SECOND / THIRD READINGS SUMMARY SHEET

ZONING CASE NUMBER: C14-2770-0065 Bassford 44

REQUEST:
Approve second/third readings of an ordinance amending Chapter 25-2 of the Austin City Code by rezoning property locally known as 8437 W. U.S. Hwy. 71 (Williamson Creek Watershed) from rural residence (RR) district zoning to single-family residence-standard lot-conditional overlay (SF-2-CO) combining district zoning. First reading approved on October 11, 2007. Vote: 7-0. Applicant: Marvin Bassford Trust (Marvin Bassford). Agent: Jim Bennett Consulting (Jim Bennett). City Staff: Robert Heil, 974-2330.

ISSUES:

OWNER/APPLICANT: Marvin Bassford

AGENT: Jim Bennett Consulting (Jim Bennett)

DATE OF FIRST READING: October 11, 2007:

CITY COUNCIL HEARING DATE: November 8, 2007

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:
October 11, 2007: The public hearing was closed and the first reading of the ordinance for single-family residence-standard lot-conditional overlay (SF-2-CO) combining district zoning with conditions was approved on Council Member McCracken's motion, Mayor Pro Tem Dunkerley's second on a 7-0 vote. The additional conditional overlay was to limit the maximum number of residential units to 90, set a 2,000 vehicle trips per day limitation, and accepting a commitment to fund traffic calming devices on Mocassin Pass.

CASE MANAGER: Robert Heil e-mail address: robert.heil@ci.austin.tx.us

ZONING CHANGE REVIEW SHEET

CASE: C14-2007-0065 Bassford 44

PC Date: August 14, 2007
September 11, 2007
September 25, 2007

ADDRESS: 8437 W. Hwy 71

OWNER/APPLICANT: Marvin Bassford

AGENT: Jim Bennett Consulting (Jim Bennett)

ZONING FROM: RR **TO:** SF-2 **AREA:** 44.673 acres

SUMMARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of single family residence (standard lot) (SF-2-CO) district zoning. The conditional overlay would limit development to no more than 2000 daily vehicle trips, and limit the maximum number of residential units to 90.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

August 14, 2007: Postponed to September 11, 2007 at the request of the applicant.
[J.REDDY, S.KIRK 2ND] (7-0) C.GALINDO – ABSENT

September 11, 2007: Closed the public hearing and continued discussion until September 25.

September 25, 2007: APPROVED STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION FOR SF-2-CO ZONING WITH CONDITIONS OF:

- LIMIT OF 90 UNITS;
- 2000 TRIPS PER DAY;
- REQUIRE TRAFFIC CALMING DESIGN ON MOQUISIN PASS.

[J.REDDY, S.KIRK 2ND] (8-0)

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The property is a large (roughly 45 acre) undeveloped lot currently zoned rural residential (RR). The request is for family residence (standard lot) (SF-2-CO) district zoning.

The property is surrounded by the largely built out Covered Bridge subdivision, with a mix of SF-1 and SF-2 zoning on interior lots, with more intense zoning on larger roadways, such as Covered Bridge Drive and US Highway 71.

Staff recommends approval of single family residence (standard lot) (SF-2-CO) district zoning. The conditional overlay would limit development to no more than 2000 daily

vehicle trips. With SF-2 zoning, a 2000 daily trip limit equates to no more than 209 single family units. Over 44.7 acres this would result in an overall density of roughly 4.6 units per acre. Additionally, the applicant has offered, and staff supports an additional limit of a maximum of 90 residential units. – roughly a density of two units per acre.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

	ZONING	LAND USES
Site	RR	Undeveloped
North	MF-1	Undeveloped
South	SF-2	Single Family Homes
East	SF-1	Single Family Homes
West	MF-1 and SF-6	Undeveloped and single family homes

AREA STUDY: The property lies within the Oak Hill neighborhood plan area. The draft future land use map calls for residential land use in the area.

TIA: A traffic impact analysis was waived for this case because the applicant agreed to limit the intensity and uses for this development. If the zoning is granted, development should be limited through a conditional overlay to less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day. [LDC, 25-6-117]

WATERSHED: Williamson Creek **DESIRED DEVELOPMENT ZONE:** No

CAPITOL VIEW CORRIDOR: No **HILL COUNTRY ROADWAY:** No

REGISTERED NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

- Oak Hill Association of Neighborhoods
- Hill Country Estates Homeowners Association
- Home Builders' Association of Greater Austin
- Austin Independent School Disctrict
- Scenic Brook Neighborhood Association
- Covered Bridge Property Owners' Association
- Wynnrock Area Neighborhood Association
- Save Our Springs Alliance
- Save Barton Creek Coalition
- Barton Spring Coalition

SCHOOLS: (AISD)

Oak Hill Elementary School Small Middle School Bowie High School

ABUTTING STREETS:

Name	ROW	Pavement	Classification
Covered Bridges Dr	68' - 70'	38' - 40'	Local
Nandas Trail	68' - 70'	38' - 40'	Local
Moccasin Path	48' - 50'	18' - 20'	Local
Smokey Hill Rd	48' - 50'	18' - 20'	Local

Streets above are not classified in the Bicycle Plan.

Capital Metro bus service is available within 1/4 mile of this property. Oak hill Flyer runs service from this area to downtown.

The streets on the west of this property have sidewalks.

CITY COUNCIL DATE: **ACTION:**

October 11, 2007: The public hearing was closed and the first reading of the ordinance for single-family residence-standard lot-conditional overlay (SF-2-CO) combining district zoning with conditions was approved on Council Member McCracken's motion, Mayor Pro Tem Dunkerley's second on a 7-0 vote. The additional conditional overlay was to limit the maximum number of residential units to 90, set a 2,000 vehicle trips per day limitation, and accepting a commitment to fund traffic calming devices on Mocassin Pass.

November 8, 2007

ORDINANCE READINGS: **1st 10/11/07** **2nd** **3rd**

ORDINANCE NUMBER:

CASE MANAGER: Robert Heil **PHONE:** 974-2330
e-mail address: robert.heil@ci.austin.tx.us


C14-2007-0065
Bassford 44
8437 W Hwy 71
From RR to SF-2
W SH 71
GR
SP-05-1623C
RR
MF-1
SF
COVERED BRIDGE DR
AMANDAS TRL
OFFICES
85-288.100RC
03-0166.SH
RED WILLOW TRL
BARCAMIN DR
SF-2
WHITE DEER XING

SUMMARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of single family residence (standard lot) (SF-2-CO) district zoning. The conditional overlay would limit development to no more than 2000 daily vehicle trips, and limit the maximum number of residential units to 90.

BASIS FOR LAND USE RECOMMENDATION (ZONING PRINCIPLES)

1. Zoning changes should promote compatibility with adjacent and nearby uses.

SF-2-CO residential zoning would be compatible with the surrounding SF-1 and SF-2 zoned neighborhood.

Transportation

A traffic impact analysis was waived for this case because the applicant agreed to limit the intensity and uses for this development. If the zoning is granted, development should be limited through a conditional overlay to less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day. [LDC, 25-6-117]

A Neighborhood Traffic Analysis is required and will be performed for this project by the Transportation Review staff. Current traffic 24-hour traffic counts may be required from the applicant. Results are provided in an attached memo. LDC, Sec. 25-6-114.

Environmental

This site is not located over the Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone. The site is in the Williamson Creek Watershed of the Colorado River Basin, which is classified as a Barton Springs Zone (BSZ) watershed. It is in the Drinking Water Protection Zone.

Project applications at the time of this report are subject to the SOS Ordinance that allows 15% impervious cover in the recharge zone, 20% impervious cover in the Barton Creek watershed and 25% impervious cover in the contributing zone. This tract lies in the contributing zone.

According to flood plain maps, there is flood plain within the project location.

The site is located within the endangered species survey area.

Standard landscaping and tree protection will be required in accordance with LDC 25-2 and 25-8 for all development and/or redevelopment.

At this time, site specific information is unavailable regarding existing trees and other vegetation, areas of steep slope, or other environmental features such as bluffs, springs, canyon rimrock, caves sinkholes, and wetlands.

Under current watershed regulations, development or redevelopment on this site will be subject to providing structural sedimentation and filtration basins with increased capture volume and 2 year detention. Runoff from the site is required to comply with pollutant load restrictions as specified in LDC Section 25-8-514.

At this time, no information has been provided as to whether this property has any preexisting approvals which would preempt current water quality or Code regulations.

Water and Wastewater

The landowner intends to serve the site with City of Austin water and wastewater utilities. The landowner, at own expense, will be responsible for providing the water and wastewater utility improvements, offsite main extensions, system upgrades, utility relocation, and abandonment . The water and wastewater plan must be in accordance with the City of Austin utility design criteria. The water and wastewater utility plan must be reviewed and approved by the Austin Water Utility. All water and wastewater construction must be inspected by the City of Austin. The landowner must pay the City inspection fee with the utility construction.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Heil, Case Manager

CC: Jim Bennett (Applicant)

DATE: September 5, 2007

SUBJECT: Neighborhood Traffic Analysis for Zoning Case # C14-2007-0065 (Bassford – 44)

The Transportation Section has performed a neighborhood traffic impact analysis for the above referenced case and offers the comments below. Bassford – 44 is located in southwest Austin just south of Hwy 71 and about 1.5 miles west of Hwy 290 and Hwy 71 split. The 45 acre tract which is currently zoned Rural Residence is requesting a zoning change to Single Family Residential (SF-2). The tract will have vehicular access from two existing stubbed out streets – Nandas Trail (on the west) and Moccasin Path (on the east). Surrounding the tract to the east is SF-1 zoning and to the north and west is MF-1 zoning.

ROADWAYS

The table below provides the street characteristics for the roadways that the proposed project will be accessing.

Name	ROW	Pavement	Classification
Nandas Trail	68' - 70'	38' - 40'	Local
Covered Bridge Dr	68' - 70'	38' - 40'	Collector
Moccasin Path	48' - 50'	18' - 20'	Local
Silvermine Rd	80' - 82	40 - 42'	Collector

Trip Generation and Traffic Analysis

Based on the ITE's publication Trip Generation, the proposed development at the time of site plan will generate a maximum of 3,216 vehicles per day (vpd). This trip generation is based on the assumption that the site develops to the maximum intensity allowed under the zoning classification (without consideration of setbacks, environmental constraints, or other site characteristics).

Land Use	Acres	Trips Per Day
Single Family Homes	44.673	3,216

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Distribution of trips was estimated as follows:

Street	Site Traffic
Nandas Trail / Covered Bridges Dr	50%
Moccasin Path / Silvermine Rd	50%

Below is a table containing the estimated number of trips that will affect each street:

Street	Existing Traffic	Site Traffic (vpd)	Total Traffic after Project
Nandas Trail	28	1,608	1,636
Covered Bridges Dr	1,887	1,608	3,495
Moccasin Path	47	1,608	1,655
Silvermine Rd	2,189	1,608	2,711

Desirable Operating Level

The Land Development Code specifies desirable operating levels for certain streets in section 25-6-116. These levels are as follows:

Street	Site Traffic
Less than 30 feet	1,200
30 feet to 40 feet	1,800
40 feet or wider	4,000

CONCLUSIONS

1) The neighborhood traffic analysis was triggered because the projected number of vehicle trips generated by the project exceeds the vehicle trips per day generated by existing uses by at least 300 trips per day, and the project has access to a local or residential collector street where at least 50 percent of the site frontage has an SF-5 or more restrictive zoning designation.
2) The traffic along all streets, except Moccasin Path does not exceed the minimum requirements established in Section 25-6-116.

3) At the time of plat or site plan review, Moccasin Path must be paved and upgraded to TCM standards for local streets at developer's expense.
4) In order to minimize traffic on surrounding streets, the intensity and uses for this rezoning should be limited to less than 2,000 unadjusted vehicle trips per day.

Sangeeta Jain, AICP
Senior Planner, Transportation Review, WPDR

Closed Caption Log, Council Meeting, 10/11/07

Note: Since these log files are derived from the Closed Captions created during the Channel 6 live cablecasts, there are occasional spelling and grammatical errors. **These Closed Caption logs are not official records of Council Meetings and cannot be relied on for official purposes.** For official records or transcripts, please contact the City Clerk at 974-2210.

ITEM NUMBER 105 IS CASE C 14-2007-0065, THE BASSFORD 44 PROPERTY AT 8437 WEST HIGHWAY 71. THIS IS A REZONING REQUEST FROM RR RURAL RESIDENTIAL TO SF TWO, STANDS FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE STANDING LOT. THE PLANNING EXHIBITION RECOMMENDATION WAS TO APPROVE FOR SF-2-CO FOR CONDITIONAL OVER THOUGH MAXIMIZE THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO 90 AND LIMIT THE NUMBER OF VEHICLE TRIPS TO NO MORE THAN 2,000. THE COMMISSION ALSO PLACED A CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT IS AGREEABLE-TO-REQUIRE SOME TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICES ON THE PASS. THE PROPERTY RIGHT NOW IS LOCATED IN THE BARTON SPRINGS ZONE, WOULD BE SUBJECT TO SOS IS IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 71, JUST EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF COVERED BRIDGE. THE CURRENT PROPERTY HAS ACTUALLY TWO STREETS STUB OUTS, ONE TO EXISTING SUBDIVISION TO THE EAST AND ANOTHER TO THE WEST. IT HAS EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES THAT ARE LOCATED TO THE EAST AND TO THE SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST. THE ENTRANCE AND WITH SINGLE FAMILY HOME DEVELOPMENT, ALSO ALONG TO THE WEST. THAT IS ADJACENT TO COVERED BRIDGE. THE APPLICANT IS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION AND THE NEIGHBORS HAVE RAISED SOME CONCERNS ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT ON THIS PROPERTY. THE PROPERTY SUNNY SKIESLY SUNNY -- PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY UNDEVELOPED AND PLANNED FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOMES UNDER THE SF-2 DESIGNATION IS APPROXIMATELY 45-ACRES OF LAND AND WOULD HAVE A DENSITY THAT IS A LITTLE LESS THAN ABOUT TWO UNITS ON AN ACRE. AT THIS TIME, I WILL PAUSE, THE APPLICANT MR. BENNETT I BELIEVE IS HERE TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT. WYNN THANK YOU. SO ON CASE 105 THAT AGENT WOULD BE MR. JIM BENEFIT. WELCOME, VUL FIVE MINUTES TO PRESENT YOUR CASE.

THANK YOU, COUNCIL. THIS PROPERTY IS 44.6-ACRE TRACT OF GROUND SURROUNDED BY RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL TYPE USES. THERE IS SF-2 ZONING FOR THE MAJORITY OF IT, SF-1 ZONING, FM-1 ZONING. THIS IS A 44-ACRE TRACT THAT HAS A STUB OUT STREET FROM THE WEST AND A STUB OUT STREET FROM THE EAST. OBVIOUSLY FOR CONNECTIVITY, AND WE HAVE PLANNED OUR SUBDIVISION TO CONNECT INTO THOSE TWO STREETS. AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING THERE WAS QUITE A BIT OF DISCUSSION, IT WAS POSTPONED, WE WENT BACK AND REWORKED THE CASE. IT WAS DETERMINED THAT WE HAD A QUESTION ABOUT TRAFFIC GOING THROUGH THE ADJOINING NEIGHBORHOOD TO THE EAST COMING OUT TO A SIGNALIZED POINT, AND STATE REPRESENTATIVE BOLDEN IN CONJUNCTION CAN TxDOT AND IN CON JUNK WITH THE COUNTY AND THE CITY -- CONJUNCTION WITH

THE COUNTY AND THE CITY IT WAS IN THE DEAL BOUGHT SIGNALIZATION AT THE COVERED BRIDGE SO IT MAKES IT SAFER COMING OUT ON TO 71. DURING THOSE DISCUSSIONS IT WAS ALSO POINTED OUT THAT PERHAPS WE COULD DO SIDEWALKS ALONG MOCCASIN PASS. AT THAT MEETING SOME NEIGHBORS DIDN'T WANT SIDEWALK, SOME DID WANT SIDEWALKS SO THE SIDEWALK FELL AWAY. HOWEVER, WE DID AGREE AND HAVE COMMITTED TO FUNDING $15,000 WORTH OF TRAFFIC PILLOWS IN THE SUBDIVISION TO THE EAST AND THAT IS A FUNDED COMMITMENT THAT WE'VE MADE, AND WE WILL LEAVE IT UP TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD PEOPLE TO DECIDE WHERE AND WHEN AND THE CITY TO WHERE THOSE PILLOWS SHOULD PLACED. AS INDICATED BY STAFF, PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED IT AND STAFF RECOMMEND WE ARE COMMITTED TO 90 LOTS ON THIS 44.6-ACRE TRACT, AND WE THINK THIS IS A GOOD SUBDIVISION. IT CARRY AS LOT OF OPEN SPACE WITH IT, APPROXIMATELY 35-ACRES, I'M SORRY, 35% OF OPEN SPACE IN OUR PROPOSED PRELIMINARY LAY OUT OF THE SUBDIVISION, AND WE THINK THAT IT IS CERTAINLY GOOD SUBDIVISION, AND WE WILL MEET YOUR ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS. SOME OF THE THINGS THE NEIGHBORHOOD MAY ASK OF YOU ARE THINGS THAT ARE NOT UNDER OUR CONTROL SUCH AS BOUNDARY STREET IMPROVEMENTS NOT BEING APPLIED IN THE STUB IN STREET ON MOCCASIN PASS. IF THE STAFF REQUIRE IT IS OR THE ORDINANCE REQUIRE IT, I WILL HAVE TO DO THAT. MAYOR, I BELIEVE THAT CONCLUDES AND IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS I WILL CERTAINLY BE GLAD TO ANSWER THEM.

MAYOR WYNN: THANK YOU, MR. BENNETT. QUESTIONS FROM THE AGENT? COUNCIL? AT THIS TIME NORMALLY WE HEAR FROM SMOKERS SIGNED UP TO TESTIFY IN FAVOR OF THE CASE. THERE ARE NONE. WE THEN GO TO FOLKS IN OPPOSITION. WE HAVE ONE SPEAKER, THAT BEING VICKY GARCIA. MISS GARCIA IS HERE, AND IS WELCOME TO COME GIVE TESTIMONY. TESTIMONY. WELCOME, MA'AM. YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES AND FOLLOWED BY A ONE-TIME THREE MINUTE REBUTTAL FROM THE AGENT IF APPROPRIATE.

I WOULD LIKE TO -- I DO HAVE PICTURES. MY NAME IS VICKY GARCIA, I LIVE AT 84 -- MAY I SIT DOWN.

MAYOR WYNN, YOU MAY, FAN HAVE YOU PHOTOS, CAN HELP YOU SHOW THEM ON THE SCREEN IF THAT WOULD HELP YOUR CASE.

MY NEIGHBORHOOD DOESN'T HAVE A NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION SO THROUGH DEFAULT I'VE COME. THROUGH DEFAULT I'VE BEEN, I'M NOT USED TO THIS.

MAYOR WYNN: YOU ARE DOING FINE, BUT IF YOU WOULD SPEAK INTO THE MICROPHONE IT WOULD HELP US ALL.

ALL RIGHT. THIS PICTURE, JUST IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE, THAT IS THE CORNER OF MOCCASIN PATH TO THE STUB GOING INTO THE PROPERTY. MY NAME IS VICKY GARCIA, I LIVE AT 8402 MOCCASIN PATH WHICH IS THE NORTHEAST CORNER IN SMOKY MILL, AND AGAIN I'M NOT USED TO THIS BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE A NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION. THE FIRST PAGE IS A SUMMARY OF WHAT I'M GOING TO, A SUMMARY OF THE FOLLOWING PAGES. OUR REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING APPROVAL ARE AS FOLLOWS: KEEP THE STUB OF MOCCASIN PATH BETWEEN SMOKY HILL AND THE PROPERTY AT THE EXISTING WIDTH OR THE 18 FEET. I UNDERSTAND IT IS 18 FEET. THE EXISTING STUB NOT HAVE CURBS OR GUTTERS OR SIDEWALKS, WE ASK THAT THESE IMPROVEMENTS, THE IMPROVEMENTS TO THIS SECTION NOT INCLUDE WIDENING OR ADDING CURBS, GUTTERS OR SIDEWALKS. THE PURPOSE OF THIS IS TWOFOLD, TO KEEP THIS SECTION COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING STREETS. AND THESE ARE PICTURES OF THE SURROUNDING STREETS, AND YOU WILL SEE THEY ALL DON'T HAVE CURBS OR GUTTERS, AND THEY ARE ALL ABOUT 18 TO 20 FEET WIDE. AND TO COMMUNICATE TO THE DRIVERS EXITING THROUGH THIS ACCESS POINT THAT THEY ARE ENTERING A PEDESTRIAN STREET. THESE STREETS WE HAVE SCHOOL BUS KIDS, HIGH SCHOOL KIDS, THE HIGH SCHOOL LETS OUT AT 5:00 AND THERE IS ONE STREET LIGHT AND SO THERE IS NOT A LOT OF LIGHT FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL KIDS. THIS ACCESS POINT, WE UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM, THE CONCERN OF THE CITY IS THAT THE ACCESS POINT OF MOCCASIN PATH REMAIN VIABLE TO EMERGENCY VEHICLES DOING THIS IMPROVEMENT WOULD ALLOW THAT THIS, WOULD ALSO MARGINALLY REDUCE THE EXPENSE TO THE PROPERTY OWNER TO IMPROVE THE STUB. THE DEVELOP -- NUMBER TWO, THE DEVELOPERS CONCEDED THAT BUILDING A SIDEWALK ON MOCCASIN PATH WOULD BE TOLERABLE. THAT IS WHAT WAS MENTIONED WAS THE MONEY, WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE BETTER SERVED IN THE SPEED PILLOWS ALONG MOCCASIN PATH IN EQUAL DISTANCE ALONG SMOKY HILL. IN ADDITION THE REDUCED EXPENSE OF DEVELOPING THE STUB WE ARE ASKING IN ADDITION THE REDUCED EXPENSE OF DEVELOPING THE STUB IMPROVING THE STUB BE USED TOWARDS THE SPEED PILLOWS, A REASONABLE TIME FRAME WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY 50% BUILD OUT OF THE PROPERTY. THE THIRD WOULD BE TO INSTALL A SPEED BUMP ON THE STUB CLOSER TO THE PROPERTY LINE, THIS WILL ALLOW, THIS WILL SLOW DOWN THE TRAFFIC EXITING THE PROPERTY THAT WILL BE ENTERING THE NARROWER PEDESTRIAN STREETS OF THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD AND IF A SPEED BUMP, WE UNDERSTAND THERE MIGHT BE PROBLEMS WITH IT BEING A SPEED BUMP AND IF THAT IS NOT ALLOWED THEN MAYBE CONSIDER A SPEED PILL THROW SLOW DOWN AND THEN FOUR, WE WOULD ALSO ASK NO SIGNAGE, AND WE THINK THE DEVELOPER IS IN AGREEMENT WITH THAT. SO I'M JUST ASKING THAT THIS BE PUT IN THE RECORD. I UNDERSTAND IT IS JUST FOR DISCUSSION. BUT THESE ARE OUR ITEMS. IF YOU HAVE ANY, IF THAT IS MY LIMIT.

MAYOR WYNN: THANK YOU MISS GARCIA. QUESTIONS FOR MISS GARCIA. COUNCIL MEMBER McCRACKEN.

THIS IS AN AREA OF A SCHOOL ZONE?

THE ELEMENTARY BUS GOES, THERE IS A 3-YEAR-OLD RIGHT NOW, FAMILY WITH A 3-YEAR-OLD. THE OAK HILL SCHOOL BUS GOES UP MOCCASIN PATH, MY DAUGHTER GREW UP, THE NEIGHBOR, EVERYONE, THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUS GOES UP MOCCASIN PATH. THE MIDDLE SCHOOL BUS IS DOWN THERE AT THE CORNER OF SMOKY HILL AND RED WILLOW, BUT THAT BUS, IN THE AFTERNOON, LETS OFF ABOUT 3:00, SO IT IS STILL DAYLIGHT. THE BUOY HIGH SCHOOL BUS, AND I KNOW THERE, BUOY, THERE ARE STILL KIDS THAT DO RIDE THE BUS --

THE QUESTION IS, THE REASON I ASKED THE QUESTION ASK WHERE ARE CHILDREN GOING TO WALK IF THERE ARE NO SIDEWALKS?

CURRENTLY, THEY WALK UP THE STREET.

I'VE GOT TO TELL YOU, I HAVE DEEP MISGIVINGS ABOUT, WE ARE TRYING TO UNDO DECADES OF BAD DECISIONS ABOUT NOT PUTTING SIDEWALKS ON STREETS, AND I LIVED ON A STREET WITHOUT A SIDEWALK IN WITH SPEED BUMPS AND IT DIDN'T DO ANYTHING TO SLOW DOWN TRAFFIC AND WITH KIDS HAVING NO FLIES GO AND HAVING TO WALK IN THE STREET IS A VERY CONCERNING THING FOR ME. I DON'T THINK I CAN SUPPORT NO SIDEWALKS. PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE FACT YOU JUST TOLD US, AND I UNDERSTAND THE CONCERN ABOUT KEEPING CARE OF THE STREET, BUT PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE FACT THERE IS A LOT OF SCHOOL KIDS AND SCHOOL BUSES, I THINK FORCING THE CHILDREN TO WALK IN THE STREET IS NOT A GOOD NEIGHBOR-FRIENDLY THING TO DO.

ORIGINALLY WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION, WHAT WE HAD REQUESTED, BECAUSE WE HAD RECOGNIZED THAT, WAS THAT THE DEVELOPER THE DEVELOPER INVESTIGATE ALTERNATIVES, SECOND ACCESS POINT, OTHER THAN MOCCASIN PATH, BECAUSE THAT ITEM WAS WHAT WAS BROUGHT UP. AND I BELIEVE THAT THE CITY HAS TOLD ME THAT MOCCASIN PATH HAS DECIDED TO BE THE SECOND ACCESS POINT WHICH THE NEIGHBORHOOD DOESN'T REALLY AGREE WITH. WE BELIEVE THAT THERE IS A POSSIBLE SECONDS A SECTOR POINT -- A SECOND ACCESS POINT TO THE PROPERTY, BUT IT WOULD BE MORE COSTLY TO THE DEVELOPER SO THE DEVELOPER IS NOT BEHIND THAT. SO GIVEN THAT WE, NEIGHBORHOOD, HAVE OUR HANDS TIED, THAT WE HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT MOCCASIN PATH IS THE SECOND ACCESS, BECAUSE THE DEVELOPER, IT WOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL COST TO THE DEVELOPER, THIS IS THE BEST SOLUTION WE CAN FIND TO ENCOURAGE DRIVERS TO USE THE NANDIAS PATH EXIT AND WITH OUR RECOMMENDATION --

I'M SORRY. I ACTUALLY AGREE WITH YOU ABOUT NOT WIDENING THE STREET GREATER THAN 20 FEET, I THINK THAT IS A GOOD WAY TO KEEP SOME TRAFFIC SLOW AND TO CREATE THE STREET AS A PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED CHARACTER, AND I THINK

THAT IS A GOOD RECOMMENDATION IN A NEIGHBORHOOD. I SUPPORT YOU ON THAT ONE. BUT I DON'T, I DON'T THINK IT IS SAFE OR GOOD TO ALSO SAY WE WILL FORCE KIDS TO WALK IN THE STREET AND PROHIBIT SIDEWALKS IT. SOUNDS THAT I CAN R LIKE THAT IS DRIVEN BY AESTHETICS, NOT WANTING TO CHANGE THE CHARACTER. WE CAN GO, WE MAY BE ABLE TO GET NARROW STREET, BUT WE SHOULD PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE FACT THERE ARE KID'S SCHOOL BUSES, SHOULD NOT HAVE A NEIGHBORHOOD POSITION SAY NOTHING SIDEWALKS. I THINK THAT IS AN ABDUCATION.

MAY I.

MAYOR WYNN: BRIEFLY, YOUR TIME IS EXPIRED.

MAY SKI THAT THE SIDEWALKS BE ON THE ROAD FROM THE CORNER OF MOCCASIN PATH DOWN TO RED WILLOW AS OPPOSED TO THE SIDEWALKS BEING AS HAD BEEN PROPOSED, ALL WAIT DOWN MOCCASIN PATH. BECAUSE THE CHILDREN THAT WILL BE WALKING ON THE STREETS WILL BE GETTING OFF AT SMOKY HILL, AT RED WILLOW AND WALKING UP SMOKY HILL AND THAT IS WHERE THE STUB IS. THE STUB IS AT --

OKAY THANK YOU. I'M SORRY, WE HAVE TO GET ON WITH THIS. I WOULD LIKE MR. BEEN NOTE TO ADDRESS THAT. I DON'T THINK I WILL ALSO BE ABLE TO SUPPORT ANY DRAW BACK IN SIDEWALKS. I DON'T THINK THAT IS GOOD FOR PLANNING FOR STARTERS. MR. BENNETT IF YOU WOULD HAVE A MOMENT IN YOUR THREE MINUTES.

MAYOR WYNN: MR. BENNETT NOW HAS HIS THREE-MINUTE REBUTTAL. WELCOME BACK MR. BENNETT.

COUNCIL MEMBER, THIS SUBDIVISION IS A HAVE YOU BEEN DIVISION OF WHICH MISS GARCIA LIVES IN, AND IT IS THE EXISTING SUBDIVISION APPROVED WHEN IT WAS IN THE COUNTY, SINCE AND NEXTED BY THE CITY. -- ANNEXED BY THE CITY. WE ARE CERTAINLY MEETING ALL THE CITY'S REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDEWALK, CURBS AND GUTTERS AND WHAT YOU OUR SUBDIVISION. THE CONNECTION POINT FOR CONNECTIVITY IS HERE, WHEN THIS SUBDIVISION WAS APPROVED IS AT THIS LOCATION RIGHT HERE, AND AT THIS LOCATION RIGHT HERE. THE CITY'S REQUIRING US TO HAVE TWO ACCESS POINTS BECAUSE OF A 30-LOT SUBDIVISION SO WE HAVE TO HAVE TWO WAYS IN. TO EXPLORE A LITTLE BIT MORE ON THE SIDEWALK ISSUE, WE WERE DISCUSSING AT PLANNING COMMISSION PERHAPS ABOUT PLOT PUTTING IN A SIDEWALK ON THE PASS. THERE WERE SOME NEIGHBORS THAT WANTED SIDEWALKS AND SOME NEIGHBORS THAT DIDN'T WANT SIDEWALKS. WE HAD AGREED WITH PLANNING COMMISSION TO INSTALL SIDEWALKS ON ONE SIDE OF THAT STREET, WHICH EVER SIDE THE NEIGHBORHOOD DECIDED THEY COULD GET A CONSENSUS TO PUT THEM IN SO AS A RESULT OF NOT GETTING A CONSENSUS TO PUT THOSE IN IT WAS DETERMINED THAT PROGRAMS THE MONEY COULD BE BETTER SPENT TO SLOW

CARS DOWN RATHER THAN HAVE SIDEWALKS. WE DON'T HAVE ANY SCHOOLS IN OUR AREA, IT IS MORE OR LESS RURAL STILL SO THE SCHOOL BUS PICKEDst UP AND DROPS OFF CHILDREN FROM DIFFERENT AREAS WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. OUR SUBDIVISION WILL HAVE SIDEWALKS IN IT. WE HAD TO BUILD THEM ACCORDING TO CITY STANDARDS. THE QUESTION WAS OVER IN THE ONE THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE COUNTY. NONE 6 THE STREETS AS I UNDERSTAND IT HAS SIDEWALKS OVER HERE SO WE COULDN'T LOOK AT COMMITTING SIDEWALKS IN THE WHOLE SUBDIVISION OBVIOUS LEAGUE BECAUSE -- OBVIOUSLY BECAUSE IT IS REALLY NOT A PART OF OUR AREA FOR APPROVAL. THIS WILL COMPLY. LOOK AT OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO GAIN ACCESS SO PERHAPS THEY WOULDN'T COME IN. ONE POINT WAS AT THIS CUL-DE-SAC HERE, EASIER TO DEVELOP LOTS WITH HOMES ON THEM SO WE COULDN'T COME IN HERE. WILLIAMSON CREEK IS RIGHT HERE SO THAT WOULD REQUIRE A BRIDGE CROSSING AND TO THE SENSITIVE WILLIAMSON CREEK AND WAS NOT ACCESSIBLE, OBTAINABLE BY US AS WELL. SO IN TRYING TO ADDRESS MOST OF THE CONCERNS WE HEARD AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CAME BACK, THIS IS THE SOLUTION WE CAME UP WITH AND WE'VE HAD THREE DISCUSSIONS WITH MISS GARCIA AND HER FOLKS, TRYING TO TAKE CARE OF AS MUCH AS MITIGATE AS MUCH OF THEIR CONCERNS AS WE COULD, AND THAT IS THE REASON WE COMMITTED TO PUTTING THE $15,000 IN ESCROW SO THAT THOSE PILLOWS COULD BE PLACED IN THEIR SUBDIVISIONS TO SLOW ANY TRAFFIC DOWN, AND WE ALSO AGREED TO PUT PILLOWS AT THE ENTRY POINTS IN OUR SUBDIVISION TO HELP SLOW ANY TRAFFIC DOWN. WE DON'T WANT TO HER PEOPLE SPEEDING THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOOD OR OUR PEOPLE THROUGH HERS THAT WOULD LEAD PEOPLE TO GO OUT THAT WAY AND NOT NECESSARILY THROUGH HER SUBDIVISION. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I WILL BE AVAILABLE.

MAYOR WYNN: THANK YOU MR. BENEFIT NET. QUESTIONS FOR -- MR. BENNETT. QUESTIONS FOR THE AGENT COUNCIL? COMMENTS? CASE 105. MR. GUERNSEY, WHAT IS STAFF PREPARED FOR AND REMIND US AGAIN OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

THIS IS ONLY READY FOR A FIRST READING THIS EVENING, MAYOR AND COUNCIL, AND THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION WAS TO GRANT THE REQUEST WITH A TRIPLE LIMITATION. THE COMMISSION ADDED THE ADDITIONAL CONDITION THE APPLICANT IS A AGREEABLE TO FOR THE TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS THAT WOULD ADD FOR CALMING. WHATEVER IMPROVEMENTS THAT WOULD BE PROVIDED FOR AND TYPICALLY THESE IMPROVEMENTS WOULD BE ADDRESSED AS FAR AS STREET CONNECTIONS AND WITH THE STREET SOME TIME IN THE SUBDIVISION PROCESS, THAT WOULD ISSUE THE TIME WOULD BE ADDRESSED, BUT THEY WOULD HAVE TO BE APPROVED BY A PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT AS FAR AT PILLOW CONSTRUCTION OR SPEED BUMPS OR WITH THE SIDEWALKS IN THIS AREA SO I WILL JUST MAKE THAT KNOWN. WE ARE ONLY READY FOR FIRST READING. IF YOU DESIRE TO GO THROUGH AND APPROVE THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION, THAT DID INCLUDE THE ADDITIONAL ITEM THAT THE APPLICANT CERTAINLY WOULD AGREE WITH AND THAT WOULD BE PROVISIONS

FOR ADDITIONAL MONIES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TRAFFIC AND CALMING IMPROVEMENTS.

MAYOR WYNN: THANK YOU MR. GUERNSEY. QUESTIONS OF STAFF? MAYOR PRO TEM.

DUNKERLEY: SO MR. GUERNSEY YOU'VE INCLUDE HAD HAD IN YOUR RECOMMENDATION THE TRAFFIC CALMING IN LIEU OF SIDEWALKS?

THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION WHEN WE ADDRESSED THE MAXIMUM UNITS AND ADDRESSED THE TRIPS NOT SPEAK TO SIDEWALKS OR THE TRAFFIC CALMING.

DUNKERLEY: THE PROPOSAL I HEARD FROM MR. BENNETT IS THAT ORIGINALLY HE HAD PROPOSED SIDEWALKS ALONG THAT AREA AND THAT THE NEIGHBORHOOD'S REQUEST CHANGED THAT TO TRAFFIC CALMING. DID UNDERSTAND THAT CORRECTLY?

THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTAND IS THAT HE WAS WILLING TO PROVIDE THAT TRAFFIC CALMING.

DUNKERLEY: IN THE DEVELOPMENT UNDER CONSIDERATION THERE WILL BE SIDEWALKS IN THAT DEVELOPMENT?

WITHIN THIS DEVELOPMENT THAT MR. BENNETT REPRESENTS THERE WILL BE SIDEWALKS THAT WOULD BE PROVIDED AND THE STUB OUT STREET THAT I BELIEVE IS MOCCASIN THAT COMES OUT ON TO THE EAST THERE WOULD BE IMPROVEMENTS FOR THAT EXTENSION AS THERE WOULD BE A STREET CONNECTION FROM SMOKY HILL TO THE SUBDIVISION VIA MOCCASIN.

DUNKERLEY: I'M FAMILIAR WITH THIS AREA AND I GUESS I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY A NEIGHBORHOOD WOULDN'T WANT SIDEWALKS AS FAR AS THEY COULD GET THEM. AS A WAY TO BEGIN HAVING THAT AMENITY FOR ANYBODY THAT WANTS TO WALK ALONG THOSE ROADS. THAT IS A RHETORICAL QUESTION.

WHAT STAFF CAN DO IS GET WITH OUR TRANSPORTATION PUBLIC WORKS STAFF AND LOOK AT WHAT SIDEWALKS WOULD BE CONTEMPLATED WITH THE EXTENSION OF THE STREET FROM THE, ALONG MOCCASIN TO SMOKY HILL, WHAT IMPROVE. S WE WOULD LOOK AT AND WHAT WOULD BE THE MINIMUM WIDTH THAT WOULD BE PROVIDED FOR AND PROVIDE INFORMATION WHEN WE BRING THIS BACK IF YOU APPROVE THIS TODAY FOR SECOND AND THIRD READING SO WE CAN GIVE YOU A CROSS SECTION 6 THE STREET, WHAT THAT WOULD LOOK LIKE AND PROVIDE IT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND ALSO TO MR. BENNETT.

DUNKERLEY: IF WE MOVE TODAY FOR THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION WE CAN ALWAYS CLARIFY THAT AT THE NEXT, ON FIRST READING QUO CLARIFY THAT IN THE NEXT COUPLE.

THAT IS CORRECT. THAT WOULD BE A PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION.

DUNKERLEY: OKAY. WITH THE SIDEWALKS.

YES.

I WILL MOVE TO APPROVE ON FIRST READING THE PLANNING RECOMMENDATION.

MAYOR WYNN: MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER McCRACKEN AND SECOND BY MAYOR PRO TEM TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND VOTE ON PLANNING RECOMMENDATION ITEM 105. FURTHER COMMENTS?

DOES THAT INCLUDE THE COMMITMENT BY US WITH THE 15,000 IN ESCROW, COUNCIL MEMBERS? THAT IS A SIDE AGREEMENT, NOT SOMETHING THE COMMISSION HAS REQUIRED. MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SAID THE SIDEWALKS ON THE STUB OUT STREET IN LIEU OF THE -- THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION WAS SPOKE TO TRAFFIC CALMING AS BEING PART OF THEIR RECOMMENDATION AND WHEN I SENT FOR MR. BENNETT HE HAS OFFER TO DO SO PROVIDE $15,000 I GUESS IN AN ESCROW ACCOUNT TO OFFSET THE COST OF THOSE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES.

WHAT DOES THAT MEAN IN TERMS OF THE SIDEWALKS ON THE STUB OUT STREET?

WELL THE STUB OUT WOULD HAVE STOCK CONSTRUCTED TO CITY STANDARDS. I THINK GEORGE CAN COME UP AND SPEAK TO THIS, BUT I UNDERSTAND THERE ARE DIFFERENT DESIGNS FOR STREET STANDARDS, BUT WE WOULD LOOK AT SIDEWALKS AS BEING PART OF THAT.

THE PROPOSAL, THE PLANNING COMMISSION DID ON THE CONNECTOR STREET THEN WHERE IT STUBBED OUT.

YES, COUNCIL MEMBER, THE EXISTING, ALTHOUGH THE RIGHT OF WAY EXISTS, MY UNDERSTANDING THE PAVEMENT IS NOT THERE SO IT WOULD HAVE TO BE CONSTRUCTED AS A NEW STREET TO CITY STANDARDS. THE MINIMUM WIDTH NORMALLY WOULD BE 24 FEET WITH RIBBON CURB ON EACH SIDE TO PREVENT DETERIORATION OF THE EDGE 6 THE PAVEMENT, AND SIDEWALK WOULD BE REQUIRED ON BOTH SIDES 6 THE STREET NORMALLY, AT LEAST FOR THAT SHORT HALF BLOCK THERE. THERE WAS DISCUSSION PREVIOUSLY ABOUT EXTENDING THE

SIDEWALK FARTHER EAST ALONG MOCCASIN TRAIL THAT WOULD NOT BE A NORMAL REQUIREMENT OF THE SUBDIVISION BECAUSE THAT IS OFF SIDE. -- OFF SITE.

LET'S HEAR THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND GET THIS SORTED OUT BEFORE SECOND READING AND MY RECOMMENDATION.

AGREED.

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request, or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website:

www.ci.austin.tx.us/development

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2007-0065
Contact: Robert Heil, (512) 974-2330
Public Hearing:
August 14, 2007 Planning Commission

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Sonja Stefaniw
Your Name *(please print)*

7200 Flynn Circle, Austin, TX 78736
Your address(es) affected by this application

Sonja Stefaniw — 8-6-07
Signature — Date

Comments: If you must change the zoning, then just go to SF-1, NOT SF-2. A beautiful valley is not to be completed via a drastic zoning change: lessen the blow of development to us all by at least requiring larger lot sizes — and perhaps a few more trees and green spaces will remain.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
City of Austin
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department
Robert Heil
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request, or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website:

www.ci.austin.tx.us/development

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2007-0065
Contact: Robert Heil, (512) 974-2330
Public Hearing:
October 11, 2007 City Council

☐ **I am in favor**
☒ **I object**

James R. Carroll
Your Name *(please print)*

7101 Seven Oaks 78736
Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature

9/28/2007
Date

Comments: Stop suburban growth in sensitive areas now!

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
City of Austin
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department
Robert Heil
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2007-0065
Contact: Robert Heil, (512) 974-2330
Public Hearing:
August 14, 2007 Planning Commission

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

Michael Eide
Your Name *(please print)*

8311 Red Willow Dr
Your address(es) affected by this application

Michael Eide
Signature

Date

Comments: This development will cause additional congestion and danger on our documented poor roadways and poor transportation system in general in Southwest Austin. The Oak Hill Area is consistently grid locked now. Adding additional people to the area will only exasperate this problem. I hope at some point someone considers the big picture.

use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
Austin
hood Planning and Zoning Department
1
88
3767-8810

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2007-0065
Contact: Robert Heil, (512) 974-2330
Public Hearing:
October 11, 2007 City Council

Cindy Coon & Renee Genre

Your Name *(please print)*

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

7104 Covered Bridge Dr.

Your address(es) affected by this application

Cindy Coon / Renee Genre 9/30/07

Signature Date

Comments:

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
City of Austin
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department
Robert Heil
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

Heil, Robert

From: Garcia, Vicki [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 03, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Heil, Robert; Jain, Sangeeta; [redacted]
Subject: case c14-2007-0065

Per your request on Monday, October 1, we are forwarding the conditions we would like to propose for inclusion in the file and the report to the City Council.

This is in regards to the rezoning of the "Massford 44" from RR to SF-2-CO.

Our requests for amendments to the zoning approval are as follows:
1) Keep the "stub" of Moccasin Path between Smokey Hill and the Massford 44 at the existing width. Our understanding is that the "stub" is an existing road, and therefore, the work done to this section of the road will be an improvement. As an improvement, this section can be made exempt from the City's width requirements. This will hopefully reduce the inclination for traffic to leave this way while keeping it a viable exit for emergency vehicles. This would also presumably marginally reduce the expense of developing roads on the property, as the "stub" will likely need to be resurfaced, but would not have to be widened or furnished with curbs and sidewalks. We also feel it would preserve the character of our neighborhood.

2) The developer has conceded that building a sidewalk along one side of Moccasin Path would be tolerable to him. We feel any money devoted to the safety of the street would be better served in funding the installation of speed pillows along Moccasin Path and an equal distance down Smokey Hill. In addition, the reduced expense of developing the stub could be applied to the cost of speed pillows. A reasonable time frame for installation of these would be at approximately 50% build out of the property. Presumably at that point it should also be possible to do an additional traffic study and/or poll of the street residents as to whether they are needed at all.

3) Install a speed bump on the stub closer to the property line. This will slow down the traffic exiting the property that will be entering the narrower streets of the surrounding neighborhood.

4) We also would prefer there not be any signage at the edge of the property being developed that would disrupt the character of our neighborhood.

Background:
We are not fundamentally opposed to the rezoning, but our concern is primarily centered around the additional traffic that Moccasin Path would see once the entire property is developed. A traffic analysis of Moccasin Path showed approximately 50 trips per day. Estimates from the city for the number of trips out of the Massford 44 is approximately 900 (10 trips per house). It was also stated that possibly 40% of these trips would exit Moccasin Path. This could result in as many as 400 trips per day down Moccasin Path. We understand it is difficult to pin down the exact number of trips until they can actually be measured in 1-3 years time, but anything approaching an eightfold increase would be a big jump in traffic.

Our goal is to encourage traffic to primarily use the Nadia street exit, and to distribute the traffic as much as possible out of the Moccasin Path exit. These exits out of Moccasin Path are to turn right on

Smokey Hill to Red Willow (a wide street with curbs), left on Smokey Hill to Sage Mountain Trail or continuing to Silvermine, or straight through on Moccasin Path. To that end, we do not want any alterations made to the existing street widths on any of the roads in Valley View Acres. Upgrading Moccasin Path alone would only encourage additional traffic. We also understand that Covered Bridge, the ultimate exit onto Highway 71 from Nadia, will have a light by the time the first houses are completed on the property in the first part of 2009. This should help considerably.

An additional goal wrapped up in all of this is maintaining the character of our street and neighborhood. The streets are narrow, winding and have a rural feel to them that we have come to appreciate. Altering the streets would alter the character of our neighborhood. This area has only been developed for about 30 years, but we feel it has a unique sensibility among the surrounding neighborhoods that is worth preserving. We also would prefer there not be any signs at the edge of the property being developed that would disrupt this.

There is a consensus among a good portion of the residents of Moccasin Path that this is an effective way to address the rezoning.

Vicki Garcia
8402 Moccasin Path