

324 A – planning instructs applicant on how to circumvent the maximum lot size limits using a conditional use that was never intended for a purely residential application. Ignores Avenues Master Plan directive to encourage preservation over demolition in historic districts though the use of up to a combined 30% State and Federal tax CREDITS for rehabilitation.

9<sup>th</sup> and G - planning relies upon the applicant's estimate of building heights (surveys were required by the ordinance) on the blockface and we end up with a building not at all in keeping with the actual blockface development pattern.

678 F – planning “works for six months” to find away around the minimum lot width requirement and then tries to obscure a meeting with City attorney to gain permission to put a DUPLEX on the already too narrow lot.

675 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue – planning tells the neighbors if they question the building's measurements or the validity of the lot boundaries to hire a surveyor and take the owner to court, planning also completely “overlooks” the fact that the original plans used to approve the building clearly depict three house keeping units in violation of the SR-1 ordinance, all with ingress and egress

678 H – planning grants multiple retroactive grade changes of up to eight feet and five feet of building height magically turns into two feet of excess height. Building Services then determines that two feet is close enough because the owner could have changed the grade by up to two feet without a permit so we'll give them the two feet. In practice, this adds two feet to the maximum building height on every property in the city, circumventing the intent of the City Council).

667 Wall (outside of GACC District but in SR-1A and very telling). Planning advises applicant to use entirely inappropriate reference properties to calculate the front setback requirements for their proposed building. Planning also supports proposed design without preparing the applicant to justify required variances. After 12 months, \$10,000 and several hearings, erroneous calculations are revealed and because planning never questioned the original design, the applicant was left completely unprepared to demonstrate the necessity of the design and therefore failed the BoA requirement that all other alternatives proved unworkable.

Planning resists community input on recently adopted residential infill permitting process. - For over 9 months Building services and planning repeatedly promise to convene a workgroup, including community representatives, to review and make recommendations regarding the new “tiered permitting process” adopted in December, 2005. After several assurances that a workgroup was being formed, in June, 2006, planning proposes (without community input) a set of recommendations that would have dramatically modified the newly adopted process. The communities react negatively and the Planning Commission rejects the proposed changes and orders planning not bring anything before the commission again without community involvement. Following several more reassurances that a workgroup is being formed, Planning once more

proposes a set of changes (September, 28, 2006) with no community input. Out of frustration and a real sense of need, community representatives approach the city council in-fill workgroup and ask to form workgroup representing the Third District. A workgroup is formed, including several top architects, contractors, realtors, low income housing advocates, and community leaders (planning was invited and received every agenda and all minutes from every meeting but never attended a single meeting or so much as made a single comment). After four months of work, the District Three Infill Workgroup submits a detailed list of recommendations. Planning, which was required to perform an evaluation of the tiered permitting process in December, 2006, repeatedly fails to even consider the workgroup's recommendations. In mid-May, 2007, after three months and significant pressure from Councilman Jergensen, planning finally agree to consider putting together a timeline to review the workgroup's recommendations.