SOUTH AUSTIN COMBINED NPA ITEMS 85-88

Reilly, Francis

From: David Foster [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 7:22 AM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: Email to Council on SACNP

Late Backup

Francis,

FYI I just sent the following email to council. I wish I could come tomorrow but am in DC. Good luck, fingers, crossed!

Thanks,

David

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I am writing once again as a resident of the Southwood Neighborhood, an officer of the Southwood Neighborhood Association, and a very active participant in the SACNP process to urge you to support the current staff recommendations on 2nd and 3rd reading at tomorrow's council meeting. I continue to believe that the current recommendations represent the consensus that we achieved in Southwood on what we want in the way of infill, and that the plan as a whole enjoys overwhelming support within our neighborhood and the whole planning area. I regret that work has taken me away from Austin this week and prevents me from attending tomorrow's meeting, but I am happy to respond to any questions or concerns you or you staff may have via email.

I extend my gratitude to each and every one of you for your years of public service.

David Foster
512-550-2402

Reilly, Francis

From: Leann Land [redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 11:03 AM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

We are good except for our deed restrictions conflict with the 15 foot set back design tool, so we would ask to have this design tool removed.

Leann Land
WTNA President
512.699.7586

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:33 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Leann,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following design tools are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions
- front yard parking restrictions

No infill options are proposed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin

505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

(512) 974-7657
[redacted]
francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Please note: E-mail correspondence to and from the City of Austin is subject to requests for required disclosure under the Public Information Act.

Reilly, Francis

From: Lizeth Gonzales <[redacted]>
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2014 9:43 AM
To: Reilly, Francis
Cc: [redacted] Rollin MacRae; Marcia Rachofsky
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Hi Francis,

I believe the Southern Oaks Neighborhood is satisfied with the current proposal as you described below. At this time, we are **not** considering any sub-districts or the addition of any infill options in the future.

I am also copying in this email some of the 2015 SONA Board as we work on the transition. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Lizeth
Gonzales

On Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 6:32 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Lizeth and Tony,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following design tools are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction

- front porch setbacks
- mobile food vending restrictions
- front yard parking restrictions

No infill options are proposed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis

512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner

Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin

505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor

Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657

✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:

Reilly, Francis

From: Rollin MacRae [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 3:03 PM
To: Lizeth Gonzales
Cc: Reilly, Francis; [redacted]; Marcia Rachofsky
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Francis, et al,
As newly elected Chair of Southern Oaks Neighborhood Association, and in the absence of a meeting of since the election, I offer that I agree with Lizeth that it appears that most folks are satisfied with the Staff version of the Plan. Most of the "No..." signs are gone, and the conversations are about moving forward on the opportunities the plan offers.
I want personally and as Chair, to thank you and your fellow staff members for all your hard work to bring the plan to completion and to work with the diverse elements within and between the sub-areas to resolve differences. Good job!

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 2, 2014, at 9:42 AM, Lizeth Gonzales <[redacted]> wrote:

> Hi Francis,
>
> I believe the Southern Oaks Neighborhood is satisfied with the current proposal as you described below. At this time, we are **not** considering any sub-districts or the addition of any infill options in the future.
>
> I am also copying in this email some of the 2015 SONA Board as we work on the transition. Please let us know if you have any questions.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Lizeth
> Gonzales
>
> On Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 6:32 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:
>
> Good afternoon Lizeth and Tony,
>
> Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following design tools are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions
- front yard parking restrictions

No infill options are proposed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis

512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner

Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin

505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor

Reilly, Francis

From: Tony Slagle <[redacted]>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 5:18 AM
To: Reilly, Francis
Cc: 'Rollin MacRae'
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Francis,

We recently had an election for new association officers. Rollin MacRae was elected the new chair and I was elected co-chair.

I have cc'd Rollin on the response as well so that he can weigh in. The recommendations made by staff on first reading removing all infills from the Westgate area reflect our neighborhood association's desires.

I am in Fort Worth with a family emergency. I hope to be back in time for the meeting. Please let us know if you need anything else.

Thanks

-Tony
512-413-4525

On Thu, 10/30/14, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Subject: Proposed infill options
To: "[redacted]" <[redacted]>
Cc: "[redacted]" <[redacted]>
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2014, 6:32 PM

Good afternoon Lizeth and
Tony,

Councilmember Martinez
requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following design tools
are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions • garage placement for new construction • front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions
- front yard parking restrictions

No infill options are proposed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

((512) 974-7657
*
francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:

http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Marcia Rachofsky <[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 3:20 PM
To: 'Rollin MacRae'; 'Lizeth Gonzales'
Cc: Reilly, Francis; [redacted]
Subject: RE: Proposed infill options

I agree.

Marcia C. Rachofsky
SONA Secretary

From: Rollin MacRae [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 3:03 PM
To: Lizeth Gonzales
Cc: Reilly, Francis; [redacted] Marcia Rachofsky
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Francis, et al,
As newly elected Chair of Southern Oaks Neighborhood Association, and in the absence of a meeting of since the election, I offer that I agree with Lizeth that it appears that most folks are satisfied with the Staff version of the Plan. Most of the "No..." signs are gone, and the conversations are about moving forward on the opportunities the plan offers.
I want personally and as Chair, to thank you and your fellow staff members for all your hard work to bring the plan to completion and to work with the diverse elements within and between the sub-areas to resolve differences. Good job!

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 2, 2014, at 9:42 AM, Lizeth Gonzales <[redacted]> wrote:

> Hi Francis,
>
> I believe the Southern Oaks Neighborhood is satisfied with the current proposal as you described below. At this time, we are **not** considering any sub-districts or the addition of any infill options in the future.
>
> I am also copying in this email some of the 2015 SONA Board as we work on the transition. Please let us know if you have any questions.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Lizeth
> Gonzales

On Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 6:32 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Lizeth and Tony,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following design tools are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions
- front yard parking restrictions

No infill options are proposed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Reilly, Francis

From: Joan Owens <[redacted]>
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2014 1:16 PM
To: David Foster; Reilly, Francis
Cc: [redacted] Lupe Sosa; Gregory Trippe Trippe; Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

Francis,
Southwood has not had a neighborhood vote on this, nor have we had our own separate poll on it. So, the written input that you may have received may perhaps best reflect the neighborhood input.

I do know that of those that attended the meetings, this plan covers the majority of that groups preference. But keep in mind that on a regular basis that was usually approximately 7 or 8 attendees out of the 2000+ Southwood households.

I do want to emphasize that I feel that more needs to be done to ensure that the flooding issues are addressed more thoroughly throughout the area and should be a strong consideration prior to adding density on any lot.

As defined for us in the planning meetings, I strongly stand by the small lot amnesty being ONLY for those that are currently in existence. It should never be used as a way to do new subdivisions of property to create them. If that issue/loophole has not been resolved, then I would say that it should be removed from the plan or explicitly defined as those lots currently in existence.

I personally feel that the document reflects a decent compromise for the neighborhood plan.

I would also be fine if we passed the plan without infill options, but added the capability for them to be addressed within the contact teams.

Joan Owens
(512) 447-3115
(512) 461-3318 cell

From: David Foster <[redacted]>
To: "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: "[redacted]" <[redacted]>; "Joan Owens [redacted]"
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2014 1:37 PM
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I will be out of town Thursday but strongly support the current proposal as you outlined. I believe it reflects majority opinion in Southwood. I would also support allowing additional infill options to be added as part of a process involving a contact team initiative, as long as the neighborhood as a whole had an opportunity to weigh on. Happy to discuss further.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:16 PM, "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Southwood officers,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options:
- small lot amnesty area wide
- secondary apartment area wide
- corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.

Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded**.

Approved design tools:
- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions

** I have received additional deed restrictions for most, if not all, of the South Manchaca planning area from someone outside of ya'lls planning area. I am awaiting further direction from our director on how to proceed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657
✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:

Reilly, Francis

From: David Foster <[redacted]>
Sent: Saturday, November 01, 2014 1:38 PM
To: Reilly, Francis
Cc: [redacted], Joan Owens [redacted]
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I will be out of town Thursday but strongly support the current proposal as you outlined. I believe it reflects majority opinion in Southwood. I would also support allowing additional infill options to be added as part of a process involving a contact team initiative, as long as the neighborhood as a whole had an opportunity to weigh on. Happy to discuss further.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:16 PM, "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon Southwood officers,
>
> Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.
>
> The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
> Approved infill options:
> • small lot amnesty area wide
> • secondary apartment area wide
> • corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.
> Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded**.
>
> Approved design tools:
> • parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
> • garage placement for new construction
> • front porch setbacks
>
> • mobile food vending restrictions
>
> ** I have received additional deed restrictions for most, if not all, of the South Manchaca planning area from someone outside of ya'lls planning area. I am awaiting further direction from our director on how to proceed.
>
> If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657
✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Guadalupe Q. Sosa [redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 7:15 AM
To: Joan Owens; David Foster; Reilly, Francis
Cc: [redacted] Gregory Trippe Trippe; Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)
Subject: RE: Infill options for South Austin Combined

Joan, Thanks so much for your response. I am appalled that David keeps saying that the majority of the neighborhood is in support of the changes advocated by the SANCP. This is far from the truth. The majority of my neighbors are not favor, nor is the majority of the neighborhhood.

Have a great day!
gs

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined
From: Joan Owens [redacted]
Date: Sun, November 02, 2014 1:15 pm
To: David Foster [redacted], "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: [redacted] Lupe Sosa [redacted], Gregory Trippe Trippe [redacted], "Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)" [redacted]

Francis,
Southwood has not had a neighborhood vote on this, nor have we had our own separate poll on it. So, the written input that you may have received may perhaps best reflect the neighborhood input.

I do know that of those that attended the meetings, this plan covers the majority of that groups preference. But keep in mind that on a regular basis that was usually approximately 7 or 8 attendees out of the 2000+ Southwood households.

I do want to emphasize that I feel that more needs to be done to ensure that the flooding issues are addressed more thoroughly throughout the area and should be a strong consideration prior to adding density on any lot.

As defined for us in the planning meetings, I strongly stand by the small lot amnesty being ONLY for those that are currently in existence. It should never be used as a way to do new subdivisions of property to create them. If that issue/loophole has not been resolved, then I would say that it should be removed from the plan or explicitly defined as those lots currently in existence.

I personally feel that the document reflects a decent compromise for the neighborhood plan.

I would also be fine if we passed the plan without infill options, but added the capability for them to be addressed within the contact teams.

Joan Owens
(512) 447-3115
(512) 461-3318 cell

From: David Foster <[redacted]
To: "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: [redacted]; "Joan Owens [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2014 1:37 PM
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I will be out of town Thursday but strongly support the current proposal as you outlined. I believe it reflects majority opinion in Southwood. I would also support allowing additional infill options to be added as part of a process involving a contact team initiative, as long as the neighborhood as a whole had an opportunity to weigh on. Happy to discuss further.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:16 PM, "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Southwood officers,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options:
- small lot amnesty area wide
- secondary apartment area wide
- corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.

Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded**.

Approved design tools:
- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks

- mobile food vending restrictions

** I have received additional deed restrictions for most, if not all, of the South Manchaca planning area from someone outside of ya'lls planning area. I am awaiting further direction from our director on how to proceed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657
✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Missy [redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 9:38 AM
To: David Foster
Cc: Guadalupe Q. Sosa; Joan Owens; Reilly, Francis; [redacted] Gregory Trippe Trippe
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

Categories: Red Category

I will have to agree with David. Please remember that the neighborhood plan is NOT just about infill. Most of that has been taken out as a compromise anyway. The large part of the plan is about making our neighborhood beautiful, accessible, walkable , bike-able, affordable, family friendly, with lots of places to gather within a couple of miles radius that provide education, entertainment, and enlightenment. And please be mindful that it is a PLAN and if we don't have one on the books, in writing, and in all of our hands, then those with less scruples will sneak right in with all that stuff we don't want and we won't have say. We will have to fight for and about every thing that comes long.

It needs to be passes and passed in THIS council. The mostly capable and knowledgeable council that has been listening to ALL sides. We do not want or need to start all over. That's a waste of all of our time and money.

Missy
Forestglade

Sent from a tiny computer

On Nov 3, 2014, at 7:35 AM, David Foster <[redacted]> wrote:

> I respectfully disagree with Lupe's assessment. I have a very different impression, based on what I have observed from what people who have weighed in believe.
>
> On Mon, Nov 3, 2014 at 7:14 AM, Guadalupe Q. Sosa <[redacted]> wrote:
> Joan, Thanks so much for your response. I am appalled that David keeps saying that the majority of the neighborhood is in support of the changes advocated by the SANCP. This is far from the truth. The majority of my neighbors are not favor, nor is the majority of the neighborhhood.
>
> Have a great day!
> gs
>
> -------- Original Message --------
> Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined
> From: Joan Owens <[redacted]>
> Date: Sun, November 02, 2014 1:15 pm

To: David Foster [redacted], "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: [redacted], Lupe Sosa [redacted], Gregory Trippe Trippe [redacted], "Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)" [redacted]

Francis,
Southwood has not had a neighborhood vote on this, nor have we had our own separate poll on it. So, the written input that you may have received may perhaps best reflect the neighborhood input.

I do know that of those that attended the meetings, this plan covers the majority of that groups preference. But keep in mind that on a regular basis that was usually approximately 7 or 8 attendees out of the 2000+ Southwood households.

I do want to emphasize that I feel that more needs to be done to ensure that the flooding issues are addressed more thoroughly throughout the area and should be a strong consideration prior to adding density on any lot.

As defined for us in the planning meetings, I strongly stand by the small lot amnesty being ONLY for those that are currently in existence. It should never be used as a way to do new subdivisions of property to create them. If that issue/loophole has not been resolved, then I would say that it should be removed from the plan or explicitly defined as those lots currently in existence.

I personally feel that the document reflects a decent compromise for the neighborhood plan.

I would also be fine if we passed the plan without infill options, but added the capability for them to be addressed within the contact teams.

Joan Owens
(512) 447-3115
(512) 461-3318 cell

From: David Foster [redacted]
To: "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: [redacted]
"Joan Owens [redacted]"
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2014 1:37 PM
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I will be out of town Thursday but strongly support the current proposal as you outlined. I believe it reflects majority opinion in Southwood. I would also support allowing additional infill options to be added as part of a process involving a contact team initiative, as long as the

neighborhood as a whole had an opportunity to weigh on. Happy to discuss further.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:16 PM, "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Southwood officers,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options:
• small lot amnesty area wide
• secondary apartment area wide
• corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.
Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded**.

Approved design tools:
• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
• garage placement for new construction
• front porch setbacks

• mobile food vending restrictions

** I have received additional deed restrictions for most, if not all, of the South Manchaca planning area from someone outside of ya'lls planning area. I am awaiting further direction from our director on how to proceed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

(512) 974-7657
francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Please note: E-mail correspondence to and from the City of Austin is subject to requests for required disclosure under the Public Information Act.

Reilly, Francis

From: David Foster <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 7:36 AM
To: Guadalupe Q. Sosa
Cc: Joan Owens; Reilly, Francis; [redacted]
Gregory Trippe Trippe; Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I respectfully disagree with Lupe's assessment. I have a very different impression, based on what I have observed from what people who have weighed in believe.

On Mon, Nov 3, 2014 at 7:14 AM, Guadalupe Q. Sosa <[redacted]> wrote:
Joan, Thanks so much for your response. I am appalled that David keeps saying that the majority of the neighborhood is in support of the changes advocated by the SANCP. This is far from the truth. The majority of my neighbors are not favor, nor is the majority of the neighborhhood.

Have a great day!
gs

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined
From: Joan Owens <[redacted]>
Date: Sun, November 02, 2014 1:15 pm
To: David Foster <[redacted]>, "Reilly, Francis"
<Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: "[redacted]",
"[redacted]" <[redacted]>, Lupe Sosa
<[redacted]>, Gregory Trippe Trippe <[redacted]>,
"Missy Bledsoe (CE CEN)" <[redacted]>

Francis,
Southwood has not had a neighborhood vote on this, nor have we had our own separate poll on it. So, the written input that you may have received may perhaps best reflect the neighborhood input.

I do know that of those that attended the meetings, this plan covers the majority of that groups preference. But keep in mind that on a regular basis that was usually approximately 7 or 8 attendees out of the 2000+ Southwood households.

I do want to emphasize that I feel that more needs to be done to ensure that the flooding issues are addressed more thoroughly throughout the area and should be a strong consideration prior to adding density on any lot.

As defined for us in the planning meetings, I strongly stand by the small lot amnesty being ONLY for those that are currently in existence. It should never be used as a way to do new subdivisions of

property to create them. If that issue/loophole has not been resolved, then I would say that it should be removed from the plan or explicitly defined as those lots currently in existence.

I personally feel that the document reflects a decent compromise for the neighborhood plan.

I would also be fine if we passed the plan without infill options, but added the capability for them to be addressed within the contact teams.

Joan Owens
(512) 447-3115
(512) 461-3318 cell

From: David Foster [redacted]
To: "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: [redacted]; "Joan Owens [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2014 1:37 PM
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

I will be out of town Thursday but strongly support the current proposal as you outlined. I believe it reflects majority opinion in Southwood. I would also support allowing additional infill options to be added as part of a process involving a contact team initiative, as long as the neighborhood as a whole had an opportunity to weigh on. Happy to discuss further.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2014, at 6:16 PM, "Reilly, Francis" <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Southwood officers,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options:
• small lot amnesty area wide
• secondary apartment area wide
• corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.
Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded**.

Approved design tools:
• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions

• garage placement for new construction
• front porch setbacks

• mobile food vending restrictions

** I have received additional deed restrictions for most, if not all, of the South Manchaca planning area from someone outside of ya'lls planning area. I am awaiting further direction from our director on how to proceed.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657
✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Wanda Mills [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 7:43 PM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: RE: Infill options for Cherry Creek

Hi, Francis: I hope you got some time off and had some relaxing days.

The infill options for our area, as proposed, are fine with the majority of our group. I don't think anything has changed from our last discussions. Most folks do not feel that any of the infill options actually apply to the majority of our particular tract of homes, thus they don't think they would be utilized even if included in the plan. We don't, however, oppose the folks east of the railroad tracks having different options. We are supportive of them making their wishes known to you and the Council persons.

Do you think second (and hopefully third) reading will happen next Thursday? I hope so.

Take care,

Wanda

Wanda Redman Mills
[redacted]
2609 Coatbridge Drive
Austin, Texas 78745-3423
512/441-8346

From: Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov
To: [redacted]
Subject: Infill options for Cherry Creek
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 2014 23:20:36 +0000

Good afternoon Wanda,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options:
No infill options aside from small lot amnesty were recommended in Garrison Park west of the railroad tracks.

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with you to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

(512) 974-7657
francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

isit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
ttp://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Hilary Adamson [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2014 4:48 PM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Francis,

We have an overwhelming "SATISFIED" with the NO INFILLS for our neighborhood within the Cherry Creek Central Neighborhood Boundaries!

Thank you for reaching out. I heard back and all were satisfied!

Keep me posted, especially if anything changes. We appreciate being listened to, and for you making sure we can maintain the character of our neighborhood as it was intended to be!

Hilary Adamson
CCCNA President

On Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 6:21 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Hilary,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

Approved infill options: none

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis

512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner

Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin

505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor

Austin, Texas 78704

☎ (512) 974-7657

✉ francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:

http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: PJ Austin <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 7:54 PM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: Re: Infill options for South Austin Combined

Categories: Red Category

Francis,

1. As residents of Cherry Creek Central Neighborhood Association, we accept the September 25, 2014 City Council 1st reading of NO INFILLS for Garrison Park, west of the railroad tracks. (Including removal of Small Lot Amnesty Infill) ftp://ftp.ci.austin.tx.us/npzd/Austingo/SACNPA_CouncilVotingResults.pdf
2. City staff is on record that deed restrictions trump anything in the plan that is in conflict with restrictive covenants, including any proposed infill tools of the SACNP. Cherry Creek Central NA has submitted deed restrictions that would prohibit any of the proposed infill options.
3. Cherry Creek Central NA submitted a neighborhood petition, dated June 5, 2014, signed by the majority residents, including us, opposing the overlay of infill options.

Respectfully,
Paula and Steve Simpson
5806 Cherry Creek Dr. 78745

Reilly, Francis

From: Henrietta Cameron-Mann <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 11:09 PM
To: Reilly, Francis; [redacted]; Ken Craig ([redacted]); [redacted]
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Categories: Red Category

Francis,

Even though the Armadillo Park Neighborhood Association is now official, as of last Sunday, in the interest of good governance, it wouldn't be appropriate for the NA itself to take a position on it since we didn't vote on it, etc. So, for the sake of the SACNP, those of us in the Garrison Park neighborhood east of the RR tracks remain committed and interested individuals. Now that this is out of the way, here is my opinion as an individual:

In favor of the small lot amnesty and secondary apartment option throughout the subdistrict.

In favor of cottage lots and urban homes now, especially in the transition areas. Disappointment that it is being pushed off into CodeNext. I want to make sure that this delay is not a back-door way of outlawing them altogether.

In favor of the porch and garage placement design tools. Not in favor of the parking placement restrictions. I got outvoted every time on this, but since you're asking my opinion on it, I'm sharing it. Parking in front and side yards is tacky but I would rather have vehicles parked off the street. The parking placement restriction says that the parking spot has to be part of an approved site plan for the property. There are a number of improvised additional parking spaces in the neighborhood that were installed with varying levels of skill and probably not involving permits. I don't want to put people in a bind if their parking is not part of an approved site plan. Many years ago, Woodhue Community Watch Group had the option of adopting this restriction in our neighborhood, but after discussing the above points, most people voted against it.

One question I did have was whether the parking restrictions grandfather existing improvised off-street parking.

If I'm outvoted again, so be it. At least I tried my best.

In favor of the mobile food vendor restrictions.

Henrietta

-----Original Message-----
From: "Reilly, Francis"
Sent: Oct 30, 2014 6:27 PM
To: "[redacted]", "Ken Craig ([redacted])", "Henrietta Cameron-Mann [redacted]"
Subject: Proposed infill options

Good afternoon,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:
Approved infill options east of the railroad tracks:
* small lot amnesty
* secondary apartment

Cottage lots and urban homes should be addressed through CodeNEXT.

Approved design tools:

* parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
* garage placement for new construction
* front porch setbacks

* mobile food vending restrictions

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option (as we initially had done for cottage lots/urban homes in the Neighborhood Transition character district). A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis
512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78704

* (512) 974-7657
* francis.reilly@austintexas.gov

Visit the South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan website:
http://austintexas.gov/department/south-austin-combined-neighborhood-plan

Reilly, Francis

From: Fred Cantu <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: Re: Proposed infill options

Categories: Red Category

Francis,

Sorry for the late reply got a rail election on my plate.

The Menchaca Estates N.A. is against all infill options.

Council recommended no infill options west of the railroad tracks including no small lot amnesty during 1st reading. All of Menchaca Estates N.A. is west of the railroad tracks in the Garrison Park neighborhood.

You have included small lot amnesty it must be in error.

Thanks!

Fred Cantu
President, Menchaca Estates N.A.

512.698.4805

On Thu, Oct 30, 2014 at 6:24 PM, Reilly, Francis <Francis.Reilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Fred,

Councilmember Martinez requested further discussion of infill options at the September 25 City Council hearing, so I wanted to check with your neighborhood association if the current draft ordinance reflects the desire of your neighborhood association and lay out options for how we can proceed through the adoption process.

The following infill options are proposed in your neighborhood planning area based on Council's first reading of the plan on Sept. 25:

- small lot amnesty

Approved design tools:

- parking placement and impervious cover restrictions
- garage placement for new construction
- front porch setbacks
- mobile food vending restrictions

If you are satisfied with the current proposal, please let me know. Alternatively, if you would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option, that is also an option. A third option is to add the infill options at some time in the future as a contact team-initiated amendment.

I apologize for the short notice on this. I am happy to meet with ya'll to discuss this further at your convenience.

Francis

512-365-4888 (cell)

Francis Reilly, Planner

Planning and Development Review Department

City of Austin

505 Barton Springs Road, 5th Floor

Austin, Texas 78704

Reilly, Francis

From: Haywood, Carol
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 7:14 PM
To: Tiemann, Donna
Cc: Walters, Mark; Reilly, Francis; Lewis, Matthew; Guernsey, Greg; Sandoval, Marie
Subject: RE: on South Austin Deed Restrictions

Hi Donna,

Francis sent us the following information this afternoon, but we were out in meetings all day and I am just getting a chance to reply. Here is what he reported to me.

Staff previously received deed restrictions from residents within the Cherry Creek Central, Cherry Creek Village, Cherry Creek Southwest, Southern Oaks, and Western Trails NAs (the West Gate NPA and western portion of the Garrison Park NPA), and the Deer Park Secs. 1 and 2 and Hilltop Addition (South Manchaca). These have been accounted for in the current recommendations and in the draft zoning ordinances.

Although Ms. Land lives in the West Gate planning area, not in the South Manchaca planning area, staff recently received deed restrictions from her for the following areas within the South Manchaca NPA:
Forest Oaks
Park Forest
Deer Park
Austin Highlands Sec 3
Bannister Acres Sec 2
Cooper Oaks Sec 1A
Emerald Forest
Greenwood Forest
Salem Village
Singing Hills Sec 1

Staff's recommendations for the South Manchaca planning area reflect the input gathered during the public planning process and respect the deeds submitted by residents of the planning area. Staff feels that deed restrictions submitted by a resident outside the planning area in question is a different situation than those accounted for in the draft ordinances and erodes recommendations arrived at through the planning process. Recent correspondence with the Southwood and Salem Walk neighborhood associations that are in the South Manchaca NPA supports the current staff recommendations as well.

Staff does not have any practical means of ensuring that private deed restrictions are still in effect or to check if they have been violated. Per conversations with the City attorney, there is no inherent conflict to zoning that does not match private deed restrictions.

Sorry for the delay.

Carol Haywood
Planning Manager, Comprehensive Division
Planning and Development Review Department
City of Austin
phone 512-974-7685
email Carol.Haywood@austintexas.gov

Please note my email address as of fall 2011 is Carol.Haywood@austintexas.gov

---

From: Tiemann, Donna
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 11:19 AM
To: Reilly, Francis
Subject: on South Austin Deed Restrictions

Hi Frances,
Can you provide an accounting of the incorporated deed restrictions for the South Austin Neighborhood Planning area? We are getting emails requesting this clarification and our Council Member wants to get a status on that work as we go into this Thursday's Council meeting.
Thank you for your help with this,
-d

Donna Tiemann
Office of Council Member Laura Morrison, Place 4
Policy Advisor

512.974.1626 (direct)
512.974.2258 (main)