

Sayers, Margery

From: LISA MARKOVITZ <lmarkovitz@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 27, 2019 10:36 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: cb36

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

I found the work session on this Bill very informative. It seems to me that it could be allowing doubling of R20 density for these projects. The fact that there are stronger storm water management requirements should not change the lot size in zones. God forbid the regulations are just followed by lowering the number of lots built, a bit, which would also entail cutting down less trees.

Reducing lot size has NO benefit except to increase further suburban single-family home units being built. If that is allowed, maybe all the increase in density should be at an increased **affordability requirement?**

Lot size, maximum density per acre, are not minimums. It is so frustrating that the ideology behind many of these types of proposed changes, is that the number of lots has to be sacrosanct, and everything else always has to bend.

Thank you for considering adding an amendment to this Bill that IF the open space and storm water management regulations cannot be accommodated by lessening the number of units built, (maybe up to some maximum percentage) for whatever logistical reasons, then they can use the sliding scale.

Take care,

Lisa Markovitz