

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Lisa Basher](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna M. Moss](#)
Subject: FW: Dave Lange with a proposal
Date: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:57:14 PM

From: Steve Szafran
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:57:11 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: FW: Dave Lange with a proposal
Auto forwarded by a Rule

From: Dave Lange [mailto:umbrellahouse@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 11:10 AM
To: Steve Szafran
Subject: Dave Lange with a proposal

Could we come up with something more restrictive than R6?
In a case where there is interest in expanding a park, it would make sense to me that the current house would be considered the last house not allowing a teardown with a huge house replacement. The current occupant would be allowed to expand it a little more than the non-conforming MUR45 rules, since the city may not be ready to purchase when it changes hands. Its in the city's interest to keep the house useable over time until they are ready to buy it.

I would also like to see an affordable housing spec for R6 usage, something that restricts housing size by bedrooms and square footage. 2 bedrooms max 1500 sq ft and 3 bedroom max 2100 square feet at most 2 garage spaces with smaller lot sizes for the starting family or empty nester. Assuming the city gets 2 houses per existing lot, you get some density, don't miss the tax benefit and its something between the 750 sq ft and the 3,200 sq ft.

We aren't doing much for the mobility challenged/no-stairs segment of our community around the rail stations and warehousing them in MUR70 doesn't seem like a lot of choice.

Any comments on the Public Comment notes I sent in for the meeting last night?

Dave Lange
206-367-7402