

---

## Fwd: Munjoy Hill zoning

1 message

---

**Jeff Levine** <jlevine@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Jennifer Munson <jmy@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: Christine Grimando <cdg@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Mar 21, 2018 at 10:07 AM

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: **Lauren Reiter** <laurenreiter@yahoo.com>  
Date: Wed, Mar 21, 2018 at 9:39 AM  
Subject: Munjoy Hill zoning  
To: Jeff Levine <jlevine@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: "bbatson@portlandmaine.gov" <bbatson@portlandmaine.gov>, "bsr@portlandmaine.gov" <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>, "estrimling@portlandmaine.gov" <estrimling@portlandmaine.gov>, "hbassett@portlandlandmarks.org" <hbassett@portlandlandmarks.org>, "jcosta@portlandmaine.gov" <jcosta@portlandmaine.gov>, Jill Duson <jduson@portlandmaine.gov>, "kcook@portlandmaine.gov" <kcook@portlandmaine.gov>, "pali@portlandmaine.gov" <pali@portlandmaine.gov>, "nmm@portlandmaine.gov" <nmm@portlandmaine.gov>

Dear Mr. Levine,

I attended the Munjoy Hill R6 Zoning meeting at East End Community School last night, at which you and other City officials were present.

My take-away from last night was quite different than what I expected. I did not hear the consistent anti-modernism that I thought was one of the drivers of the anti-development movement (even though there were a few of those comments). My sense is that flat roofs and modern facades are not the arch enemy of those opposing the new developments. I also don't think that taking down old, crummy buildings was really the chief concern either - but rather the size of what often replaces them.

What I heard was that overpowering building MASS was the real issue. And I have to say that I agree in a number of cases. There are a few new buildings that, to me, DO overpower their immediate neighborhoods. It seems that the zoning needs to be more nuanced in its mandate: that there are many side streets where the existing typology (regardless of style) is SMALL, and that it is not unreasonable to limit development on these streets to one-to-three family unit buildings. The larger, wider streets are more suitable for larger buildings, and I believe that there are numerous areas that would qualify, particularly edges and main thoroughfares.

The other concern that I think has merit is that entire ground floors of new buildings might be used only for parking; while, in my opinion, the pedestrian fabric has not been destroyed by the number of garage entries already built, one always has to think about zoning as "what if everyone did it?". So I think that proposing a ratio of occupied building to garage door - say 50% - is a practical solution that solves all of the issues, including the importance of having off-street parking in a city where snow is so frequent.

I hope that the Planning Dept. is willing to take a more nuanced view of all of these issues -- particularly the issue of historic designation and scale -- because I think that the diversity of the neighborhood really does demand something other than a one-shoe-fits-all kind of mandate.

Thank you for your attention to these opinions.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Reiter

**Reiter Architecture & Design**

Lauren J. Reiter, RA, LEED AP

[laurenjreiter@yahoo.com](mailto:laurenjreiter@yahoo.com)

cell. 917.502.2225 / tel. 207.359.2300

Portland office: 6 South St., Portland, ME 04101

Brooklin office: P.O. Box 275, Brooklin, ME 04616

[www.facebook.com/reiterarchitecture](http://www.facebook.com/reiterarchitecture)