

---

## Fwd: Munjoy Hill R-6 Recommendations

---

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

Mon, Apr 9, 2018 at 8:38 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: **Peter Murray** <pmurray@gwi.net>  
Date: Sat, Apr 7, 2018 at 10:58 AM  
Subject: Munjoy Hill R-6 Recommendations  
To: Jeff Levine <jlevine@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: Dropbox <pmurray@gwi.net>

Dear Jeff -

Here are my suggestions for your and your staff's consideration as you formulate your recommendations to the Planning Board for post-moratorium changes to the R-6. The intent of the recommendations is for the R6 to permit reasonable redevelopment of small Munjoy Hill lots at the same density at which they were originally developed - one or two-family homes - and to permit condo projects only on larger lots. This will tend to preserve the affordable housing stock we now have and protect the historic streetscapes and ambience of the neighborhood from oversized condominium boxes on small lots originally laid out for single family homes. The IPOD was a step in the right direction, but without some strengthening, might not be enough to contain this recent and unfortunate trend.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations and for your thoughtful concern for our neighborhood in the context of Portland's overall comprehensive plan.

Best wishes,

PLM  
Peter L. Murray  
104 North Street  
Portland, ME 04101  
[pmurray@gwi.net](mailto:pmurray@gwi.net)



**M-2-recommendations.docx**  
153K

## Memorandum

To: Jeff Levine and Portland Planning staff  
Fr: Peter L. Murray  
Re: Revisions to the R-6 Zoning Ordinance – Munjoy Hill Overlay  
Dt: April 6, 2018

As you finalize staff recommendations to the Planning Board, here are some thoughts and recommendations on revisions to the R-6 zoning ordinance.

1. The pre-2015 R-6 had meaningful setback, lot coverage and parking requirements with a special program for undersized lots that permitted development of single and two family homes on small lots, and larger projects on large lots. This worked well for the Hill.
2. The 2015 version of the R-6 relaxed dimensional requirements to such an extent that it became economically attractive to developers to acquire existing one and two family houses on small lots, tear down the houses, and over-improve the lots with four-story blocks of 4-7 condominium units to the serious deterioration of the character of the neighborhood.
3. The IPOD restrictions represent some improvement, but may not be sufficient to protect valuable existing housing stock and screen out over-size condominiums. Under the Ipod, a 3600 square foot lot laid out for a single family house could be over-redeveloped with a four story condo with a footprint of over 2000 square feet and total enclosed area of nearly 8,000 square feet, enough for four units plus common areas.
4. Returning to the dimensional standards of the pre 2015 R-6 would insure that development of conforming lots would be reasonable and that large condominium projects could only be built on relatively large parcels. Dimensional minima from the old R-6 that are particularly important are 10' side lot setbacks, 4500 square foot minimum lot size, 50% maximum lot coverage. In addition heights should be capped at 35 feet for buildings up to 3 units or on lots smaller than 4500 square feet, with 45 feet for buildings of more than three units on lots of more than 4500 square feet and with an additional 5-foot setback on each side and the front for everything above 35 feet. Rooftop appurtenances should be counted in the maximum height limits.
5. The R-6 dimensional minima should be accompanied by a small lot program that would permit otherwise undersized lots to be developed for one or two family houses under strict design guidelines.
6. There should be no "alternative design review" available on Munjoy Hill. All development should be subject to the Design Standards as developed and maintained by the Planning Department.
7. Demolitions of existing structures from the Hill's original building fabric should be subject to a process that requires a period of repose of up to 6 months to permit consideration of alternatives to demolition.
8. The Planning Department with the assistance of Greater Portland Landmarks and upon notice to the neighborhood should proceed promptly with the establishment of historic districts as recommended by Landmarks.

Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.

PLM