

C-2



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commissioners

FROM: Lee Heckman, AICP
Planning and Development Review Department

DATE: August 22, 2014

SUBJECT: Additional Stakeholder Correspondence – Item C-2
C14-2014-0070
Korean United Presbyterian Church

Dear Commissioners:

Attached please find additional stakeholder correspondence relating to this application.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "LH", written in a cursive style.

**Lee Heckman
Planning and Development Review Department**

From: Ted Hatfield
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Heckman, Lee; Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Justin Lane, Cullen Ave Redevelopment.

Contrary to popular belief not everyone in the Crestview Neighborhood is opposed to the redevelopment of the Church on Justin Lane.

I live on Cullen Ave across from the Church and I am all for redevelopment of the area as long as the city can provide for proper traffic flow on the area between Justin Lane, Hardy Dr, Cullen Ave and Burnet Lane.

Truthfully I think redevelopment of the entire block is warranted.

Moving the traffic calming devices on Hardy Lane down a block and denying street parking would certainly help with traffic flow.

Ted Hatfield
ted@io-tx.com
Allendale Condominiums.
2104 Cullen Ave #219
Austin, TX 78757

From: Nancy Harris
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 5:06 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen; Heckman, Lee
Subject: RE: Cases NPA-2014-0017.01 and C14-2014-0036 Korean United Presbyterian Church at 2000 Justin Lane and 2009 Cullen

Dear Mr. Heckman and Ms. Meredith,

History of the proposed zoning case at Contact Team Meetings

I have attended all 6 meetings the Crestview Neighborhood Planning Contact Team (CNPCT) has held regarding this case. These meetings each had 40 to 70 attendees. At no time did I ever feel that the majority of the residents had a strong desire to see an office building of the magnitude that would be allowed under GO or LO.

In October 2013, Mr. Thrower, the applicants representative, came to the meeting with no concrete plans of what the developer planned to build, but wanted the CNPCT to vote to waive the city's requirement that he wait until February to request a zoning change. It was not on the agenda to vote on this issue, and the contact team members wanted Mr. Thrower to provide more information regarding the developer's plans at the next CNPCT meeting.

He was unable to attend the next two CNPCT meetings, but appeared at the April 2014 meeting along with Mr. Kahn, the prospective owner, with very sketchy plans for an office building with a few token living units and a parking garage. After hearing staff's overview and from Mr. Thrower and Mr. Kahn, the general tone of the meeting was that residents were not in favor of his project or of changing the zoning to GO (as indicated by a vote of 48 to 1 against it). The hour was late and most people were tired and did not truly comprehend the alternative proposals that were laid out by the contact team officers. In addition, it later became apparent that the vote that was taken was not conducted according to the bylaws of the CNPCT that required all votes to have a simple majority.

At the third meeting in June, Mr. Thrower returned with a new plan and two alternatives of what "could be built" if the property were zoned LO or MF (both were worst case scenarios) – not that the developer planned to build either. His new plan included a taller garage (3 levels instead of 2) and no residential units. In addition, he had not changed the design to reflect the neighborhood feelings that ingress and egress should be limited to Justin, but instead had added a driveway on Hardy to the original one on Cullen, both local streets.

At that meeting, the contact team members felt their concerns were not being addressed. It also had become apparent that many people had not understood alternatives that had been laid out at the April meeting. A committee was formed to look at other conditional overlays besides those of lighting, location of ingress and egress, and height of the building that had previously been discussed. This committee reported back at a specially called meeting in July. The committee had met with and talked to numerous individuals living in the vicinity of the proposed office complex to gather feedback. The vast majority of them were not in favor of zoning the 3 tracts for office use. The April vote was rescinded (34 to 4), and the committee was asked to bring back more information regarding the city code as it might affect development on this property.

This second special meeting in August resulted in a vote of 71 to 0 to oppose the developer's request for GO.

At the regularly scheduled meeting on August 18, city staff had an opportunity to respond to questions from persons in the neighborhood. Following this there was a discussion of the potential impact and appropriateness an office structure of this immensity on the surrounding neighborhood. The CNPCT then voted 57 to 0 to oppose city staff's recommendation of LO and to leave the neighborhood plan in place as it had been approved by the city council and the neighborhood that worked so hard on it in 2004.

Some correspondence has implied that there was a "change of heart" in the neighborhood regarding this project from April to June. However, as I have observed the progression of events on this project, it seems to have been more of a "change in understanding" of what options were available to the neighborhood combined with an ever growing feeling that the developer was not sensitive to the vision and desires of the neighborhood.

Personally, I ask that the Planning Commission respect the wishes of the CNPCT as expressed in its votes, the neighbor's directly affected by this project, and the approved neighborhood plan that reflects the neighborhood vision for development of this property and deny any change to the FLUM and any zoning change to the property.

Sincerely,
Nancy Harris