

**NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING CHANGE
REVIEW SHEET**

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN: Bouldin Creek

CASE #s: NPA-2017-0013.01/C14-2017-0026

DATE FILED: March 8, 2017

PROJECT NAME: Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Area-Wide Garage Placement Plan Amendment and Rezoning

PC DATE: June 13, 2017
May 23, 2017
April 25, 2017
April 11, 2017

ADDRESSES: Area-wide (various)

DISTRICT AREA: 9

SITE AREA: 761.7 acres

Boundaries are:

North – Lady Bird Lake
East – West side of South Congress Avenue
South – North side of Oltorf Street
West – Union Pacific Railroad tracks

APPLICANT FOR ZONING CASE: City of Austin, Andrew Moore, Planning & Zoning Dept. (City-initiated)

APPLICANT FOR PLAN AMENDMENT CASE: Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team (Sean Kelly, Current Chair/Stuart Hampton, Chair when application was submitted)

AGENT: Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team (Sean Kelly, Chair)

TYPE OF AMENDMENT:

Change in Future Land Use Designation

From: n/a

To: n/a

Base District Zoning Change

Related Zoning Case: C14-2017-0026

To: Add the Garage Placement Design Tool

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ADOPTION DATE: May 23, 2002

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

June 13, 2017- Motion to grant staff's recommendation to add the Garage Placement Design Tool to the planning area. [P. Seeger – 1st; K. McGraw – 2nd] Vote: 7-5 [Commissioners Oliver, Seeger, Nuckols, White, Shieh, McGraw and Zaragoza voted aye. Commissioners Kazi, Thompson, Anderson, Schissler and Vela voted nay. Commissioner A. DeHoyos Hart absent].

May 23, 2017- Postponed to the June 13, 2017 hearing date at the request of the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team. [P. Seeger – 1st; K. McGraw – 2nd] Vote: 7-1 (G. Anderson nay. F. Kazi, A. De Hoyos Hart, J. Schissler, J. Thompson and T. White absent].

April 25, 2017 – Postponed to the May 23, 2017 hearing date after a postponement discussion. [G. Anderson – 1st; T. Nuckols-2nd] Vote: 8-2 [N. Zaragoza, J. Vela, and T. White absent].

April 11, 2017 – Postponed on the consent agenda at the request of the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association to April 25, 2017. [N. Zaragoza – 1st; P. Seeger – 2nd] Vote: 11-0 [S. Oliver and T. White absent. Schissler recused from Items # C-7, C-18-, C-20, C-21. F. Kazi recused from Item C-7].

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommended

BASIS FOR STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION: In the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan document is a section on Voluntary Design Guidelines. One of the goals is to maintain the single-family character of the interior of the neighborhood and to encourage new construction, additions or reconstruction that use key architectural character elements found the neighborhood. Guide 1.4 in the Voluntary Design Guidelines addresses the desire to de-emphasize the garage as an architectural element. The Garage Placement Tool would help to implement this design guideline.

Note: The current language in the draft Code Next document has the following language that addresses Garage Placement:

Parking shall not be located in front of the front façade of the building, and shall occupy no more than one-third the width of the front façade. This applies to all SF building types in the T3 and T4 zones.

Supporting Sections from the Bouldin Creek
Neighborhood Plan Document

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Residential Objective 1: MAINTAIN THE SINGLE-FAMILY CHARACTER OF THE INTERIOR OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. MAINTAIN THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF HOUSE STYLES WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. ENCOURAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION, ADDITIONS OR RECONSTRUCTION THAT USE KEY ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER ELEMENTS FOUND IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Guideline 1.1: Houses are predominantly 1 story high, with the first floor level 12-24 inches above the ground. The height of each floor of new construction should be similar to floor-to-floor heights on existing houses. If a second story addition is desired, locate the addition to the center of building footprint, and design it to resemble the existing house in overall shape, materials and colors.



Guideline 1.2: Use a house footprint similar to the typical simple rectangle or L-shape plan, with the narrow end of the rectangle facing the street.



Guideline 1.3: Roofs should be simple in form, either gabled or hipped, with low to moderate pitch (5 or 7:12 is common). Typical roofing materials include metal and tabbed composition shingles.



RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES


MAINTAINING THE SINGLE-FAMILY CHARACTER OF THE INTERIOR OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Guideline 1.4: Garages or carports are not common in the neighborhood but where they exist, they are detached and located at the rear of the lot. If an attached garage is desired, setting it back at least 10 feet from the front facade of the house will help to preserve the people-oriented character of the streetscape. Garages are typically designed to resemble the house in shape, material and color.

April 4, 2017 Staff Note:
Formatting error in the plan document.



Modest houses have half the front yard space to sit



BOULDIN CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES DRAFT MAY 2002 47

BACKGROUND: The Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan was approved by City Council on May 23, 2002, which at that time the neighborhood plan design tools did not exist. On September 25, 2003, the City Council approved three neighborhood plan design tools, Garage Placement, Parking Placement and Impervious Cover Restrictions, and the Front Porch Setback, although the Garage Placement design tool ordinance was recently amended on May 5, 2016.

This application is a request by the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team to add only one of the design tools, the Garage Placement, to the planning area. The Garage Placement design tool is to de-emphasize the garage as a central architectural element and will be applied to single-family, duplex, and two-family residential uses.

On September 27, 2016, the Planning Commission approved a motion directing staff to initiate a zoning application to start the process to add the Garage Placement Design Tool to the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Planning Area. In addition, the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team submitted a plan amendment application that would add text to the plan document to reference the addition of the Garage Placement Design Tool to be applied to the planning area boundaries.

PUBLIC MEETINGS: The ordinance required community meeting was held on March 29, 2017. Approximately 6,600 community meeting notices were mailed to people who live or own property within the planning area and to people who live within 500 feet of the planning area boundaries. Thirteen people attended the community meeting not including two City staff members, Maureen Meredith from Planning and Zoning Department and Juan Camou from the Development Services Department, Residential Review.

After staff gave a brief presentation, the following questions were asked:

Q. Why is this happening?

A. Cory Walton explained how an architect who lives in the planning area approached the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team with this idea and the team suggested he make some presentations to NPCT and the neighborhood. He made these presentations and they did outreach and eventually the NPCT approved a motion to start the process. The outreach they used was forums, general neighborhood association meetings, website, list serve and newsletters.

Q. How does this apply to new construction?

A. It applies to brand new construction and to existing homes where the homeowner wants to build a carport. If the carport is not flush with the home, the design tool would prohibit the construction. The homeowner would have to go to the Board of Adjustment to ask for a variance, but it's really only for a hardship.

Q. How does this apply to existing garages?

A. For an existing garage, you could build higher, but you can't change the footprint of the garage.

Comments:

- This design tool is not about aesthetics within the neighborhood, but it's really about protecting the bungalows.
- If single family homes need two off-street parking places, this design tool might affect this requirement.
- I didn't know a carport is considered a garage and would be affected by this ordinance.
- When people saw the Garage Placement in the newsletters and emails, we didn't know that it would affect how we develop our properties.

After the discussion, a vote of the people who attended the meeting was taken:

Support: 6

Opposed: 4

Abstained: 2

(One person may have left before the vote because thirteen people signed-in)

Count of emails and comment forms received:

Support: 15

Opposed: 43

CITY COUNCIL DATE:

May 11, 2017

ACTION: Postponed to June 8, 2017 at the request of staff. [O. Houston – 1st; A. Alter – 2nd] Vote: 11-0

June 8, 2017

ACTION: Postponed to August 3, 2017 at the request of staff. [P. Renteria – 1st; J. Flannigan – 2nd] Vote: 9-0 [De. Garza and A. Kitchen absent].

August 3, 2017

ACTION: Postponed to the September 28, 2017 hearing at the request of the neighborhood. [D. Garza – 1st; G. Casar – 2nd] Vote: 11-0.

September 28, 2017

ACTION:

CASE MANAGERS:

Maureen Meredith, Plan Amendment Case

PHONE: 512-974-2695

Andy Moore, Zoning Case

PHONE: 512-974-7604

EMAILS: maureen.meredith@austintexas.gov
Andrew.moore@austintexas.gov

Item E-02

Material Submitted to Planning
Commission

1 of 1



MEMORANDUM

TO: Stephen Oliver, Chair
Planning Commission Members

FROM: Mark Walters, Planning and Zoning Department

DATE: September 22, 2016

RE: Small Area Planning Joint Committee Recommendation to the Planning Commission to initiate an areawide rezoning to implement the Garage Placement Design Tool for the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Area

At their September 14th, 2016 regular meeting, the Small Area Planning Joint Committee unanimously voted (5-0) to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission recommending that the Commission initiate a zoning change for the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Planning Area to adopt the Garage Placement Design Tool. If the Commission were to initiate the zoning case, the Bouldin Creek would initiate a plan amendment that will support the zoning change.

At the meeting a representative from the neighborhood, Corey Walton, spoke and expressed community support for the zoning change. He described the initial outreach steps that neighborhood association has taken to engage the residents. These included several postings in the neighborhood association newsletter as well as a community meeting held to discuss the issue. At that meeting a vote was taken which supported the proposed amendment and necessary zoning change.

Approved Planning Commission meeting minutes
from September 27, 2016



**REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
September 27, 2016**

The Planning Commission convened in a regular meeting on September 27, 2016 @ 301 W. 2nd Street, Austin, TX 78701

Chair Stephen Oliver called the Commission Meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Commission Members in Attendance:

Stephen Oliver – Chair
Karen McGraw
Tom Nuckols
Angela PineyroDeHoyos
James Schissler
Patricia Seeger
James Shieh
Jeffrey Thompson
Jose Vela
Trinity White
Michael Wilson
Nuria Zaragoza

William Burkhardt – Ex-Officio

Absent:

Fayez Kazi – Vice-Chair

Robert Hinojosa – Ex-Officio
Dr. Jayme Mathias – Ex-Officio

EXECUTIVE SESSION (No public discussion)

The Planning Commission will announce it will go into Executive Session, if necessary, pursuant to Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code, to receive advice from Legal Counsel on matters specifically listed on this agenda. The commission may not conduct a closed meeting without the approval of the city attorney.

Private Consultation with Attorney – Section 551.071

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Northtown MUD Consent Agreement Amendment

Discuss and consider an amendment to the Northtown MUD Consent Agreement to accommodate a driveway cut on Howard Lane specific to a property located at 2800 S Heatherwilde Blvd.
Staff: Virginia Collier, 512-974-2022
Planning and Zoning Department

Motion by Commissioner Michael Wilson, Commissioner Trinity White seconded on a unanimous vote to recommend approval with an additional recommendation that the length of the right turn lane on Heatherwilde Blvd should be extended. Motion approved on a unanimous vote. Vice-Chair Faye Kazi absent.

2. Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Planning Area

Discussion and possible action to initiate an area-wide zoning case for the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Planning area to amend the Infill and Design Tools.
Staff: Mark Walters, 512-974-7695
Planning and Zoning Department

The motion to direct staff to initiate an area-wide zoning case for the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Planning area to amend the Infill and Design Tools was approved on the motion by Commissioner Trinity White, Commissioner James Shieh seconded on a unanimous vote. Vice-Chair Faye Kazi absent.

3. Discussion and possible action regarding the Annual Internal Review of the Planning Commission.

No action taken; item tabled to October 11, 2016 on a consensus vote.

F. ITEMS FROM COMMISSION

1. Discussion and possible action regarding the practice of staff informing the Planning Commission of the proposed disposition of items on the Agenda. (Commissioners Nuria Zaragoza and Trinity White)

No action taken.

Planning Commission Note: Staff to consider verbiage for both the public hearing form and the online web page informing the public on how items are pulled for discussion.

Summary Letter Submitted by the Bouldin Creek NPCT

City of Austin Application Packet for Neighborhood Plan Amendment
For Neighborhood Plan Contact Team

Neighborhood Plan Amendment

SUMMARY LETTER

THE COUNCIL-ADOPTED BOULDIN CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN CONTAINS 10 PAGES OF VOLUNTARY DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT.

THE GUIDELINES STATE: "IF AN ATTACHED GARAGE IS DESIRED, SETTING IT BACK AT LEAST 10 FEET FROM THE FRONT FACADE OF THE HOUSE WILL HELP TO PRESERVE THE PEOPLE-ORIENTED CHARACTER OF THE STREETSCAPE."

THE INFILL DESIGN TOOLKIT, INTRODUCED IN 2003 WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD WHEN THE PLAN WAS WRITTEN AND ADOPTED IN 2002.

THE GARAGE PLACEMENT TOOL CODIFIES A MOSTLY IGNORED VOLUNTARY DESIGN GUIDELINE AND PROVIDES ONE SMALL TOOL TO HELP PRESERVE THE NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AMID ACCELERATING RE-DEVELOPMENT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

SINCERELY,



CHARLES C. (COREY) WALTON
SECRETARY, BOULDIN CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD
PLAN CONTACT TEAM

Bouldin Creek NPCT Meeting Minutes – Vote on
Garage Placement Design Tool

From: Cory Walton

Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 3:01 PM

To: Leslie Moore; Vicki Knipp; kris@; Jennifer Wenzel; Magdalena Rood; Brad Patterson; Koreena Malone; 'Scott McNearney'; Melanie McNearney; Gary Hyatt; Stuart Hampton; scott.specht@; klewis849@; lilli.a.poulson@; Bert McIlwain; sewaltz@; m.cathcart@; baindr@; Patricia McNew; npoulson@; Casey Wenzel; John Bodek; Murray Freeman; Susan Helgren; Koreena Malone; Melody Snow; Tom Hurt; Paul Strange; Lorie Barzano; Philip Keil; Sean Kelly; Tim Rotunda; James Retherford; Sue Bornstein

Cc: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Bouldin Creek NPCT Meeting Minutes

All,

Here are minutes from Bouldin's February 9 Neighborhood Plan Contact Team meeting. Maureen, please note item #3, wherein the team voted to amend the plan by adopting the garage placement tool.

Many thanks, y'all.

Please contact me with any questions.

Rgds.

Cory Walton, BCNPCT Secretary

9 February 2017

Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team

The High Road. 700 Dawson Rd, Austin, TX 78704

Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Stuart Hampton 1006 S. First St., shampton@

Susan Helgren, 1700 Block, S. Congress Ave., susanhelgren@

Kevin Lewis, 1002 Bouldin Avenue, klewis849@

Murray Freeman, murray@

Melody Snow, melosnow@

Paul Strange, 717 Post Oak, strange20@

Sean Kelly, smtkellypg@g

Cory Walton, 1701 Bouldin, coryellwalton@

Magdalena Rood, 1003 S. 2nd Street, mrood@

Jesse Moor, jtmoore624@

Meeting called to order 7:05 PM

Attendee Introductions

Review of minutes from last meeting (December 2015) Those present at that meeting voted unanimously to approve.

Officer elections. Candidates: Sean Kelly, Chair; Cory Walton, Secretary,

Magdalena Rood, Vice Chair. No additional nominations from floor. Motion to approve slate of officers seconded and passed unanimously by those eligible to vote (previously attended a BCNPCT meeting).

Plan Amendments: Review of opt-in, opt-out infill options:

1. Parking on front yards
2. Food truck distance from residential properties.

Members voted unanimously not to opt-in to either option.

3. Review proposed Garage Placement tool option LDC 52-2-1604— Discussed previous year's notification efforts, review and approval votes by BCNA zoning, steering & general association. Motion to approve adoption, seconded; approved on 6-2 vote.

Review February 8 NPCT training session by City staff. Addition of consideration of fair housing access in planning areas and other possible city support initiatives. No action taken.

Bylaws revision discussion—small change recommendations from city staff for review, consideration. No action taken.

Meeting adjourned 7:57 PM



15 June 2016

Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team officers,

Following presentation in two consecutive bi-monthly general association meetings (April 12 and June 14, 2016), and several referrals to the City of Austin web site's description of the neighborhood plan design tool kit posted to the neighborhood's listserv for resident referral and review, the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association's (BCNA) zoning committee, steering committee, and general association voted their support of adopting the Garage Placement Tool into the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan.


BCNA urges the plan contact team to consider the tool, and beginning the process for review and adoption at earliest convenience, considering adoption out of the plan's customary amendment cycle.

Many thanks for your consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cory Walton", is written over the printed name.

Cory Walton, President
Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association.

Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association, P. O. Box 3683, Austin, Texas 78764




DESIGN TOOLS

Garage Placement for Single-Family, Duplex, and Two-Family Residential Use LDC 25-2-1604

Attached or detached garages and/or carports with entrances that face a front yard that abuts public ROW must be located flush with or behind the front façade of a house. The width of a parking structure located less than twenty feet (20') behind the front façade of a house may not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the width of the façade of the house. For example, if the front façade of a house—not including the garage—is thirty feet (30') wide, then the garage may be no wider than fifteen feet (15').

There is no garage width limitation for side entry garages or for attached or detached garages and/or carports located twenty feet (20') or more behind the front façade of a house.



§ 25-2-1604 - GARAGE PLACEMENT.

- (A) This section applies to a single-family residential use, a duplex residential use, or a two-family residential use.
- (B) In this section:
 - (1) BUILDING FACADE means the front-facing exterior wall or walls of the first floor of the principal structure on a lot, and the term excludes the building facade of the portion of the principal structure designed or used as a parking structure. Projections from front-facing exterior walls, including but not limited to eaves, chimneys, porches, stoops, box or bay windows, and other similar features as determined by the building official, are not considered part of the building facade.
 - (2) PARKING STRUCTURE means a garage or carport, either attached or detached from the principal structure.
- (C) A parking structure with an entrance that faces the front yard abutting public right-of-way:
 - (1) may not be closer to the front lot line than the front-most exterior wall of the first floor of the building facade; and
 - (2) if the parking structure is less than 20 feet behind the building facade, the width of the parking structure may not exceed 50 percent of the width of the building facade, measured parallel to the front lot line, or the line determined by the building official if located on an irregular lot.

Source: Ord. 030925-64; Ord. 031211-11; [Ord. No. 20160505-051, Pt. 1, 5-16-16](#).

Proposed Text and Information to be
Added to the Plan Document

Proposed new text, graphic and general information *(if approved by City Council)*:


(SEE DRAFT ORDINANCE)

DESIGN TOOLS

Garage Placement for Single-Family, Duplex, and Two-Family Residential Use
LDC 25-2-1604

Attached or detached garages and/or carports with entrances that face a front yard that abuts public ROW must be located flush with or behind the front façade of a house. The width of a parking structure located less than twenty feet (20') behind the front façade of a house may not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the width of the façade of the house. For example, if the front façade of a house—not including the garage—is thirty feet (30') wide, then the garage may be no wider than fifteen feet (15').

There is no garage width limitation for side entry garages or for attached or detached garages and/or carports located twenty feet (20') or more behind the front façade of a house.



Comments Received **In Favor**

From: Melynda Nuss
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 3:31 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan -- Garage Placement Tool

Hi Maureen --

My husband and I live in Bouldin Creek (2308 S. 2nd), and I'm writing to express support for the garage placement design tool that's proposed as an addition to our neighborhood plan. The house across the street from us has an obtrusive garage, and it takes away from the neighborhood's friendliness and walkability. The planning tool is a great idea.

Thank you so much for your time!

Melynda Nuss (+ Jose Skinner)
2308 S. 2nd
512-799-9792

From: Stephanie Land
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2017 9:51 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bouldin Garage Placement Rule

Dear Maureen,

I was told I should email you to register my support of the Bouldin Garage Placement rule. We have enough blank walls going up in the neighborhood without putting garages front and center, too.

Thank you very much,

Stephanie Land
S. 2nd Street

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Your Name (please print) Carol Watts
 1308 So 5th St Austin TX 78704
 Your address(es) affected by this application
Carol Watts Signature 3/21/17 Date

Comments:

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Your Name (please print) Ashley McLean + L.G. Schmeel
 2103 Wilson St. Austin 78704
 Your address(es) affected by this application
L.G. Schmeel Signature 3/22/17 Date

Comments: Build in lots are too small for garages really, if the intention is to avoid loss of visual neighborhood character by using existing garage construction we support that. We hope it does not deter tasteful redevelopment that allows families to continue to live in our area.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Deborah Trigo
Your Name (please print)

177 Gar St. Austin, TX 78704
Your address(es) affected by this application

3/24/17
Date

Comments: I am in favor of this
appropriate regulation to maintain
the historic and aesthetic
character of our neighborhood

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Becky Strange
Your Name (please print)

177 Post Oak St. Austin TX 78704
Your address(es) affected by this application

Becky Strange
Signature

Comments:

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Kim Geary
Your Name (please print)

1109 W ANNIE
Your address(es) affected by this application

Kim Geary
Signature

3-22-17
Date

Comments:

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates: Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Your Name (please print) Kim Geary
 Your address(es) affected by this application 802 S 1st st #107 & 112
 Signature Kim Geary Date 3-22-17

Comments: _____

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates: Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Your Name (please print) Donald G. Hatch
 Your address(es) affected by this application 2101 Newton 78704
 Signature Donald G. Hatch Date _____

Comments: I have been in my home since 1982 and have watched the old homes being rapidly replaced in the recent years. I have made time out every weekend to do as many screenings as I can. I am for open friendly to the fewon walls and no grasses as Warrens. Hatch

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM	
If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to: City of Austin Planning and Zoning Department Maureen Meredith P. O. Box 1088 Austin, TX 78767-8810 If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.	
Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026 Contact: Maureen Meredith Public Hearing Dates: Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017	
☒ I am in favor ☐ I object	
_____ Your Name (please print) Amy Hopkins	
_____ Your address(es) affected by this application 1512 Newton St.	
_____ Date 3/30/17	
Comments: _____ WGC AGAIN FULL SUPPORT OF THIS. IT IS A SHAME HOW THE DEVELOPERS ARE IGNORING THE STREET LEVEL INTERACTION BY REPLACING PORCHES WITH SUBURBAN GARAGES WHICH DOMINATE THE HISTORICAL DESIGN OF OUR HOUSES.	

From: Molly White
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 9:50 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bcna garage template

Dear Maureen Meredith,
A garage template amendment has been proposed for the BCNA neighborhood plan. We are long term neighborhood residents - 40 years - and I think we need all the help we can get to protect the neighborhood going forward, including the garage template. Consider this a letter of support.
Molly White
1200 S. 5th

From: paul strange
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 11:10 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bouldin Creek Garage Placement Design Tool

Maureen, I want to go on record that I am in favor of the neighborhood adopting this tool and incorporating it into the Neighborhood plan. There have been numerous emails about lack of outreach and the fact that numerous smaller neighborhood lots make this tool inappropriate for Bouldin Creek. I don't believe that to be the case and feel this tool would benefit the neighborhood and for those residents who have a small lot and no alley access, they have the option of getting a variance if they desire off street parking.

Paul Strange, 717 Post Oak, Austin, TX 78704

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission- Tues. April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs. May 11, 2017

☒ I am in favor
☐ I object

Your Name *Reyne Telles*
(please print)
2215 Post Road # 2003
78704

Your address(es) affected by this application
Reyne Telles
Signature
Date 4/13/17

Comments:

-----Original Message-----

From: George Coldwell
Sent: Sunday, May 07, 2017 5:39 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: NPA-2017-0013.13 and C14-2017-0026

TO: MAUREEN MERIDITH

RE: Public Hearing Comment: NPA-2017-0013.13 and C14-2017-0026 City Council - Thurs. May 11, 2017

COMMENT:

I AM IN FAVOR OF THE BOULDIN CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AMENDMENT WHICH ADDS, "THE GARAGE PLACEMENT TOOL." My residence is within the boundaries of the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan.

FROM:
George Matthew Coldwell.
710 West Gibson St. 78704

512-415-1708

-----Original Message-----

From: George Coldwell
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 10:28 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: NPA-2017-0013.13 and C14-2017-0026

Dear Maureen,

I am writing to let you know I am in favor of the garage tool amendment added to the Bouldin neighborhood plan.

I live at 1205 Sth. 3rd. St. I am a resident member of the BCNA and plan.

Please show my vote as "In Favor" of the amendment NPA-2017-0013.13 and C14-2017-0026 at the City Council Meeting scheduled for May 11, 2017.

George Myers Coldwell Sr.
WWII Vet
512-350-2395

From: Jesse Moore
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 2:59 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bouldin Creek garage placement tool--please approve

Hello Ms. Meredith--I am Jesse Moore. Please include this note in the backup materials for the planning commission's consideration of this issue.

I rent a home in the Bouldin Creek neighborhood & grew up there. I wanted to voice my support for extending the garage placement tool into my neighborhood. It is my understanding that almost all central Austin neighborhoods have a similar restriction. I believe that the garage placement tool is a good idea since it reflects the character of our walkable, pleasant, and open urban neighborhood. Large garages at the forefront of houses emphasize cars over people and are unsightly and uninviting. The garage placement tool still permits sensible and modest garages.

I would note that Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association and the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Contact Team have discussed this issue extensively and voted in favor of it. None of the votes were close. The opposition to this seems to be lead by non-residents.

Thank you--Jesse

Comments Received in Opposition

From: stephanie kera
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2017 8:37 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Carport Ban / Garage Placement in Bouldin - Opposition Vote

Good morning Ms. Meredith,

I'm sending a quick note to voice my opinion to oppose the proposed zoning restrictions on carports and garages.

Thanks,
Stephanie Dulimba
2115 Newton St.
Austin, TX 78704

From: Jeffrey Andrews
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2017 9:46 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Bouldin Carport Ban

Ms. Meredith,

I'd like to register my dissent to the proposed rule changes, from what I understand of them from the mailing I received and discussions amongst neighbors.

There are already so many building restrictions, and this proposed change strikes me as very heavy handed. As you are probably aware, there are a vocal minority of residents in Bouldin who seem to be a bit overzealous in terms of preservation and adding new rules. Having just built a guest house, I realized how complicated and labyrinth the existing rules are.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeff Andrews
1900 S. 2nd St

From: Aaron McGarry
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2017 6:53 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Carport/Garage Issue in Bouldin Creek

Maureen,

I hope this note finds you well. I plan on attending the March 29th public hearing as long as I have no flight issues getting home. Just in case I don't make it back in time I wanted to provide my feedback.

1. If you have a large lot and doing new construction you could do a side driveway and have a rear garage. You could also easily comply.

2. If you have a smaller lot and a exiting home you would be heavily restricted.
3. If you have an alley lot you have options.
4. If you have a corner lot you are good to go.

This seems to directly target people like myself who own a 1953 home that is already at the setbacks, on a narrow lot (50ft wide) and would promote people tearing down old homes versus remodeling them. I have to jump through enough red tape just to have covered parking (carport) on my property as it is. This would make it literally impossible.

I am extremely against this proposal.

Thank you,

Aaron McGarry
2210 S. 2nd Street

From: Jan Duffin

Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 5:28 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Regarding the 3.29 Public Hearing Case number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026 (Bouldin Garage Tool)

To: Maureen Meredith

City of Austin

Planning and Zoning Department

In regards to Case number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026, the proposed amendment to adopt a Garage Placement Design Tool to the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan.

From: Jan Duffin

901 W. Annie Street

Thank you for encouraging online comments, as I cannot be physically present at the March 29 community meeting.

There has been a lively online discussion by Bouldinites prior to this meeting and I will address some of their comments below. I hope to reference them fairly as I make a case for my vehement **objection** to the amendment.

1a) I refute the argument made that it is too late in the game to be objecting to a tool that has so much support from the planners.

1b) My argument: I should be heard on equal footing as the "for" viewpoint, and not disparaged because of the timing of my objection.

Yes the endorsers (BCNA Zoning Committee, BCNA Steering Committee, BCNA General Association meeting attendees, BC Neighborhood Plan Contact Team Officers) have been working on this awhile. It doesn't mean that they reached everyone. While it is apparent that it was discussed in meetings and placed in the Bouldin newsletter, those facts do not guarantee that the methods reached all people with an opinion. Just because I responded

to the one public input outreach I *did* hear about (the City's mailing about the Public Hearing Information) shouldn't imply that I didn't care up until this point. It could simply mean that's the first I'm hearing about it and want to make sure my voice is heard.

2a) I refute the argument that garages facing the street that stick out past the façade of the house (actually called "snout houses" by some) discourage community or diminish the "people-oriented character of the streetscape."

2b) My argument. This is absolutely too subjective an argument that has no logical basis. It relies entirely on aesthetics and is not rooted in any common safety issue or violation of current enforceable or implied code.

The use of the word "streetscape" in the pro-Placement tool presentation makes it sound as if Bouldin is a static painting. We are not. We are a vibrant, living, ever-changing, grand and wonderful neighborhood with growing diversity. And more diversity, it can be argued, is better for decision-making on a grand scale—NOT restriction of thought or aesthetic or opinion.

This tool is trying to solve a problem that does not empirically exist.

3a) I refute the argument that because other areas of the city are using it makes it good for Bouldin (according to the pro-Placement tool presentation, 23 areas have adopted it).

3b) My argument. So what? Each area also probably solicited feedback and made a decision. It's our turn. We're not the Justice Department going against a solid precedent. We're going through the process based on what we as a neighborhood believe would be in the best interests of our hood. I think this is going to divide us more than bring our interests together. There is ample email proof of the divisiveness of this issue already. Why codify this thing and cement these harsh feelings?

If these are voluntary guidelines, let us accept the current City mailing as our notification that says "We'd like you to follow this..." End of story. No going in front of the City Council or bothering the Zoning folks necessary!

I agree with a neighbor's previous assessment of this situation who basically said these code restrictions upon current residents who would like to stay in their Bouldin homes and build to suit a need, are instead encouraged to move away. I would add they are not only hobbled by the City restrictions and onerous building permit process, but actually goaded to leave by the very nasty e-list comments of some residents who say "don't move here and then try to change anything about your property, just live elsewhere." Which ironically enough will result in fewer long-time residents dedicated to making solid connections with neighbors, thus fewer opposing viewpoints to these restrictions.

Finally, the PowerPoint that was presented in order to garner support for this tool reasoned with an "urgency" claim in a few bullet points.

- Rapid demolition and re-development... (and)
- Will anyone recognize what is left?

My point is "Who will BE left?" And my answer is "The unhappiest (but determined to keep their perfect picture of the hood) Bouldinites who just want to call in to Code Compliance about the new neighbors, who will keep streaming in because that's just what happens to a very very popular neighborhood."

Thanks for your time.

From: Mike
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:46 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Regarding Case number NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026 (Bouldin Creek Garage Placement Design Tool)

From: Mike Cruzcosa
901 W Annie St

Dear Maureen Meredith

Thanks for encouraging feedback on this item

I'm strongly opposed to the amendment. I think it's arbitrary, illogical and unnecessary. I think the proponents of the amendment owe their neighbors a sincere apology, especially those they have attempted to stigmatize and out-group with their criticisms and the use of the "snout house" slur

Some considerations

- I've met some very likable people who live in "non-compliant" homes and I've read some cruel and mean-spirited e-list postings by people who apparently don't. I'm an introvert and I tend to shy away from all social interaction regardless of whether I have a garage or not. There is no correlational or causal relationship between sociability and garage configuration

- I've seen some "compliant" homes that I think are downright ugly and some "non-compliant" homes with innovative designs that I think complement the neighborhood. But these are my opinions and entirely a matter of subjective aesthetics. It would be poor form to presume that my subjective opinions should be imposed on my neighbors. There is no architectural absolute that equates garage configuration with aesthetic appeal

- People who prefer the way Travis Heights looks should probably move to Travis Heights or visit there more often

- I didn't find out about this debate until recently but I think my opinion about it counts equally

- If the underlying concern is to somehow insulate Bouldin from the urban transformation that is occurring across Austin and surrounding communities, it seems a little bizarre to fixate on garage configuration. If the intent is to exclude people who would transform our community in ways we don't like, let's just go whole hog and establish a Bouldin Creek Aesthetics Tribunal. We could review the designs of prospective homes and exclude the ones we don't like. We can require prospective residents to write essays about why they want to live here and exclude the ones we don't like. Just kidding of course, but then again some might like the idea which to me is more objectionable than the parameters of any garage or

carport. Bouldin has a unique charm and is diverse, vibrant and evolving. The character of Bouldin is not a function of the garages attached to the houses. It's a result of the people who live in these houses and how they treat each other and they pride they take in being part of the community

Thanks for taking the time to read these comments

Regards, Mike

From: Murray Freeman

Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 6:41 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Regarding the 3.29 Public Hearing Case number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026 (Bouldin Garage Tool)

Hello Maureen Meredith!

I am filing my objection to this new rule

I have a trade show that I have to attend, in order to pay my property taxes in Austin, so I cannot attend the meeting on the 29th to speak in person.

My address is 616 W Monroe, Austin Tx 78704

My objections are based on these opinions

a) many older Bouldin homes have been photographed, that do not comply with this rule. As such, the rule is not "preserving" an existing style as much as it is imposing new restrictions, many many garages, carports exist in Bouldin, some even at the edge of the sidewalk, that were not mentioned at the time this came to a vote - as there was not time for people to collect data.

b) Fewer than 2% of the owners in Bouldin were at the meeting where this was presented. Many believe this rule is voluntary. Once a critical posting was made to the local newsgroup - that posting, last week, raised awareness to the 98% who had not realized the importance of this zoning change. Yes it is late - but what is the hurry to push this thru with such low participation?

c) At the meeting - their was a biased presentation in favor. At no time has time been allotted for someone to go back and study the impact on the narrow lots that are here in Bouldin

d) way isn't there an impact study? Why not a report on the number of new and older homes that do not comply?

e) I understand that many long term residents of Bouldin - who are more active in the Neighborhood association compared to people who moved here 5 or 10 years ago - that these residents are upset about the rapid replacement of older homes. However - the very fact that these older homes are being replaced, proves that the neighborhood plan has failed to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Indeed, these classic older homes cannot be duplicated - as they do not comply with current COA rules like

- Setbacks

- FAR
- Impervious Cover
- ADA
- "Tent"
- electrical and fire safety

Preservation of the visual character of the community has been made impossible by City zoning - resulting in a visually unappealing compromise between modern architecture and the very narrow limits on the size, outline, and features of new construction. This compromise has not slowed growth - but it has resulting in cookie cutter designs being proven as permissible and then duplicated over and over again.

f) the notion of a Variance application was given - that is not realistic, it inserts a subjective variability into the planning process and causes months if not years of delays.

Respectfully

Murray Freeman

From: Matt Cochran
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 9:35 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Opposition to "Garage Placement Tool" Case: C14-2017-0026

Maureen,

I'm writing this email in regards to the proposed "Garage Placement Tool" that is up for debate this evening (zoning case: C14-2017-0026). I can't attend due to work, but I wanted to express my thoughts as a Bouldin Creek homeowner. If possible, please forward my email to the interested parties in my absence.

I am strongly opposed to this new zoning restriction, and I do not think the small group of BCNA members speak for the community as a whole.

I understand that the BCNA have good intentions at heart, but opinions on "character" and "history" of our neighborhood are as varied as the houses themselves. Imposing this zoning code on a neighborhood such as Bouldin Creek seems to run in opposition of everything it stands for.

Adopting this new zoning plan would be detrimental for a few reasons:

1. Lot sizes and access to alleys vary significantly throughout the neighborhood. Building/zoning codes such as the proposed typically are applied to neighborhoods with conformity. In fact, the neighborhoods in Austin that have adopted similar restrictions are mostly newer, suburban areas – not central, urban neighborhoods. The code would place unnecessary burden on properties without access to alleyways.
2. This would not eliminate front access driveways. Homeowners remodeling their homes would still provide parking in the front of the house (because most don't have alley access).

Now we'd simply stare at more cars in front lawns instead of garages/carports. That doesn't solve anything from an aesthetic or pedestrian standpoint. Cars would still enter from the front.

3. This could potentially harm home values as certain lots would have restrictions on floor plans and parking.

In short, this proposed zoning change appears to be a veiled attempt by older homeowners to prevent certain architectural styles in remodels/new builds. This would not accomplish their goal, nor would it help with pedestrian traffic for the reasons mentioned above. It simply doesn't work for our neighborhood. MANY other homeowners feel the same and would be disheartened to see the measure passed.

Thank you,

Matt Cochran

Bouldin Creek Resident

-----Original Message-----

From: curwin@

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 12:32 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Feedback on Garage Placement Design Tool for Bouldin Creek

Maureen -

We are unable to attend the meeting tonight about case # NPA-2017-0013.01 & C14-2017-0026. We object to the proposed amendment.

We feel the proposal is too restrictive. We live in Bouldin Creek (614 W Johanna St) & are fortunate to have an oversized lot with alley access to a driveway in the back. Not all our neighbors have that luxury. Street parking is difficult at times & many lots are not sufficiently wide, so some residents have no option but to create parking in the front of their homes. Limiting garage width to half the house width also seems rather arbitrary, if there is sufficient land area. And many front-area garages & carports already exist in the neighborhood.

Thank you for gathering feedback. Hope the meeting goes well.

Charlene Urwin & John Pratt

From: Ben Stark

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 1:26 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen; Me

Subject: Against Garage Placement Tool in Bouldin Creek - Resident & Homeowner @ 105 W. Mary - Voting Against

I am a resident and homeowner in Bouldin Creek at 105 W. Mary. I am voting against and object to the zoning change for the garage placement tool on my house and across my neighborhood. I oppose both the content of the ordinance and I object to the process with which this ordinance was nominally voted on by a select few members of the neighborhood without a due process.

A major factor that makes a historical neighborhood like Bouldin Creek or Clarksville unique is the way the lots were uniquely subdivided. This was partly due to the historical presence/settling of African Americans in these neighborhoods prior to the major 1928 master plan zoning changes. Thus, both Bouldin and Clarksville have many smaller lots subdivided and carved out of otherwise standard subdivision city lots. Especially around corners and near intersections. This is what allowed for urban bungalows in an eclectic historical setting and appropriately dense housing environment given its proximity to downtown.

According to tax records and water tap records, 105 W. Mary was originally built and this lot was subdivided back in 1927. It is less than a 3,000 sft lot. There is no street parking allowed in front of my house as there is a bike lane in front of my house and high traffic intersection a block away. I have to be able to park at my home or walk across both lanes of traffic at a very busy intersection of Mary St to get to my house. The only way to park a car at my house is in the front. There is absolutely no other functional or even possible way. You can look at the survey of the lot.

As most of my neighbors, I both have and want to maintain the right to build and cover the parking for at least 1 car at my house with a carport. This one size fits all ordinance would not allow for that in a functional or design appropriate way given the unique lot of the house. The many neighbors who live on these types of lots should be allowed to have covered parking in a way that is uniquely appropriate to their lot without having to rebuild or reconfigure a curb cut and/or driveway or go through a series of reviews presentations and undetermined approvals for a number of months if not a year. It seems unfair to force the many homeowners or neighbors on these lots to carry groceries in the rain, or have their cars covered in bird excrement or tree pollen. It also seems unfair to force someone to have to go through a very stressful, time consuming and expensive variance process and go around seeking the approval of every neighbor just to get a covered parking spot that these other neighbors already have.

This ordinance creates and entrenches an adversarial process, not a friendly/neighborly process.

I also object to the process with which this ordinance could be adopted. I was not aware of the content of this ordinance nor was I aware that the City would be voting to adopt it until I read an email on the neighborhood listserve from a concerned citizen last week. I personally did not receive anything in the mail regarding the content of this ordinance. Nor was I aware of the content of the ordinance or its implications before the small group of neighbors voted in favor of it on a Tuesday evening many months ago.

The overwhelming majority of residents of Bouldin Creek were not aware of the actual content or details of the ordinance before a vote took place on it. Only those who happened to attend one meeting on a Tuesday night before a vote was taken to supposedly represent all the residents and homeowners of the neighborhood. This

vote will place permanent restrictions on all the lots across the neighborhood without respect to unique needs of the individual homeowners or lots. There was insufficient notice and due process in seeking a representative and informed vote.

I ask the commission to ask and consider how many people total actually voted on this at the meeting where the vote took place? **What were the actual number of votes that took place and what was the attendance at this meeting on a Tuesday night? What is the number of residents and homeowners that this ordinance permanently restricts?**

I work late and into the evening almost every weeknight. I personally was not able to go vote at this meeting many months ago even if I was aware of the ordinance itself, the determining vote, and its implications. As a matter of due process, a more informed and representative vote should take place on adopting this ordinance.

I do thank you for your time and consideration,

Ben Stark
105 W. Mary St.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

PAUL W. KING II

Your Name (please print)

1506 S. 3RD ST. AUSTIN TX 78704

Your address(es) affected by this application

[Signature]

Signature

Date

Comments:

THE GARAGE TOOL SHOULD NOT APPLY
TO BUILD IN THAT MOST LOTS
ARE 50 FT WIDE OR LESS, GIVING
HOME OWNERS NO OPTION OTHER THAN
TO: A) NOT HAVE A CARPORT/GARAGE
B) MOVE
C) TEAR DOWN AND REBUILD

3

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Erin McLean

Your Name (please print)

2304 S. 3rd St Austin TX 78704

Your address(es) affected by this application

[Signature]

Signature

Date

Comments:

Mostly the lot in Bouldin
are 50 ft or narrower. This rule
will create more tear-downs, tear down
houses that are not good for older
disabled people. This will NOT
preserve the neighborhood but destroy
having a garage or carport in your
front yard does not inhibit neighborhoods
This rule is BAD

3

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

BRIAN DERSY
Your Name (please print)

1100 S. 2nd STREET

Your address(es) affected by this application

B. Dersy 3/25/17
Signature Date

Comments:

Our city code is over taxed and
over regulated, already. I'm sick
to death of more rules and
restrictions, while my ever-increasing
taxes are being disproportionately
re-distributed to other parts of Texas,
as reported in the stateman a few
months ago.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☐ I object

Holly Tompkins
Your Name (please print)

807 Christopher Street, 78704

Your address(es) affected by this application

Holly 3/23/17
Signature Date

Comments:

Our lots are too narrow in
Bouldin and those of us
that don't have corner lots
or alleys are unfairly
negatively impacted by this
regulation.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin

Planning and Zoning Department

Maureen Meredith

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print)

1704 Sank 6⁷⁰ Steep

Your address(es) affected by this application

Date _____

~~Signature~~

Comments: Many of the narrower lots will be forced to have 1 car garages. It is also unfair to now convention to adhere to garage standards and design preferences as a place or existing homes

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin

Planning and Zoning Department

Maureen Meredith

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor

☐ I object

Your Name (please print)

2412 HAVASINE DR

Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature

Date _____

Comments:

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
Contact: Maureen Meredith
Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs, May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Maureen Meredith
Your Name (please print)

1708 Newton #A Austin Tx 78704
Your address(es) affected by this application

Maureen Meredith
Signature

3-22-2017
Date

Comments:

see attached

I live in a snout house and I am concerned that the addition of the Garage Placement Design Tool application is unnecessarily restrictive.

The snout design allows for more flexibility in design and lot utilization, often giving homebuyers more home for their dollar. Shorter driveways mean less impervious cover.

Randy Dostal, of Thomas Dostal Developers and the past president of the Greater Cedar Rapids Housing and Building Association, stated in Dec 10, 2016, edition of the Gazette, "The snout design allows builders to give homebuyers more home for their dollar with larger kitchens and common areas, as well as laundry rooms, tucked behind the garage." The article continued, "Design is dictated by the lot size....The cost of ground has gotten more expensive, so lots have become narrower...City zoning requirements control how far the structure must be set back from lot lines and the city is moving away from alleyways, which would facilitate a garage in back, so the garage sticks out in front. It's the most efficient, cost-effective design."

Like many homes in the Bouldin Creek neighborhood, we do not have an alleyway. My husband and I chose the snout design because it allowed us to have all of the main living areas and bedrooms on the ground floor, with only a guest room upstairs. Due to our own aging knees and the advanced age of our parents, stairs are not a good option for us.

There are many practical reasons for choosing the snout floor plan, but most arguments against it are based on nothing more than aesthetics. One argument is that it makes the house less approachable, yet fences are frequently built enclosing front yards to the same effect. Another argument is that it isolates owners from their neighborhood community, yet my experience is that your personality is more likely to color your interaction with neighbors than the style of your house.

Please let landowners choose a home to fit their preferences, lifestyle, and budget.

Channing Hall
1708 Newton #A
Austin TX 78704
512924-5463

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

YOUR NAME (please print)
SERGIO ROSAS

Your address(es) affected by this application
2206 S. 3RD ST.

Signature
S. ROSAS Date
3-23-17

Comments: I object to this garage limitation. I want to take care of my auto's & that means I need a garage. This proposal means I can NEVER have one due to the size & shape of my long narrow lot. Not fair at all!

3

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print)
Lynne LeFanks

Your address(es) affected by this application
1906 Bouldin Ave.

Signature
L. LEFANKS Date

Comments: this older neighborhood has many lots that are subdivided of minimum legal lot size, including mine. These lots are already at a disadvantage because of their size and I object to further restrictions. This is unnecessary and may impact my decision on staying in the neighborhood.

I have never sent in a comment before this. 13.

3

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-00301 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Janet Dunkelberg

David LaPier

Your Name (please print)

800 W. Annie St # 1706 S 3rd

Your address(es) affected by this application

Janet Dunkelberg

Signature

Date

3-29-17

Comments: This rule/ zoning change sounds like an attempt at aesthetics control, which is not appropriate for development rules. It would also make building more difficult on many lots in this neighborhood which would make that housing more EXPENSIVE.

2017-03-29 BCNA Garages - Mar 29, 2017, 11:56 AM / 1

Planning Commission

Hearing Date: April 11, 2017

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

✓ I object.

Melissa Sinclair Stevens



604 Bouldin Ave, Austin TX 78704

2017-03-29

Comments:

I am opposed to the proposal, both generally (the philosophical concept) and specifically (the design), for the following reasons.

PHILOSOPHICAL OPPOSITION

Character

The character and joy of our Bouldin Creek neighborhood does not spring from a single architectural style. Quite the opposite. The character of our neighborhood is that nothing is standard. Almost every house is a custom design: from humble converted double-wide, to bungalow, to Texas deco triplex, to 60s brick duplexes, to fantasy Swiss chalets, to mid-twentieth century modern houses (original and retro).

We were not built as a single development tract by a single builder at a single point in time. We're not Circle C. To say that a one style is representative of our neighborhood is just not the case. Almost no two houses look alike or are built from the same materials.

Thus any one-size-fits-all solution doesn't fit our neighborhood character. Our character stems from our diversity, our (as some people might call it, our wacky individuality).

Regulation

The code is intended to ensure the safety of Austin residents. This change has nothing to do with safe building standards.

2017-03-29 BCNA Garages – Mar 29, 2017, 11:56 AM / 2

This design proposal does nothing to make our homes safer but instead exacerbates three existing problems in our neighborhood:

* Problem: Parking

Parking on the street is no longer an option as it was seventy years ago. Lack of parking is one of the biggest problems in our neighborhood. New houses are required to provide two parking spaces...but this change makes that practically impossible to do so unless we pave over one side of our yard.

* Problem: Personal Safety

If you're a woman coming home at night alone, you probably feel more comfortable driving into your garage and closing the door before unlocking your car, than getting out in a dark driveway. If you are trying to get your kids out of their carseats and into the house during a hail or thunderstorm, you might be wishing that you had a house with a garage, or at least a carport.

* Problem: Protection of Property

Almost every day we hear about car break-ins and auto theft in our neighborhood. Having a garage in which to park our cars, might ameliorate this problem.

Even if you aren't hit by crime, if you've live in Austin for any length of time, your car is going to get hit by hail. And in our neighborhood with its many old and dying trees, we also face the problem of falling tree limbs in a storm. And at the very least, leaving our cars out in the open means they're going to be covered in cedar elm and other pollens. And finally there's the sun damage from our brilliant Austin summers.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO THIS DESIGN SPECICALLY

The proposed design is not a functional design

If you walk around our neighborhood, you'll see that almost nobody has a functioning example of this design. (My own house at 604 Bouldin is an exception which is possible only because my house straddles two lots and thus has 100 feet fronting the road. So I speak from 24 years of experience of living with this design when I outline what's wrong with it.)

Most houses in the Bouldin Creek neighborhood are built on single lot with 50 foot street frontage. They might have an outbuilding in the

2017-03-29 BCNA Garages – Mar 29, 2017, 11:56 AM / 3

back, but if they were ever used as garages to begin with, they are not used as garages now. In the majority of cases the driveway to them has been fenced off so that the back yard is enclosed.

Why?... because it's not a workable design for a garage. If it was workable, people would be using them rather than parking on the street or in their driveways close to the front of their houses.

The proposed design is not site-specific

The proposal doesn't consider the topography of each site, the existing large trees, the actual lot sizes, or lack of alley access.

Our neighborhood is not a carved out of flat, scraped farmland. It's hilly and every lot has a different topography. For property is on a steep hill, then building a garage behind the house into the hill might not even be physically possible. A split-level design is more appropriate and more economically feasible.

If you have big trees on your site, you are limited to where you can place buildings and it might not be possible to push the garage behind the house without removing trees. Currently Austin's tree protection regulation are under fire by the Texas State Legislature. Don't give them more fodder for overturning our tree protections by reducing even further the buildable portions of our lots.

Not every lot is a corner or has alley access. If you have have alley access then of course it makes sense to build your garage in the back, where the garage door fronts the alley. But for everyone else, this design means paving one side of your yard to gain access to the the back. Basically it creates a paved alley between every house.

The proposed design is unfriendly to the environment

* Unnecessarily paves over at a minimum and extra 400 square feet of our increasing both the heat sink effect and increasing water runoff.

* Encourages the removal of trees that could have been saved if a garage/ carport were brought closer to the street, rather than pushing it behind the house.

The proposed design is unfriendly to neighbors

2017-03-29 BCNA Garages – Mar 29, 2017, 11:56 AM / 4

* Pushes the noise and smells of cars and garages next to our neighbor's back yards. I don't want my bedroom window to be 10 feet away from someone's garage door as it opens and closes all hours of the night. Do you?

Garages, and their noise, should be close to the street, the public area of our property not by our bedrooms.

The proposed design is unfriendly to families

Seventy years ago, residents might have gotten by with one family car parked on the street in front of the house. That's not the reality of most families in our neighborhood today. While I personally don't need a two car garage, given that I'm retired and my husband bike-commutes, I understand that most people need two cars. And, the city code requires that we provide parking for two cars. For their safety and the safety of their property, why would we make it as difficult as expensive as we possibly can for them to have a garage, or even a carport, if that meets their needs?

The reason some people didn't have garages seventy years ago wasn't because of an aesthetic considerations. It's because they couldn't afford to build a garage. But they still needed to protect their cars from the elements. Just walk around the neighborhood to see the extent that people go to protect their cars from the elements.

Moreover people use their garages for other purposes: storage, woodshop, laundry room.

The proposed design stifles innovation

The proposed change specifies a limitation on the width of garages. But one infers that whatever problem it's trying to solve, that what its proponents don't like is actually garage doors.

The current wording makes it impossible to design alternatives, like a smaller garage door that services a larger garage, or a garage door that blends with the facade of the house. Rather than articulate the problem clearly and leave the solution open to a variety of creative possibilities, the specific wording makes it almost impossible to do anything but pave over one side of our yards and sacrifice our back yards

2017-03-29 BCNA Garages – Mar 29, 2017, 11:56 AM / 5

to the garage.

The unintended consequence of pushing cars into the back yard and families out of them is that more and more people are going to start enclosing their front yards so that their children and pets have a safe place to play.

CONCLUSION

Do not pave over our neighborhood.

Do not mandate that people build garages where our neighbor's garage door is placed next to our bedroom windows.

Do not adopt a standard that is more concerned with how things look than how they work. Do not sacrifice the safety and comfort of our families and property for appearances sake, just because some people don't like the look of garages (or is it garage doors? that's not clear).

Remember that the spirit of our neighborhood and South Austin is celebrated in its individuality, not bland conformity.

Melissa Sinclair Stevens

604 Bouldin Ave, Austin TX 78704

Resident of South Austin since 1974

Resident of Bouldin Ave since 1993

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

WILLIAM BROWN
 Your Name (please print)

2405 S. 6TH STREET
 Your address(es) affected by this application

WJB 3/27/2017
 Signature Date

Comments:
We need less zoning changes. This does not increase or decrease values of properties. Let homeowners decide what garages are applicable to their own property.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Mercedes Limon
 Your Name (please print)

906, 908, 910, 916 W. Live Oak St.
 Your address(es) affected by this application

Mercedes Limon 3-26-17
 Signature Date

Comments: This proposal and new criteria are not compatible with the older homes in this neighbor hood. The 1924, 34, 44 homes do not have garages or carports. They do have lots of heritage trees, smaller lots and different setbacks which conflict with this proposal. This makes it impossible to maintain an older home with future growth addition of a carport or garage. Tear down a bound. Save our homes.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print) Edward Resendez
 Your address(es) affected by this application 701 W Oltorf Austin TX 78704
 Date 2 Apr 2017

Signature [Signature]
 Comments: NO

3

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Maureen Meredith
 P. O. Box 1088
 Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
 Contact: Maureen Meredith
 Public Hearing Dates:
 Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
 City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print) Twila Willis
 Your address(es) affected by this application 200 W Mary St ATX 78704
 Date 28 March 17

Signature [Signature]
 Comments: I do NOT wish for south of river to become downtown - Residential neighborhood feel NOT high rise, condo, retail, S. Lamar has been ruined over

3

From: Brian Streig
Sent: Sunday, April 09, 2017 5:32 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Cc: Brian Streig
Subject: Garage Placement Tool for Bouldin Creek Neighborhood

Hello Maureen,

I am writing this email in regards to the proposed "Garage Placement Tool" that is being debated for the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood. It is my understanding that the next hearing for the rules change is tomorrow, April 10, 2017. Unfortunately, I am a tax CPA and have my own deadline at work that prevents me from getting away so I can attend this hearing.

I just wanted to get my opinion heard because I don't feel like the official Neighborhood organization is doing a good job at representing all the neighbors in our neighborhood. I do not agree or approve of the Garage Placement Tool for many reasons. Here are a few of the reasons:

1) The neighborhood is full of tiny lots and this tool will prevent many modern livable houses to be built. Limiting the amount of garage space on the front facade of the house is nothing more than an aesthetic and architectural preference that might be a good goal, but is definitely not a requirement that the city should force on the neighborhood.

2) Many of the older homes would not meet the requirements of the Garage Placement Tool. These older homes have already established a precedent that we can all live with these types of designs without any detriment to the neighborhood. In fact, my own condo would not meet this requirement because of the width of my garage, however, I think my condo has a very charming and welcoming front porch that more than compensates for this design style.

3) The rationale for this rule that's been proposed seems to be that it will make the neighborhood more livable and walk-able, but that doesn't make any sense to me. If you want to have that as a goal, it seems you would require sidewalks on all streets and limit the gates that are in the front of houses. I can tell you that I frequently have to walk in the street because of a lack of sidewalks or overgrown vegetation on the sidewalks. This is a much bigger hindrance to walk-ability than any garage in front of someone's house.

On another note, there is also a related discussion in our neighborhood about carports in front of houses. I want my voice to be heard that I completely approve and encourage people to install carports in front of their houses. There is no reason why these should be prohibited, especially for houses that don't have a garage (because it won't fit on their lot). This micromanagement of design style is really getting out of control and doesn't seem to add any value to the neighborhood. There are so many other issues in our neighborhood that should be addressed that this seems like a silly debate to even be having.

I hope you'll take my opinions into account when you make your decision on these issues.

Best regards,

Brian Streig
1011 Brodie Street #21
Austin, TX 78704

From: David Smith
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 6:46 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Cc: Harden, Joi
Subject: Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Regarding:

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission – Tues., April 11, 2017

City Council – Thurs., May 11, 2017

Dear Ms. Meredith,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed **Plan Amendment and Zoning Change Request** in the above referenced case. Unfortunately I missed the community meeting on March 29 when the proposal was discussed or I would have communicated my objections in person. I am opposed to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. **The Proposed Plan Amendment will have a Direct Adverse Impact on Me**
– I have a curb cut at the front of my property and one day I would like to build a carport in front of my home at 1708 South 5th Street. My home has a detached two car garage facing an alleyway at the rear my property. When I first purchased my home few of my neighbors used the alleyway. However, use of the alley has increased including to allow heavy trucks and equipment access to neighboring lots for construction purposes. The alleyway has been blocked on occasion and I have been delayed when I leave or arrive home. Having covered parking at the front of my house would allow me to avoid these situations. Also, the parking at the rear of my home cannot be seen from the front of the property and first time visitors and service personnel do not know where to park. Parking at the front of my property would alleviate this issue. The proposed Plan Amendment will prevent me from improving my property as I wish.
2. **The Proposal Fails to Consider the Nature of the Neighborhood** –
Bouldin Creek is not a new neighborhood and the vast majority of the lots contain structures. It may be impossible for homeowners who wish to add covered parking to comply with the proposed requirements because of how existing buildings are situated on their property. In addition, Bouldin Creek is

an old and traditionally lower income neighborhood. When the neighborhood was platted, many small and narrow lots were created. The proposed Plan Amendment creates a set of requirements which cannot be practically satisfied by owners of small or narrow lots and will effectively deny them any means of obtaining covered parking.

3. The Proposal Constitutes an Unwarranted Governmental Taking –

Covered parking is at a premium in this neighborhood and has an associated value for homeowners and potential future home buyers. In response to this situation, many property owners have built carports in the front of their lots. I have lived in the Bouldin Creek neighborhood off and on since 1994 and I have never observed a negative impact from such structures as long as they comply with existing set back and impervious cover requirements. If this proposed Plan Amendment is adopted, I will, without compensation, be denied the opportunity to improve my property in the same manner enjoyed by many of my neighbors. The proposed Plan Amendment constitutes an unwarranted government taking.

4. The Proposal is Simply Unnecessary -- Construction within the Bouldin Creek neighborhood is already subject to zoning restrictions, set back provisions and impervious cover requirements. Existing regulations address construction issues that might inconvenience neighbors and stakeholders. These provisions are enforced by a city department that is stretched thin and burdened with interpreting numerous, sometimes conflicting, rules and regulations. The proposed Plan Amendment is simply one more rule that must be interpreted and enforced, making life more difficult both for city inspectors and residents seeking to enhance their property. Finally, the city has already undertaken to adopt a rationalized set of regulations as part of the CodeNext initiative. I see no purpose or benefit in promulgating additional regulations while CodeNext is being considered.

I receive notifications about requested variances and zoning proposals frequently. I have never objected to variances requested by my neighbors or other amendment proposals. However, I want you and anyone you are in communication with about the proposed Plan Amendment to understand that I am strongly opposed to the proposal and I am completely serious when I say this constitutes a governmental taking. I believe that the proposal is short sighted, ill conceived and poorly timed. I will oppose this effort in every way that I can.

Sincerely,

David Smith
1708 South 5th St.
Austin, TX 78704
(512)762-2069

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin

Planning and Zoning Department

Maureen Meredith

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

Contact: Maureen Meredith

Public Hearing Dates:

Planning Commission- Tues, April 11, 2017

City Council- Thurs, May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Jesse Lunsford

Your Name (please print)

1903 Nechols 78704

Your address(es) affected by this application

Jesse Lunsford

Signature

3-20-2017

Date

Comments:

This is way too restriction for an area

w/ such small lot size.

let people create the best house they

can w/ the small lots we have here.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
Contact: Maureen Meredith
Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

FRANK GORDON
Your Name (please print)

704 W MURKOE ST UNIT A
Your address(es) affected by this application

FM Signature 4/14/2017 Date

Comments: _____

See attached page

CASE NUMBER: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026

FRANK GORDON

704 Monroe St Unit A

I strongly oppose the imposition of these restrictions because:

1. The restrictions unfairly penalize new construction and redevelopment.
2. The restrictions infringe on private property rights by imposing the design tastes of the few on the property of many.
3. The restrictions impose unnecessary subjective design guidelines on top of typical zoning restrictions such as setbacks, height, lot coverage and bulk. One result of the new design restrictions would be to impair the ability of a property owner to design functional, higher density units otherwise in compliance with zoning.

What is the public interest here other than to stifle new construction and redevelopment? I disagree with this result.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
Contact: Maureen Meredith
Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print) Justin Krizec
Your address(es) affected by this application 2012 Wilson Street
Date 3/25/17
Signature [Signature]
Comments: This planning tool severely limits the ability to build garage structures on small lots. The Bouldin Creek neighborhood consists almost entirely of small lots, and they are 50 feet wide or less. Limiting what we can build on a lot effectively reduces the value of our lots.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:
City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2017-0013.01 and C14-2017-0026
Contact: Maureen Meredith
Public Hearing Dates:
Planning Commission- Tues., April 11, 2017
City Council- Thurs., May 11, 2017

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Your Name (please print) Harold G. Jones
Your address(es) affected by this application 1005 West Johnson St, Austin, TX
Date 04/01/17
Signature [Signature]
Comments: Ridiculous. There is not enough space on these lots to do this. DO NOT AMEND TO ADD THE GARAGE PLACEMENT DESIGN OR.

From: Jason Oliver

Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 3:48 PM

To: Moore, Andrew; bc-Angela.PineyroDeHoyos@austintexas.gov; Kazi, Faye - BC; Anderson, Greg - BC; Shieh, James - BC; Mathias, Jayme - BC; Thompson, Jeffrey - BC; Vela, Jose - BC; McGraw, Karen - BC; Seeger, Patricia - BC; Oliver, Stephen - BC; Nuckols, Tom - BC; White, Trinity - BC; Burkhardt, William - BC; Zaragoza, Nuria - BC; Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Opposed to Items 5 and 6 on tonight's agenda (NPA-2017-0013.01 & C14-2017-0026 - Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Plan Area-Wide Garage Placement)

Commissioners,

As a property owner in the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood for 20 years I am writing to oppose this amendment on the grounds it is not appropriate for Bouldin Creek and as indicated at the March 29th meeting a large majority of Bouldinites in attendance and via emailed opposed it as well (28 to 10) and on similar grounds, which I'll reiterate.

This amendment will severely constrict building options as a large majority of lots in Bouldin creek are 50 feet wide, don't have alley access nor on a street corner, setting garages back will increase unnecessary impervious cover and then throw in some protected trees limiting even more buildable area and/or building options. This new requirement will effectively limit most lots to one car garages at best and limit the other City required off street parking space to be the drive way or in a paved portion of the front yard. Is this more "people centric and less car dominate" as this tool was hyped in the Neighborhood's October/November 2016 newsletter? Seeing cars in front of homes? Or worse forcing more cars to park on Bouldin's congested streets? I'd also like to add the the picture shown for the amendment is for a 40 foot wide house with a 20 foot wide garage (the minimum width to park 2 cars). This only works for a 70 foot wide lot, minimum. Again, Bouldin Creek has quite a few lots only 50 foot wide.

So, why am I just now objecting to the amendment? I honestly did not know until March of this year. Our lot is vacant, raw land, so we never received the personally delivered notices from the neighborhood. Should I have been on the neighborhood's email list? Hindsight is 20/20. I didn't receive notice until the City delivered it to my TCAD address, which is likely true for some other Bouldinites. I would argue the neighborhood needs to go the extra mile on delivering notices especially when it involves restricting their neighbor's land rights.

If the amendment is not voted down I respectfully request that the vote be at least postponed so studies can be preformed to show the impact this amendment will have on Bouldin Creek's narrow interior lots with protected trees.

Sincerely,

Jason Oliver

From: Reid Fleming
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 3:48 PM
To: Moore, Andrew
Cc: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: DISSAPPROVAL of Bouldin Garage Tool Adoption NPA-2017-0013.01/C14-2017-0026

Hello,

My name is Reid Fleming. I live in the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood on Jewell St. I wanted to express my extreme **disapproval** of the adoption of the garage tool.

I would much rather look at a pretty wooden garage door than a driveway full of cars and streets lined as far as the eye can see with automobiles.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I appreciate your time.

Regards,

Reid Fleming

From: Marcela Sanz Blanco
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 8:28 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Cc: Stephen.Oliver@austintexas.gov
Subject: oppose NPA-2017-0013.1 Bouldin

City of Austin Officials,

I am writing this email to strongly **oppose NPA-2017-0013.1** which adds restrictions to the building of carports and garages.

This proposal by/ or being pushed by the Bouldin Neighborhood Association has not taken into account the needs of all of the people who live in this neighborhood. In addition to that, I am against any proposal that does not come from the majority of the neighbors in Bouldin regardless if they are active in the neighborhood association or not.

When we moved to this neighborhood we tried to be active in the Bouldin Association meetings but since they commonly complain about any new buildings or modifications I did not feel welcome in those meetings since my house was build in the last 15 years and I think the people in the neighborhood are against anything new.

One of the reasons we moved to this neighborhood is precisely the freedom of building or modifying your house however you wanted within City limitations. This garage restrictions will only apply to Bouldin neighborhood and it feels like it is turning into a Home Owners Association when we really did not buy our house to limitations from Home owners associations.

I do not have a carport or garage and this proposal will greatly impact us if we ever want to build a garage or a carport in the future. This will also impact most of the neighbors in my street as the majority of the people in my street does not have carports or garages and as a matter of fact only a couple of houses in my entire block have a garage or a carport.

I hope that wen reviewing this proposal, the city takes into account all the tax payer neighbors of Bouldin, and not only the ones that have the interest in passing this proposal so that the neighborhood does not change a single bit.

Sincerely,

Marcela Sanz Blanco
1711 S 5th St.
Austin, Tx,
78704

---Original Message-----

From: Robert Wenner
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 5:54 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen; Stephen.Oliver@austintexas.gov
Subject: NPA-2017-0013.1

Mrs Meredith, Mr Oliver:

neighbors mentioned that NPA-2017-0013.1 would regulate how house and garage or car port can be aligned.

You probably had good reasons for this in mind, but it would be a mess for us. Our house is set back from the street and we park on our property in front of the house. While we have no plans for a carport or garage, it would be nice to keep such an option open.

We cannot build on the side of the house as there is just not enough room. Moving the house is clearly not an option, either.

I oppose NPA-2017-0013.1 Please do not pass NPA-2017-0013.1.

Thanks and regards.

Robert Wenner

From: M Sinclair Stevens
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 12:57 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Comments for Planning Commission Meeting May 23, 2017

Attached is a pdf of my comments opposed to the BCNA Garage Placement rules that will come before tonight's Planning Commission Meeting.

Based on our conversation earlier today, I hope that you can include it with the packet for the Planning Commission. I printed it 4-up on pdf in order to reduce the page count. (I don't have Powerpoint).

If this format doesn't work for you, let me know and I'll try to convert it to something that does work.

Thanks for all your help.

Melissa Sinclair Stevens
604 Bouldin Ave

BCNA Garage

First Rule of Design (in general)

Start with the problem and seek the best solution for each context.

Don't start with a solution and impose it on the all contexts. One size does not fit all.


First Rule of Design (in architecture)

Consider the site.

- ◆ Topography
- ◆ Trees
- ◆ Dimensions

Lot Dimensions: Theoretical Lot


7500 square foot lot: 75'x100'



Bungalow and Garage on Theoretical Lot

A typical 1600 square foot bungalow and 400 square foot garage.


Important. As the 20 foot garage is not "more than" 50% of the 40 foot face of the house, this garage would not have to be pushed back.



Lot Dimensions: Typical Bouldin Lot


7500* square foot lot: 50'x150'

* Many lots in Bouldin are smaller than 7500 square feet.




Bungalow and Garage on Typical Boulder Lot

However on a typical Boulder lot, the same configuration would put the garage in the neighbor's yard.



Setback is Irrelevant


And no matter how far you pushed it back, it would still be in your neighbor's yard.



Proposal Necessitates Alley or Side Access

To build the same garage with the same bungalow as shown in the proposal on a typical Boulder lot, we'd have to put the garage completely behind the house.

For all the lots that do not have side-access or alley access, there would be no way to get our car in the garage.




Unintended Consequence

Because there is no way to build a garage or carport on a typical lot with a typical bungalow under this proposal, it will result in **more** bungalows being scraped, not less.

Bungalow Scraped and New House Set Back

In order to build on a garage or carport, we'd have to knock down the bungalow.

The house setback would now be 45' from the street, making it more expensive to run utilities and reducing size of the back yard. (Reduces affordability).




Front Entry Not Allowed

This design would not be allowed.



Side Entry Necessitates More Paving

Moreover, the proposed restrictions require that a garage in the front be side-loading. This increases the amount of impervious cover a 400 square feet. That's the expense of 400 square feet of paving at the reduction of usable yard space for plants or play.




Narrow the House and Create Private Paved Alley

Another solution would be leave the house at a 25 foot setback but make it narrower.

When ten feet is allowed for a driveway, the same 1600 square foot bungalow would have dimensions of about 30x53.

However, the amount of impervious cover is increased by 730 square feet.



1403 South 6th Street

This is what this proposal will result in: a concrete alleyway between every house.



This proposal is so broadly written that it will stop all sorts of innovative approaches to garages and carports while not achieving its ulterior motive: to prevent new construction that looks like this.

Whether or not you agree with that objective, the result of this proposal will result in more bungalows being scraped because it will be impossible to build a garage or carport any other way.

We have a rich variety of house and garage styles in our neighborhood, where almost every house is individual and different. How many existing houses in our neighborhood have a garage or carport that could meet these regulations if they were built today?

From: David Smith

Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 1:30 PM

To: Oliver, Stephen - BC; Kazi, Faye - BC; McGraw, Karen - BC; Nuckols, Tom - BC; DeHoyosHart, Angela - BC; Schissler, James - BC; Seeger, Patricia - BC; Shieh, James - BC; Thompson, Jeffrey - BC; Vela, Jose - BC; White, Trinity - BC; Zaragoza, Nuria - BC; Burkhardt, William - BC; Anderson, Greg - BC; Mendoza, Richard [AW]

Cc: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: NPA-2017-0013.1 - Garage Placement Tool in Bouldin Creek

Commissioners,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed adoption of the Garage Placement Tool in the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood. I already have a two car garage letting out to an alley at the back of my property. Adoption of this tool will have little direct impact on me.

The main reason for my opposition to this proposal is the **profoundly undemocratic and unrepresentative** way in which it was pursued. This proposal appears to be advocated by two individuals who are active in the Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association (BCNA). I am not active in the BCNA myself but have not, until now, taken issue with the organization.

In this case, the BCNA has misrepresented the nature and efficacy of the steps they took to perform outreach. Upon researching the matter, I discovered several votes by small groups which included Mr. Strange and sometimes Mr. Walton who both favor this proposal. The BCNA managed to have this proposal passed in a meeting attended by only 12-13 members of the community where, after a year of "outreach," the proposal passed by a vote of only 6-4. Both Mr. Strange and Mr. Walton attended this meeting and may represent the two votes that are imposing this regulation on 1600 properties.

During your meeting on April 23, Commissioners asked Mr. Strange if it would be possible for "latecomers" to the discussion to meet with the BCNA Zoning committee. **Mr. Strange replied "absolutely" but refused to hold such a meeting despite the fact that I asked him to do so several times.** Finally, Mr. Walton, who was copied on the email exchanges, agreed to allow me to meet with "a smaller group" which actually turned out to be Mr. Strange and Mr. Walton.

In 2016 the City of Austin conducted an audit of the Neighborhood Planning Process and discovered **numerous problems with lack of representation**. Passing this proposal will simply be another example of a few individuals imposing their will on a much larger community, a problem which the City's Audit Department has already communicated to you. **Please do not let this happen and vote against the proposal.**

Thank you,

David Smith
1708 South 5th St.
Austin, TX 78704

From: Marcela Sanz Blanco
Sent: Sunday, June 11, 2017 5:30 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen; stephen.oliver@austintexas.gov
Cc: James.Shieh@austintexas.gov; Fayez.Kazi@austintexas.gov; Greg.Anderson@austintexas.gov; William.Burkhardt@austintexas.gov; Angela.PineyroDeHoyos@austintexas.gov; Jayme.Mathias@austintexas.gov; Karen.McGraw@austintexas.gov; Tom.Nuckols@austintexas.gov; Patricia.Seeger@austintexas.gov; Jeffrey.Thompson@austintexas.gov; Jose.Vela@austintexas.gov; rinity.White@austintexas.gov; nuria.zaragoza@austintexas.gov
Subject: Oposing NPA-2017-0013.1 Bouldin Garage Placement / Carport Ban

Commissioners,

I am writing to oppose the NPA-2017-0013.1 Bouldin garage placement rule.
We do not have a carport/garage and this rule will affect us directly if we ever want to build one in the future.
Decisions on city planning should be based on regulations that will benefit the majority of the people living in the city and not promoted by a small group of people without the consultation of affected neighbors.
I do not see how these proposed regulations are going to help our neighborhood and the future of the city.

Sincerely,
Marcela Sanz Blanco
S. 5th. St.

From: Erin McGann
Sent: Saturday, June 10, 2017 3:41 PM
To: Erin McGann
Cc: Oliver, Stephen - BC; DeHoyosHart, Angela - BC; Meredith, Maureen; Shieh, James - BC; Kazi, Fayez - BC; Anderson, Greg - BC; Burkhardt, William - BC; Mathias, Jayme - BC; McGraw, Karen - BC; Nuckols, Tom - BC; Seeger, Patricia - BC; Thompson, Jeffrey - BC; Vela, Jose - BC; White, Trinity - BC; Zaragoza, Nuria - BC; j8oliver@ pablo_rey@; msinclirstevens@; tredly@; apovedano@; mar_blanco@; dsmith@; bendstark@; cat@; aaron.mcgarra@
Subject: NPA-2017-0013.1 Bouldin Garage Placement / Carport Ban

Commissioners,

I am writing against the garage amendment.
1) This has been presented as making houses more neighborly. There is no evidence that the placement of your garage or carport on your property makes one more or less neighborly.
2) BCNA is attempting to put "taste" on the line. A completely subjective topic that should only be mandated in neighborhoods with covenants.
3) CodeNext is being assessed right now. It is supposed to simplify building code. Adding this Garage Tool in now will confuse the issue.

Erin McGann
S 3rd street

78704

From: Murray Freeman

Sent: Saturday, June 10, 2017 10:09 AM

To: Oliver, Stephen - BC; DeHoyosHart, Angela - BC; Meredith, Maureen; Shieh, James - BC; Kazi, Fayez - BC; Anderson, Greg - BC; Burkhardt, William - BC; Mathias, Jayme - BC; McGraw, Karen - BC; Nuckols, Tom - BC; Nuckols, Tom - BC; Seeger, Patricia - BC; Thompson, Jeffrey - BC; Vela, Jose - BC; White, Trinity - BC; Zaragoza, Nuria - BC

Cc: j8oliver@; pablo_rey@; msinclirstevens@; tredly@ apovedano@; mar_blanco@yahoo.com; dsmith@; bendstark@; cat@ aaron.mcgarra@; Erin McGann

Subject: NPA-2017-0013.1 Bouldin Garage Placement / Carport Ban

Hello Commissioners!

I would like to register my objection to the Garage Placement Rule adaptation in Bouldin, I submitted my objection in time when the CoA mailing went out, here is a refresh based on conversations with dozens of concerned owners here. After that CoA mailing - I contacted 20 of my immediate neighbors and many of them sent emails with objections, not one neighbor was in favor of the garage placement rule. Please note - 50% of the lots near me are less than 50 ft wide.

I attended the original Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association meeting one year ago - in which claims were made by the presenter - that garages created poor community. No reference to support that statement was given. This was a complete surprise to have this rule come up.

Photos of greenfield built houses on almost treeless 70 ft wide lots in new suburbs were presented that look nothing like Bouldin Creek. Essentially places with zero walkability scores, then after a brief discussion a vote was held. No time was allocated for any other viewpoint to be researched and presented at a follow up meeting. Neighborhood rules prevent many from attending from voting, specifically first time visitors. It passed. Yet fewer than 2% of Owners in Bouldin ever heard of this rule, and less than 1.5% voted in favor. After this meeting, little was done to inform people, until the City letter was sent 9 months later.

At no time did BCNA provide any opportunity for a counter presentation, nor any kind of study of the impact at any time.

Bouldin has dozens of destinations for food and services that we visit all the time on foot, the width of the garage has no relevance to community or walkability if there are destinations. The CoA has zoned much of Austin to be unwalkable - garage width will not fix that.

Mandating the width of a garage - or more importantly banning carports - does nothing to improve community. It creates a group of privileged properties that predate these restrictions - hundreds of properties that have garages, setbacks, design elements that contribute to the overall look of Bouldin - but are prohibited in new construction. Many of the BCNA old-timers, own properties with cool grandfathered attributes - including front facing garages right on the curb - that are prohibited in new construction. We find that to be a conflict.

I own a carport that would be prohibited for my neighbors to reproduce under these rules, it uses solar panels for a roof, it has little street impact and everyone who sees it praises it. It reduced impervious cover, reduced heat islands, it isn't clear why Austin would want to ban structures like this. The Garage Placement Rule causes an increase in impervious cover too. I welcome anyone to stop by and view it.

We are completely baffled by this rule, by the process used to promote it, and by the disregard for real world, physical lots vs a tidy schematic hypothetical greenfield architectural rendering used to justify this rule.

Best Regards

Murray Freeman
616 W Monroe
Austin Tx 78704

--

CITY OF AUSTIN PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 13, 2017

PROPOSAL TO ADOPT THE "GARAGE PLACEMENT DESIGN TOOL" IN THE BOULDIN CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD
DAVID SMITH, NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENT – IN OPPOSITION

A FLAWED OUTCOME FROM A FLAWED AND UNREPRESENTATIVE PROCESS

A LACK OF OUTREACH AND INCLUSION

"So called" BCNA Outreach

- Multiple notifications on "neighborhood" listserv
- Notifications in two issues of neighborhood association newsletter
- Two public meetings of the BCNA
- Votes by three "review" bodies within the BCNA
- Review and a vote by Neighborhood Plan Contact Team
- Review and approval by the City Small Area Plan Joint Committee

Actual Results

- Emails to those who sign up for BCNA a Yahoo email replication / distribution tool that is essentially "spam"
- One article and a one sentence blurb
- Discussion by attendees at BCNA meetings (number of attendees unknown)
- Votes by BCNA sub-committees including one chaired by Mr. Strange
- Mr. Strange is a member, Mr. Walton is the Secretary and the chairman believes tool is bludgeon as opposed to a scalpel (**passed 6 vs 2**)
- Vote taken by City Committee addressed by BCNA president Mr. Walton (who spoke in opposition?)

**THIS IS NOT OUTREACH, THIS IS A ECHO CHAMBER WHERE THE SAME FEW
BCNA MEMBERS TALK TO THEMSELVES**

NOVEMBER 2016, CITY AUDIT OF NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

"THE CITY'S NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING EFFORTS ARE INEQUITABLE AND HAVE LACKED ROBUST AND REPRESENTATIVE PARTICIPATION."

As summarized in the Austin American Stateman:

- "Only 13 of 30 neighborhood plans were approved by more than 1 percent of the neighborhood's population. In one case, only 19 residents participated in crafting a plan that affected a neighborhood with nearly 13,000 residents."
- Rental units accounted for 82 percent of the housing in one neighborhood, but only two renters were included in the plan's drafting."
- "Only five of 31 "contact teams" provided "complete information" — such as date, time and place — for upcoming meetings."

As summarized in the Austin American Stateman (continued)

- "The bylaws for 30 of the 31 contact teams the city auditor reviewed contained 'barriers to voter eligibility.'"
- While the city code required these committees to provide contact and membership information to the city's Planning and Zoning Department each year, there were no city sanctions for noncompliance until a new ordinance was approved in January.

THE CITY KNOWS THAT PARTICIPATION AND REPRESENTATION HAVE BEEN CHALLENGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

IS THIS REALLY WHAT BOULDIN WANTS?

City Outreach

- Mailing by Neighborhood Planning Department
- Public meeting conducted by Neighborhood Planning Department
- Proposal placed on April 25th Planning Commission consent agenda and subsequently delayed

Result

- Thousands of people informed of proposal, numerous complaints and active discussion begins on BCNA listserv
- 12-13 members of the community attend, 4 were members of the Contact Team, one was a spouse (5 of 12)
 - After one year of "outreach" proposal supported by BCNA gains approval at meeting by 6 votes to 4
 - 2 votes decided for a neighborhood of 1600 homes
- Commission grants delay and receives 28 messages of opposition vs. 12 in favor (one from a contact team spouse) now support exceeds 50 people opposed

- The proposal has a huge impact on an unrestricted/uncovenanted neighborhood that affects hundreds of property owners and over \$800 million of our most valuable assets, our homes
- The BCNA may be well intentioned but they are a completely voluntary organization, have no authority and purport to speak for the neighborhood while actually seeking to impose their will
- This Commission cannot in good conscience approve this proposal without proof that it is supported by the community and no such proof has been presented