

Allen, Amber

From: Paula Kothmann [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 12:13 PM
To: PAZ Preservation
Cc: Paula Kothmann
Subject: 804 Rutherford Place
Attachments: PC_Improvement Values_SF TH vs Downtown HLC Meeting Feb 28, 2022.pdf;
THZC7PointsOnePageCommitteeFinal.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Dear Commissioners:

Representing SRCC (~5,000 households):

3. PRESERVATION / DEMOLITION

We agree with The Imagine Austin Plan, which advises that comprehensive urban planning and design should protect historic areas and help maintain neighborhood character.

However, McMansion FAR limits are not sufficient to discourage the extensive demolition of residences within the central neighborhoods. Preservation incentives, such as more flexibility in regard to ADUs coupled with greater density rather than new development, are a positive step and another tool to avoid extensive demolition

Representing myself:

1. I ask for a postponement on 804 Rutherford Place because there was no notice of a public meeting posted at the property.

2. Attached please find improvement values for 804 Rutherford Place, 806 Rutherford Place, and surrounding properties.

- Improvement values for these two properties more than doubled from 2020-2021
- It's my opinion that the huge increase in property tax burden may have prompted the landlords of these properties to sell
- It's my opinion that if we had some kind of City historic property tax credit for preservation, more landlords would be able to keep their properties and we'd have less demolitions
- Travis Heights is losing some relatively affordable rentals that require no subsidy from taxpayers
- The commercial improvement values are laughably low compared to residential, although for landlords their properties are "commercial"
- landlords don't get the same homestead exemption that protects other residents
- please consider initiating some kind of preservation incentive with the City to help us preserve our old, affordable rentals to keep Travis Heights diverse i

Thank you for your consideration,

Paula Kothmann

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

Outline of the South River City Citizens' Position 2019 Regarding Proposed Land Use Code Revision

1. SHADES OF TRANSITION ZONES

We agree that the City should allow for more housing density along the corridors of Congress Avenue, Riverside, IH-35, Ben White Boulevard, and on parcels already identified in the *SRCC Neighborhood Plan*.

However, the proposed application of transition zoning to single-family houses in close-in neighborhoods unfairly targets some homeowners. All neighborhoods in Austin should share equally in the responsibility for providing more affordable housing units.

2. NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS ARE PART OF AUSTIN'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

We agree with the reference to Neighborhood Plans, which have been carefully and thoughtfully worked out over long periods of time, and in many cases voted on by a majority of residents. Neighborhood Plans are adopted by City ordinances and are still in force.

However, we disagree with proposed maps that ignore Neighborhood Plans. Although we recognize that we need more density along corridors (see point 1), the neighborhoods themselves should help the city locate them since they know the areas best.

3. PRESERVATION / DEMOLITION

We agree with The Imagine Austin Plan, which advises that comprehensive urban planning and design should protect historic areas and help maintain neighborhood character.

However, McMansion FAR limits are not sufficient to discourage the extensive demolition of residences within the central neighborhoods. Preservation incentives, such as more flexibility in regard to ADUs coupled with greater density rather than new development, are a positive step and another tool to avoid extensive demolitions.

4. FLOODING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

We agree with the proposed zoning changes' goal to address environmental concerns, such as a decrease in total impervious cover, especially in light of the vulnerability of SRCC neighbors to flooding, according to post Atlas 14 floodplain definitions.

However, developers often remove trees that prevent erosion & decrease temperatures. These trees add to the property values, and we have the right to rigorously protect our property values in the State of Texas. The current infrastructure, such as water, wastewater, and utilities, likely would not support the proposed increase in density. The City of Austin cannot afford litigation expenses if property owners sue for damage suffered because of overdevelopment. Development should not result in downstream flooding.

5. AFFORDABILITY

We agree that Austin needs more Affordable Housing, especially close to large employers to help cut our traffic congestion. People earning 50-60% Median Family Income, including many government, nonprofit, academic, small business, service workers and young professionals flee our city because of lack of affordability. SRCC has numerous affordable units in older homes, ADUs, and multifamily homes today.

However, we disagree with fee-in-lieu alternative for developers who receive greater entitlements in exchange for community benefits. 20% of the units should be on-site affordable housing, and other developments such as boardwalks and climbing walls should not be considered an alternative to building on-site affordable housing.

6. COMPATIBILITY

We agree that we may need to increase height on the corridors in order to attain more housing.

However, we believe that we should retain compatibility standards within the neighborhoods in order to retain the character, decrease congestion, and increase safe walkability.

7. PUBLIC ACCESS TO DECISION MAKING

We agree that public access to the LDCR process and final product is necessary and appropriate. There are three periods in which public input should be maximized. These periods are 1) owner access to City staff regarding personal lots; 2) access to the City Planning Commission review of the revisions; and 3) City Council meeting on revisions.

However, we believe that decision-making should rely on accurate, transparent data, presented in a timely fashion for public input and approval.

**Improvement Values
Travis Heights area
per TCAD**

Property Type	Address	Sales Price	Impr Value '21	Impr SF	Impr \$/SF	Yr Built	Imp Value 2020	Cost/SF	Delta 20-21	Delta %	Property Tax
Industrial	305 S Congress Statesman		\$1,776.00	60,986	\$0.03	2007	\$2,000.00	0.03	-224.00	-11.20%	
F3	604 W JOHANNA Restaura		\$6,084.00	1,296	\$4.69		\$6,084.00	4.69	0.00	0.00%	
: Stream Realty	Snoopy PUD 401 South First St		\$ 3,562,061.00	345,735	\$10.30	2020	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%	
F4	200 Lee Barton: Paggi House	\$97,000,000.00	\$48,590.00	2,544	\$19.10	1959	\$47,973.00	18.86	617.00	1.29%	
Apartments	WOODLAND AVAria Grand		\$1,667,983.00	63,906	\$26.10	2020	\$1,535,775.00	24.03	132,208.00	8.61%	
Restaurant	301 W RIVERSIDE DR		\$304,824.00	11,078	\$27.52	1973	\$299,622.00	27.05	5,202.00	1.74%	
Commercial	200 Academy Dri		\$3,047,582.00	54,945	\$55.47	1960	\$5,972,215.00	108.69	-2,924,633.00	-48.97%	
Commercial	1924 South First St		\$367,103.00	5,194	\$70.68	1961	\$585,360.00	112.70	-218,257.00	-37.29%	
"Affordable "	2324 Wilson St Lucero		\$22,089,754.00	187,558	\$117.78	2015	\$14,450,500.00	77.05	7,639,254.00	52.86%	
e old small apt	804 Rutherford Place 78704		\$347,287.00	2082	\$166.80	1933	142,000	68.20	205,287.00	144.57%	\$17,354.38
S + \$2100/rent	806 Rutherford Place 78704	\$1,250,000	\$384,100.00	2,035	\$188.75	1935	151,900	74.64	232,200.00	152.86%	13,391.84
SF	1317 Kenwood Ave 78704		\$619,177.00	2,660	\$232.77	1928	\$344,800.00	129.62	274,377.00	79.58%	
Condos	500 E Riverside Dr		\$103,163.00	399	\$258.55	1971	\$86,510.00	216.82	\$16,653.00	19.25%	
SF Home	311 W Milton St 78704 rental		\$465,097.00	1,690	\$275.21	1949	\$193,250.00	114.35	271,847.00	140.67%	
Commercial	1600 South First Street		\$8,299,808.00	22,826	\$363.61	2021	\$0.00	0.00	8,299,808.00	NA	
Condo	900 South First St		\$657,876.00	1,347	\$488.40	2018	\$574,620.00	426.59	83,256.00	14.49%	

Residential improvement values doubled 2020-21
Why are commercial properties so much lower than residential?