

**Upper Boggy Creek Neighborhood Planning Team
Decision Record
10/23/01
6:30 PM to 8:00 PM
Maplewood Elementary**

*Attendees:

Leslie Lawson
Bo McCarver
Lyn Estabrook
Jay Velgos
Mark Lind
Stephen Kreger
David Westenbarger

*Based on sign-in sheet

City of Austin Staff: Mark Walters, lead planner, and Kathleen Welder

Meeting formally began at 6:40 PM

I. Decision Record 10-9-01 and 10-16-01

The Decision Records for 10-9 and 10-16 were approved, with two amendments to DR 10-16: 1.) add "Dave Westenbarger" to attendance list and 2.) correct the spelling of Stephen Kreger's name.

II. Infill Options in UBC/ Sub-districts in UBC

Leslie Lawson commented on action item #7 and the breakdown results provided by Kathleen Welder. Delwood II did not seem content with its sub-district boundaries. Wilshire Wood seemed very clearly in agreement with its proposed infill package, which was to elect none of the infill options.

Lyn Estabrook, who was stationed at the Land Use table during the Open House, said she attempted to dispel dot voters' confusion over and suggested that the results on this question were fairly accurate.

Stephen discussed the results of the infill vote that occurred at a special Cherrywood meeting the week before. Although some of the votes were close, all infill options passed. They asked the two residents of Schieffer that were present if they would prefer to break away from the Cherrywood sub-district, and they said "no." ~~Stephen added that outreach was done before the special infill meeting.~~ (amendment 11/9)

Lyn outlined the exact boundary of Cherrywood on a map for the team. Mark Walters said he did not intend to create conflict among UBC residents based on the sub-district boundaries. He created them on the basis of housing stock and style of architecture.

Mark Lind said that he might not support the plan because Cherrywood's vote to approve all infill options will change its character more than any other change since the time of its first platting.

Deed restrictions and policies regarding their enforcement were discussed. Because these restrictions are a civil matter, Stephen discouraged further discussion.

Mark Lind contested the way the City had collected info about the Neighborhood Plan so far. For example, the comments collected at the Forum were “mush.” Questions on the first survey were specific, but they did not seem to be incorporated into the Plan. Since then, questions have been broad. Maybe ballots should be sent out to the neighborhood with the infill options. Maybe ballots should be sent to all residents of Shcieffer to ask whether or not they wanted to be part of the Cherrywood sub-district.

Bo and Leslie responded that character of housing stock was a more appropriate criterion for sub-districting than individuals’ ballot responses. Mark Lind repeated that his solution to answering problems so far is, “What do the people think?”

Leslie asked if they could determine the Shieffer residents’ opinions about infill based on their survey responses. Mark Walters said the City does not have that kind of cross-tabulating software.

Jay Velgos said that the team’s real problem was people with feelings like Mark Lind’s who oppose infill in Cherrywood. (He was not at odds with Mark Lind, just simply making a statement.) Mark Lind said that many others who oppose infill were not present at the recent Cherrywood meeting. He suggested that this one issue might bring the Plan to its knees and waste a year of their work.

The parameters of the various infill options were then discussed in detail. Lyn said that if the infill options were better explained they might be more acceptable to the neighborhood. It was pointed out that few projects could be carried out with the passage of the infill options due to setbacks and other requirements. Mark Lind emphasized that architects will get around the toughest requirements in order to build to the largest extent possible.

Decision: A tentative compromise was made regarding infill options in the Plan that would pre-empt the need for sub-districts. Urban Home, Cottage Lot, Corner Store: NO; Small Lot Amnesty: YES; Garage Apartments: UNKNOWN. See below for rationale.

Bo said that as long as the team included language that permitted the Blackland CDC to build affordable single family housing, the neighborhood could live without permitting urban home and cottage lot options outright. Everyone agreed that small lot amnesty was acceptable, especially since it only applied primarily to Blackland and not the rest of the planning area. Everyone agreed that the corner store was not highly desirable. Garage apartments were a sticking point for the team, but they were pleased that they had already come to a compromise on 4 of the 5 options.

They decided that compromising now was valid, in spite Cherrywood’s vote the week before. The Plan was an evolving process, and those who wish to participate are always invited to attend.

The conversation about deed restrictions was revived, despite earlier suggestions to the contrary. It was suggested that deed restrictions could help them design a compromise around the garage apartment infill option. The team discussed the possibility of St. George’s Church selling its property and subsequently being subdivided so that a prospective future developer could take advantage of the garage apartment infill ordinance and build to the more dense capacity. Mark Walters said he would look into plat notes, suggesting that they may carry more weight than deed restrictions. Leslie said that she was not willing to take chances on infill, so if UBC Plan did elect to have garage apartments to compromise with the desires of Cherrywood (possibly in favor of garage apts.), Wilshire would have to have sufficient back-up to protect it against garage apartments on small lots in the future. Mark Walters said he would investigate the use of a restrictive covenant.

Decision: At 8:05 PM, the team elected to extend the meeting to 8:30 PM.

After more discussion and no decision being reached on the topic of garage apartments, Stephen congratulated the team for agreeing on four of the five options and postponed the garage apartment discussion for a later meeting.

Members then addressed individual items in the plan.

Mark Lind revisited Action Item #11.

Leslie said that Barbara Stocklin wanted the church property across from her home to be changed from P-Public to SF-3, since the P zoning permits large neon signs.

Action Item #8 was also revisited.

Stephen then asked if the team had completed its Manor Road and MLK zoning recommendations. They decided they needed to review corridors throughout the area, except for I35 from 26th to 38 ½, since the team just recently completed its Conditional Overlay.

III. Design Guidelines/ Neighborhood History

Mark Lind has attempted to write them and has done some observatory research but does not know if he is qualified to write the Guidelines for the entire neighborhood. Lyn Estabrook said she has not worked on the Guidelines recently. Perhaps some of the history contributors could be candidates for helping out with the Design Guidelines.

Regarding the history of UBC, all history contributors noted on the 10-16 Decision Record had been confirmed. Delwood II was still unspoken for, so Jay said he would find someone to do the job.

Stephen called attention to the next major assignment of the team, which is to prioritize the action items. At some point they need to construct a matrix by which to rank them.

The meeting ended at 8:40 PM.

Announcements

Blackland Neighborhood now has a website: <http://Blackland.home.texas.net>

Requests

Mark Lind asked if staff could print a poster size map of UBC with updated zoning recommendations.

Mark Walters said he would look into plat notes and restrictive covenants.