

---

## Fwd: questions

---

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

Wed, Apr 18, 2018 at 4:09 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: **Jill Duson** <jduson@portlandmaine.gov>  
Date: Wed, Apr 18, 2018 at 4:07 PM  
Subject: Re: questions  
To: Grace Braley <gbraley55@gmail.com>  
Cc: Jeff Levine <jlevine@portlandmaine.gov>, Jon Jennings <jpj@portlandmaine.gov>

Thanks, for your note.

I confess that I am not sure where to start in response to your message.

The premise that the moratorium in question "was about the need for affordable housing", just doesn't connect. I think maybe the best starting point is to provide you a copy of the moratorium order.

<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/documentcenter/view/18580>

By copy of this message, I am also forwarding an FYI copy of your note to city staff for inclusion with the public comment received to date.

It is not too late to weigh in with your concerns and desires and impact the outcome of this review in the public hearings re: any recommendations.

On Wed, Apr 18, 2018, 9:02 AM Grace Braley <gbraley55@gmail.com> wrote:

Jill, I think you know that an interest of mine is affordable housing.....as well as just a citizen's interest in having a city to feel what? happy and comfortable in?

When I moved here, my real estate agent thought I might like Munjoy Hill, but I ended up deciding for across town -- Deering/Rosemont.

Anyway I have been very interested in Munjoy. With its quirky history and all, it has been moving in a way to show off the attractiveness of its particular style and some historic architecture. It has become an attractive part of Portland....whether or not it always was.

I thought the recent moratorium was to hold up development and consider whether to protect or defend some of the old neighborhood style and feel.

I didn't know the moratorium was about the need for affordable housing, which can be addressed in other sectors of Portland.

So, where would I find to read the moratorium to see what it says?

Also, to you, as housing chair, this is my concern:

If the purpose was to protect the character and personality of this particular Portland neighborhood, then why would the proposed revised zoning codes give "rewards" to housing design that diminishes the quality of appearance in exchange for an affordable unit apartment?

I feel like we were walking down a road the best we could -- the recent meetings were wrenching in how people expressed their frustration and conflicts -- but it seemed mostly about protecting an attractive design in the neighborhood.

So, the bonus for a 45 foot high structure as a reward for an affordable unit feels like the whole thing got off track and the vehicle fell over the cliff.

After I listened to what was being said, and drove around the neighborhood (well, I go there, have friends there), it seemed to me that the ugliest, most damaging design change wasn't the lot coverage or side requirements -- or even the contemporary designs because people have rights to their style preferences --

what seems like the real ugly problem is the places where this big square extra ten feet -- to 45 -- sticks out over the top of all the rows of gable roofs.

Can't Portland protect the dignity of a neighborhood?

Grace