

---

## Fwd: R6 input

1 message

---

**Jeff Levine** <jlevine@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Mar 7, 2018 at 1:22 PM

For the Munjoy Hill file.

Jeff Levine, AICP  
Director  
Planning & Urban Development Department  
389 Congress Street 4th Floor  
Portland, Maine 04101  
Phone (207)874-8720  
Fax (207)756-8258  
<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/planning>  
@portlandplan

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

From: **Markos Miller** <[markossmiller@hotmail.com](mailto:markossmiller@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Mar 7, 2018 at 9:02 AM  
Subject: R6 input  
To: Jeff Levine <[jlevine@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jlevine@portlandmaine.gov)>, Belinda Ray <[bsr@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:bsr@portlandmaine.gov)>

Jeff, Belinda, and supporting staff,

Thanks for hosting the Munjoy Hill R6 listening session last week. I appreciate all the work you all are doing for the City.

I'd be curious about what conclusions you are able to reach from the visual survey. I think these can be helpful tools.

I'm opting to submit my input via email as I did not think the forum was a satisfactory way to share my ideas.

### My Big Issue:

I must push back on Jeff's assertion that this is not an issue about affordability. I completely disagree. Planning can and must address affordability. Mixed income communities are clearly a goal of this City (Comp Plan), and the free market is not providing this. There are many carrots and sticks the City can be using. And should be using. Otherwise, what's the point?

1. The 45' height bonus must be connected to providing 1 unit of affordable/workforce housing. Let the penthouse view subsidize a similarly sized unit- and prioritize families for these units.
2. Raise the IZ in lieu fee. If everyone is paying it then it is too cheap.
3. Prioritize housing fund for use in neighborhoods where \$ is being generated.

### Design

1. No more automobile entrances fronting the streets. These are creating dead streetscapes. The proposed 10' of "active space" is not enough- a dead hallway

while everyone zips up in the elevator from the garage. We need residences facing the streets.

2. That and limiting the 45' height are my big issues. I don't like some of the new buildings aesthetically, some of them I don't like because no one lives there- or Never see them. Weekenders, second homes, Air BnB... But other contemporary buildings are alright.
3. Historic District- I love the Hill and the texture of the neighborhood, but don't want to it to become some precious thing that we've trapped under glass. I see some defining architecture that maybe we should preserve, but I don't think this is a majority of the Hill. Any district should be very limited. Maybe designation of individual properties is a way to go. I don't see how an Historic district or conservation district would address my primary concern of preserving and strengthening a mixed-income income neighborhood. It probably does the opposite.
4. setbacks- necessary, but I'd like to see some flexibility and consideration of context of site.
5. tear downs- Portland could have a demolition fee. Demolition should not be away to avoid paying condo conversion fee.

#### Function

1. Housing for residence. We know we are gaining more units than residents. Fees for owners who are not using address as a primary residence.
2. Air BnB. I went on Craigslist to see how many long term rental 1 bedroom apts were listed for the Hill. Zero. I went on Air BnB and searched 1 bedroom's on Munjoy Hill. 150.

#### Process

1. Alternative Design Review- You mean if I don't want to meet all the standards I can take an alternative review track and show how I meet the standards I want to? ADR must be scrapped. Uniformity of process is important.

I fear the forum was just like most other debates- everyone defining their side, but a missed opportunity to find common ground and how to build upon that. I think the larger concern about "Character" is not just the massive boxes maxing out the R6 footprint, but rapidly (for Portland) changing demographics, and the transient nature of second homes/visitors/etc. So a design tool might get at the visual part of this, but not at the "people" stuff, and that's what I think is really valuable.

Finally, as a property owner I understand issues of property rights and nest eggs and such. But when someone gets up and complains that the value of the nest egg they have held onto for 10-20-30 years would be jeopardized by revisions to the R6 (I'm generally supportive of the current R6) they need to be called out. Those properties are going to be more valuable no matter what. The added value of the new R6 only came around 3 years ago, and no one bought on the Hill before that banking on R6 zoning changes that would further increase their value. So they might get their \$600k instead of \$750K. Zoning decisions should be about more than \$; they should be about communities. At least that's what our Comp Plan claims.

Bests,

Markos

17 Atlantic St  
Portland, ME  
04101  
(207) 807-2681