius, has the highest density of large buildings on the Hill and has the least consistent neighborhood fabric. We strongly feel that our project is highly contextual and that it will add more consistency to the neighborhood fabric.

The allowed dimensions governed by zoning are a direct reflection of what mass and scale are considered appropriate for Munjoy Hill. This appropriateness is the result of over 150 years of institutional wisdom of many city councils, mayors, city managers, planning department personnel and other city employees. This should not be lightly discounted. A proposal to limit the height of buildings to 35' was directly considered just a few months ago and it was rejected by the current City Councilors as it has been rejected since building started on Munjoy Hill.

The current limits on lot coverage, impervious surface areas and new setbacks are some of the most restrictive in our neighborhood's history. These current limits do not allow the replication of the historical fabric found across Munjoy Hill. Not one of the beloved existing homes across the street from our site on Willis Street would be allowed to be built today under the current regulations. Only one home on Montreal would be able to be built as it currently exists under today's rules.

Key elements of the building design have been incorporated to reflect the historical and traditional design elements found in the immediate area. Every major design element is exemplified in other nearby structures. The mansard roof is reflected in the home kitty corner to the project as well as several other houses in the neighborhood. The triple decker form with bays is a common form found on the adjacent blocks. The breakdown of the Willis Street facade into town homes mimics the scale found directly across the street. The facade materials are found in the first home built on this side of the hill and found in almost every home in the vicinity. The entry way and landscaping reflect the current patterns found in the neighborhood and elsewhere on the Hill. The plinth structure is common to most of the homes built on the Hill that are faced with the similar design challenge associated with the change in slope. The house on the corner of North and Walnut on the Washington / Montreal side represents a similar plinth structure that has higher walls than what this project requires. The major difference is that this project works to improve street engagement and approachability by including entryways to the building on each street facing side. We think this is a strength not a weakness. The lot next to it has a much larger retaining wall for its house on North Street than this project requires. Houses built on slopes require this type of plinth and they have been utilized on Munjoy Hill for over 140 years. We have listened to the feedback from the HP Board, staff and the community. Our flexibility and willingness to incorporate change is indicative of our commitment to build a quality project, our commitment to the neighborhood and the City of Portland. We strongly feel that this project is highly contextual and appropriate.

33 Montreal LLC
37-33 Montreal Street
Portland, Maine 04101

List of Changes from the previous Workshop Submission

1. Mansard roof form instead of Butterfly mono-pitch.
2. Lowered Willis St townhouses 12" in height.
3. Lowered Montreal St apartments 24" in height.
4. Moved parking garage entrance to lowest point on Montreal St.
5. Created staircase leading directly to sidewalk on Montreal St from building entrance.
6. Tucked accessible ramp behind plantings, secondary to entrance stairs.
7. Shortened accessible ramp due to height lowering.
8. Removed stone bench and landscape amenities.
9. Removed landscape boulders.
10. Simplified planting materials for simpler maintenance and for more residential feel.
11. Removed safety and guard railing along landscape ramp entrance.
12. Changed and enlarged porch roof style to cover entry area per contextual tradition.
13. Changed porch column materials to natural wood finish for more residential feel.
14. Changed brick masonry color to white / light beige color for more residential feel.
15. Changed bay cladding to painted wood paneling for more residential feel.

Design Certification Program
R-6 Infill Development
Design Principles & Standards


Montreal Street Apartments
October 5, 2018

R6 Alternative Design Review

The Review Authority under an Alternative Design Review may approve a design not meeting one or more of the individual standards provided that all the conditions listed below are met:

- A. The proposed design is consistent with all of the Principle Statements.
- B. The majority of the Standards within each Principle are met.
- C. The guiding principle for new construction under the alternative design review is to be compatible with the surrounding buildings in a two block radius in terms of size, scale, materials, and siting, as well as the general character of the established neighborhood, thus Standards A-1 through A-3 shall be met.
- D. The design plan is prepared by an architect registered in the State of Maine.

Two Block Radius Diagram



Principle A Overall Context

The proposed multifamily residence at Montreal and Willis Streets is uniquely situated in one of the most architecturally and use diverse area on Munjoy Hill. Within the two block radius of this site are three-family homes, single family residences, three major housing

developments (including high-rise condos), numerous four story apartment buildings, a senior housing facility, the East End School and community garden, a ball field, parking lot and the Portland Water District Treatment Facility. In order to understand how a building can act like a stitch between two such different areas, while also reflecting the unique culture and architectural character of Munjoy Hill, we have considered the immediate community as well as other residential buildings located in similarly transitional areas in our analysis.

Standard A-1 Scale + Form

This two block radius of Munjoy Hill offers a wide variety of scale of housing from single-family, three-family and larger-scale housing developments (like the MacArthur Gardens Apartments adjacent to the proposed building and which occupy the other half of the block) and the nearby 14-story Promenade Towers).

We are proposing a 15-apartment residence on Montreal Street, which will provide an alternative housing option for Munjoy Hill families, within a more intimate mid-scale community model. 2 of 15-units are slated as “workforce housing” - affordable units which encourage social and economic diversity in the neighborhood, a value that has defined Munjoy Hill since the early 20th century.

The scale of the project approximates other similarly-sized multifamily buildings within a two block radius such as

119 Morning Street
16 Emerson Street
58 North Street
158 North Street
135 Sheridan Street

The form of the building breaks down the four story height in numerous ways with several changes in massing and forms. The mansard roof over the two residential sections softens the roof edge shape while giving clarity to the three story masonry massing of the main sections of the design. The central setback section of the building creates a variety of forms and simulates the effect of two adjoined buildings. A strong cornice datum line at the third story brings down the scale to harmonize with neighboring buildings. The setback on the lower side of the building reduces the scale of the building as the hill slopes away, reducing the visual appearance.

The building height has been lowered by two (2) feet from the previous submission overall by relocating the parking garage entrance to the lowest point on the site.

Standard A-2 Composition of Principal Facades

Willis Street

The building's three rowhouses face Willis Street and feature covered entries and contemporary bay windows, a modern take on the predominant Federal styling of many of the neighborhood's 3-family residences.

Montreal Street

These elements of the Willis Street facade are repeated as the building turns the corner extends down Montreal Street, with extrusions and recesses reflecting the interior articulation, but with less prominence to reflect its nature as a secondary façade.

The main entry to the building is defined by an intimate portico with both ramp and stairs, promoting universal access to pedestrians and engaging neighbors through a direct staircase leading to the sidewalk in a simple, approachable design that reflects the context of the neighborhood.

Standard A-3 Relationship to the Street

The Willis and Montreal Street facades are each set back from the Property Line enough to provide stoops and porch entries, in the contextual pattern of the immediate neighborhood.

The Montreal Street façade now has a simple, direct flight of stairs that leads directly to the sidewalk, with an informal, residential and neighborhoodlike feel. The lower height of the building has also shortened the staircase length overall from previous submissions. The accessible ramp is now secondary to the staircase, and set back along the side to have less visual prominence.

The relocation of the parking garage entry to the lowest point on the site and the lowering of the building entrance by two (2) feet has brought the ramp lower down on the hill and shortened its length.

The revised landscape design has reduced the extensive planting areas, removed benches and stone retaining walls throughout which brings the project closer to the sidewalk in a more intimate residential relationship. It is more clearly a delineation between Public and Private and less of a public realm amenity.

Principle B Massing

Standard B-1 Massing

The building massing is conceived of as three distinct forms - articulated with material and depth - that help the building relate to the scale of the neighboring residential homes - these are two blocks that contain the residences and an inner center section with darker siding that houses the main entry lobby, stair core and services.

The strategy of pushing and pulling the facade (along Willis Street with each rowhouse unit and again along Montreal Street) allows the massing to further relate to the neighboring three-family homes. The Willis Street fourth floor massing is softened by the mansard roof and accentuates the three story cornice and masonry massing.

The top floor of the building is recessed on the downhill side of Montreal Street and materially appears lighter, which reduces the perceived height and mass of the overall structure while providing discrete private exterior spaces for the occupants.

The revised mansard roof form reduces the scale of the project from the previous butterfly roof and reduces the overall scale of the project and is referential and related to forms found throughout the two block radius of the context.

Standard B-2 Roof Forms

The building's roof consists of a pair of mansard roofs with a quiet low slope roof between. The mansard roof with dormers gives the building a light and visually quiet top story, reducing the overall mass of the building, and harmonizing with existing buildings found throughout the local two block context.

Similar Mansard Roofs are found on the following addresses in the two block radius:

52 Merrill St
42 Montreal St
78 Melbourne St
80 North St
84 North St
92 North St
107 North St
122 North St
158 North St

Standard B-3 Main Roofs and Subsidiary Roofs

The main roof form is a mansard roof. Subsidiary roofs are all low slope and only appear over service areas of the building, street entries or bay windows.

Standard B-4 Roof Pitch

All roof pitches meet the Standard.

Standard B-5 Façade Articulation

The principle facades are articulated with several architectural elements which reflect the character of the neighborhood: stacked balconies, recessed entries, covered porches, projecting bays, predominantly vertical rectangular window openings, stairs directly facing the sidewalk.

Standard B-6 Garages

The building's garage beneath allows for ample off-street parking for residents and opens up 2 street parking spots by reducing the 3 existing curb cuts down to 1. The entry to the garage is on Montreal Street, but its visual prominence is diminished by the landscaping and projecting bay element of the living areas immediately above. The garage opening measures far below the max 40% of the width of the facade required.

Principle C Orientation to the Street

Standard C-1 Entrances

The buildings entries are organized by type, with the three rowhouse private entries facing Willis Street, while the building's main entry faces Montreal Street. Each entry is clearly articulated by a recessed portico and contrasting color door, with signage indicating street number and building name. The Montreal Street entry provides universal accessibility with both ramp and stair access. The ramp provides barrier-free access towards North Street, while

the stairs provide direct access to Montreal Street and towards the Eastern Promenade. Landings provide opportunities for residents to pause and engage with neighbors.

The current design reduces the former separation of the entrance from Montreal Street by lowering the height of the living level one (1) foot along Willis Street and two (2) feet along Montreal Street. The design has removed many of the public amenities along Montreal Street to provide a simpler, more contextually appropriate landscape design but retained simple stone retaining walls and elevated entrances as are commonly found throughout the two block radius.

The multifamily entrance now takes on the character of the porches that exist in other neighborhood buildings in its relationship to the street and the circulation like those found along Morning, Waterville, and Atlantic Streets.

Standard C-2 Visual Privacy

Building occupants retain a sense of privacy by elevating the first floor window sills at least 36" above sidewalk grade and providing finished floor elevation at least 12" above the sidewalk elevation. Landscape features between the building facade and the entry ramp along Montreal Street and beneath the bay windows along Willis Street provide an additional buffer between passersby and residents.

Standard C-3 Transition Spaces

Transition spaces are afforded between the sidewalk and the front doors through use of sidewalk garden and recessed entries. In addition, a low wall along the Montreal Street facade defines the edge of the entry ramp, provides seating for a neighborly conversation and features a planter for shrubs and small trees.

Principle D Proportion and Scale

Overall Proportion and Scale have been improved by the change to the mansard roof, the reduction in height and width of the bays along Willis and Montreal Streets, the lighter color of facade materials, the overall lower building height, the simplified entrance scheme, and the relocation of the parking garage entrance.

Standard D-1 Windows

Windows are proportioned and oriented vertically, to reflect the scale and aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood homes. Windows along both facades are proportionate to commonly-used vertically-oriented windows, measuring 2'-8" x 5'-8".

Standard D-2 Fenestration

Consistent with the R6 Design Standards, the total area of fenestration of the two principle facades along Montreal and Willis Streets is greater than 12% of the total facade area.

Standard D-3 Porches

The entrance porch along Montreal Street is twenty-one feet wide, composing 20 % of the Montreal Street facade.

First floor resident terraces are primarily oriented to the East, rather than towards Montreal Street. However, 26' of landscaped terrace adjoins the Southeast corner of the building. This portion of the terrace has a depth of 9' and an area of 247 ft.

Principle E Balance

Standard E-1 Window and Door Height

Doors and windows along both principle facades share a common horizontal datum line, with the exception of the stair core windows - their head height aligns with the sill height of the adjacent windows, providing visual interest and reinforcing their verticality.

Standard E-2 Window and Door Alignment

All windows and doors stack in such a way that their centerlines are in vertical alignment.

Standard E-3 Symmetricality

Symmetrical pairs of vertically oriented and proportioned windows compose all of the fenestration of the principle facades. Along Montreal Street, the axis around which windows and doors are symmetrical corresponds to the meeting of the two mansard roofs, at the building's main entry door. Along Willis Street, the three rowhouse entries and windows are distributed evenly along the facade, with the center rowhouse door aligned to the right side of the unit, which draws the eye to the corner of the building and toward the main building entry on Montreal Street.

Principle F Articulation

Standard F-1 Articulation

Both principle facades articulate the building's form and fenestrations through use of shifting volumes around bays and to define rowhouses, window reveals, recessed entries and contrasting color, which helps to punctuate doors and help with wayfinding.

The window reveal is one brick in depth, or approximately 4" setback from the face of the building to add shadow and articulation.

Standard F-2 Window Types

The building utilizes consistent window types and limits variation to a minimum of types throughout. The predominant three styles are casement, fixed, and operable with a fixed transom above.

Standard F-3 Visual Cohesion

The material choices help to further define the primary masses of the structure - brick masonry for the predominant material, wood paneling with decorative reveals for the bay windows, shiplap siding for the center entrance siding, masonry anchoring the ground floor, and diamond pattern patina-ed metal shingles for the mansard roof. A consistent light color palette provides cohesion between the few select materials.

Standard F-4 Delineation between Floors

Floors are articulated primarily through use of regularly spaced window header datums and reinforced by the bay windows, third floor cornice, and fourth floor mansard roof.

Standard F-5 Porches, etc.

The Montreal Street façade now has a simple, direct flight of stairs that leads directly from a simple front porch to the sidewalk, with an informal, residential and neighborhoodlike feel. The lower height of the building has also shortened the staircase length overall from previous

submissions. The accessible ramp is now secondary to the staircase, and set back along the side to have less visual prominence.

Building balconies point East, tucked into the face of the building facade, providing optimal views, affording privacy but allowing some degree of “eyes on the street” and engagement when desired, without obscuring the architectural features of the principle facade.

Standard F-6 Main Entries

Main entries are articulated clearly through use of recessed porticos and door colors that contrast with the main building color and are further emphasized with landscape features.

On Montreal Street a more extended porch creates a better integrated and contextual approach compared to the previous version.

Standard F-8 Articulation

1. Rakes above entry doors are 10”, consistent with the R6 Design Standards, in order to clearly define and further emphasize these locations for easy identification.
2. n/a
3. All offsets in the building face and roof form are greater than 12” in order to clearly articulate these shifts in form.
4. n/a

Principle G Materials

Standard G-1 Materials

Light colored brick masonry expresses the building’s primary material, a choice which relates to many other buildings within the two block radius, including:

Seven (7) Macarthur Gardens buildings directly adjacent along lower Montreal & Walnut Streets

16 Emerson Street
58 North Street
79 & 81 North St
158 North St

Remaining materials:

Patinated soft-toned metal cladding accentuates the mansard roof face.

Painted wood paneling provides a traditional surface material for all bay windows as is traditional in the neighboring context.

Painted shiplap siding on the center entry section provides a quiet, strong, and simple traditional residential material.

Aluminum clad windows with a charcoal grey color add durability and a calm backdrop material.

Weightier granite masonry for the ground level retaining wall anchor the building.

The brick color has changed to a light white / warm beige color to better harmonize with the context and be approachable, residential, and quiet in tone. All materials on the lower three story buildings are now traditional to the local two block context, limited to brick masonry and painted wood cladding.

Standard G-2 Material and Façade Design

The facade is constructed of materials which aid in articulating and reducing the visual impact of the mass of the structure, with heavier materials at the core and base and lighter metal cladding wrapping the upper story.

Standard G-3 Chimneys

N/A

Standard G-4 Window Types

The building utilizes consistent window types and limits variation to a minimum of types throughout. The predominant three styles are casement, fixed, and operable with a fixed transom above.

Standard G-5 Patios and Plazas

The first floor terraces, site walls, and other landscape features will be constructed of granite fieldstone.

Historic Preservation Standards for New Construction

Montreal Street Apartments

October 5, 2018

Scale and Form

1. Height

Height shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures when viewed from any street or open space

Munjoy Hill has many *four-story buildings* that are located next to smaller scale single-family or two-family houses, built over many decades now. This pattern of varied building size can be seen throughout Munjoy Hill, and has existed since the 19th century. Some of the many larger or similarly sized multi-family buildings in the immediate neighborhood include:

Existing 4-Story Buildings

Address	Number of Homes	Lot Size
80 North Street	9 homes	122' by 48'
58 North Street	22 homes	130' by 70'
119 Morning Street		
16 Emerson Street		
118 Congress Street	14 homes	108' by 85'
135 Sheridan Street	20 homes	130' by 50' and 111' by 60' L shape
55 Morning Street	8 homes	98' by 46'
63 Morning Street	8 homes	88' by 65' and 34.5'
49 Morning Street	8 homes	90' by 55'

As well as closely-spaced *triple-decker* residences in the immediate neighborhood seen at:

Existing 3-Story Buildings

Address	Number of Homes	Lot Size
101 North Street	3 homes	86' by 31'
70 Morning Street	3 homes	78' by 35.5'
98 Congress Street		
16 Cleeve Street		
34 Lafayette Street	3 homes	80' by 60'
101 North Street	3 homes	86' by 31'

The height of the current design is also mitigated through a common contextual roof-form seen throughout Munjoy Hill with a traditional Mansard-style roof clad in gray metal shingles (a modern reference to traditional slate). The contrast in color helps visually recess the roof reducing its visual impact on both principal facades. On the downhill side of the building, along Montreal Street, the height has been physically reduced by recessing the roof from the façade to form a porch for the occupants and creating a clear three story building height along the lowest point on the site.

2. Width

The width of a building shall be visually compatible with structures and open spaces to which the building is visually related

The overall width of the proposed building, has been through a number of design iterations which have resulted in the current articulation of the principal facades that minimizes the perception of width on each street façade. On Willis Street the building relates to the forms of the narrow town-homes on the opposite side of the street. On Montreal Street the building width has been broken into two primary building masses with a central recessed section in a differing siding material. The widths of the Montreal Street facades are visually compatible with the adjacent existing buildings of Macarthur Gardens Apartments.

3. Proportion of Principal Facades

The relationship of the width to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible with structures to which the building is visually related.

Willis Street

Facing Willis Street, several strategies are employed to reinforce the rhythm of contextual facades along the street. The building's three 2-story rowhouses feature welcoming granite stoops leading to solid wood doors with covered entries and prominent bay windows, a modern take on the predominant Federal styling of many of the neighborhood's 3-family residences. The individuality of the three homes are further distinguished in this façade by subtle vertical gutter channel in the brick detailing that runs between units. Gardens separate the space between the McGovern's adjacent property on the corner of Walnut and Willis.

Montreal Street

This façade of the building has changed dramatically through the historic preservation board design review process in order to promote a proportion that is more characteristic of the neighborhood context. The horizontality of this façade is broken into two smaller bays, further articulated by bay window forms. The two masses are joined by an intimate portico entry with ramp and stairs leading directly to the sidewalk, promoting universal access to residents, guests, pedestrians directly at the street level.

4. Roof Shapes

The roof shape of a structure, including rooftop additions, shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related.

The building's fourth floor consists of a traditionally-proportioned Mansard-style roof. The roof form has evolved significantly from the initially-proposed Butterfly form to this more contextually-appropriate Mansard form, typical of many nearby structures throughout Munjoy Hill.

5. Scale of the Structure

The immediate Munjoy Hill neighborhood offers an eclectic mix of housing with a varying scale that includes single-family, three- to twelve-family buildings, and several larger-scale

housing developments like the MacArthur Gardens Apartments adjacent to the proposed building and which occupies 75% of the block, and the nearby 14-story Promenade Towers.

Within this context, our proposal is a mid-scale, 14-home residence on the corner of Montreal Street and Willis Street. It is designed to be a transitional element between the larger housing developments surrounding this area and the 3-unit apartment buildings and single family residences.

Composition of Principal Facades

1. Rhythm and proportion of openings

The relationship of the width to height of windows and doors and the location of windows and doors within the façade shall be visually compatible with structures, public ways, and places to which the building is visually related.

All windows and doors are rectangular and vertically proportioned, to reflect the scale and aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood homes. Windows along both facades are proportionate to commonly-used vertically-oriented windows, typically measuring 2'-8" x 5'-8". Pairs and trios of windows create a hierarchy between windows that appear on the primary façade and those that mark the bays. However, all windows are aligned to a common datum per floor level, with the exception of the stair core windows, which are offset proportionally to the adjacent windows.

2. Rhythm of solids to voids in facades

Distinction of solids from voids is a strategy used in the building's principal facades to break up the massing into more contextually-scaled forms. On both facades, the portico entries and bays help define the individual units within the multifamily home. The recessed entry centered between larger volumes on the Montreal Street façade is instrumental in creating the perception of two smaller-buildings, relating it formally to the surrounding neighborhood.

3. Rhythm of Entrance Porches and Other Projections

The rhythm of entrances and other façade projections or recesses shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.

Entries along the principal facades are distributed symmetrically along the length. On Willis Street we have created a series of inviting covered stoops with a traditionally street facing orientation.

On Montreal St the homes are entered through a centered main entry. The entry has a sheltering porch roof with wooden columns marking the protected entry, a staircase leading directly to the front door of the building, and a ramp along the side to ensure accessibility for all residents and guests. The two-story bay windows are evenly distributed along the Willis Street façade, while a

subtle offset on the Montreal Street façade allows for alignment with the parking garage entry at the lower street level.

4. Relationship of Materials, Texture and Color

The relationship of the color and texture of materials (other than paint color) of the façade shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the structures to which they are visually related.

There is a clear and consistently applied hierarchy of materials, textures and colors which have been selected to help define the building massing and primary facades as well as to relate the building to its historic Munjoy Hill surroundings. In response to review feedback, we have chosen a material and color palette that responds more closely to the surrounding neighborhood – namely simple, fine-grain, human scaled materials – brick, clapboard and wood panel siding, metal shingles at the roof, and a masonry foundation. The primary volume is clad in a warm, light neutral color brick with a soldier course header set over windows and doors. Bay windows appear as simple extruded volumes through the application of a painted wood paneled siding of similar neutral tone. The void between masses on the Montreal Street side is clad in a dark gray wood shiplap siding that helps this portion of the building recede visually. The roof presents as a single volume through use of dark gray metal shingle next to gray extrusions surrounding the fourth floor windows. A handsome cornice wraps the masonry building and reinforces the classic proportions defined by base, middle and top.

5. Signs, canopies and awnings

n/a

Relationship to the Street

1. Walls of continuity

Facades and site structures, such as masonry walls, fences, and landscape masses shall, when it is a characteristic of the area, form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street, to ensure visual compatibility with the structures, public ways, and places to which such elements are visually related.

On Montreal Street, the building is slightly set back from the sidewalk in a manner consistent with the single-family home facing it (9 Willis Street) as well as the adjacent MacArthur Gardens. Minimal or no wall or fencing is seen in the immediate neighborhood, with the result that homes have a very accessible presence on the street. Significant efforts have been made to refine the approach and main entry along Montreal Street in order to engage passersby more directly and to have a more hospitable presence at the street level. Retaining walls and built-in wall seats have been minimized or eliminated where possible, with the ramp and stairs on Montreal Street reoriented to face the sidewalk directly, rather than circuitously. The landscape and simple low wall along both principal facades offers several inviting spots for sitting and chatting among neighbors.

2. Rhythm of Spacing and Structures on Streets

The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects, public ways, and places to which it is visually related.

The building mediates two divergent rhythms that exist along Montreal Street on either side. To the West, as has been noted, there exists a “building / drive / building / drive” pattern, while the MacArthur Gardens complex to the East establishes its own more dispersed rhythm of structure and open space, including surface parking lots. The recessed volume at the building’s entry helps to break up the façade along Montreal Street in a manner that balances the diversity of site orientation seen in this block alone between the variety of building scales.

3. Directional Expression of Front Elevation

A building shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways, and places to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical, horizontal, or nondirectional character.


Along Willis Street, the building’s three articulated rowhouses lend it a predominantly vertical character, which relates to the single-family homes in the surrounding context. The Montreal Street façade, while longer, uses bay windows, vertically oriented windows and a clear distinction between two masses to break up the horizontality. The effect is to relate this façade’s directional expression more closely to neighborhood multifamily buildings of similar scale.



102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
 (207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

TWO BLOCK RADIUS

MONTREAL ST
 Montreal St Portland ME 04101



1 MONTREAL STREET VIEW DOWNHILL



2 MONTREAL STREET DOWNHILL




3 MONTREAL STREET DOWNHILL



4 MONTREAL STREET VIEW UPHILL




5 MONTREAL STREET UPHILL



6 MONTREAL STREET UPHILL


EXISTING CONTEXT: MONTREAL



① WALNUT STREET PERSPECTIVE



② WILLIS STREET FROM WALNUT



③ WILLIS STREET FROM MONTREAL



④ MONTREAL STREET PERSPECTIVE UPHILL

EXISTING CONTEXT: WALNUT & MONTREAL ST




WILLIS - MONTREAL INTERSECTION



WILLIS - MONTREAL INTERSECTION



WILLIS - MONTREAL INTERSECTION



102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
(207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

EXISTING CONTEXT: MONTREAL / WILLIS INTERSECTION

MONTREAL ST
Montreal St Portland ME 04101



101 North Street
MONTREAL STREET ADJACENT West

MacArthur Gardens 13-27
MONTREAL STREET ADJACENT East



89 North Street
MONTREAL STREET FACING West




9 Wills Street
MONTREAL STREET FACING East



Promenade Towers 340 East Promenade
WILLIS STREET ADJACENT



51 Melbourne Street
WILLIS STREET FACING



SITE LOCATION



NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT - STREETScape



1 PROPOSED WILLIS STREETSCAPE

SCALE: 1:266,67



2 PROPOSED MONTREAL STREETSCAPE


SCALE: 1:266,67




PROPOSED STREETSCAPES




PROPOSED SITE PLAN



GARAGE LEVEL PLAN



GROUND FLOOR PLAN



ROOF PLAN



PREVIOUS WORKSHOP SUBMISSION



PREVIOUS ELEVATION: WILLIS ST



REVISED ELEVATION



PROPOSED ELEVATION: WILLIS ST



PREVIOUS WORKSHOP SUBMISSION



PREVIOUS ELEVATION: MONTREAL ST

SHIPLAP SIDING,
PAINTED

ZINC SHINGLE,
DIAMOND PATTERN

MANSARD DORMER

DEEP CORNICE

ALUMINUM CLAD
WOOD WINDOW,
DARK CHARCOAL
COLOR

MASONRY OR STONE,
WHITE / LIGHT BEIGE.



WOOD PANELING, PAINTED

WOOD COLUMNS, CLR FINISH

BASEMENT GARAGE

FIELDSTONE GARDEN WALL

REVISED ELEVATION



102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
(207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

PROPOSED ELEVATION: MONTREAL ST

MONTREAL ST
Montreal St Portland ME 04101



PROPOSED NORTHEAST ELEVATION

ZINC SHINGLE,
DIAMOND PATTERN

SHIPLAP SIDING, PAINTED

ROOF

MANSARD DORMER

DEEP CORNICE

4TH

ALUMINUM CLAD WOOD
WINDOW, DARK
CHARCOAL COLOR

3RD

MASONRY OR STONE,
WHITE / LIGHT BEIGE.

2ND

ALUMINUM CLAD
TERRACE DOOR,
PAINTED

138

137

BASEMENT
GARAGE

FIELDSTONE GARDEN WALL

MTL-WALNUT-NW ELEV.
10.04.2018



PROPOSED NORTHWEST ELEVATION



102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
(207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

VIEW FROM MONTREAL STREET

MONTREAL ST
Montreal St Portland ME 04101



Kaplan
Thompson
Architects

102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
(207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

VIEW DOWN WILLIS STREET

MONTREAL ST
Montreal St Portland ME 04101



Kaplan
Thompson
Architects

102 Exchange Street Portland, ME 04101
(207) 842-2888 kaplanthompson.com

VIEW FROM LOWER MONTREAL STREET

MONTREAL ST
Montreal St Portland ME 04101

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeff Levine, Director
Planning & Urban Development Department

FROM: Jennifer L. Thompson, Associate Corporation Counsel

DATE: May 31, 2018

RE: Questions regarding R-6 Overlay and interplay of site plan and design standards

I understand that, in connection with the proposed Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (the "Overlay"), questions have arisen regarding the interplay of site plan review, zoning, and design standards. This memo will attempt to outline the general regulatory framework for land use development in the City and clarify the applicability of the City's various standards.

In order to orient the discussion, I start with a bit of background: Land use and development are subject to review by the City only as expressly required by our Code. Typically, review takes three major forms: subdivision, zoning and site plan. The questions that are circulating regarding the Overlay relate exclusively to zoning and site plan review, so I'll focus on those.

Under Chapter 14, there are 3 levels of site plan review that are required, depending on the size and scope of the proposed development. Level I site plan review is for relatively small projects, typically involving site alterations or 1 or 2 additional residential dwelling units on a site. The review for Level I projects is done administratively by staff who apply the guidelines set by the Council. Level II is for somewhat larger projects and is also typically reviewed administratively, though can be referred to the Planning Board as appropriate. Level III site plans are required for larger-scale projects and are approved exclusively by the Planning Board, also using standards articulated by the Council. The differing levels of review are outlined in Section 14-523 of the Code.

Currently, the "Design Standards" commonly referred to in your Munjoy Hill work consist of both the "Zoning Related Design Standards" (largely dimensional in nature) outlined in Section 14-526(a)(9) of the site plan review ordinance and the guidelines outlined in the City's "Design Manual" which is incorporated in Section (a)(9) of the site plan ordinance by reference. Both sets of design standards are expressly articulated as standards that apply to all levels of site plan review. The specific design standards that are applicable to a development depend on the zone in which it sits but for projects in, for example, the R-6, all residential developments are subject to the City's design standards if they are also subject to site plan review.

With respect to applications for site plan review and the extent to which conformance with design standards is required, the answer is, "yes." As noted above, meeting the design standards outlined in the design manual is its own requirement and applies to all residential development in the R-6 (see Section 14-526(a)(9)(a)(vi)(d)). Therefore, where a development meets dimensional

standards but does not meet other requirements in the design manual, a site plan application can be denied. So long as a residential development in the R-6 is subject to site plan review, it must meet both the dimensional requirements and the design standards.

Another question has arisen regarding the extent to which design standards are applicable to projects that are not subject to site plan review. Under the Code as it currently exists, the City's design standards are not generally applicable unless a project is subject to site plan review. As noted above, land uses and development only come under the City's review when the Council has expressly required it. That is, we can only apply our development standards, including design standards, when a development is required to be approved by the City. If something is not subject to site plan review (which is the context in which design standards are currently applied) then there is no basis or grounds for the City to require conformance with those standards. However, there are some cases where design standards are written directly into the zoning code, in the form of dimensional standards. In those cases, those standards would apply regardless, and be implemented as part of the regular review of a project for a building permit.

Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division



Subject: R-6 Small Infill Design Review – 37 Montreal Street
Written by: Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer
Date of Review: Wednesday, October 10, 2018

A preliminary R-6 design review for the proposal for new construction of a multi-family project at 37 Montreal Street was performed by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer and Deb Andrews, Historic Preservation Program Manager. The project was reviewed against the *R-6 Small Infill Development Design Principles & Standards* (Appendix 7 of the Design Manual) for Alternative Design Review. Staff sketches are also provided to illustrate some of the review comments and suggestions for potential strategies to address the standards not met. This is a preliminary review prior to the formal Site Plan application to provide feedback to be incorporated into the Site Plan application.

R6 Alternative Design Review:

The Review Authority under an Alternative Design Review may approve a design not meeting one or more of the individual standards provided that all of the conditions listed below are met:

- A. The proposed design is consistent with all of the Principle Statements.
- B. The majority of the Standards within each Principle are met.
- C. The guiding principle for new construction under the alternative design review is to be compatible with the surrounding buildings in a two block radius in terms of size, scale, materials, and siting, as well as the general character of the established neighborhood, thus Standards A-1 through A-3 shall be met.
- D. The design plan is prepared by an architect registered in the State of Maine.

Alternative Design Review further takes into consideration:

- Compatibility with surrounding buildings and general character of the established neighborhood
- Building type and use
- Unique characteristics of the site
- Design flexibility to accommodate sustainable design practices and/or affordable housing units

The project as currently proposed requires some revisions in order to meet the standards for the Alternative Design Review. However, at this point staff recommends that the Preservation Board vote to forward the current plans and staff comments to the Planning Board so the applicant can commence the formal Site Plan process. This will allow additional time for discussions between staff and the applicant as that process moves forward. The ADR review will have to return to the Historic Preservation Board for a formal approval as part of the Site Plan process.

Design Review Comments (*red text denotes principles or standards that are not met; request for more information or questions*):

R-6 Design Standards

Principle A Overall Context – see below. The predominant, character-defining elements of residential architecture in the neighborhood context include vertical proportion massing, simple roof forms, vertical windows with local symmetry, two or three-bay façade composition, and simple material palettes – predominantly clapboard with masonry foundation.

- *A-1 Scale and Form*: The proposal is attempting to mediate between a more recent

context of Promenade Towers and MacArthur Gardens – two large/mid-scale apartment complexes – compared with the predominant, traditional fabric found a block away. The massing and forms proposed do not directly replicate any of those existing forms but instead uses a hybrid or massing, roof forms, façade orientations and compositions to relate the scale to these varying contexts while being authentic in its expression of use and typology. Though the design does successfully break down the four-story height in some ways with a change in massing and forms, the overall form is more complex and of larger scale than is found in the context. The scale is mitigated with townhouse modules on Willis Street – the scale of those, expressed with entrances, bay windows, a datum at the 3rd floor, and a faux mansard roof form with dormers, relate and correspond to the single-family homes directly across the street. The scale and massing of the building on Montreal is more similar to the MacArthur Gardens buildings. The overall building scale at four stories is both taller and longer than the single and two-family fabric in neighboring blocks but again, is mitigated to some degree through massing and articulation strategies. For example, a strong datum line at the third floor relates to the scale and form of a triple-decker type building. The fourth floor roof form was changed to a faux mansard to reference contextual forms and to mitigate scale impacts. The faux mansard roof form unifies the building, *however, the approach of trying to unify the building with this element also results in drawing attention to the scale, length, and height of the building. Staff recommend that this approach be reconsidered in order to bring this building – which is larger in height and length than those buildings found within the immediate streetscape context – to a smaller scale masses and forms (see attached illustration for suggested strategies).* The grade change on Montreal Street causes the building to appear taller at the downhill side and again, *the unifying roof form accentuates scale and height rather than mitigating it,* though the faux mansard does help reduce the scale impact of the fourth floor and reference contextual forms. *Staff request the applicant consider further revisions in order to meet the standard regarding scale and forms that relate to the context. It is a combination of the height, length, scale, and massing that are not meeting the principles and standards – it is the staff's belief that revisions to some of these components, especially massing, height, and form changes, can bring the project to compliance with the standards and compatibility with the context.*

- *A-2 Composition of Principal Facades*: The composition of the street-facing façades take on some traditional characteristics and symmetries. The façades generally relate to the context through the pattern/rhythm of windows and the creation of a datum line at the

third floor to set up a similar façade proportion as a triple-decker or multi-family building type. Willis Street: The design makes Willis Street the primary façade for the townhouses. The façade composition emphasizes the third story with local symmetry for each townhouse with an offset entry and bay window. **The bay windows, however, are too wide in relationship with the overall façade and should be reduced in width to create façade relationships more in keeping with those proportions found in the context.** Montreal Street: As the project turns the corner, the façade composition is treated as a more secondary façade – this is appropriate. The first mass associated with the townhouses is also now more differentiated from the rest of the building through the massing, materials, and façade composition. The rest of the building continues the datum line at the third floor, regular window patterns, symmetry, but authentically expresses the multi-family type building. **Staff find the roof forms and window compositions on the 4th floor and the local façade composition of the multi-family massing on Montreal Street to not, yet, be resolved in a way that is harmonious with the context or the overall façade composition – further revision is requested that differentiates the two building masses, contributes to the scale mitigation, and creates proportions and symmetries compatible with the traditional facades in the streetscape (see attached illustration for suggested strategies).**

- **A-3 Relationship to the Street:** Willis Street: The building placement is consistent with the existing relationship of the front façade to the sidewalk – slightly setback from sidewalk to allow for stoops, plantings, and provide privacy. Montreal Street: The “side” façade on Montreal is further set back to accommodate ramps/stairs/grade change – this placement is closer to the street than the neighboring MacArthur Gardens which is preferable and more in line with the placement of the traditional buildings in the neighboring blocks. This building has structured parking under the building and so does not follow the “building/drive/building/drive” pattern of the smaller buildings in neighboring blocks – this pattern does not exist within the project’s block. The structured parking does bring benefits, allowing the building to create a strong street wall, provide efficient use of the lot, and reduce the amount of impervious surfaces. **In regards to the planters, steps, and retaining wall on Montreal Street - houses on Munjoy Hill have a direct relationship to the street with simple, approachable porches, planters and foundation walls that provide some privacy but also convey the small-scale, residential uses. Further revision is needed for the building interface on Montreal Street to give the entrance and planter walls a more compatible character with the neighborhood and improve the relationship with the street.**

Principle B Massing – Partially Met - The proposed massing in some ways reflects or reinforces the traditional building character of the neighborhood as seen in the plan diagram but hybridizes characteristics from different typologies that differ from the massing found nearby. The proposal’s overall proportion and scale differs from the smaller, traditional buildings – the Willis Street façade is wider in proportion than found in the existing building context but each individual townhouse is similar in scale and proportion to the single-family homes in the context. The building is also larger in scale than the surrounding buildings – the massing generally attempts to break down the building into volumes that relate to the scale of the neighborhood and that scale is mitigated through several strategies including bay windows, the roof forms, and massing variation to emphasize vertical proportions. The project has a clear definition and separation of the two primary masses on Montreal Street – staff think this has been successful in mitigating the scale of the building. **But ultimately, this side of the building is**

a long, horizontal façade compared with the proportions and scale found within the neighborhood and becomes almost as tall as five stories at the lower end of the building – Staff and board have recommended revisions to mitigate this scale issue on Montreal Street and to improve the massing relationship.

- **B-1 Massing:** The massing is a hybrid of forms and does not directly replicate the massing or forms found nearby. The existing building massing across the street on Willis and Montreal are simple, rectangular masses with the narrow end facing the street and simple roof forms such as front-end gables or mansard roofs. The MacArthur Gardens complex within the same block as this project has simple, boxy forms, hipped roofs with dormers but with varying relationships and orientations to the street. The project presents a simple, rectilinear form on Willis Street with three townhouses, and box bays – the overall massing is horizontal in proportion to the street, the bays provide massing variation, and the faux mansard roof form mitigates the scale impact of the fourth floor and provides a form more similar to those found in the context. The Montreal Street massing is again horizontal in proportion but has a clear break with two masses and includes the faux mansard roof and circulation tower to vary the form with a couple of box bays. The design was revised to clarify the two masses, the third floor is defined by the form and material change. The standard requires the massing to be harmonious with the context (it does not require that existing massing be replicated) but especially in relationship with the buildings immediately adjacent. **Staff, with board comment, find that the Montreal Street façade does not, yet, meet this standard in terms of creating massing that relates in proportion and scale with the surrounding streetscape. Further revision is needed to reduce the scale, modify the width and proportion, and potentially alter the roof form and scale of the multi-family portion of the building where it is also tallest and has the biggest scale impact. See attached illustrations for further comment and suggestions.**
- **B-2 Roof Forms:** The context includes simple roof forms – front-end gables, mansard roofs, and flat roofs on multi-family buildings. The proposal was revised to include flat roofs and a faux mansard roof – both are found within the context.
- **B-3 Main Roofs and Subsidiary Roofs:** There is a clear main roof form at the 4th floor. The roof line of the circulation tower is clearly subsidiary.
- **B-4 Roof Pitch:** Pitch of the mansard is steeper than a traditional mansard but this roof type is not specifically called out in the standard. The sections with flat roof have a defined cornice line of at least 12”.
- **B-5 Façade Articulation:** The project employs three of the required articulation elements – covered entry, recessed entry, bay windows.
- **B-6 Garages:** Garage is integrated into building with living space above; less than 40% of the overall façade.

Principle C Orientation to the Street – Partially Met - On Willis Street, the project is oriented to the street with street-facing doors and stoops, treating Willis as the primary façade for the townhouses. The grade change on Montreal Street is challenging and steps/ramp with a retaining wall and planter areas transition between the sidewalk public realm to the upper level of the multi-family entrance - this façade is longer than most buildings in the context which exacerbates the challenge of providing a direct access. The grade and design both provide transition between public and private but also could create too much separation between the two making it feel inhospitable or unapproachable. In looking at conditions around the neighborhood, staff observe that buildings have a direct relationship from the street to the

building. In response to the workshop comments, the applicant lowered the building in order to provide a direct entrance on Montreal Street. There is a clear delineation between public and private through planters, retaining walls, and porches/stoops. The proposal attempts to provide public amenity through terracing and deep landscape spaces between the sidewalk and the building. While this is attractive, it exacerbates the separateness of the project from the street and strays from the contextual character which does occasionally rely on simple stone retaining walls and elevated entrances but overall conveys approachability and neighborly front porches. Staff suggest the retaining walls be simplified as much as possible, limiting the terracing. The multi-family entrance should be compatible with the character of the porches that exist in other neighborhood buildings in its relationship to the street and the circulation, railing, post, and canopy detail – narrow the steps, use simple posts, refine the profile of the roof canopy (consider Morning Street examples).

- *C-1 Entrances:* The entries are all street-facing and emphasized with a recess and canopy. Adjust the design/detail of the multi-family entrance to be compatible with the residential vernacular entrances. The stoops on Willis Street now include details like railings and canopies with planter space between the sidewalk and building.
- *C-2 Visual Privacy:* Visual privacy is adequately addressed; ground floor windows are higher than 48" above adjoining sidewalk grade.
- *C-3 Transition Spaces:* The project uses a recessed entry, stoops, and planters to provide transition spaces; the living spaces are elevated above the street.

Principle D Proportion and Scale – Not Met – The bay windows are out of proportion with the overall design. Staff suggest the bay windows on Willis Street be reduced in width to improve the scale and proportion.

- *D-1 Windows:* The majority of windows are rectangular and vertically proportioned; the applicant revised the window proportions to be more similar with the context.
- *D-2 Fenestration:* The 12% fenestration requirement is met on street-facing facades.
- *D-3 Porches:* The main entrance on Montreal Street could be considered a porch – in which case, the 20% standard is not met. The other dimensional requirements are met. The fourth floor includes roof deck space – the dimensions meet the standard.

Principle E Balance – The building has two facades. The Willis Street façade composition includes local symmetry around each row house but also an overall symmetry in window and bay composition. The Montreal Street façade is more asymmetrical in its composition given the massing and change in unit design within the building but is clearly arranged around vertical axis lines.

- *E-1 Window and Door Height:* The majority of window and door head heights align along a common horizontal datum.
- *E-2 Window and Door Alignment:* The majority of windows stack so that centerlines of windows are in vertical alignment.
- *E-3 Symmetry:* Overall and local symmetry are employed on Willis Street façade. The Montreal Street façade is more asymmetrical in its composition but is clearly arranged around vertical axis lines.

Principle F Articulation – The project provides adequate articulation through material texture, balcony railings, bay windows, and canopies.

- *F-1 Articulation:* Surface articulation is provided by material texture, bays, and the balcony details will create shadow lines on the façades. These appear to be consistently treated across all façades visible from the public right-of-way.
- *F-2 Window Types:* More than two types and sizes are used. There is design justification for smaller windows in the circulation tower, ground floor living spaces, dormers in the faux mansard roof.
- *F-3 Visual Cohesion:* The visual cohesion of the façades is good. The materials are placed to emphasize the two three-story masses and differentiate the fourth floor. Staff recommend further revision to the material placement to address the staff and HP Board concerns about the scale and massing. Simplify the material palette even further so that the bay windows and multi-family 4th floor are tied to the overall building. The material placement on Montreal Street could be used to differentiate the two sections of the building – see the attached illustration for example strategies.
- *F-4 Delineation between Floors:* The floors are delineated by fenestration patterns, balconies, material changes, balconies.
- *F-5 Porches, etc.:* The front entrance for the multi-family building does not feel resolved – the character does not contribute to the residential character of the neighborhood and is not necessarily incorporated into the overall design. Top floor balconies are created with a step back of the fourth floor. Balcony and stoop railings are used to provide articulation and shadow lines to the front façade – more information is requested regarding the character of these railings.
- *F-6 Main Entries:* There are multiple “main entries” making this proposal anomalous. All entries face the street, are recessed with some emphasis given by canopy/stoop/porch. The direct access from the sidewalks is a positive, contextual feature. The Montreal Street entrance meets the intention of this standard but the character and details need further revision to be more compatible with the neighborhood character in terms of compatibility.
- *F-7 Articulation Elements:* The roof overhangs at the 3rd floor roof line project at least 6”; window trim details are unclear; the façade offsets are at least 12”, trim at both roof lines.

Principle G Materials – Partially Met - The character defining materials and architectural features of the neighborhood are predominantly simple and fine-grain – clapboard siding, architectural detail at bays, porches, or canopies, and masonry foundation. The result is warm, approachable, and vernacular character. The MacArthur Gardens development, within the same block as the proposal, uses red brick. Otherwise, no other building in this surrounding streetscape is brick. In some cases in this context, larger, multi-family buildings are sometimes brick as befitting a larger scale, different building type.

The proposal uses a fine-grain material palette – brick, panel, shiplap clapboard, and metal shingle. There are now four materials within the palette – simplification will make the project more compatible with the palettes found in the neighborhood but also will help with some of the concerns about scale, form, and massing. Staff recommend that the bay window material be reconsidered for a more residential material and use a material or color already found in the palette.

- *G-1 Materials:* The context includes warm, approachable, and vernacular character where clapboard with masonry foundation predominate. The selected materials are fine-grain but brick is not found in the traditional buildings within this immediate context. The lighter brick with darker details helps the building towards meeting the

vernacular, residential character – however, the Board and staff would like more information about the color of brick proposed to ensure that it reflects this residential character. Staff support using the materials to help to distinguish the different parts of the building and mitigate some of the scale impacts on Montreal Street. The material placement and selection can help address the scale and composition standards not met on Montreal Street – see attached illustration for further explanation and suggestions.

- *G-2 Material and Façade Design:* The materials are placed appropriately to the façade design and their nature. The material placement was revised – the metal tile now appears on the 4th floor faux mansard roof which staff support as appropriate.
- *G-3 Chimneys:* Not applicable.
- *G-4 Window Types:* More than two window types are used within the building. Detailing changes at the 4th floor where there are dormers.
- *G-5 Patios and Plazas:* The Montreal St side of the building includes hardscape, stone masonry walls, and planter area. Simple stone retaining and planter walls are found within the neighborhood – terracing is not considered reflective of the vernacular residential character. The foundation wall and retaining/planter wall edges should be simplified as much as possible. More information is needed to evaluate the materials proposed for the stoops, steps, paths, and entry porches.



10/10/18 Design Review
37 Montreal Street
C. Cameron, D. Andrews

- Narrow bays in proportion to overall facade
- Adjust material - use material already found in palette
 - simplify + residential in character
- Supportive of lighter material color here but samples/palette needed - residential character



Adjust window pattern here => current configuration awkward

Continue some material/roof form across to 2nd mass (or similar strategy) to differentiate + mitigate scale impacts

Lower roof height as much as possible
Flat roof across to differentiate 2 masses
Step back top floor? => scale/height mitigation + compatibility

Cut away this corner to reduce length/scale of this mass and create 3 bay => better proportion
more rational form given the roof form/edge
at least 3 floors

Railings should be simple/residential in character

This mass potentially diff material from corner to differentiate

Simple foundation wall and planter edge consistent w/ neighborhood character - not too much terracing

Simplify entrance
Narrow stairs, no terraced planters
Simple posts, shorter windows

10/10/18 Design Review
37 Montreal Street
C Cameron, D Andrews

MICHAEL HOOVER
40 Melbourne Street #3
Portland, ME 04101

12 October 2018

Ms. Deb Andrews
Historic Preservation Program Manager
City of Portland
Portland, ME 04101

RE: 33-37 Montreal Street Development Proposal Written Comments

Dear Ms. Andrews:

My comments on the current proposal are as follows.

As I have stated, I do not believe there has been adequate opportunity for public participation.

No application materials will be made available to the general public via the City's website as of October 12. You indicate that the staff report will be distributed Oct 12, which includes written comments from the public. If this is true, and you are following the framework of the City's guide to effective public participation in Portland's planning process, the City is not providing information for the residents of Portland to review and provide written comments on the development proposal so that these comments can be submitted to the Board and included in the public record with the staff report.

As a resident of Portland, I am requesting that the public meeting scheduled for next Wednesday be rescheduled due to the fact that the City of Portland has not provided adequate opportunity to citizens to effectively participate in this process. I reiterate my observation that you are providing **ZERO DAYS** for written comments on this proposal, and a total of two working days for the public to be prepared to provide verbal comments at the hearing. Providing no materials to the public for their review does not equate to a public participation element for this hearing.

My written comments are severely compromised by the absence of any review time to evaluate this proposal.

At the September Historic Preservation Board Public Meeting, the comments from the public and the Board related primarily to the massing of the building. Specific comments focused on the incompatibility of the structure massing in relation to the immediate two block neighborhood. The current proposal has not addressed these concerns in any substantial manner. The continued, uninterrupted massing of the structure has remained. The revised structure simply has not addressed previous design revision comments from either the public or the Board.

The size and massing are in no way consistent with current building conditions in Munjoy Hill. The City's Planning Board has documented that the residential density in this area of Munjoy Hill is the lowest in the district. A review of existing structures in the immediate neighborhood reveal a mix of single family to three/four unit multifamily structures. These structures exist on 40 foot wide lots, and have a front façade of approximately 25-30 feet. This creates a massing pattern of relatively small residential structures repeating themselves along the streets. The large majority of these structures contain square footage living spaces of between 1,500 square feet to 4,000 square feet.

The existing proposal proposes a 180 foot long, uninterrupted building mass along Montreal and Willis Street. It will contain 14 living units with a conservative living space of 1,200 to 1,500 square feet per unit. This will result in a structure which will contain approximately 17,000 to 21,000 square feet of living space. Comparatively, the mass of the structure will be 8-10 times greater than the mass of existing structures in the neighborhood. The argument that the mass of this structure is compatible with the existing neighborhood cannot be reconciled with a building that will be 8-10 times larger than the current structures.

In laymen's terms, there is no hiding the fact that the proposed structure is HUGE compared to the current building pattern of the immediate neighborhood. Again, there is no manner in which this size discrepancy can be considered consistent or compatible with existing building massing. Simply impossible.

Given that A) there has been no public participation afforded to the residents of Portland for this process, and B) the structure under consideration is in no way comparable or consistent with the existing neighborhood structure composition either in massing or character, I strongly recommend the Board to deny this application as proposed.

Thank you.

/s/

Mike Hoover



Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Concerns over 3rd Submission of 33 and 37 Montreal to HPB

1 message

Karen Snyder <karsny@yahoo.com>

Fri, Oct 12, 2018 at 12:40 PM

To: Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>, Belinda Ray <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>, "munjoyhillconsvcoll@gmail.com" <munjoyhillconsvcoll@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Andrews, Chairman Chair Sheridan and Members of the Historic Preservation Board,

The general consensus of surrounding property owners of 33 and 37 Montreal proposal has always been the overall neighborhood context of scale and massing is not compatible to surrounding buildings and does not comply with Design Standards: Principle A-Overall Context and Principle B-Massing.

I believe below I have provided conservatively estimated factual evidence that this proposal does NOT meet the neighborhood context for scale and massing and must be rejected.

- The surrounding buildings around 33 and 37 Montreal on average are **2 stories high and estimated 27,565 cubic feet in building mass.**
- The 33 and 37 Montreal proposal is **4 stories high and estimated 450,000 cubic feet in building mass.**


This means that 33 and 37 Montreal proposal is roughly on average over 10 times greater in building mass and twice as high as the surrounding buildings.

Therefore, this proposal is grossly out of proportion to the immediate surrounding buildings.

R-6 Infill and Historic Preservation design standards are legally bound to protect neighborhoods from strip mining the neighborhood context and characteristics. In the Munjoy Hill Conservation District, the design standards are just as important and legally enforceable as zoning. Zoning is only suppose to represent the maximum of buildout but does NOT mean that it can be maxed out when compared to surrounding buildings are that much smaller. As such, the scale and building massing of 33 and 37 Montreal is on average over 10 times larger than surrounding buildings, this 3rd submission of 33 and 37 Montreal project can not be approved.

Please see below my conservative estimated calculations of the all the buildings scale and massing surrounding 33 and 37 Montreal.

I have also attached the document for further analysis.



Please reject this 3rd proposal of 33 and 37 Montreal submission.

The survival of neighborhood context is in your hands.

Regards,
 Karen Snyder
 Munjoy Hill Property Owner

ScaleMassingAnalysis_33and37Montreal_20181012.pdf
 210K

to: Portland Historic Preservation Board
% Deborah Andrews, Executive Director

October 12, 2018

Dear Chair Sheridan and members of the Board:

Enclosed please find a petition from residents of Willis and Montreal Streets asking your consideration for addition of parts of those streets to the proposed North St Historic District on Munjoy Hill. Specifically we are asking to have that portion of Montreal St not now included in the proposed district (houses at the top of the street have been selected for study as part of the North St District) with the exception of the MacArthur Gardens apartment complex be added to the proposed district.

We have talked with as many of our neighbors as we could. A few properties are absentee-owned. One resident is in a nursing home and unavailable at this time. We understand that public discussion about the impact of a Historic district on the neighborhood is part of the process, and the Board would need to know that most of the residents were in favor. We hope this petition provides some of the evidence you need to initiate a process, and are anxious for the opportunity to ask questions such as, "can I replace my windows?" and "will my children be unable to develop the property?".

We believe Montreal and Willis Streets represent a rare surviving snapshot of what Portland was like before and after the great fire of 1866. The period represented by the homes identified by Greater Portland Landmarks as significant or contributing covers the years from the 1850s to the mid 1930s. 86% of the properties in our proposed district were found last year to be significant or contributing to the historic streetscape of the Hill, and since that time an additional Willis Street property has undergone considerable restoration of its exterior. In its August 15 testimony to the Board, Greater Portland Landmarks described Montreal Street as having what were "urban farmhouses".

The streetscape still includes many small single family homes that housed tradespeople typical of the period. At the bottom of Montreal Street, what is now #12 (built 1860) housed a boatbuilder, and his shop survives today. This house is part of a row of houses dating from the mid-1860s on both sides of the street. Near the top of the street, closer to North, stands a property at #55 which housed a long-surviving greenhouse and nursery business from the 1850s onward. Residents there today report remarkable soil conditions. Across the street at #48 (built 1860) the neighborhood speakeasy was in business during Prohibition and the house still contains a cellar phone and sliding door accessible to customers from the street.

Landmarks has already begun the work of researching the histories behind this unique streetscape, including the social fabric it supported, and we are grateful to them for the history we have drawn upon for this petition. And MacArthur Gardens (1947) at the bottom of Montreal Street, while not built in the period of significance, sits on a piece of land which was integrated into the streetscape with small Italianate dwellings until the great reservoir flood of 1893 washed out four houses and four people lost their lives. The land remained empty until MacArthur gardens was built in 1947 and thus these apartments, in their way, preserve a piece of the history of Montreal Street.

Willis Street enjoys a similar history, with many single family tradespersons homes and three multifamily homes built for rental purposes during the midcentury, at least one by well-known Munjoy Hill developer Moses Gould. The house at #9 is believed to have been a farmhouse when it was built; early city maps showed the property originally extending all the way to the Eastern Promenade. The home still sits on a property covering one entire block on the north side of the street.

Munjoy Hill properties are in danger of teardowns for highly lucrative condominium developments seeking ocean views and proximity to the Old Port. While the new Conservation District can slow the pace of teardowns, it does not have sufficient teeth to prevent outsized and incompatible replacement buildings. Historic District status would help preserve the streetscape and inhibit incompatible development. There is continuous improvement and restoration work underway on the street, and homeowners generally strive for historic compatibility.

Willis and Montreal Streets still house small businesses of the type historically located there. They continue to provide family housing and children are often on the streets. We love our neighborhood and wish to preserve its unique streetscape and the social fabric it supports. We hope you will agree and include it in consideration of the proposed Historic District for Munjoy Hill.

Thank you.

Jean (Nini) Mc Manamy, 10 Willis Street
329-1232

Enclosures:

1. Map of proposed Montreal and Willis Streets addition to potential North Street Historic District
2. Petitions of property owners requesting inclusion in the proposed district

Petition: Historic Preservation District for Munjoy Hill

We the undersigned request the Portland City Council and Planning Dept conserve and preserve the structures that makes Munjoy Hill vibrant by being included in the Munjoy Hill Historic District districts.

Street Address	Name (PRINT ONLY)	Primary	Signature	Email Address
✓ 1 12 Montreal St C	Carol Conner	Y		balsanigue@live.com
✓ 2 16 Montreal St C	George Libby	Y		
3 18 Montreal St C	Linda Douglass	Y		
✓ 4 22 Montreal St C	Vanessa McGrath	Y		
5 24 Montreal St C	Edward Gillis & Marta Rankin	Y		
✓ 6 32 Montreal St C	Sanjay & Laura Patel	Y		
7 33 Montreal St C	St. John's Valley LLC	N		
8 37 Montreal St C	Kevin Carter	N		
✓ 9 41 Montreal St C	Kevin Johannen & Meghan Connolly	Y		kenm@iknow.net
10 42 Montreal St C	Liane C. Billings	Y		
✓ 11 45 Montreal St C	James Cole ^{McGrath}	Y		jim.kc.de@gmail.com krafodp@mcgrathmaine.com
✓ 12 48 Montreal St C	Cama Clarkson Woodward	Y		
13 49 Montreal St C	Colleen Jackson-Commiss	N		
14 52 Montreal St C	Ryland & Brook Rankin	Y		
15 54 Montreal St NC	Montreal St. Realty LLC	N		
✓ 16 55 Montreal St C	Alison Grey & Oiver Murray	Y		
✓ 17 60 Montreal St	Patricia Ryan	Y		pryan2@maine.vv.com
✓ 18 46 Montreal St	Marguerite Cartonio	Y		
✓ 19 55 Montreal St	Alison Grey	Y		
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

Petition: Historic Preservation District for Munjoy Hill


We the undersigned request the Portland City Council and Planning Dept conserve and preserve the structures that makes Munjoy Hill vibrant by being included in the Munjoy Hill Historic District districts.

Street Address	Name (PRINT ONLY)	Primary	Signature	Email Address
✓ 1 9 Willis St. C	Maragret Hillman	Y		
✓ 2 10 Willis St. C	Jean McManamy	Y		
3 20 Willis St. NC	John Mahoney & Allision Kamar	N		
4 22 Willis St. NC	Rebecca Dreher	Y		
✓ 5 23 Willis St. NC	Frances McGovern	Y		
6 24 Willis St. C	Patricia Bleech	Y		
✓ 7 28 Willis St. C	Susan Shaw	Y		
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

Montreal and Willis Streets: proposed addition to potential North Street Historic District

North Street Historic District currently under study = 

Proposed Montreal and Willis Streets addition = 



Fwd: 33-37 Montreal Street

1 message

Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:17 AM

To: Julia Sheridan <jdevl@msn.com>, bruce@sarabruce.us, John Turk <john.turk@resurgenceengineering.com>, "ppollar1@maine.rr.com" <ppollar1@maine.rr.com>, Ian Jacob <iancasperjacob@gmail.com>, "rjobrien@mail.com" <rjobrien@mail.com>, Julia Tate <julia@simonsarchitects.com>, Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Beth Snyder** <snyderbes@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Oct 16, 2018 at 6:14 PM

Subject: 33-37 Montreal Street

To: <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Dear Deb Andrews,

I'm writing you this evening because I can't attend the public hearing tomorrow to discuss 33-37 Montreal Street.

I live at [81 North Street](#) and frequently walk the side streets to the Eastern Prom -- Quebec St, Melbourne St and Montreal St. As I walk down the hill on one of these streets, the houses 'step down' as the street declines and they create a cohesive structure to the street.

I'm very concerned about the proposed construction plan for 33-37 Montreal. Its scale and mass are excessive for the street. It would dwarf its neighbors.

I've heard arguments posed that the large apartment complex on Walnut acts as a precedent. I don't see the point of citing bad examples as reasons to proceed and add to a smaller collection of unappealing architecture on Munjoy Hill.

If anything, when planning new construction, we in the City of Portland should set our sites high and look for ways to beautify our neighborhood.

Thank you for considering my concerns,
Beth Snyder

--

Deb Andrews
Historic Preservation Program Manager
[City of Portland](#)
[389 Congress Street](#)
Portland, Maine 04101
(207) 874-8726

Fwd: Munjoy Hill (37-33 Montreal Street)

1 message

Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:03 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Carol Connor** <balsamique@live.com>
Date: Tue, Oct 16, 2018 at 3:23 PM
Subject: **Munjoy Hill (37-33 Montreal Street)**
To: dga@portlandmaine.gov <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Sent from my iPad October 16, 2018

To Deb Andrews and Members of the Historic Preservation Board and Staff,

Once again I am writing and speaking to voice my deep concerns about the development on Munjoy Hill that is whittling away the traditional buildings that characterize this very special area of Portland. In particular I am writing about the proposed demolition and construction that has been proposed for 37-33 Montreal Street.

It is incomprehensible to me that plans have progressed to the point that 3 buildings, including one that is deemed "Preferably Preserved," will very likely be torn down to clear the way for an oversized institutional style structure that overtakes and offends the streetscape.

The most recent revision of the plan includes attempts to mitigate the appearance of its massive scale and unwelcoming entry way by making small adjustments. The multi-unit structure has not changed its style or bulk in any significant way. It is still grossly out of proportion and style to all of the surrounding buildings. It is an affront to an otherwise quaint, welcoming neighborhood that is characterized by 2-3 story homes, apartments and condos.

The "Preferably Preserved" home at 37 Montreal is a sound, handsome building that is worthy of preserving. It anchors the corner, compliments neighboring homes, and presents a beautiful example of early 1900's architecture. This beautiful family home could be remodeled to incorporate 4 or more condos or apartments in a style that would preserve history and honor the existing character of the block. In your important position with The Historic Planning Board, please hold the builder to the highest standard of scrutiny and adhere to the requirements outlined in the design standards. to reject construction of this project. Please insist that the developer adhere to the mass, scale and height that is typical of the Montreal and Willis Street homes.

My initial reaction to early plans has not been altered by the contractor's superficial adjustments in design. I view this current version of the project proposal as being grossly out of scale, and excessively inconsistent with the R6 Design Principles and Standards.

Design Principles and Standards

Principal A Overall Context

A-1 Scale and Form

The attempt to mitigate scale with rowhouse modules on Willis Street fails to successfully relate and correspond to the single family homes directly across the street.

At 4 stories, the overall building scale is unharmonious with neighboring homes, and the effort to mitigate the height through massing and articulation strategies is unsuccessful. There are no 4 story structures on Montreal Street, and to maintain harmony of the streetscape, this building should be limited to 3 stories.

Principal B Massing

B-1 Massing

The overall massing, scale, form and design presents as institutional in appearance, and bears no resemblance to a welcoming residence.

The oversized institutional design introduces discord to the existing streetscape and is in no way complimentary or harmonious with immediately adjacent buildings.

Please consider refusal of this 3rd revisit of the project as it stands, in order to encourage a more compatible redesign that would preserve an existing home, enhance the neighborhood, and set an example for right-sized development that enriches rather than overtakes and offends. New construction should not take away from the character and appeal of a neighborhood, but should be a compatible compliment that enriches community life.

Respectfully,
Carol M. Connor
[12 Montreal St](#)
Portland, Maine 04101

207 232 2265

--

Deb Andrews
Historic Preservation Program Manager
[City of Portland](#)
[389 Congress Street](#)
Portland, Maine 04101
(207) 874-8726

Fwd: Montreal Willis Development:) OCT 17

1 message

Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:03 AM

Jen,

I'm going to forward a series of emails I've received on 37 Montreal since the packet went out. Can you upload these to the website as well? Thanks!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Debby Murray** <debbym@awi.net>
Date: Tue, Oct 16, 2018 at 1:34 PM
Subject: Montreal Willis Development:) OCT 17
To: Belinda Ray <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>, <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Hello Deb and Belinda,

I feel as if this is my possibly last letter about the development on 31-31 Montreal but as I cannot attend tomorrow night, here's hoping it makes it into the binder.

So I hear that the project will likely be approved but I don't understand how it can be? Rather than writing you an umpteenth letter about how the 15 unit, 4 story plan is too big (which it is) I will take another tack.

On Willis Street there is a restoration currently underway that I urge you to look at. Craftsmen are carefully restoring a single family home. It's been a joy to observe. I cannot believe after all the care and work that has gone into this project, the owner will potentially look at a blank wall of townhouses. She has lost her view, her light and in my opinion, her sense of place in the neighborhood. Soon her hard work will be lost in a sea of cars, a 45 foot wall of building, and scale beyond the single family house she has restored.

This is very sad. This whole process has been sad. We carefully and thoughtfully opposed this project and nothing I see in the new renderings convinces me that the developers have tried to work with the new rules. In fact nothing about the planning board's reaction to the project convinces me that the city gives a fig about neighbors' opinions. It's money, money, money and as I have previously written, frustrating and sad.

I will pick up the paper with a mixture of hope and dread on Thursday morning.

Debby Murray
104 North St.
Portland 04101

--

Deb Andrews
Historic Preservation Program Manager
City of Portland
389 Congress Street
Portland, Maine 04101
(207) 874-8726



16 October 2018

Chair Sheridan and Members of the Historic Preservation Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed project at 37 Montreal Street. We have two questions that we would like to see addressed at the public hearing on Wednesday evening.

First, the average grade as shown on the drawings is 136'- 3". It is difficult to verify without a scale on the various elevation drawings. Has this been confirmed by city staff? We are concerned that the average is not correctly calculated and may need to be adjusted to bring the overall height below what zoning allows.

Second, does there need to be a formal vote on the Alternative Design Review at this time? The staff report says that a formal finding of conformance with ADR requirements is not required at this time, but is only being requested. The application does not contain the level of detail and documentation that would be required at the time of site plan approval. As noted in the staff report there are a number of not met and partially met items listed. Given the level of detail and the number of concerns expressed in the staff report, we ask the board to consider whether it is appropriate to determine at this stage that the design will likely meet the ADR requirements?

We thank the applicant for responding to board, staff and public comments that have improved the building's interaction at the street level. However, we continue to believe that the proposed design is visually incompatible with structures to which it is visually related as stated in Chapter 5 of the Historic Resources Design Manual. As we have commented previously, a threshold question for the board is whether the massing of the proposed project is harmonious with its context. While the building is much larger in volume than its immediate neighbors, the board suggested to the applicant in the workshop sessions strategies that might help mitigate the impact of the height and massing to make the development reasonably compatible with its context. Those suggestions included reducing part of the building's height as it stepped down Montreal Street. Greater Portland Landmarks does not believe the applicant has taken sufficient steps to mitigate or reduce the scale of the building along Montreal Street in its revised design. At the eastern end of the site the building appears to be five stories in height and this is incongruous with the height of neighboring buildings.

Landmarks does not agree with the staff conclusion that it is appropriate to move forward with conditional approval, utilizing staff prepared sketches included in the public hearing packet. The applicant had ample opportunity to make similar changes before the public hearing based on comments from the board, staff, and the public at the workshop sessions and chose not to do so. Building design is a complex and holistic process. We believe that the process of approving staff submitted elevations is not a good precedent and we urge you not to approve the project based on these sketches. Therefore, we ask that you find the application is not consistent with the historic preservation ordinance's Standards for Review of New Construction.

This project will help to set the precedent for future reviews under the new Munjoy Hill Overlay Conservation District. While the board always carefully considers the impact of any proposed development on its neighborhood, we also ask that you carefully consider the process of your decision making on Wednesday evening given the ambiguity between the applicant and staff proposals. Your review and the building that results from your decision will have a long term effect on neighborhood character, the building's immediate neighbors, and the success or failure of the overlay district.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

Julie Ann Larry
Director of Advocacy

Fwd: Submission for HP Board meeting tonight - 37 Montreal Street

1 message

Deb Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:20 AM

To: Julia Sheridan <jdevl@msn.com>, bruce@sarabruce.us, John Turk <john.turk@resurgenceengineering.com>, "ppollar1@maine.rr.com" <ppollar1@maine.rr.com>, Ian Jacob <iancasperjacob@gmail.com>, "rjobrien@mail.com" <rjobrien@mail.com>, Julia Tate <julia@simonsarchitects.com>, Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Peter Murray** <pmurray@zwi.net>

Date: Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:00 AM

Subject: Submission for HP Board meeting tonight - 37 Montreal Street

To: Deborah Andrews <dga@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Peter Murray <pmurray@zwi.net>, Karen Snyder <karsny@yahoo.com>, Barbara Vestal <vestal@chesterandvestal.com>, Nini McNamamy <ninimaine@aol.com>, Mike Hoover <chzstk@gmail.com>, G. Robinson Whitten <rob@whittenarchitects.com>, Maggie Wolf <mswnola@gmail.com>, Belinda Ray <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>

Dear Deb -

Attached please find my comments for the Historic Preservation Board in connection with tonight's public hearing. Unfortunately, it will not be possible for me to be at the meeting in person this time. Can you please forward these comments to the members of the Board so that they might have the chance to read them before tonight's hearing?

As stated in the submission, this is a very important decision for the Board. The project is clearly and obviously too big and too institutional for this neighborhood. The applicant has had three tried to revise the scale to make it more compatible. Enough.

Oversight of applications under the demolition ordinance and under the alternative design review were placed within the jurisdiction of the HP Board because the City Council had confidence that that Board would have the independence and sensitivity to architectural integrity to protect the fragile fabric of the Munjoy Hill neighborhood. This is the opportunity for the Board to show that the confidence of the City Council was not misplaced. On the other hand, if the Board grants the application, even "conditionally," it will be a sign to the waiting developers that it is open season on the Hill.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation,

Sincerely,

PLM

Peter L. Murray
104 North Street
Portland, ME 04101
pmurray@zwi.net

--

Deb Andrews
Historic Preservation Program Manager
City of Portland
389 Congress Street
Portland, Maine 04101
(207) 874-8726

 I-hpb 2 101718.doc
74K

Comment on proposal for 33-37 Montreal St, Plan #HPBR-000272-2018

Jim Cole <jimkcole@gmail.com>

Oct 17, 2018 12:10 PM

Posted in group: **Historic Preservation**

To Whom it may Concern,

My name is Jim Cole, and my partner Hannah and I have lived at 45 Montreal Street since July 2015. We won't be able to attend the Historic Preservation board meeting on Wednesday night because we'll be looking after our 1-year old daughter. Since we can't attend I wanted to share my comments on the proposed development at 33-37 Montreal St.

First of all, let me say that as a resident of the Portland peninsula since 1998, and as a professional in my 30's who has been able to live and work in his home state, I love this city and am proud of how far it's come in 20 years. I am generally in favor of development, (although of course mindful of the need for affordable housing). But I'm happy to see new, modern buildings mixed in among the historic buildings in our neighborhood on Munjoy Hill - it's all part of the eclectic, diverse neighborhood we love. It's why we chose to live here in the first place.

I also am happy to see old, historic buildings be renovated, even if they're then sold at top dollar by developers. Our house is one of those buildings, purchased by a developer, updated and sold for a profit just over a year later.

I mention all of this just to point out that I don't have any reflexive opposition to development, modern design, new construction, flipping historic houses, developers making a profit, etc. Even when it's in our backyard.

That being said, after carefully reviewing the proposed development at 33-37 Montreal, it appears to be completely out-of-scale with the neighborhood we love, and it would do irreparable damage to the visual character of the street. There is no other structure like it in our residential neighborhood, and any comparison to the high rise at Promenade East, which is an outlier and not in the center of a residential street, doesn't pass the common-sense test. Regardless of the architectural style or materials, the scale and mass of the proposed development would stick out like a sore thumb, surrounded by mostly 1.5 and 2 story homes.

Montreal and Willis Streets are not Congress Street or even North Street. They have a small-scale, neighborhood feel that is hard to create, and easy to destroy. If you walk Montreal St down towards the prom, it's easy to see that the developers' comparisons to the few triple deckers or 3-units in the immediate neighborhood simply don't hold up. And while I appreciate their willingness to modestly revise the structure and building materials in their latest design, that doesn't address the fundamental issue of scale and mass.

If this development had existed, been under construction, or even proposed when we were considering purchasing at our house at 45 Montreal, we would not have paid a premium to live in this neighborhood, and I think many other potential buyers would have felt the same. This development would greatly diminish the very qualities that make this part of the Hill appealing to buyers; and ultimately, that doesn't benefit developers either.

To be clear, I think the existing building at 37 Montreal St is a beautiful, historic, and ideally I'd love to see it restored. I have no doubt that such a renovation (whether as a single family home or a multi-family) could be profitable in the current market on the Hill, as our house at 45 Montreal was. But if the property owner chooses to tear down the building(s), and is approved to do so by the Historic Preservation Board, I also have no real problem with the construction of modern buildings, multiple units etc. They can be boxes, they can have a flat roof, they can be orange, purple or green. Montreal Street will still be Montreal Street.

What we are hoping to avoid is only this: a single, monolithic structure, 4 stories tall all the way across, casting a large shadow and taking up two entire lots, with an underground parking garage that would feel more at home in downtown Boston.

This plan, which is so out of character with our historic/eclectic neighborhood, is something we can't support, no matter how much we want to see Portland grow.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.
Best Regards,

Jim Cole
45 Montreal St
207 831-4898

Tom McGovern
23 Willis Street
Portland, Maine 04101
September 5, 2018

Historic Preservation Board
City of Portland, Maine

Dear HP Board Members,

I am writing to offer my support for the proposed condo building to be built on the 37 and 33 Montreal Street lots. My family has lived at 23 Willis Street since 1947. I have lived here my whole life and seen Munjoy Hill go through ups and downs. My family were good friends with the O'Rourke's for 60 years. While my mother and I have many fond memories of the O'Rourke house at 37 Montreal and like it dearly I also intimately understand the challenges it presents in trying to restore it.

I have reviewed the proposed plans and discussed the project with Tim Wells for many months. I do not oppose the new building and feel it would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood.

Warmest Regards,

Tom McGovern

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom McGovern". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "T" and "M".

CHESTER & VESTAL

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

107 Congress Street, Portland, Maine 04101
Telephone (207) 772-7426 Fax (207) 761-5822

EDWIN P. CHESTER
BARBARA A. VESTAL
MICHAEL P. DIXON
CAITLIN ROSS WAHRER

chester@chesterandvestal.com
vestal@chesterandvestal.com
dixon@chesterandvestal.com
wahrer@chesterandvestal.com

October 17, 2018

Julia Sheridan, Esq., Chair
Historic Preservation Board
389 Congress Street
Portland, Maine 04101

Re: 33-37 Montreal Street

Dear Chair Sheridan and Members of the Board:

I would like to focus my comments on the review process. As you know, this is in front of you because one of these buildings was identified as “**Preferrably Preserved.**” The Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District says that the Building Authority shall not issue a demolition permit for a Preferrably Preserved building for up to 12 months unless the applicant meets certain standards. The ordinance encourages the applicant to “actively pursue alternatives to demolition.”

In this case, we are about 5 months into the 12 month demolition delay. The applicant has opted not to pursue alternatives to demolition. So the applicant is trying to get the Board to determine that it has met the required standard to lift the demolition delay. To do that the ordinance states it must get the Board to “approve a development for the site as consistent with the Historic Resource Design Standards as applied to a new building.” Then the Building Authority may issue a demolition permit without making the applicant wait 12 months.

Importantly, the ordinance itself contains two examples of what might qualify for lifting the delay, noting they are not exhaustive. One example of what might justify lifting the delay is proposed “demolition of a portion of the building while maintaining the principal structure and/or most architecturally significant portion of the building.” That does not apply here; the proposal is to demolish the entire building.

The other example, provided in the ordinance, is demolition of the entire Preferrably Preserved building, as proposed here, “but with a replacement proposal that is acceptably contextual in the surrounding neighborhood.” 14-140.5(e)5(b)

What does it mean for a building to be “**acceptably contextual in the surrounding neighborhood?**” That is up to the Board to determine. But as this is the first one, I would encourage you to take the time to flesh this out.

I don't think it should be deemed sufficient if a proposed replacement building merely meets the most minimal standards for new construction in an historic district. It is going to have to essentially meet very similar standards anyway to proceed under Alternative Design Review, whether before or after the 12 month demolition delay. Surely this test for removing the demolition delay must mean more than just whether the building will be approvable in the future under the Alternative Design Review Standards. Or whether it will just barely meet the new construction standards as applied in a vacuum.


I would argue that the ordinance requires something more to lift the 12 month demolition delay: that the new building is so appropriate and so compatible with the surrounding neighborhood that it offsets the loss of the Preferably Preserved building. It is so appropriate for its surroundings – **so acceptably contextual in the surrounding neighborhood** - that the applicant should be rewarded by not being required to wait the entire 12 months to demolish a preferably preserved building.

To gauge whether it is "acceptably contextual" it seems to me that the Board needs to go through a process similar to what would have been done in an historic district designation report. Maybe this has been done already, but I am not aware of it. It seems like the Munjoy Hill Conservation District needs to be looked at as a whole to identify the valued visual qualities which led to the conservation district's special designation. The established patterns and important architectural characteristics have to be identified so the Board can assess whether the proposed new design is sufficiently responsive, and avoids diminishing the district's valued visual qualities. The important character-defining features of the Munjoy Hill Conservation District need to be identified. Without this, the Board is being asked to decide whether the proposed replacement building is "acceptably contextual" in a vacuum.

On a different but related topic, I think you also need to be concerned about future enforcement. The ordinance allows the City to treat a substantial variation from an approved replacement building as a violation. So the Board needs to be very precise about what is approved as a replacement building so that the City has a way to determine whether what is built is a substantial variation. You only have "sketch quality" elevations of the Eastern Prom facing side and the Walnut Street facing side. In addition, the staff has identified several important areas where the proposal in front of you does not meet scale and mass standards for new construction.

I would argue that the design should be fully detailed and the proposed replacement building should fully meet the required standards **before** you give approvals that would authorize the Building Authority to lift the demolition delay. Meeting the standards should not be left to a condition of approval which anticipates further modification. It is inappropriate, and weakens the ability to enforce an appropriate replacement building, if you grant a conditional approval which leaves important details to be resolved in some later review.

Very truly yours,


Barbara A. Vestal

Workshop this evening about 33 and 37 Montreal Street development

1 message

Elizabeth Streeter <streeter.beth@gmail.com>

Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 3:45 PM

To: dga@portlandmaine.gov, planningboard@portlandmaine.gov, Belinda Ray <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>

I am a resident of Monjoy Hill and at the last minute I am unable to attend the meeting tonight. I want to say that I am very upset at the thought of this building degrading the beauty and livability of this wonderful neighborhood. You have heard all the objections so I need not repeat them.

I hope you all have been to this site. You will find that although the very large and out of place grey building is visible as you face these properties, it is very ugly and not something we want to emulate. Down the street is the group of 2 story brick buildings that are not in character with the Hill but are nowhere nearly as offensive as the proposed structure and should not be an excuse for this building.

You will also find that across the street, on both Montreal and Willis, there are many lovely renovations going on that protect the character of the neighborhood. There is a very beautiful garden directly across the street that the owner could sell to developers if the only important aim in the neighborhood is to make money.

The size and mass of this structure has not been changed in this 3rd submission. And the architecture is in no way compatible with the surrounding properties.

I live on Quebec St, close to Merrill. As you know Merrill has already been severely degraded by the buildings that slipped under the timeline for the Munjoy Hill Moratorium.

Please preserve the character and livability of Munjoy Hill.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. You have all worked very hard to listen to all sides.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Streeter
66 Quebec St

October 17, 2018

Chair Sheridan and members of the Historic Preservation Board:

Tonight the hopes and efforts of Munjoy Hill residents who have worked hard with city staff, the council and planning board to protect and preserve the Hill's architectural heritage are being tested: either the new ordinance establishing a Conservation District works, or it doesn't.

You and staff have worked with the applicant for the Montreal St project to help them conform to the Historic Preservation New Construction standards. You have asked them to reduce the bulk and mass of the project and told them that profitability is not a consideration under the ordinance. As a resident of the immediate neighborhood of this project, I find it disheartening that the applicant has not only failed to reduce the massing of the project, but has actually increased the proposed number of units to 15.

The overall context of the neighborhood and the immediate block is of much smaller buildings, with a stepped streetscape and an average building height of 2.5 storeys. It is specious to include comparisons to buildings on the other side of the Hill, down on Sheridan Street, or 340 Eastern Promenade as exemplars—340 Eastern Promenade could not be built today and in fact that building motivated improvements to zoning for the Hill.

33-37 Montreal is still too tall and wide. The garage wall on the northeast side facing the Promenade—from which it will be readily visible—is still too high. The massing principle appears to not be met, but since the applicant has not yet told us the dimensions of the building, it may be even more out of scale than the proposal published for our review..

The two principle facades do not relate to each other at all and the building has a Hollywood quality, oddly connected at the Willis-Montreal corner like two separate stage sets—the Willis Street side is a row of more compatible townhouses, the Montreal St side still looks like a medical office building. The contrast with the very readable single and multifamily homes already on the two streets could not be more stark. The Scale and Form principle is not met.

The facade facing Willis Street holds some promise that the neighbors across the street will get to know the townhouse residents. But the facade on Montreal is remote from the street and lacks the pedestrian connection typical of the neighborhood. In fact, it is likely residents will not use the front entry, wherever it is (the building reads poorly as to where residents actually enter) —preferring to use the elevator and garage door. Height at the lower Montreal end of the building is still intimidating and the applicant has failed to step down that section to meet the neighborhood streetscape pattern of stepped roofs. Orientation to the street is not met.

The materials and articulation have produced a busy, hard-to-read building. The neighborhood is characterized by clear front entries, a single type of cladding material for each building, and where bays are part of the facade, they are covered with the same cladding material as the main structure. The articulation and materials standards are not met.

Finally, the applicant continues to present a building without measurements. How are we to evaluate massing, proportion and scale, and the other Principles, with confidence if the actual size of the building, and therefore its exterior treatment, is still withheld from public view?

33-37 Montreal sold for \$675,000 to its present owner—a bargain price on Munjoy Hill, where buildable lots are now going for half a million, for a rare, single family house. It could readily and profitably be renovated to six lovely condos with coveted views, on site parking, and a gracious entry with green space. Although the Historic Preservation ordinance does not consider profit as a standard for approval, we must acknowledge the pressure brought to bear

upon city staff and members of public boards by developers. And we must keep in mind the fact that these properties hold potential for many other buildings besides the oversized block proposed here.

This building is not ready for any kind of approval and demolition should not be granted until a more complete design showing compliance with the New Construction Principles is presented. Kicking the can down the road with conditional approvals leaves negotiations between staff and developers out of public view, and threatens the intent of the new Conservation District.

Jean (Nini) McManamy
10 Willis St.
Portland