

**Oak Hill Planning Contact Team Work Session
on the Draft Neighborhood Plan
Wednesday, Nov. 7, 2007
Hampton Branch Library
6:30 p.m. – 8:45 p.m.**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm.

The below listed voting members were present:

Richard Armitage – Secretary
Mickey Bentley
Frank Bomar
Charles Draper
Chip Graves
Beki Halpin
Neerav Mehta
David Richardson – Chair
Carl Schupp
Bill Schultz
Tom Thayer
Jackie Waters

The below listed voting members were absent from the meeting:

Stacie Engeling
David Hasan
Steffen Waltz
Chuck Winkley

The following additional people were present:

Sandy Baldrige (General Member)
Maureen Meredith (Austin NPZD)

Additions to the Agenda

The Chair distributed copies of the proposed agenda and requested any additional items.

The following items were included in the updated agenda:

1. Approval of the minutes from the Oct. 6th work session.
2. Proposal to include “Annexation History of Oak Hill” in the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan (requested by Jackie Waters).
3. Resolution by Bill Schultz to have the OHNPCT operate in the interim period before the Plan is adopted under the Bylaws adopted on May 31, 2007.
4. Review Goals, Objectives and Recommendations handout.
5. Review comments on Chapter 4.

6. Review comments on Chapter 5 (time permitting).

Approval of Minutes from Oct. 6th Work Session

The minutes from the Oct. 6th work session were reviewed. There were a number of items questioned and corrected. These included the following:

There was clarification on the comments from SOS regarding the Edwards Aquifer Conservation District. It was agreed that the statement “Have they recommended prohibition in Barton Springs Zone” would end with a question mark and that the statement “We need clarification on what this actually relates to and what it means” would be added to the minutes.

There was clarification of the paragraph on page 2 regarding Mickey Bentley’s statement about property owners who wanted to rezone their property. It was agreed that the section would be modified with the addition of the phrase “through the planning process after all.”

There were several other minor corrections and additions to the minutes.

A motion was made to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion passed without objection. Bill Schultz abstained.

The updated minutes will be posted to the website.

Proposal to Include Annexation History in Plan

Jackie Waters requested that a section on the annexation history of Oak Hill be included in the Neighborhood Plan. She stated that her property, along with other properties in Oak Hill, had been annexed by the City in 1985 and then de-annexed in 1987 because of actions by the State Legislature requiring that certain services be provided. It was then annexed again in 2001. Jackie stated that there would be value in including these historical events in the Neighborhood Plan. After a period of discussion, Maureen Meredith stated that the City staff would add the appropriate information regarding the annexation history to the plan.

Resolution by Bill Schultz

Bill Schultz distributed the following resolution for consideration:

“Whereas the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team (OHNPT) was formed by an election of the General Members who formerly were the Steering Committee members that largely had input to the City of Austin for the Neighborhood Plan.

Whereas the OHNPCT has been acting as an advisory group to City of Austin's Neighborhood Planning since August 2007 under the guidance of the adopted Bylaws of May 31, 2007.

Whereas the OHNPCT desires to continue to be empowered to operate under Bylaws adopted on _____ and as amended, until such time that the Neighborhood Plan is approved by the City of Austin City Council.

Whereas the OHNPCT will be empowered to review zoning changes for compliance with the "Neighborhood Plan" and Future Land Use Map (FLUM) after approval by City of Austin City Council.

Be it resolved, the we, the elected and serving members of the OHNPCT, do agree to operate under the Bylaws established and included as part of the "Plan", even though this "Plan" is not yet approved."

Bill stated that according to Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws, the Bylaws and the Contact Team are effective once the Plan is approved. We have been acting as if the Plan has been adopted. Since the Plan has not been adopted, approval of this resolution may eliminate some potential future conflict.

Dick Armitage questioned whether this resolution was not appropriate for consideration at a work session designed to review the Plan. He suggested that it might be more appropriate to deal with this matter at our next regular meeting. A motion was made to add the item to the agenda for the November 28th meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

Review Goals, Objectives and Recommendations Handout

Maureen Meredith distributed a handout showing an example of how goals, objectives and recommendations would be numbered for identification throughout the Plan. Goals would be identified with a capital letter. Objectives under a goal would be identified with the goal's letter plus a number. Finally, recommendations would be identified with a combination of the goal's capital letter, the number of the objective, and a series of lower case letters for each recommendation. For example:

- A. GOAL
 - A1. Objective
 - A1a: Recommendation 1
 - A1b: Recommendation 2

Review of Comments on Chapter 4

The first stakeholder comment reviewed was an e-mail dated September 9, 2007 from David Richardson. Comments in the e-mail pointed out that people in Oak Hill do not

want commercial development along highways that would look like 183 N or even Brodie Lane or South Lamar. People want to cluster commercial uses and preserve the rural ambiance of the existing highway corridor. Charles Draper pointed out that highway corridors are appropriate for commercial development so that we don't have to extend infrastructure back into open spaces and green spaces. Having commercial development along the highway also limits traffic impact in the neighborhoods. He did not agree that limiting such development was an accurate reflection of what the community is suggesting.

Bill Schultz pointed out that with SOS development restrictions regarding impervious cover, commercial development in Oak Hill would never look like 183 N due to the differences in impervious cover allowed in the two different watersheds.

Bill went on to state that he had heard that there was a CAMPO study [Bill subsequently advised that he meant to say Cap Metro] that stated that Oak Hill would need 900,000 square feet of commercial development to support its current needs. If we do not meet that need for commercial services within Oak Hill, we will create the requirement for additional drive miles. The potential town center can only satisfy part of this demand, hence the highway frontage is needed.

David stated that with a requirement for sufficient setback from the highway, a vegetative buffer could be used and it would not look like 183. Maureen pointed out that this is a design consideration within the Plan, and that the Contact Team working with developers could help implement the vision. Bill pointed out that the new Commercial Design Standards address these issues.

Bill then raised the issue of transferring development rights within the watershed protection area. Specifically he suggested that the Contact Team move to adopt a recommendation that we allow for the transfer of impervious cover within the watershed. Beki Halpin indicated that she would not agree with that suggestion because it merely shifted the problem to another area. Allowing development in one part of the watershed in exchange for restricting development in another area would not provide assurance that the other area would not succumb to development pressure in the future.

David Richardson pointed out that the Water Quality Protection Dept. of the City of Austin has sequestered 31% of the lands within the City jurisdiction as water quality zones. The 31% is permanently sequestered as open space, some with very limited access. Beki pointed out that it does not necessarily mean that such land will be preserved in perpetuity, especially if the land is outside the City jurisdiction. Bill Schultz pointed out that a restrictive covenant would resolve that potential future problem.

The discussion continued on the need to change current impervious cover rules to allow clustering of commercial development in exchange for maintaining open space in areas where land is cheaper and is located in the water quality contributing zone in Hayes County.

Beki continued to point out that eventually people will build up around the open spaces in Hayes County and then there will be pressure to develop on those open spaces.

Dick Armitage stated that the Oak Hill Plan currently has as an objective preserving the rural environment of Oak Hill. By suggesting that we allow more dense development in Oak Hill in exchange for open mitigation land in Hays County may not be consistent with what the Oak Hill people have stated in the plan work sessions.

Mickey Bentley pointed out that we would not get public transportation without density.

Maureen Meredith pointed out that these issues might have been addressed with the big policy changes added from the Oct. 6th meeting.

David summarized the discussion and stated that we need to be willing to re-examine the fundamental premise of our policy objectives and the current policies if we want to continue to develop and also protect the water quality of Barton Springs and the Edwards Aquifer.

Charles Draper stated that we should not insert in the Plan comments that would make development more restrictive if the comments reflect the opinion of only a small number of people. He did not believe it appropriate to incorporate the points from the Sept. 9th e-mail in the Plan.

Bill Schultz again pointed out the importance of coming up with some mechanism to allow for the trading of impervious cover rights. He explained how the value of land (and impervious cover) varies with the location. He advocated creating a market where impervious cover in different locations could be transferred from one location to another (Transfer of Development Rights) via a procedural mechanism regulated by the City. Documenting and recording TDR transactions that preserve open space or accomplish some other environmental goal could be taxed by the City with tax proceeds reinvested within the community.

Beki Halpin responded that the impervious cover restrictions were implemented solely to insure water quality protection and any considerations of TDR should only be applied to water quality protection and no other community or environmental goals.

Maureen Meredith pointed out that much of this discussion has not been previously vetted through the community, but there may be a way to raise the issue in the Plan by recording these as policy change ideas from the Contact Team and putting them in an appendix.

David Richardson referred the group to the handout “Who Is Responsible for Protecting the Aquifer?” He pointed out the importance of coming up with a financial mechanism that would balance clustered development and open space.

Mickey Bentley again pointed out that with 15% or 25% impervious cover restrictions you just cannot cluster unless you allow trading of impervious cover credits.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

The next work session is scheduled for Nov. 17th.