

**CRITIQUE OF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS IMPROVEMENT
REPORT TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
BY
KEN GOLDEN REPRESENTING HIMSELF**

1. There is an assumption that there is a problem but apart from the Edgewater and perceptions by some, none has been documented.
2. The report does not offer an historical perspective. The landmarks Commission and Urban design Commission emerged out of a historical context. To ignore it is to fail to predict things that will re-occur.
3. The role of leadership by alders or other officials is not mentioned as a problem. When alders leave developers to work directly with neighborhoods and watch rather than lead, projects falter. Why is this not mentioned? What about leadership at the highest level? Taking sides is not leadership- it's a prescription to failure.
4. There should be a greater emphasis on education of the public during planning processes. A poorly educated public will not see the connection of density to why they have no grocery or have a failing business district. Education of novice developers is also needed.
5. The word traffic does not appear in the report- Traffic is the single issue that sandbags most projects with active neighborhoods.
6. Difficult projects can be predicted- it is isn't in the/a plan, is a significant change in use or intensity, is near a body of water and will generate a great deal of additional traffic on a crowded arterial or on to neighborhood streets, the proposal will have problems.
7. The report fails to identify how the costs of all the additional city assistance will be covered. Will fees cover it or will the tax payers subsidize the projects? I thought the people who don't like the current process wanted less government?
8. The federal reserve quote on the cover indicates a bias in perspective.
9. The super-majority vote is a sign of respect for two commissions that are appointed (or should be) based on expertise that merits respect.
10. Why is our process and timing not compared to good cities- Portland, not Houston.
11. Eliminate unnecessary conditional uses and having an administrative review of simple projects is a good idea.
12. This report is irrelevant to low income neighborhoods.