HI Greg-

I am supportive of your ordinance proposal for PUDs. I can absolutely see the necessity for a 3/4 vote to approve any PUD at the Council level. (Not so concerned about the PC or land use bodies vote since they are not elected officials.) **Since PUDs have been abused in the past by the investor community, I do see a need to impose high standards such as a supermajority vote at the City Council level.**

One argument for the Council 3/4/supermajority vote is that a PUD- any PUD- is supposed to be a superior development. This raises the bar- and a supermajority vote is needed to keep that standard high.

Best,
Mary Ingle

On Feb 5, 2016, at 1:44 PM, Dutton, Greg wrote:

<Ordinance re PUD Approval Criteria - 2nd & 3rd Reading (02-04-16).pdf>
I read the amended resolution to put before city council regarding zoned and land not zoned for PUD development; while not as inclusive as it needs to be, it is a very good start.

We cannot continue to let developers run rampant over our city developing at will for financial gain using any and all excuses, most commonly that it will provide more affordable housing units (most of the time totally untrue,) while tearing down usable housing stock, or putting totally un-matching types of dense development with enormous traffic congestion consequences never mind sewer, etc. utilities as they please! Some governmental brakes need to be applied and we look for that from first the Planning department that SHOULD be mindful of a balanced approach INSTEAD of promoting almost all of these developments regardless of devastation to otherwise intact neighborhoods. Secondly our city council should take leadership in retaining livable neighborhoods in our city's urban core instead of their current actions that seek to destroy these more affordable residential areas.

_Sammy Easterday_