


Recommendations that Differ from Planning Commission Recommendation

Group 1 - WP

| Tract Number & Address | Planning Commission and Staff recs | RG4WP | BL Rec | BL Explanation | Important Notes |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 16 1200 Ridgehaven Drive/5701 Cameron Road | PC and Staff Same Civic LO-MU-NP | Civic SF-3-NP | Civic SF-3-NP | I disagree with the staff recommendation I know Cameron Road very well I used to live off of it and travel it daily This portion of Cameron Road is mostly single-family homes The church should remain single family zoned so that if someone chooses to redevelop the property, adjacent land owners will be made fully aware of any plans in the rezoning process | The uses for NO and LO zoning are things like professional offices and art gallerys They are low intensity and would probably work in the church building, but the potential redevelopment is my concern |
|  67 1806 Patton Lane | Civic MF-3-NP | Civic SF-3-NP | Civic SF-3-NP | This property currently provides a transition for the adjacent single-family neighborhood The base zoning needs to be SF of some sort SF-3 would be the most compatible with existing zoning in the area, but council could pursue something a little more dense like SF-6 should they desire to do so Civic land use designation ensures this site would be up for discussion should someone wish to redevelop the church into something else | |
| 51 2120-2128 Gaston Place, 6104-6114 North Hampton Dr | PC and Staff Same Multi-Family MF-1-NP | Higher Density Single Family Residential SF-6-NP | Higher Density Single Family Residential SF-6-NP MF-1 | There's not a lot of difference between MF-1 and SF-6, but considering lot 52 is already developed with townhomes, it seems appropriate to rezone these properties to SF-6 for continuity This is the desire of RG4WP | If we are to downzone this property, I think it would be important to ask staff if the owner of the land is aware and understands his property is subject to downzoning RG4WP Rec |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| 52 2111-2121 Wheless Lane | Mixed Use GR-MU-CO-NP CO to limit the amount of building square footage in non-residential use to no more than 50% of total building square footage | Higher Density Single Family Residential SF-6-NP | Higher Density Single Family Residential SF-6-NP MF-1 | The property is developed with townhomes. It would continue the zoning of the previous tract 51, if it was rezoned SF-6. If not, GR-MU-CO-NP is fine, CO as described by the Planning Commission. | RG4WP Rec |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|

Recommendations that Differ from Planning Commission Recommendation

Groups 2, 3, 4 - WP

NO CHANGES TO PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations that Differ from Planning Commission Recommendation

University Hills

| Tract Number & Address | Planning Commission and Staff recs | RG4WP | BL Rec | BL Explanation | Important Notes |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 210 2 828 Acre Tract of ABS 258 SUR 26 Tannehill JC, 4 798 Acre Tract of ABS SUR 29 Tannehill JC | Staff Mixed Use, LR-MU-CO-NP PC Mixed Use, LO-MU-NP | Office NO-CO-NP (with CO for Class 2 group homes) UHNA does not believe this site is appropriate for retail or residential uses, and would like to promote more office uses in the planning area | Mixed Use LR-MU-NP Similar to staff recommendation I don't know their CO, but I don't see a reason for one | A portion of the site is currently zoned LR I went with LR base zoning because it reflects the current entitlements of the site The site is undeveloped RG4WP recommends to zone the site NO, but this area does not meet the intent of Neighborhood Office zoning It's for more interior roads and, as staff states, usually for existing structures (like houses) I'm not a fan of restricting Class II homes, but I know of no opposition towards it Definition at right | GROUP HOME, CLASS II use is the use of a site for the provision of a family-based facility providing 24 hour care in a protected living arrangement for not more than 15 residents and not more than 3 supervisory personnel This use includes homes for juvenile delinquents, halfway houses providing residence instead of institutional sentencing, and halfway houses providing residence to those needing correctional and mental institutionalization |
| 213 4720 Loyola Lane | Staff Mixed Use, GR-MU-CO-NP PC Commercial, GR-CO-NP (CO for Class 2 Group Homes and automobile-oriented uses) | Commercial GR-CO-NP (CO for Class 2 Group Homes) | Mixed Use GR-MU-CO-NP (CO to prohibit automobile-oriented uses) | Everyone seems to agree that GR is an appropriate use for this undeveloped tract If the site is unsuitable for residences due to drainage problems as RG4WP suggests, staff can handle this at site plan The MU designation does not require residential units It can still be developed as entirely commercial if it is the highest and best use | I still do not recommend putting a CO on Class II homes |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>220 5301 Loyola Lane</p> | <p>Staff <i>Single-Family Residential, SF-3-NP</i></p> <p>PC No Action taken by PC Direction to staff to explore a zoning recommendation that is not 100% residential, e g , add commercial zoning to the portion of the site that fronts Hwy 183</p> | <p><i>Civic</i></p> <p>P-NP</p> | <p><i>Single-Family Residential</i></p> <p>SF-3-NP</p> | <p>There needs to be some type of phased zoning, which is pretty much what the Planning Commission suggested The zoning needs to have some light commercial uses along the intersection of Layola and Ed Bluestein and blend down towards single-family in the interior</p> | <p>This tract is owned by AISD, it was purchased with bond funds in 1969 for a school AISD has since determined that it is not an appropriate site for a school, and the property is now for sale The school board made the decision to sell the property on June 28, 2004</p> |
| <p>220a 976x367 portion of 5301 Loyola Lane</p> | <p>Staff <i>Commercial, GR-NP</i></p> <p>PC No Action taken by PC This is the portion of site that PC directed to staff to zone as commercial</p> | <p><i>Civic</i></p> <p>P-NP</p> | <p><i>Commercial</i></p> <p>GR-NP</p> | <p>Commercial along US 183 would be much more appropriate for the site Single-family should not back up onto 183</p> | <p>Portion of tract staff took out to accommodate PC recommendation</p> |

Other

| Tract No | Current Use & Zoning | Planning Commission Recommendation | Staff/Zoning Committee Recommendation | Responsible Growth for Windsor Park (RG4WP) Recommendation | Votes Required | Valid Petition | Votes Received |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------|----------------|
| 37 1400, 1404, E 51st Street | 1400 E 51st Street Multi-family, 1404 E 51st Street Single-family Residential Zoning District 1400 E 51st Street MF-2, 1404 E 51st Street SF-3 | Mixed Use GR-MU-CO-NP | Mixed Use GR-MU-CO-NP Community members wanted to see the north side of 51st Street offer similar retail and office uses that will be located at Mueller on the south side of 51st Street | Office LO-NP RG4WP does not support mixed use at this location | 4 for 1st Reading, 5 for 2nd/3rd Reading | | |