

Kelly Franklin – Building Heights & Density – 4/13/2022

I agree that Mr. Bordeaux' experience in Ft. Lauderdale will inevitably be repeated if staff are given administrative approval to offer bonus height and density for "affordable" housing pegged at 120% AMI. Labelling this "affordable" solves none of the very real shelter and cost of living issues for workers and young families.

It is purely a giveaway to developers that solves no civic problem, degrades the quality of life for all of us by overstraining our infrastructure, and promulgates the ill-considered manifest destiny push to keep getting bigger and bigger as a city. Why? Why must we be larger? Why must we make a handful of developers even wealthier at the expense of all that makes us a community?

And why can't we do what the county just did with 25 million of federal relief funds and direct it toward real affordable housing? This seems like a more pressing social need than \$350 million dollar replacement for the perfectly sound and distinctively purple Van Wezel.

As for your predictions about what the planning board members will do with this, I have heard Terrell Salem speak passionately, knowledgeably, and honestly about the housing situation and this sort of faux solution. I can't envision that savvy civic-minded leader supporting this. Kathy Kelly Ulrich is a one of the fairest and most analytic individuals I've encountered in this city. I can't imagine her ever supporting these giveaways for no societal gain to developers. As for the architects. Architects like to design things. It would be nice if they could build the right things in the right places without entombing the surroundings. That is what the Sarasota School of Architecture was really about, and I hope and think there is affinity for that philosophy in some of the current members of that panel.

In short, I hope the planning board will show wisdom and situational awareness of not recommending the passage of the mislabeled, misleading, and inevitably misused height and density bonuses for not-really-affordable and if so, not for long, housing.

That said, it does seem like there is both will for and need for some zoning changes to foster the development of relatively low rise housing and mixed use along the "corridors" and in Park East. I don't know enough about those plans to oppose or support them, but it does seem like if that is the real goal here, there out to be better ways to achieve that than with these particular zoning rule and policy changes.