9/20/2016
CONF Meeting
BUS-1
Provided by
Abby Laughlin

The ID ordinance ***can not*** stand the way it is written now. It is the end result of the PUD building moratorium in 2011 and only produced an ordinance of bigger and more invasive projects. It is obtuse and poorly defined.

I understand the commission likes flexibility but there is a serious and cavernous gap between the narrow analytical focus of planning and the end result. The flexible components of this ordinance are open to wide interpretation and that causes misunderstanding and confusion for the very neighborhoods these ID projects are foisted on. Neighborhoods are ill equipped to handle these overwhelming projects and receive no support from city staff or commission on their endeavors to protect their interests.

You must rewrite this ordinance to clearly define the *substantial, significant and recognizable improvements* that have a beneficial effect to the neighboring community and the city as a whole. You must quantify those improvements in the same way you use "rational nexus" to calculate impact fees. You must define the "*neighboring community*". And finally, you must define where these projects can go. They should be reserved for neighborhoods in transition, neighborhoods experiencing slum and blight and neighborhoods within a RAC or redevelopment area.

Galleria, for example is bringing over a thousand units to the neighboring community of 190 single family homes. That's quintupling the size of the fully developed and mature neighborhood of Sunrise Intercoastal. Galleria is attempting to combine non-contiguous parcels. The founding purpose of the project is to increase a couple of basis points on a pension fund. There's no public purpose – anything they want to do as far as improvements already exists in the ULDR.

Context is everything. I urge you to reconsider this ordinance and more clearly define the flexible components that are the hallmarks of *substantial significant and recognizable public benefits.*

Abby Laughlin