

BOB THOMPSON

109/110

**Rough Tally of Nature of Feedback within Email Thread entitled Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood (Aug. 19 - Aug. 22, 2013)**

**Responders Critical of Developers' Proposed Plans (see attached emails)**

---

**Hiliary Dyer  
Robin Heart Shepperd  
Patricia Fiske  
Geoff Harter  
Beth Brannon  
Marci Roberts  
Brian King  
Dona Williamson  
Steve Lacker  
J. Redagain**

**Late Backup**

**Note: There were at least 3 responders favorable to Developers' Proposed Plans, including Andrea Smith & Dr. Greg Frebourg, Cullen Hanks, Andy McCasland**

**There were also at least 3 fairly neutral responses.**

Subj: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/19/2013 10:53:18 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Hello Fellow Members of the SLNA:

My name is Claudia Cuchia, my husband, Johnny, & I are members of SLNA. Johnny and I own property at 3504 Clawson Road and we are in the process of purchasing the property located at 3903 Clawson Road. We have been trying for several months to get the zoning changed at 3903 & 3907 Clawson Road so we can do a joint development with the owner of 3907 Clawson Road.

The City of Austin Staff has recommended the zoning change and we went before the Planning Commission who voted 5-2 to approve the zoning change. We have also been to the last two SLNA meetings with the purpose of informing the members of SLNA of the merits of changing the zoning. It is our desire to improve the neighborhood. The current zoning on these two properties is SF3 and the request is for a SF5 on 3907 and SF6 on 3903. These two lots will be developed with or without the zoning change but the development will be much more desirable and beneficial to the neighborhood if the zoning is approved since the properties can be developed under a unified plan. This will allow a better use of the land and will have only one entrance/exit on Clawson Road instead of two separate driveways if the properties are developed individually. Additional benefits will include sidewalks, additional green space and the protection of more trees. However, just tonight, I learned that certain members of SLNA have started a petition drive to try to stop the zoning change of our property and the property next door at 3907 Clawson.

If you would like additional information on the zoning cases or the planned development of these two lots please feel free to call me for more information. We need your support for this zoning change so we can make these positive changes to the neighborhood. Please reply to this message if you are willing to support our zoning change.

Thanks very much for you time,

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
 GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
 1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
 Austin, Texas. 78758  
 512.799.0801 - Mobile  
 512.327.0807 - Office  
 512.448.3625 - Fax

[REDACTED] my iPad

[Reply via web post](#) [Reply to sender](#) [Reply to group](#) [Start a New Topic](#) [Messages in this topic \(1\)](#)

**RECENT ACTIVITY:**

[Visit Your Group](#)

+REMEMBER, Hitting REPLY will go just to the author, REPLY ALL will send your response to all SLNA group

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

**Subj:** Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
**Date:** 8/20/2013 7:26:11 A.M. Central Daylight Time  
**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]

Hi Claudia,

Thanks for reaching out to the neighborhood about your project. When I bought my home in SLNA, I made an investment in a single-family home, in a single-family neighborhood with the expectation that the zoning would remain consistent throughout the years. After all, isn't that the purpose of zoning? Many, many of us chose to live in SLNA with that same mindset, and have put our life's savings into our homes, our biggest investment. Now we see developer after developer come into our neighborhood with the purpose of tearing down old homes and building dense condos, all with the expectation of a zoning change so they can increase the number of units, and make more and more money. I have no problem with someone, especially a SLNA owner and resident, doing whatever they want with their property within the current zoning, and if they make gobs of money in the process, more power to them. But we constantly hear developers say, without even the slightest hint of irony, "but if I don't get the zoning change, I can't make any money!" It sounds like a teenager buying a fancy car and saying, "but I can't make the payments!" Obviously, they shouldn't buy the property then, should they?

So I fully support your project, and I am understanding your proposed benefit to the neighborhood is a sidewalk in front of it, green space, and trees - that's great. And I would be supportive of a zoning change provided the number of units stays the same as it is in the current zoning. Is that the case?

Thanks,  
 Hilary

---

**From:** Claudia [REDACTED]  
**To:** "SouthLamarNA@yahoogroups.com" [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 10:51 PM  
**Subject:** [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Hello Fellow Members of the SLNA:

My name is Claudia Cuchia, my husband, Johnny, & I are members of SLNA. Johnny and I own property at 3504 Clawson Road and we are in the process of purchasing the property located at 3903 Clawson Road. We have been trying for several months to get the zoning changed at 3903 & 3907 Clawson Road so we can do a joint development with the owner of 3907 Clawson Road.

The City of Austin Staff has recommended the zoning change and we went before the Planning Commission who voted 5-2 to approve the zoning change. We have also been to the last two SLNA meetings with the purpose of informing the members of SLNA of the merits of changing the zoning. It is our desire to improve the neighborhood. The current zoning on these two properties is SF3 and the request is for a SF5 on 3907 and SF6 on 3903. These two lots will be developed with or without the zoning change but the development will be much more desirable and beneficial to the neighborhood if the zoning is approved since the properties can be developed under a unified plan. This will allow a better use of the land and will have only one entrance/exit on Clawson Road instead of two separate driveways if the properties are developed individually. Additional benefits will include sidewalks, additional green space and the protection of more trees. However, just tonight, I learned that certain

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: [SLNA] Re: Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 10:51:56 A.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]  
 To: [REDACTED]

Fellow neighbors, I have known Claudia and Johnny for several years now and have seen and in fact leased properties they have built.

Gold Key Builders is a local builder who invests where they live. The properties Johnny has built are beautiful, and well maintained with attention to natural aesthetics. He personally maintains his commercial properties, both of which are on S. Lamar. (Although one of the commercial sites was torn down to make way for a gargantuan apartment complex). :(

I also have friends who recently purchased a duplex-condo, on the north side, from Johnny and Claudia, and they love the property. I am sure if you asked Johnny for references, you too would understand the value these properties can bring to a neighborhood.

We look forward to adding the new and beautiful garden homes they have proposed near my house on Clawson. Contact either Claudia or Johnny if you have any questions about this great addition to our neighborhood.

Cheers!

Andrea Smith & Dr. Greg Frebourg  
 Clawson Rd

[Reply via web post](#) [Reply to sender](#) [Reply to group](#) [Start a New Topic](#) [Messages in this topic \(6\)](#)

#### RECENT ACTIVITY:

[Visit Your Group](#)

+REMEMBER, Hitting REPLY will go just to the author, REPLY ALL will send your response to all SLNA group members (and anyone else who may have been cc'd). Should your response be sent to the entire group or just the author?

+REMEMBER Please CHANGE THE SUBJECT LINE of your email every time you post. Reflect what you just posted, not the previous post! It is actually best to start a NEW email rather than a Reply. This avoids reposting a previous email and creates a new Subject line.

Visit <http://www.southlamar.org> for more neighborhood resources!

\*Opinions expressed here are those of the individual making the post, not of the SLNA.

**YAHOO! GROUPS**

[Switch to: Text-Only](#) • [Daily Digest](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#) • [Send us Feedback](#)

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 11:43:31 A.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]  
 CC: [REDACTED]

Robin - Perhaps you are a little confused. The 78758 address is a business address. We currently live in southeast Austin approximately 4 miles from Clawson Road. Johnny and I intend to move into the house at 3903 Clawson when we close on the property. We intend to build our house on that property. We will be living in the very project we intend to build. I travel Clawson almost daily so I am aware of the road conditions.

I'm sorry but I disagree with your premise that our project will make Clawson Road more dangerous. Building sidewalks and road improvements have to start somewhere and our project will put a sidewalk on a street that could use more sidewalks. I met with some of the City Council members and their staff and they advised me that more development of Clawson Road would bring attention to the road changes we all desire. As far as the trees go they can be cut down if a fee is paid to the city. Also, a fee can be paid in lieu of a sidewalk. Our project will improve the neighborhood and increase property values. Our project will offer families a place to live where they can have backyards for their children to play. Most of the projects currently being built in the SLNA area do not offer yards. Our project provides on site parking for the residents and their visitors. There will be no parking on Clawson Road.

We have the support of City Staff & the City Planning Commission voted 5 -2 in favor of our project. We have the support of several City Council Members. I am seeking support from SLNA. I appreciate all positive feedback I have received from members of SLNA and I will present your emails at the City Council meeting on Thursday.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Clau dia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
 GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
 1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
 Austin, Texas. 78758  
 512.799.0801 - Mobile  
 512.327.0807 - Office  
 512.448.3625 - Fax

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 9:54 AM, Robin Heart Shepperd <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello Claudia,

Perhaps you don't understand that every new builder is required to add a sidewalk and to not cut down all the trees. I fail to see how those of us who might support your project makes that any different. I see that your address is in the 78758 zone, so just because you own the lots and you have joined the SLNA doesn't mean that you live in our neighborhood or care about the challenges we are having with packing more and more residents into our neighborhood. Clawson is already a dangerous road for foot and bicycle riders. Your planned changes will make it more so.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 12:17:19 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Hilary:

Thank you for responding to my email. We are only requesting one additional duplex and that is to help defray the cost of the City required infrastructure. These expenses include but are not limited to fire hydrant, turn around space for emergency vehicles including fire trucks and a detention pond.

I hope this answers any questions you have regarding our need for the additional unit. We have also agreed to several concessions with regard to our project, we have agreed to sign a Restrictive Covenant limiting these properties to the units that we are requesting. This agreement will attach to the land in perpetuity. No one will ever be able to increase the density on these two pieces of property, no apartment complex will be allowed in the future. We also agreed to a lower the zoning request on 3903. And, in addition we have agreed that we will not put a gated entrance on Clawson Road.

If you have any more concerns or questions please feel free to call me.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
 GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
 1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
 Austin, Texas. 78758  
 512.799.0801 - Mobile  
 512.327.0807 - Office  
 512.448.3625 - Fax  
 [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 7:25 AM, Hilary Dyer [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Claudia,

Thanks for reaching out to the neighborhood about your project. When I bought my home in SLNA, I made an investment in a single-family home, in a single-family neighborhood with the expectation that the zoning would remain consistent throughout the years. After all, isn't that the purpose of zoning? Many, many of us chose to live in SLNA with that same mindset, and have put our life's savings into our homes, our biggest investment. Now we see developer after developer come into our neighborhood with the purpose of tearing down old homes and building dense condos, all with the expectation of a zoning change so they can increase the number of units, and make more and more money. I have no problem with someone, especially a SLNA owner and resident, doing whatever they want with their property within the current zoning, and if they make gobs of money in the process, more power to them. But we constantly hear developers say, without even the slightest hint of irony, "but if I don't get the zoning change, I can't make any money!" It sounds like a teenager buying a fancy car and saying, "but I can't make the payments!" Obviously, they shouldn't buy the property then, should they?

So I fully support your project, and I am understanding your proposed benefit to the neighborhood is a sidewalk in front of it, green space, and trees - that's great. And I would be supportive of a zoning change provided the

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 12:30:53 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

Thanks Claudia. This clears it up. Doesn't look like the NA got this one.

This is a great area to live in with lots of close amenities.

---

On Tue, 8/20/13, Claudia [REDACTED] wrote:

Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
To: "Justin Scanio" [REDACTED]  
Date: Tuesday, August 20, 2013, 8:59 AM

Justin:

Great question, however, where we live now is not as important as where we are going to build our home.

It is our intent to live at 3903 Clawson Road.

We have several friends that live on Clawson Road and this location is near to both of our office complexes.

We love the area, it is near Maudie's and the Green Mesquite, two of our favorite restaurants.

We can hardly wait to move into the house currently at 3903. We will live in that house until we can build our new home. I hope that answers your question.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR GOLD KEY

BUILDERS1901 Albury Cove, Unit

AAustin, Texas. 78758512.799.0801 -

Mobile512.327.0807 -

Office512.448.3625 - [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 8:07 AM, Justin Scanio [REDACTED] wrote:

Subj: [SLNA] Fwd: Emailing: Clawson Patio Homes Proposed Site Plan  
 Date: 8/20/2013 12:53:42 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

**Resent-From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** August 20, 2013, 12:40:27 PM CDT

**Resent-To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject: Re: Emailing: Clawson Patio Homes Proposed Site Plan**

Colin - Clawson Road will be our neighborhood. We intend to live in the very project we are building. I moved to south Austin in 1979 (before MoPac existed) and Johnny has lived in Austin since 1962. He attended Baker elementary, McCallum High School and UT. He has lived in south Austin most of his life. So we have seen our share of changes in Austin. I know a changing Austin is hard for some people to accept. I know some people want Austin to remain a sleepy little hippy community but the truth is Austin is changing and will continue to change in the future. Our project falls in line with the City planners vision of Austin's future. "Imagine Austin" calls for more people to live closer to downtown for ease of traffic and less fuel consumption. This allows more people to bike to work or catch a bus. It allows people a better quality of life and we agree with their vision.

If you are happy with Clawson Road in its current state, with no sidewalks and no curbs & gutters then you can always oppose any improvements to the neighborhood, however, if you would like sidewalks and such improvements as curbs & gutters, some new developments must come to Clawson Road otherwise the City of Austin will have no incentive to make improvements to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your response,  
 Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
 GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
 1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
 Austin, Texas. 78758  
 512.799.0801 - Mobile  
 512.327.0807 - Office  
 512.448.3625 - Fax  
 [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 9:20 AM, Colin Ratliff [REDACTED] > wrote:

Johnny

Thanks. I'll take a look. I was asking that you share this with the group. A developer/ contractor/ realty company making personal appeals to a neighborhood that has already seen so much change in such a short period does not go over well. If you want support you'll have to look at things from the neighborhood's perspective and address their concerns. Otherwise, you'll have people coming out of the woodwork to oppose your plans. I'm not one to oppose any and all development.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308



Subj: **Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood**  
Date: **8/20/2013 1:28:24 P.M. Central Daylight Time**  
From: [REDACTED]

Claudia, with all due respect, you are using circular logic to make your argument and in doing so, have exactly made my case: the "city required" infrastructure is costing you more money, so you have to add more units beyond what you are currently allowed in order to pay for it. As developers, you knew what infrastructure would be required before you bought the property. Let's be clear, the city is doing what we ask the city to do – make sure that new infill development does not negatively impact the existing homes by requiring the additional infrastructure needed to support new development. I take issue with your inference that the city is making you do this. As a developer this is part of your job, and I would certainly hope you would add the needed infrastructure whether the city required it or not. Having to change zoning so you can add more units than currently allowed just so you can defray your building costs is a hollow argument.

With reference to Clawson, a short sidewalk is a useful addition but seriously won't do anything to help safety. As more condo developments go in along Clawson, compounded with what is going in on Lightsey and Del Curto, the road will only get more dangerous.

Again, I would fully support your development if you kept it within the current zoning.

---

From: Claudia [REDACTED]  
To: Hilary Dyer [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 12:11 PM  
Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Hilary:

Thank you for responding to my email. We are only requesting one additional duplex and that is to help defray the cost of the City required infrastructure. These expenses include but are not limited to fire hydrant, turn around space for emergency vehicles including fire trucks and a detention pond.

I hope this answers any questions you have regarding our need for the additional unit. We have also agreed to several concessions with regard to our project, we have agreed to sign a Restrictive Covenant limiting these properties to the units that we are requesting. This agreement will attach to the land in perpetuity. No one will ever be able to increase the density on these two pieces of property, no apartment complex will be allowed in the future. We also agreed to a lower the zoning request on 3903. And, in addition we have agreed that we will not put a gated entrance on Clawson Road.

If you have any more concerns or questions please feel free to call me.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
GOLD KEY BUILDERS

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 1:28:31 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

Hilary:

The City is not doing what you asked it to do in this case. The increased cost of the infrastructure is because we are unifying the lots for a more aesthetic and desirable community. Also it allows us to use one driveway approach on Clawson Road instead of two. In addition, Johnny & I will add a detention pond on our lot that is not currently required. That is an tremendous added expense.

When meeting with the City Council members and their staff we were advised by these people that the City does not like flag lots and that is exactly how the land will have to be developed if we don't do a unified project with the owner of 3907 Clawson. This will mean two driveways and separate utilities for each project. The detention pond is not required on our lot. More concrete will be used on the projects because Mr. Chen will have to have his driveway and we will have to have one of our own.

From your response, I understand you don't like change and that you will not be supporting our project on Clawson. I guess we can agree to disagree. Thank you for your response anyway.

See you at the next SLNA meeting.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
Austin, Texas. 78758  
512.799.0801 - Mobile  
512.327.0807 - Office  
512.448.3625 - Fax  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 12:53 PM, Hilary Dyer [REDACTED] wrote:

Claudia, with all due respect, you are using circular logic to make your argument and in doing so, have exactly made my case: the "city required" infrastructure is costing you more money, so you have to add more units beyond what you are currently allowed in order to pay for it. As developers, you knew what infrastructure would be required before you bought the property. Let's be clear, the city is doing what we ask the city to do – make sure that new infill development does not negatively impact the existing homes by requiring the additional infrastructure needed to support new development. I take issue with your inference that the city is making you do this. As a developer this is part of your job, and I would certainly hope you would add the needed infrastructure whether the city required it or not. Having to change zoning so you can add more units than currently allowed just so you can defray your building costs is a hollow argument.

With reference to Clawson, a short sidewalk is a useful addition but seriously won't do anything to help safety. As more condo developments go in along Clawson, compounded with what is going in on Lightsey and Del Curto, the road will only get more dangerous.

Again, I would fully support your development if you kept it within the current zoning.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 1:31:21 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: cecuchia@yahoo.com  
To: [REDACTED]

**From:** Claudia [REDACTED]  
**Date:** August 20, 2013, 9:31:12 AM CDT  
**To:** Bradley Harrington [REDACTED]  
**Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood**

Bradley - if we get our zoning change, there will only be one driveway on to Clawson Road, otherwise there will be two because the lots will be developed individually. There will be more green space, trees. etc. because there will be less concrete infrastructure. We will be sharing a common driveway.

If you look at our plan you can see that we have less density on the 3907 lot than there is on the houses located on Greyford.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR&nb sp;  
GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
Austin, Texas. 78758  
512.799.0801 - Mobile  
512.327.0807 - Office  
512.448.3625 - Fax  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 9:03 AM, Bradley Harrington [REDACTED] wrote:

Claudia,

Could you explain how two driveways are better than one? Also, how would joining to the adjacent property add more "sidewalks, additional green space and the protection of more trees" than if the lots were developed individually?

Thank you,  
Bradley

On Tue, Aug 20, 2013 at 8:07 AM, Justin Scanio [REDACTED] wrote:

Claudia,

You said that you own 3504 Clawson, but can you tell us where you live since a house does not exist at this address?

Thanks,

Justin

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 1:58:48 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

Claudia,

Snappiness is not furthering your case among the neighborhood, as people read your emails. Nor is sarcasm. While I was not a part of the circulation of the petition, and have not seen it, I am more inclined to sign it due to your hostile attitude.

As we have all learned, city council rarely has our best interests at heart when they wheel and deal with builders. We, the people that actually live here, cannot help but notice the ever-increasing traffic on Clawson. And if we agree to the changed designation, others will follow. Since I have worked on getting sidewalks here for more than 10 years, I highly doubt that your project is going to favorably change any of the minds of the powers that be.

Robin

On Aug 20, 2013, at 11:42 AM, Claudia wrote:

Robin - Perhaps you are a little confused. The 78758 address is a business address. We currently live in southeast Austin approximately 4 miles from Clawson Road. Johnny and I intend to move into the house at 3903 Clawson when we close on the property. We intend to build our house on that property. We will be living in the very project we intend to build. I travel Clawson almost daily so I am aware of the road conditions.

I'm sorry but I disagree with your premise that our project will make Clawson Road more dangerous. Building sidewalks and road improvements have to start somewhere and our project will put a sidewalk on a street that could use more sidewalks. I met with some of the City Council members and their staff and they advised me that more development of Clawson Road would bring attention to the road changes we all desire. As far as the trees go they can be cut down if a fee is paid to the city. Also, a fee can be paid in lieu of a sidewalk. Our project will improve the neighborhood and increase property values. Our project will offer families a place to live where they can have backyards for their children to play. Most of the projects currently being built in the SLNA area do not offer yards. Our project provides on site parking for the residents and their visitors. There will be no parking on Clawson Road.

We have the support of City Staff & the City Planning Commission voted 5-2 in favor of our project. We have the support of several City Council Members. I am seeking support from SLNA. I appreciate all positive feedback I have received from members of SLNA and I will present your emails at the City Council meeting on Thursday.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
Austin, Texas. 78758  
512.799.0801 - Mobile  
512.327.0807 - Office  
512.448.3625 - Fax  
[REDACTED]

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

**Subj:** Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
**Date:** 8/20/2013 2:00:10 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
**From:** [REDACTED]

Thank you Hilary for being such a wonderful guardian of our community. As you know, for two years we have been battling the effects of the city making an unwise concession to a builder, who flooded our property due to a waiver from the city. I'm sure this person feels justified in asking for this change, but I hope the change is not granted. Peace, Patricia

— Original Message —

**From:** Hilary Dyer  
**To:** Claudia  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 12:53 PM  
**Subject:** Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Claudia, with all due respect, you are using circular logic to make your argument and in doing so, have exactly made my case: the "city required" infrastructure is costing you more money, so you have to add more units beyond what you are currently allowed in order to pay for it. As developers, you knew what infrastructure would be required before you bought the property. Let's be clear, the city is doing what we ask the city to do – make sure that new infill development does not negatively impact the existing homes by requiring the additional infrastructure needed to support new development. I take issue with your inference that the city is making you do this. As a developer this is part of your job, and I would certainly hope you would add the needed infrastructure whether the city required it or not. Having to change zoning so you can add more units than currently allowed just so you can defray your building costs is a hollow argument.

With reference to Clawson, a short sidewalk is a useful addition but seriously won't do anything to help safety. As more condo developments go in along Clawson, compounded with what is going in on Lightsey and Del Curto, the road will only get more dangerous.

Again, I would fully support your development if you kept it within the current zoning.

---

**From:** Claudia [REDACTED]  
**To:** Hilary Dyer [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 12:11 PM  
**Subject:** Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Hilary:

Thank you for responding to my email. We are only requesting one additional duplex and that is to help defray the cost of the City required infrastructure. These expenses include but are not limited to fire hydrant, turn around space for emergency vehicles including fire trucks and a detention pond.

I hope this answers any questions you have regarding our need for the additional unit. We have also agreed to several concessions with regard to our project, we have agreed to sign a Restrictive Covenant

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: [SLNA] Positive Change for Clawson Road  
 Date: 8/20/2013 2:10:24 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Geoff:

I'll go one step further, this City is becoming too congested. It appears everyone wants to live in Austin. I can hardly blame them. Also, a lot of these people want to live in 78704. I don't blame them for that either. Johnny and I will be joining the neighborhood shortly. We intend to move into the house at 3903 Clawson while we work on our site plan for 3903 & 3907 Clawson. One of the first buildings we build will be our home. We intend to live in the project we are developing. I love the location as it is close to downtown, the hospital, close to our favorite restaurants and the H2O carwash. Also it is close to our office buildings located at 2003 South Lamar and at 5307 Hwy 290.

In response to your email, and according to City staffers, increased development on Clawson Road is what will bring attention to any deficiencies on Clawson Road. Otherwise the City has NO incentive for improvement. We will be doing our part by adding sidewalks in front of our project. We will also improve the road in front of our project or contribute to a fund for same, the City will make that decision for us.

Our project will be a beautiful and desirable place for families to live, this includes me & my husband.

These lots are going to be developed. The unified plan is just a more attractive plan. Also the unified plan allows for one entrance/exit on to Clawson Road. Having one driveway allows us to have more green space and to save more trees.

Thank you for responding to my email.

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
 GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
 1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
 Austin, Texas. 78758  
 512.799.0801 - Mobile  
 512.327.0807 - Office  
 512.448.3625 - Fax

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 6:58 AM, Geoff Harter [REDACTED] wrote:

> This neighborhood is becoming too congested without the city putting in infrastructure to support it (storm sewers, bike lanes, enough bridge lanes to get all the cars across Town Lake, car lanes wide enough for the increased traffic on roads (very much the case on Clawson since it lacks sidewalks)). Changing zoning will allow more housing which will contribute to this.

>

> When developers unite to push the city to build the items above then more density can happen. I realize that you will have sidewalks but what about the rest of narrow Clawson road as more housing and thus cars come?

>

> The city originally created zoning for areas of town for a reason. That was deemed how much density that area

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 2:19:00 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

From: Claudia [REDACTED]  
Date: August 20, 2013, 2:15:21 PM CDT  
To: Robin Heart Shepperd [REDACTED]  
Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Robin:

That's one of the problems with email communication. People read in emotions that are not intended. I'm sorry if you thought my response was anything but responsive to your email. No "snippiness" was intended. These lots are going to be developed. I believe that our plan will prevail as it is the best plan for the neighborhood.

I'm astonished that you or anyone would sign a petition based on "hurt feelings" and not based on what is best for the community. Please take time to review the plans we have uploaded then look at what flagged lots look like and base your decision on the facts and not emotions.

I think a petition involves property owners within 500 feet of the proposed zoning change.

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR  
GOLD KEY BUILDERS  
1901 Albury Cove, Unit A  
Austin, Texas. 78758  
512.799.0801 - Mobile  
512.327.0807 - Office  
512.448.3625 - Fax  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 20, 2013, at 1:58 PM, Robin Heart Shepperd [REDACTED] wrote:

Claudia,

Snippiness is not furthering your case among the neighborhood, as people read your emails. Nor is sarcasm. While I was not a part of the circulation of the petition, and have not seen it, I am more inclined to sign it due to your hostile attitude.

As we have all learned, city council rarely has our best interests at heart when they wheel and deal with builders. We, the people that actually live here, cannot help but notice the ever-increasing traffic on Clawson. And if we agree to the changed designation, others will follow. Since I have worked on getting sidewalks here for more than 10 years, I highly doubt that your project is going to favorably change any of the minds of the powers that be.

Robin

On Aug 20, 2013, at 11:42 AM, Claudia wrote:

Robin - Perhaps you are a little confused. The 78758 address is a business address. We currently live in

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 2:25:43 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Claudia,

I've been reading the string of emails from beginning and find that you're giving us a hard sell along with making snarky comments ("I can see you don't like change, so..." "you don't understand..."). We who live here do understand. I won't support the change in zoning for your project as I believe it will not be in the best interest of this neighborhood for myriad reasons. I'm not adverse to change, and I've been in real estate law for decades so I very well understand the zoning and development processes. I just don't think a zoning change is the right move for anyone but you and your development interests. I do wish you well in your endeavors however.

***Possunt quia posse videntur. ~ Vergil***

---

From: Claudia [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:18 PM  
Subject: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

From: Claudia [REDACTED]  
Date: August 20, 2013, 2:15:21 PM CDT  
To: Robin Heart Shepperd [REDACTED]  
Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Robin:

That's one of the problems with email communication. People read in emotions that are not intended. I'm sorry if you thought my response was anything but responsive to your email. No "snippiness" was intended. These lots are going to be developed. I believe that our plan will prevail as it is the best plan for the neighborhood.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308



Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 2:28:43 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

For what it is worth, the larger of these two lots is going to be developed for higher capacity. The shape does not make sense for a single family dwelling, and preventing her from rezoning will not prevent that lot from being developed; even as SF3.

Honestly, it is a good thing that these two lots are being consolidated. Considering the shape and size of the lots, it is an opportunity to develop something nicer than two separate projects.

Claudia, I wish you luck. I hope you create a good place for people to live.

Best,

Cullen

---

From: Robin Heart Shepperd [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 1:58 PM  
Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Claudia,

Snappiness is not furthering your case among the neighborhood, as people read your emails. Nor is sarcasm. While I was not a part of the circulation of the petition, and have not seen it, I am more inclined to sign it due to your hostile attitude.

As we have all learned, city council rarely has our best interests at heart when they wheel and deal with builders. We, the people that actually live here, cannot help but notice the ever-increasing traffic on Clawson. And if we agree to the changed designation, others will follow. Since I have worked on getting sidewalks here for more than 10 years, I highly doubt that your project is going to favorably change any of the minds of the powers that be.

Robin

On Aug 20, 2013, at 11:42 AM, Claudia wrote:

Robin - Perhaps you are a little confused. The 78758 address is a business address. We currently live in southeast Austin approximately 4 miles from Clawson Road. Johnny and I intend to move into the house at 3903 Clawson when we close on the property. We intend to build our house on that property.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/20/2013 2:54:16 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]

I agree that combining the lots is better and will create a better project for everyone involved. What I don't understand is why combining the lots has to involve a change in zoning? Can't the lots be combined and developed with a unified plan that only includes the total number of units that existing zoning allows? Wouldn't that maintain all of the improvements that you are proposing (unified plan, only one driveway, more green space, etc..)?

And, if I read your statement about the detention pond correctly, per the city, your proposed development does not require a detention pond but you are building one anyway? Can you clarify that please?

On Aug 20, 2013, at 2:28 PM, Cullen Hanks [REDACTED] wrote:

For what it is worth, the larger of these two lots is going to be developed for higher capacity. The shape does not make sense for a single family dwelling, and preventing her from rezoning will not prevent that lot from being developed; even as SF3.

Honestly, it is a good thing that these two lots are being consolidated. Considering the shape and size of the lots, it is an opportunity to develop something nicer than two separate projects.

Claudia, I wish you luck. I hope you create a good place for people to live.

Best,

Cullen

---

From: Robin Heart Shepperd [REDACTED]

To: Claudia [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 1:58 PM

Subject: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Claudia,

Snappiness is not furthering your case among the neighborhood, as people read your emails. Nor is sarcasm. While I was not a part of the circulation of the petition, and have not seen it, I am more inclined to sign it due to your hostile attitude.

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 3:38:46 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Hi Claudia,

I don't have a problem with change. I wouldn't have lived in SLNA the last decade and a half if I did!

I think we actually agree on quite a lot. Your proposed development sounds very nice, and would be a nice addition to the neighborhood. For me personally, I wouldn't have an issue at all with an upzone if you agreed to a density cap equal to the existing zoning. I appreciate the fact that you see your property through your focused lens, and see your property only and you are probably thinking, "Why wouldn't these crazy neighbors love this awesome development?" That is totally understandable. For us though, it's far more than just your property:

<https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0>

Almost every one of those colored properties expects some type of concession. Almost every one of them will increase density and put an extra burden on our already insufficient and stressed infrastructure. So please don't take my position personally. It's the cumulative effect of all these current developments, and all those completed and yet to come, which have a substantive negative impact on our quality of life.

To your property specifically, having to put in a detention pond with a higher density zoning is not a surprise to you. The reason for that, obviously, is to mitigate the run-off impact of the denser development. I am quite certain your downhill neighbors will appreciate you putting in the detention pond. It is not a superfluous burden put on you by the city, but a practical engineering safety net. You knew going in before you started your project that this would be part of the cost of development. Either the project makes economic sense or it doesn't.

To my way of thinking, bottom line, it's not fair for you to expect your neighbors to concede to higher density just so that you can make more money.

As Cullen said, this property will be developed by you or by someone else. And it most likely will have more than the single home it does now. But that can happen with or without a zoning change within the current density. Any density greater than that benefits you – it doesn't benefit the neighborhood.

Thank you for engaging in a discussion.

- Hilary

---

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:52 PM

Subject: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Please forgive me Cullen for calling you Vince. That is what I get for trying to do two things at once. I was talking to Vince and calling him Cullen and writing a response to your email and calling you Vince. Oh boy..... I think I'll take a break!!

Claudia

Claudia E. Cuchia, REALTOR

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: RE: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 5:17:43 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Dear Claudia,

I just wanted to add my support for Hilary's well described position.

It is mine as well.

Marci Roberts

**From:** [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** Hilary  
 Dyer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:39 PM  
**To:** Claudia; Cullen Hanks  
**Cc:** SouthLamarNA@yahoogroups.com  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

Hi Claudia,

I don't have a problem with change. I wouldn't have lived in SLNA the last decade and a half if I did!

I think we actually agree on quite a lot. Your proposed development sounds very nice, and would be a nice addition to the neighborhood. For me personally, I wouldn't have an issue at all with an upzone if you agreed to a density cap equal to the existing zoning. I appreciate the fact that you see your property through your focused lens, and see your property only and you are probably thinking, "Why wouldn't these crazy neighbors love this awesome development?" That is totally understandable. For us though, it's far more than just your property:

<https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0>

Almost every one of those colored properties expects some type of concession. Almost every one of them will increase density and put an extra burden on our already insufficient and stressed infrastructure. So please don't take my position personally. It's the cumulative effect of all these current developments, and all those completed and yet to come, which have a substantive negative impact on our quality of life.

To your property specifically, having to put in a detention pond with a higher density zoning is not a surprise to you. The reason for that, obviously, is to mitigate the run-off impact of the denser development. I am quite certain your downhill neighbors will appreciate you putting in the detention pond. It is not a superfluous burden put on you by the city, but a practical engineering safety net. You knew going in before you started your project that this

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

even "Jovitas". Then came the "Hey don't you want a privacy fence instead of this chain link? I politely said no. After about a year Jimmy say the markets down He is gonna sell his dream home and "Remodel" the corner house into his New Dream Home! Using the money on the sale of 1604.

Jimmy is fast, and must have had an "expediter" while his house was closing He had the corner house down to a slab and "1" door standing. This time it rained some, so it took almost a month to build his new "DREAM HOME". Finished in record time with the weather, it seemed like synchronized swimming, his old dream house closed, his new one was finished and I was being introduced to the new owner and Jimmy was asking for help, to move a heavy couch into the Corner Dream Home! Ahh Peace in the 04, and 2 new MacMansion compared to the late 40 and early 50 houses that are in the Bradshaw Lot. Jimmy and I would be "Neighbors" for ever!

Well 6 months later "the markets to good" my "Neighbor Jimmy" laments, "I have to sell"! Soon he has a buyer. And even has a mover pick up that heavy couch that not a year ago we labored over.

Just like that, in about two and 1/2 years a small home on the corner was turned into 2 MacMansions and "Jimmy" I am going to live in my dream home is gone. don't get me wrong I now have 2 wonderful "full time" neighbors in the wonderfully Large homes.

The moral here is even with the best intentions, people don't always do what the say. I watched it in front of my eyes, and now wonder what if I had fought to preserve what was best for the neighborhood?

Also with the dream of the 3903 and 3907 being built and condos sold what would the plan be for 3504? Ahh yes! a nature buffer for kids!

I hope I did not offend anyone and if my dates where off, it was just a fable.

donnie

**donnie williamson 5126326669 cell**

---

Reply via web post

Reply to sender

Reply to group

Start a New Topic

Messages in this topic (1)

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: [SLNA] the fable of 1604 lightsey  
 Date: 8/20/2013 5:21:24 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Hi all,

Donnie Williamson 24 year resident @1606 lightsey, the only neighbors that are within a stones throw with a longer residency, are Mrs. Rue and Mr. Tom Cantu. I used to be very political and did at one time attend an SLNA meeting. I personally know some of you and I do follow the email threads . So I believe I have a grasp of what might transpire.

First "FABLE"

**fa·ble**

/ˌfæbəl/

**Noun**

A short story, typically with animals as characters, conveying a moral.

**Verb**

Fabricate or invent (an incident, person, or story).

**Synonyms**

story - legend - tale - myth - fiction

About 10 years ago a nice outgoing gentleman knocked on my door and loudly said "Hi Neighbor!" " I have just moved in on the corner and I want to introduce myself, I am Jimmy!" Jimmy went on to tell me how he buys and sell's house's but now it time to settle down and build his "Dream Home". Well at the time there was not a 1604 Lightsey it was the Attached lot that belonged to the house on Kenny and Lightsey. His dream home (1604) would be the nice buffer of nature that I had just to the east of me.

Within days there where bull dozers and Backhoes clearing the lot. It was summer time and there was a drought on so not a day went by with out construction noise, and because it was before the MacMansion ordinance he was able to occupy almost 80% that wasn't beautiful oaks. Amazingly My new neighbor Jimmy had his New almost 3 story monstrosity right next to me, I kept quiet. We would see each other around town,

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

Subj: Re: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
 Date: 8/20/2013 6:25:47 P.M. Central Daylight Time  
 From: [REDACTED]

Hello Claudia, and thank you for bringing this to the broader attention of the neighborhood mailing list!

I most definitely DO support a positive change for the neighborhood. I support renovation, remodeling, and development under conditions that actually, realistically cause a positive change for people who have invested their futures (and in many cases, their past) in living here, as well as the people who will be arriving in the new developments. Just so you know, my wife, daughter, and I have occupied our home since 2001. Before that, the home belonged to my grandmother and grandfather who bought the property and began building in 1940. I spent a great part of my childhood in this neighborhood, I remember when Lightsey and Clawson were un-paved, graded gravel roads, and I've seen a lot of changes- some very bad, but most very positive. My roots here are deep and I intend for my future here to be very long, Lord willing. I don't toss the terms "positive change for the neighborhood" around casually. Things like increased zoning levels are very important decisions and we generally only have ONE chance to get them right for our lifetimes and maybe our kids' lifetimes as well. Zoning applies not only to what you plan, but what a future owner of the property might plan too. It affects the dirt itself, not just the people who own the dirt at the time.

The neighborhood association has a long-standing policy on up-zoning, and I fully support that policy- namely allowing up zoning for improved *layout* of development, but without increasing *entitlement* (that is density, impervious cover, etc.) over what currently exists on said land. This is a reasonable and practical stance and has generally served us well. Part of that longstanding policy is to engage in creative and positive negotiations with those who wish to change zoning and/or develop land in the neighborhood. There are engineers, scientists, environmentalists, and artists in this neighborhood, all of whom can and do contribute to solving real-world problems just like these and willing to offer the thought processes they normally get paid for *free* to a developer willing to listen for the betterment of the neighborhood. By and large, this has left a string of happy developers and residents, and only in the cases where a developer tried to break this paradigm has dissatisfaction resulted... for everyone.

Negotiation is by definition two-sided- in return for up zoning, there must be a concession in return. Specifically to your case, I believe that while there are certain advantages that SF-5 and SF-6 bring to the table (better placement of driveways and structures to avoid removing trees, as an example), I would only support such up-zoning with restrictive conditional overlays applied at the time of up-zoning. Restrictions of such a C.O. should include but not be limited to placing a limit the density of housing units per acre to the same (or preferably less) than the existing maximum entitled density under SF-3, and allowing no more (preferably less) impervious cover than SF-3. These are the types of concessions that I expect from any developer in order for me to be able to positively support up-zoning for a win-win outcome for everyone. Developers get to develop, the neighborhood gets to maintain the best and most unique aspects of its current character. Density, more than any other factor in my opinion, is the enemy of our whole city today and MUST be limited, because it cannot be undone. It also has huge consequences in terms of traffic (virtually all the new traffic headed toward downtown from your development t will pass within 100 feet of my front bedroom for example), strain on water, electrical, and wastewater infrastructures. If your proposed development were to be done under such a give-and-take negotiation and with codified and enforceable conditional overlays, then YES, I would wholeheartedly support your request!

I have not been a part of the negotiation team on this case, so I speak solely for myself in this E-mail.

-Steve Lacker  
 1704 Lightsey Road

Tuesday, August 20, 2013 AOL: JRT3308

> > crazy neighbors love this awesome development?â€œ That is totally  
> > understandable. For us though, itâ€™s far more than just your property:  
> > [https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?  
msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0](https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0)  
> > <[https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?  
msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0](https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0)>  
> >  
> >  
> > <[https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?  
msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0](https://maps.google.com/maps/ms?msid=210884829006389740304.0004d6b5ed2fbd8c31472&msa=0)>  
> >  
> > Almost every one of those colored properties expects some type of  
> > concession. Almost every one of them will increase density and put an  
> > extra burden on our already insufficient and stressed infrastructure.  
> > So please donâ€™t take my position personally. Itâ€™s the cumulative  
> > effect of all these current developments, and all those completed and  
> > yet to come, which have a substantive negative impact on our quality  
> > of life.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > To your property specifically, having to put in a detention pond with  
> > a higher density zoning is not a surprise to you. The reason for that,  
> > obviously, is to mitigate the run-off impact of the denser  
> > development. I am quite certain your downhill neighbors will  
> > appreciate you putting in the detention pond. It is not a superfluous  
> > burden put on you by the city, but a practical engineering safety net.  
> > You knew going in before you started your project that this would be  
> > part of the cost of development. Either the project makes economic  
> > sense or it doesnâ€™t.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > To my way of thinking, bottom line, itâ€™s not fair for you to expect  
> > your neighbors to concede to higher density just so that you can make  
> > more money.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > As Cullen said, this property will be developed by you or by someone  
> > else. And it most likely will have more than the single home it does  
> > now. But that can happen with or without a zoning change within the  
> > current density. Any density greater than that benefits you â€œ it  
> > doesnâ€™t benefit the neighborhood.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > Thank you for engaging in a discussion.  
> >  
> > - Hilary  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > -----  
> >  
> >  
> > From: Claudia <[REDACTED]>

Thursday, August 22, 2013 AOL: JRT3308



Subj: Re: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood  
Date: 8/22/2013 10:49:38 A.M. Central Daylight Time  
From: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Well said Hillary, and i fully agree .

J

— In [REDACTED] Bryan King [REDACTED] ...> wrote:

>

> Ditto,

> Bryan

>

> [REDACTED] wrote:

>

>>

>>

>> Dear Claudia,

>>

>>

>>

>> I just wanted to add my support for Hilary's well described position.

>>

>> It is mine as well.

>>

>>

>>

>> Marci Roberts

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> From: [REDACTED] On Behalf Of Hilary Dyer

>> Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:39 PM

>> To: [REDACTED]

>> Subject: Re: Fwd: [SLNA] Support a Positive Change for the Neighborhood

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Hi Claudia,

>>

>> I don't have a problem with change. I wouldn't have lived in SLNA the  
>> last decade and a half if I did!

>>

>>

>>

>> I think we actually agree on quite a lot. Your proposed development  
>> sounds very nice, and would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.  
>> For me personally, I wouldn't have an issue at all with an upzone if  
>> you agreed to a density cap equal to the existing zoning. I appreciate  
>> the fact that you see your property through your focused lens, and see  
>> your property only and you are probably thinking, "Why wouldn't these

Thursday, August 22, 2013 AOL: JRT3308