
Fwd: on revisions to policies

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

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 11:27 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: **Grace Braley** <gbraley55@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 11:20 AM
Subject: on revisions to policies
To: jlevine@portlandmaine.gov

To Jeff Levine:

I am out of town and could not attend the meeting Tuesday, not sure if comment was being taken.

Having reviewed recent proposals, I have just a couple of comments.

Primarily, although we do need housing affordable to people with lower incomes,

1. *Letting the inclusion of housing people can afford affect the revised design standards for any part of Portland does not make sense. We can keep an aesthetically attractive city and increase the needed housing.*

The height of a building has nothing to do with "workforce" housing. [It is the rectangular building tops that pop up really ugly above the more common rooflines on Munjoy Hill.]

The attractiveness of a neighborhood should have no relationship to affordability. It should certainly not compromise how design and construction are carried out.

There seem to be no resources offered to households with the 50% - 80% income population. The population with incomes between 80% and 120% can afford what they need or want without any assistance or incentive.

Please do not make design standards a negotiable factor.

2. *There is another concern here that should be named. When a builder wants to put in high-priced condos, and with the designer, also wants to squeeze in one more unit for more dollars, is this not likely to force a design sacrifice on the character of neighborhood standards?*

Some of the contemporary designs are relatively attractive. I fear the risk of some sacrifice being made when the developer wants the gain from an extra unit or two. How do we deal with this?

OTHER:

As for economic hardship as a reason for demolition, this is confusing. Are there alternative methods for deriving a list of feasible reasons for demolition?

Also, although demolition gets me very anxious, I still wonder whether an 18-month stay is not a punitive time-frame?

Grace Braley