

MEMORANDUM

DATE June 15, 2004
TO Village of Volente City Council
FROM Carey Witt, Chair, Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee
RE Interpretation of the Village of Volente Community Survey Results

To date, the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee has met five times and produced both its interpretation of the Community Survey results and its drafts of the Goals, Objectives and Strategies (GOS) for the six individual master plans that will eventually be integrated into the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Our committee carefully considered two issues. First, will the community let us regulate at all? We believe the answer is "yes". Second, does the committee feel comfortable in determining the degree to which the Village will regulate itself? We believe this answer lies in the determination of the areas to be regulated. With these beliefs always at the forefront of our deliberation, our committee proceeded with its discussion of its interpretation of the survey results.

It also must be said that we began our task with a question-by-question review of the entire survey and if there was full committee agreement on what appeared to be an obvious mandate from the community by its responses to any given question—please see attached raw data tabulations--then the committee noted its consensus and moved on to questions where it was felt that greater scrutiny and discussion were warranted. Therefore, provided below is my report to Council on the committee's interpretation of the "parking lot issues" within the Community Survey results:

POLLUTION CONTROL?

- **Residential Water Quality**
 - \geq 70% (LCRA) (YES)
 - \geq 80% (Disagreement...There may be community support for more stringent controls. Some feel there is stronger support for \geq 80%. All believe the community needs water quality education. Regarding stormwater/run-off treatment, the most popular answer was "No Opinion" and the committee believes the community wants more information about this issue.)
- **Commercial Water Quality**
 - \geq 70% (LCRA) (YES)
 - \geq 80% (YES)
 - \geq 95% (Uncertain...Some feel there may be support for 95%.)

LOT SIZE?

- Support 1/8 and 1/4 acre lot sizes? (NO...The committee agrees there was no support for less than 1/2 acre.)
- Support 1/2 acre lot size? (Uncertain...There is controversy because of a fear of its consequences on density and rural image, but there is some support.)
- Support \geq 1 acre lot size? (YES...This is where the majority of support lies. Most of the lots in Volente are above one acre. The survey points to one acre for well/septic and one acre for organized water.)

COMMUNITY IMAGE?

- Retirement community? (YES... The committee discussed that Volente is already a retirement community, so what we have now is our answer, i.e., that here it means many folks are no longer working and that we are a rural community. These folks can maintain their own household, tend their garden and still live on their own (e.g., not yet needing an assisted living arrangement). The predominant age of respondents was 45-55, so the committee assumes they want elements of a retirement community, not density, and that the respondents were not talking about garden homes or a strict interpretation of "retirement community", e.g., Sun City.
- Bedroom community? (YES)
- Rural, low density? (YES)
- Pedestrian-friendly (NO...Volente citizens like their cars.)
- Environmentally-friendly (YES)
- Affordability? (YES)

MEMORANDUM
June 15, 2004
Page Two

DENSITY?

- Low density? (YES)
- Green space – Residential?
 - >= 50% (YES)
 - >= 80% (Uncertain...The greatest support is for 50-80%, but the number for how much is non-residential is unknown at this time.)

Other outstanding issues reviewed and discussed by the committee yielded the following consensus items:

- Re sidewalks, the committee discussed continuing the existing community image. Citizens were very clear in their responses that they do not want a suburb—they clearly want to maintain a rural atmosphere--and that sidewalks are inappropriate for the preferred lot size of the community. Committee consensus: NO.
- Re a community center, the committee discussed that even though the Fire Hall is sufficient now, it might not be adequate for future Village needs. However, it is clear that respondents do not want to pay for it with tax monies. There was discussion that if a center was funded by a developer, then yes, but only if the Village also owned it. Committee consensus: YES...but using little/no tax dollars.
- Re architectural restrictions, there was discussion that for commercial, there was more support for controls (no big, ugly buildings, more durable materials, etc.) and for residential, there was less support for controls (everyone agreed that nobody wants a cookie-cutter village). Committee consensus: Residential NO/Commercial YES.
- Re healthcare facilities, the committee discussed that small offices offering professional services might be welcome, especially if locals owned them. Nobody thought citizens wanted a large-scale hospital or strip center. Committee Consensus: Individual offices or doctor/dentist/professional alone YES/Large hospitals/clinics NO.
- Re assisted care facilities, there was continued discussion about the selection “medical or healthcare facilities” as indicated above. Committee consensus: NO...for now.
- Re mixed-use development, survey respondents clearly do not wish to encourage mixed-use development as a goal for the community. There was very strong support for the regulation of where commercial or industrial areas are developed in the community, for the regulation of the amount of space or buffering between commercial and residential areas, and for the regulation of commercial or industrial development along major roadways. The committee discussed the current mixed-use in the Village and its treatment in the coming Zoning Map/Ordinance and Future Land Use Map. Committee consensus: NO.

The Steering Committee seeks the acceptance and approval of this report by Council. This committee also seeks the acceptance and approval of the GOS drafts submitted to you. If there is any part of either of these submittals which Council wants sent back to the committee for further consideration, the committee seeks that instruction, if applicable.

Respectfully submitted,

Carey Witt, Chair
Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

Attach. (Survey Tabulations-5 Pages)