

## CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Austin, Texas

Regular Meeting -- August 9, 1977

The meeting of the Commission was called to order at 7 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Present

Miguel Guerrero, Chairman  
Freddie Dixon\*  
Gabriel Gutierrez, Jr.  
Mary Ethel schechter  
Sally Shipman  
Bernard Snyder  
Bill Stoll  
James G. Vier

Absent

Sid Jagger

Also Present

Tom Knickerbocker, Assistant Director of Plannin  
Tracy Watson, Supervisor Advanced Planning  
Evelyn Butler, Supervisor Current Planning  
Duncan Muir, Planner  
Brian Schuller, Planner  
Bill Perkins, Planner  
Homer Reed, Assistant City Manager  
Maureen McReynolds, Ph.D., Director of  
Environmental Resource Management  
Curtis Johnson, Director of Water and Wastewater  
Daron Butler, Director of Research and Budget  
John Meinrath, Legal Department  
Fred Rodgers, Health Department  
Bill Lowery, Urban Transportation Department  
Ouida W. Glass, Senior Secretary

\* Left at 7:20 p.m.  
Returned at 8:40 p.m.

C14-74-014 Richard B. Robinson: A, 1st to C, 1st  
1139-D-1141-D Springdale Road

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff presented the staff report and explained this request was to extend this case with the following conditions: (a) delete subdivision requirement; (b) dedicate right-of-way by street deed. (The owner will need to subdivide prior to issuance of building permits.)

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved approval of the extension subject to staff recommendations and departmental requirements. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Shipman and Schechter.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

Recommended for extension.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C14-74-020 Commerce Park Association: A, 1st to GR, 1st  
(by Wm. Terry Bray)  
704-714 Nelray Boulevard  
Rear of 5501-5511 North Lamar Boulevard

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained the owners are working on the subdivision and wish to have this case extended.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved approval of the extension subject to staff recommendations and departmental requirements. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Shipman and Schechter.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

Recommended for extension.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C14-74-022     Edward R. Rathgeber, Jr., and Doris Harris  
                 Warlick: Interim A, 1st to GR, 1st  
                 (by Tom Curtis)  
                 6900-7014 Nuckols Crossing Road

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff presented the staff report and recommended extension; the owner is pursuing subdivision at the present time.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard testimony as presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved approval for extension subject to staff recommendations. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
              Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

Recommended for extension.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C14-74-028     Fawnridge Development Corp.: Interim A, 1st  
                 (by Robert L. Davis)                             to LR, 1st  
                 7901-7907 South 1st Street  
                 and bounded by Dittmar Road  
                 and Boggy Creek

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff presented the staff report and stated this request was to have this case extended with the following conditions: (a) delete subdivision and curb cut limitation requirements; and (b) to dedicate right-of-way by street deed.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved approval of extension in accordance with departmental recommendations. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
              Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

Recommended for extension.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

CL4-74-036 Robert G. W. Girling: A, 1st to O, 1st  
1404 North Loop Boulevard

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff presented the staff report. He stated that this was a request to extend; the right-of-way deed was sent to the owner in July of 1974 and not executed, however, a new deed has been sent and the case will be in order for passage under the original conditions very soon.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to extend subject to departmental recommendations.

Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

Recommended for extension.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C12-77-001      Public Services

Presentation of West Rim Study and  
Consideration of the Water and Wastewater  
Approach Main for the West Rim Subdivision

Mr. Guerrero explained to the members of the Commission that when the first hearing on West Rim was held, the hearing was closed at that time. He asked if they now wished to reopen the hearing for reconsideration.

COMMISSION VOTE:

Mrs. Shipman moved that the hearing be reopened for reconsideration but with a time limit for those persons wishing to speak. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Guerrero, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

NAY:        Mr. Gutierrez

ABSENT: Messrs. Dixon and Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 6-1 VOTE.

The hearing on West Rim was reopened and a time limit was set for persons wishing to speak; three minutes for the speakers; five minutes for presentations; and ten minutes for rebuttal.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Mr. Tracy Watson, Supervisor of Advance Planning, presented the staff report and explained that this study came about by action of the Planning Commission in their April meeting to answer four questions raised by the Office of Environmental Resource Management on the request by Mr. Doyle Wilson for utility service to the West Rim Subdivision.

1. Total area that could be served by the proposed lines at full capacity.
2. Existing roadway capacity and possible need to upgrade these roads to accommodate further development.
3. Projected school capacity needs.
4. Fiscal impact on the City to provide services to this area.

Mr. Watson read the following letter from Dick Lillie, Director of Planning:

"While we believe the first three questions are answered adequately, the staff only provided indicators of probable fiscal impact. For example, an average of 1.3 million gallons of effluent under one alternative vs. 6.7 million gallons under another alternative; or the population level at which a fire station is required or school rooms necessary. The time allowed for the work and the staff's ability to produce this fiscal data was not adequate to reflect what might be called a cost/benefit analysis for the area.

At the request of interested participants a fiscal statement has been drafted by the staff of the Research and Budget Department. The statement is included in the support material on this item and includes analysis for only the small service area of the present and proposed utility lines.

CL2-77-001 Public Services (continued)

The report, in addition, also goes beyond the immediate area of concern, the West Rim Subdivision, to include the total area north of West Lake Hills. The future of this area has been of some concern to property owners and to the various governmental jurisdictions for years. It was of concern also that no policy has been developed for City decisions on annexation and facilities and service requests in the area. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to address these concerns; and, hopefully, reach some conclusions as to the need to form a development policy for the area.

Our hope and intent too was to include representatives from the area in developing the report. Shortly after the assignment a meeting was held with jurisdictional representatives. Data needs were assigned and each representative was asked to respond to the three growth options as to the effect on their responsibilities. The comments that were submitted are included in the report. During the three weeks of report drafting we had no real opportunity or need to meet regularly with interested parties. There was limited distribution of the first rough draft, and prior to consideration by the Commission the staff was requested by the Manager's office to do some redrafting. We had also received communication from Mr. Wilson and from Commissioner Richards that identified some shortcomings and conflicts in the report.

During the past 30 days, with redrafting and printing, consideration of letters from the applicant and Mrs. Richards, the report was not able to be cleared until July 22. In order to meet the Planning Commission deadline it was placed on your agenda for July 26. I want to express my appreciation to those who did participate and responded to the needs of the report and at the same time apologize to the applicant, the neighborhood, and Mrs. Richards because we did not do a better job of keeping them informed. This is the first study of this kind we have made. It was made without adequate time. We can improve on this performance.

The first five chapters provide background and purpose statements, the environmental description of the area of the subdivision, and the overall study and description of land use and services in the study area. Chapter VI identifies the growth alternatives -- selected by the staff: continued low scale of development activity; development to suggested Lake Austin Plan recommendations; and development with full infrastructure. About 250 units exist in the total study area. These three options suggest an increase of about 1,100 dwellings under Alternative 1 with continued service by private septic systems and minimum improvements to the public facility and service and road network; an increase of about 5,400 dwellings under Alternative 2 with marginal justification for public sewer system and the need to upgrade public facilities and services and certain streets to carry increased traffic; and an increase of about 12,400 dwellings under Alternative 3 with the need to provide a public sewer system and a plan for public facilities and services and for street development or improvement.

Each alternative suggests more intensive development and the need increases for supporting facilities and services such as fire, police, refuse, water, street maintenance, and new construction and new schools.

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

The West Rim Subdivision is requesting both water and sewer approach mains for City of Austin service. The sewer line proposed for extension now terminates in the vicinity of Orleans Harbor. This 12-inch main serves the 33-unit Orleans Harbour and as many as 20 detached dwellings along West Lake Drive. The main drains to a lift station directly north of Bee Creek and is pumped under Lake Austin to the North Austin outfall. The 41-unit Los Altos development is connected to the main with an 8-inch sewer line. The 12-inch wastewater main has a capacity of 505 equivalent living units and is apparently now connected to only about 94 units. It therefore should be able to serve about 411 additional units.

A 12-inch water distribution main parallels the wastewater main and is assumed to have identical connections. It has a capacity of 703 equivalent living units, and therefore should be able to serve an additional 509 units. The West Rim Subdivision now proposes 230 lots on 102 acres, giving a density of 2.25 units per acre. The development is to be phased over a period of about six years. The applicant has requested that both water and sewer mains be extended another 1,100 feet north along West Lake Drive to connect with the subject tract. The lift station near Bee Creek will also require minor improvements. The cost of extending the water line is estimated to be about \$28,000; of this the City's cost will be about \$12,600. The wastewater line extension and lift station improvements will cost about \$44,150; the cost borne by the City will be about \$15,370.

The remaining capacity after West Rim is connected will be about 181 wastewater customers and about 279 water customers. The sewer facilities appear to be capable of serving only another 80 acres at the same density as West Rim. The small Mount Larson watershed in which West Rim is situated is 551 acres in size. Los Altos is several thousand feet west of the 12-inch main, in the large Bee Creek watershed and its 8-inch connecting main is reported to be already at or near capacity. Therefore, any additional development which might tie into the sewer main will most likely occur along the lake shore (either north or south of West Rim, or higher in the Mount Larson watershed near West Rim subdivision. It should be noted that an approved but unbuilt PUD -- Village Harbor with 150 units -- lies just south of Orleans Harbor.

When present sewer capacity is reached, it is unlikely that the present wastewater main will be replaced or that another line will be placed parallel to it. Instead, connections across Lake Austin to the Cross Town tunnel are far more desirable. Four potential crossing points have been designated by the Water and Wastewater Department: at Hucks Slough, Dry Creek, Cat Creek, or Bull Creek. In fact, sewage from the West Rim subdivision may eventually be lifted back to one of these points, as well as the sewage collected from the entire Bee Creek watershed.

The mains crossing Lake Austin into the study area were originally placed there as approach mains, under previous City utility extension policies. Two later decisions extended the mains to the widely separated developments of Orleans Harbour and Los Altos.

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

One analysis of the approach main question would conclude that the mains represent isolated facilities which already exist and have unused capacity, and that this capacity may as well be utilized. When capacity is reached, then that fact will justify refusal for further extension of services. Hence, the present capacities of the mains will impose natural limits to the provision of utilities. Viewed in this manner, then the decision has very little potential for growth inducement: simply West Rim subdivision and perhaps several hundred additional units will be facilitated.

A different analysis of the question emphasizes the precedents that are set for serving the entire area, and the fact that the decision may perpetuate a density that is dependent on sewer service -- similar to that of Alternatives 2 and/or 3. The water and sewer mains may, and may have already, set a crucial precedent for serving land inside the city along the lake shore. Any owner of land, or future development in, or partially within the land below the 504.9 elevation may be able to point to this area as proof that the City does serve, and has a policy of serving, similarly situated areas. An owner may then demand similar services, stating that he is entitled to them under the Municipal Annexation Act, Art. 970a, Sec. 10. Since almost all of the West Rim subdivision is above the 504.9 elevation, the decision may also appear to establish a precedent of annexing and providing services to all developments which request it, and which may be reached with an approach main.

In the case of the "similarly situated" land below the 504.9 elevation, the "limited capacity" justification for refusing services may not hold up. Very often cities do not have adequate locally-situated facilities to serve newly developing areas. Traditionally, however, it has been the obligation of the City to upgrade the locally-situated facilities in order to properly serve the new developments within its incorporated limits.

A more far-reaching point is the question of whether or not the capacity of these particular mains is a true natural limit. A good argument can be made that the concept of a capacity limit is not valid in this situation, and that it will fail in many cases as a justification for refusing to provide City utility services. The capacity of wastewater service to the study area, for instance, is not really the capacity of the small 12-inch main now in place -- it is the capacity of the Cross-Town tunnel, which for these purposes can be considered unlimited. The owners of large developments, or consortiums of developers, may readily pay their share of the cost of pump stations and large mains placed only a short distance across Lake Austin to connect with the tunnel.

There are alternative methods of obtaining utilities that do not require either the extension of City facilities or the expenditure of City funds. These options are listed on pages 36-38 and discussed on pages 41-43 of the report. In summary, if State requirements from the Texas Water Rights Commission and/or Texas Health Department on water, or the Texas Water Quality Board and/or City-County Health Department on wastewater are met, then private development can occur.



CI2-77-001 Public Services (continued)

The Commission should reach a conclusion on the preferable method of serving the development which exists, is approved, is pending approval, or is likely. The basis for that conclusion should be the series of adopted development guidelines expressed in the Comprehensive Plan and in the approach main policy. Other guidelines, unadopted, include the 1975 Annexation Report and the Lake Austin Growth Management Plan.

In brief, Alternative 1 appears to be most compatible with the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan. This alternative allows growth to occur in the study area, but suggests that the City should not speed up the development process and encourage densities greater than those which have occurred under established trends. In spite of continued reliance on septic tanks, Alternative 1 should have the least impact on environmental elements, including water quality.

The Lake Austin Growth Management Plan embraces the philosophy that at least several different types of development patterns might be appropriate to any particular area providing that precautions are taken to mitigate environmental impact. In brief, the plan generally encourages low densities in the entire Lake watershed, with as few public improvements as possible. Most of the study area is in the Hill Region, which is described as "intrinsically poorly suited for conventional residential subdivisions." The Lower Terraces closer to the lake are considered to be the most favorable areas in the study area for development. The Lake Austin Corridor was deemed the least suitable. Most of the 504.9 lands are designated as conservation zones.

The development allowed by Alternative 3 appears to be far too intensive to promote the Plan's principles for conservation and development. Impact on water quality would be rather high. Limited development zones cover most of the study area and the Lake Austin Plan encourages a fairly low density for these areas. The Plan does not encourage the provision of city sewer facilities into this area.

As stated in Section VII, each extension of City utilities in the study area is a precedent which more firmly establishes the City's commitment to serve and annex the area. The result is a major development and annexation policy determined by a series of widely separated decisions. It appears in this situation that future use of the "no more capacity" justification for limiting service to the area will not be valid. If the City wishes to keep the option of not annexing and providing services, including fire, police, and public works improvements to roads, then the City's activities should be the result of policy. No such policy presently exists. Neither the Comprehensive Plan nor the priorities of the 1975 Annexation Study appear to support the further extension of the water and sewer mains now existing south of the West Rim Subdivision.

On the other hand, the particular approach main extensions to West Rim Subdivision will have, by themselves, very little physical impact on growth in the study area. Most of the subdivision is situated on the Lower Terraces, and provision of utilities to the lower Terraces is not inconsistent with the Lake Austin Growth Management Plan.

## C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

It is our hope that this study will allow the Planning Commission and City Council to make a decision on this application and to reach a development policy for this study area. The action of the larger area does not have to be taken at this meeting.

A development policy needs to be drafted by City staff and appropriate boards and commissions in consultation with interest groups and governmental jurisdictions to assist the City Council determine the City's commitment to development on the west side of Lake Austin."

Mr. Watson then introduced Mr. Homer Reed, Deputy City Manager, who made the following comments:

Before the Comprehensive Plan was adopted the citizens of Austin, developers and the City Council were told that the preferred development pattern did not constitute "a wall around Austin." To the contrary, they were told that it would be a guide to policy making for the City Council and others who participate in policy development including the Planning Commission. I quote briefly from the City Manager's letter recommending adoption of the plan to the City Council:

"As City Manager, I strongly recommend City Council adoption of the Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan as proposed by the Planning Commission. My recommendation includes a number of qualifications, but the document should be approved as a means of developing Austin's master outline for the future.

This plan is flexible. It is designed to accommodate change. Hopefully, the flexibility will also stimulate innovation in land use and structural design.

There is one section of this package that could be easily misunderstood. I am referring to 'selection of a future development pattern to guide geographic growth decisions.' The alternatives considered for such a pattern have been referred to as fixed or mandatory, which is not intended.

The future development pattern would assist the Council in guiding the direction of growth -- not forcing it. The adopted pattern would not become a wall around Austin. As a matter of fact, the monitoring and review process contained in the plan may illustrate the need to adjust this development pattern frequently."

If the development corridor is not a "wall around Austin", what is it? You will start the process of answering that question tonight. I want to share with you briefly our concept of what it means. I will explain by use of illustrations:

(1) It means the City should provide services and extend utilities to make it attractive to develop and live in the preferred growth corridor. It means the City should provide utilities, parks, greenbelts, hike and bike trails, sidewalks, golf courses, tennis courts, softball fields, good streets and mass transportation systems, health services, libraries and a host of improvements to the quality of life that will attract both developers and the people to purchase what they develop in the growth corridor.

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

(2) It does not mean that people who prefer to develop property or live outside the preferred corridor should be denied that right. It does not mean the City should deny available services outside the growth corridor provided those services can be self-supporting either through the owner participation, service charges or taxes.

To consider the preferred growth corridor as rigid or as a wall around our City will insure that Austin will become ringed with incorporated cities, unincorporated villages, utility districts and subdivision developments which utilize septic tanks, inefficient sewer package plants and other substandard facilities.

We do not believe that is the pattern of development envisioned by those who first dreamed and worked for the Austin Tomorrow Program.

The perfect world envisioned by some -- where all development occurs within the preferred corridor -- can be brought to reality only through one of two means: (1) complete dictatorship or (2) ownership of all surrounding lands. I hope none of us has the desire to be dictator, and I know the City does not have the fiscal resources to own all the land.

We believe the goals of the Comprehensive Plan can be approached far more effectively by maintaining freedom of choice for those who are willing to pay in inconvenience, if not in dollars, to live in the hills or outside the growth corridor. The freedom of choice will also include the freedom to live in the growth corridor where the quality of life will be second to none.

When viewed in this way, we believe it would be appropriate for the Commission to narrow the area of your concern tonight to the small sub-drainage basin that can be served through the sewer lift station and 8" force main which crosses Lake Austin. This does not open a Pandora's box. The limit on the City's ability to extend service in the area is posed by the size of the line. We know of no legal precedent that could force the City to invest the major amounts required to extend additional sewer lines across Lake Austin in order to permit any other areas to be served.

You have received a financial feasibility study which shows it to be good business for the water and wastewater utility for the requested approach mains to be approved. It does not appear economically feasible for the City to continue annexations in the area. For this reason, we suggest favorable consideration of the approach mains with service to be provided on an outside city limits basis.

At the conclusion of Mr. Reed's remarks, Mr. Gutierrez again emphasized that included in the motion is that sufficient notice has been given to reopen the hearing, by the news media, newspaper, radio, television.

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

## CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

WRITTEN COMMENTS IN FAVOR

Mrs. Frances Larson Ledbetter, 2751 Westlake Drive  
Dee E. Wheeler and Associates, 221 West 6th Street

WRITTEN COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION

Dorothy Depwe, 2508 Westlake Drive  
Carl Teel, 904 Old Stonehedge  
Mrs. John Ledbetter, 2751 Westlake Drive  
Vestal Lemmon, City National Bank  
Mrs. J.H. Mackin, 200 Mount Larson Road  
Mr. & Mrs. James G. Noland, 101 Double Ford Road  
Tommy L. Thomson D.D.S., 1500 West 38th Street, Suite 44

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Carl E. Wootten, 2215 Westlake Drive  
R.L. Buford, Jr., 2531 Exposition  
Maury Hood, 8400 B. Tallwood  
Ray A. Wilkerson, 6011 B Shadow Valley Cove  
H.R. Mickey Bentley, 1300 Hollow Creek

PERSON APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

Robert J. Becker, 2951 Westlake Drive  
Charles Kastner, 1835 Westlake Drive  
Dorothy Depwe, 2508 Westlake Drive  
J.P. Cauvin, 102 Westhaven Drive  
Martha Thompson, 301 McConnell Drive  
Mr. & Mrs. Jack D. Elliott, 2613 Westlake Drive  
Mrs. George Moffatt, 1907 Lake Shore Drive  
Mrs. D. W. Brann, 2007 Westlake Drive  
Mrs. Charles R. Schupp, 1831 Westlake Drive  
Joan H. Bertholf, 109 Westlake Drive  
Richard W. Tims, 1503 Ridgecrest  
Neal C. Harbin, 2404 Deerpass  
Mrs. Neal C. Harbin, 2404 Deerpass  
James A. Cunyus, 2409 Deerpass  
Joyce T. Cunyus, 2404 Deerpass  
Mr & Mrs. Raymond L. Carr, 1100 Ridgecrest Road  
Eileen M. Thompson, 1 Shady Drook Cove  
Clare Scherz, 12 Hull Circle  
Harold Scherz, 12 Hull Circle  
Dick Stanford, 405 Skyline  
Dodi Nichols, 1837 Westlake  
Tommy Thomson, 1104 Yaupon Villey Road  
M.L. Thomson, 1104 Yaupon Valley Road.  
Charles Cleland, 3427 Monte Vista  
Amy W. Orum, 1504 Ridgecrest  
Donn L. Durio, 2405 Deerpass  
Delana Batson, 2405 Trail of the Madrones  
Helen Durio, 2405 Deerpass  
Judi Hewett, 1303 Constant Springs

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

Charles Fergusson, 905 Old Stone Hedge  
Peggy Fergusson, 905 Old Stone Hedge  
Stanley Depwe, 2508 Westlake Drive  
Evelyn Johnson, 3425 Monte Vista  
Henrietta Jacobsen, 8 Nob Hill Circle  
Mr & Mrs. Walter Ducloux, 2 Wildwind Point  
Nancy Scanlan, 1102 Yaupon Valley Road  
Dagmar Hamilton, 403 Allegro  
Ann D. Foster, P.O. Box 1868, St. Stephens School  
Elizabeth Foster, P.O. Box 1868, St. Stephens School  
Mrs. William R. Norman, 2311 Camino Alto  
Robert Hamilton, 403 Allegro  
Dr. John T. Burdine, 1905 Toro Canyon  
Hildy Soper, 3101 West Lake Drive  
Mrs. Carl F. Schupp, 2961 Westlake Drive  
Carl F. Schupp II, 2961 Westlake Drive  
Mrs. Walter Gledhill, 2959 Westlake Drive  
Bill Crenshaw, 3201 Westlake Drive  
Bee Crenshaw, 3201 Westlake  
Mrs. John Leach, 3817 Westlake Drive  
R.E. McCollum, 2208 Trail of the Madrones  
Mrs. Daniel M. McRae, 2509 West Lake Drive  
Gaylord Humberger, Jr., 2705 Westlake Drive  
Ann Richards, 810 Red Bud Trail  
Betty J. Cleland, 2427 Monte Vista  
John Scanlan, 1102 Yaupon Valley Road  
W.W. Rostow, 1 Wildwind Point  
Tom Leach, 3821 Westlake Drive  
Ken Manning, 213 West 41st.  
Guy A. Thompson Jr., 1 Shady Brook Cove  
Jack Holford, 3409 West Lake Drive  
Marilynn Waite, 1405 the High Road  
David B. Preble, 1603 Mearns Meadows  
Mrs. Frank C. Schlicher, 1505 Ridgecrest  
Frank C. Schlicher, 1505 Ridgecrest

Planning Commission--Austin, Texas

Reg. Mtg. 8-9-77

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

## COMMISSION ACTION

There was discussion regarding what would happen if the City does not extend the approach main in this area. Mr. Reed indicated that when any area is ready to be developed, development will in some way occur. Mr. Curtis Johnson, Director of the Water and Wastewater Department, indicated that if approved the approach main can be handled with the facilities available. Mr. Daron Butler, Budget Director, indicated that it makes good economic sense to comply and extend the line. Substantial revenues would be returned to the city as a result of this extension. If, however, the area is annexed, the fiscal implications would reverse. It would have a tremendous negative impact on the City to annex the subdivision; roadway system especially, as well as other responsibilities such as fire protection and other services needed. Maureen McReynolds, Director of Environmental Resource Management, stated that the Lake Austin Study would recommend that alternative nodischarge type septic tanks be used if the approach main is not approved -- conventional septic tanks have problems out there now. There was also much discussion regarding the approach main policy for the City -- if the City participates in an area that is within the City limits or will be annexed within one year of the date in which the City Council has approved said approach main. There also was discussion regarding what action would be taken regarding the small tracts that are already within the City limits.

Mr. Doyle Wilson, the applicant, stated that the issue at this time is the approach main only -- not subdivision. Other items would be considered at a later time. He indicated that it is a good business investment; not asking for annexation at this time. It was also brought out that environmentally it would be for the best interest of Austin that this area be included; this area is served by septic tanks emptying into Lake Austin; and that is our water supply.

Commissioner Ann Richards brought attention to some problems that would occur without proper planning which can omit expensive errors. Planning should consider the roadway system and fire protection. She stated we owe an obligation to the people who are landowners and who would like to develop the area, that the implications here in relation to this subdivision are a signal to say what has happened in this instance should be your expectation in individual instances in the future. She was of the opinion that they have a right to expect that. "We in Austin and in Travis County need your help. We need it for the future, for the policy, for the planning and flexibility and cooperation between not only the City and Travis County, but other small municipalities."

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

John Scanlan representing the Neighborhood Association, emphasized that the purpose of this hearing was for the approach main only; whether or not to extend the water and wastewater utilities to the West Rim Subdivision. He also called attention to the approach main policy, especially regarding annexation. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan discourages growth in developmentally unsuitable areas where there are major limitations. This area is the watershed for the Edwards Aquifer; it is on steep hills; and it represents a threat to the water supply of the City of Austin. He stated there was no alternative except to deny because it is inconsistent with the City Master Plan. He submitted a copy of the Texas statute which authorizes cities to control nuisances within their boundaries and within 5,000 feet of their boundaries. It gives the City of Austin the power to prohibit the pollution of any stream, drain or tributary thereof which may constitute the source of water supply for any city and to provide for policing the same as well as providing for the protection of any watersheds and the policing of the same. He stated the city has the authority now to police that watershed and to insure that there is no pollution in it; and, secondly, that he agrees with the Planning Department that that should be taken as the first priority. He feels that the existing capacity in the water line and the wastewater line be used to solve the existing pollution problems before any additional ones are added. He requested the approach main be denied and asked that the West Rim study be continued and they be given an opportunity to continue to work with the Planning Department.

Charles Cleveland, representing Save our Lake Association, felt the request was premature and would set a precedent. He felt there is adequate time and thinks it would be a judicious thing to disallow this particular action.

Mr. Tom Leach, President of the Lake Austin Hill Country Neighborhood Association, was of the opinion that this should be the last sewer crossing the lake and that it should be serving equitably, and submitted a petition for persons in that area requesting they be assured of being connected when the service is provided.

Mr. Walt Rostow, a resident of the area, testified that he does not see how there is any way a decision can be made regarding this project, the extension or the larger issue of it, without facing up to the kind of development is wanted in the area and what the cost will be, how it relates to the Comprehensive Plan, and the Lake Austin Plan. He felt that the people of the neighborhood should have a voice in its development. He recommended that the decision be put off until the study of the full implications of this development have been completed and the residents have had an opportunity to study them.

Ken Manning, representing the Austin Group of the Sierra Club, stated this does not comply with the Master Plan, and opposes approval of the approach mains. Jack Holford, an engineer, does not believe the City's existing wastewater system is adequate to handle this approach main; septic tanks can be regulated. He pointed out there was no right-of-way dedicated along West Lake Drive and easements would have to be secured to go through there. He felt the developer should serve

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

what he has out there now and clean up the pollution he now has. He pointed out that the Edwards Underground Aquifer District in San Antonio has approved this concept and sponsored a \$55,000 study in which they basically are in favor of septic tank regulation; and that San Antonio is the most stringent area in the state for septic tank dispersal. There are new ways to serve homes that will adequately protect the water supply. He felt the density should be modified so that it will be consistent with the remainder of the areas also developed; or a density somewhere in the area of one unit per acre is much more consistent with the desires of the neighborhood and with the goals of what the City should be looking for. He believes that the sewer could be extended to serve that; if it is, it should be annexed and the City should proceed in making some of the improvements that are necessary. There will be a negative fiscal impact if the area develops totally in a density like this project is proposed.

David Prebble, Travis County Engineer, stated this subdivision in this area at this time could create a traffic hazard and that the County government is financially unable to cope with within the foreseeable future, even with the reallocation of resources. He and his staff would recommend that the project be postponed until some reasonable alternatives are found to avoid severe traffic limitations. He agrees in that there are alternatives to improve septic tanks. Dorothy Depew, owner of West Lake Beach, stated she had been trying to get sewer service for 15 years; the lake needs to be cleaned up; septic tanks are draining into the lake now; it is essential to keep clean drinking water.

In rebuttal, Roy Bechtol stated that they have applied the proposed Lake Austin standards; they are in excess of the proposed standards of 30%, 20%, and 10% and they do intend to comply. Don Bird stated there is ample available support for the existing units as well as their subdivision and some extension of the area in the neighborhood as it presently exists. Upgrading of the lift station would not be an expense to the City -- that is included in the subdivider's expense, and they have already agreed to pay it. He said if there was a precedent set here, was it not, in fact, set when the 8-inch force main was brought across the lake, or when the three previous subdivisions were approved. It seemed unfair to suddenly attempt to place a precedent argument on the middle link of a chain.

The Commissioners discussed the City's approach main policy; what would happen if the property were annexed. Mr. Vier questioned whether or not it is a requirement that the City annex the subdivision within one year if they decide to participate; also discussion regarding what participation means. Mr. Wilson said he was willing to bear the total expense of the approach mains if the City did not participate. Mr. Dixon wanted to know what would happen to the property within the City limits regardless of what action is taken. Mr. Dixon felt some things needed to be in perspective; there were different interpretations of some items. Mr. Vier asked Mr. Wilson if there was any conceivable basis whereby he would consider a reduced density from 2.25 units per acre to 1.75 units per acre and find a mutual ground to keep both parties happy, if possible. At this time Mr. Wilson was not willing to agree to this. Mr. Stoll indicated that he was disappointed in the information. The City should not have been participating if it is to follow its own policy. Mr. Gutierrez was very concerned about the fact that the applicant was not willing to change his attitude; two of the



C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

four objections from the neighborhood were regarding density. Mrs. Schechter wanted to know that if the line is approved, will the people who are already there be assured of service, or have first choice to get on this line. Mr. Johnson answered that once the line is constructed, it belongs to the City and the City has control of any connections made to it -- not the subdivider. He does not know of any reason why these persons would not be able to tie on.

**COMMISSION VOTE**

Mr. Dixon moved that in light of the existing data that was received thus far concerning West Rim project and the approach main, based upon unsuitable environmental conditions predicated upon the density raised by those residents and some noncompliance with the developer itself, that this approach main be denied. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion. Mr. Guerrero requested discussion on the motion and Mrs. Shipman expressed concern about the entire concept of the Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan in this and asked that he include in the motion that the extension of an approach main to this site violates the Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Guerrero stated this was not true. Mrs. Shipman stated that regardless, she felt this to be the case and cannot support it. Mr. Guerrero stated there were problems with both policies; it is merely a matter of how they are interpreted. Mr. Vier stated the applicant had just informed him that he was willing to live with the 1.75 density overall and he would like to make a substitute motion that the approach main be approved with no refund as per their indication and that no annexation be required; and that the developer has willingly suggested a reduced density of 1.75 units per acre. Mr. Gutierrez seconded the motion.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Wilson to publicly make this statement. He responded "I verbally agree and whenever I submit my plan it will show it."

Mr. Dixon at this time raised the question -- "Why is it -- it seems the developer was given adequate time prior to the motion that was put here and the substitute motion and he could have made the announcement that he just did. It seems as though he only made this announcement predicated upon the motion that was placed before the house." Mr. Stoll stated he did not think this is the way we should do this. Mr. Snyder stated that unfortunately things sometimes happen under most unethical sorts of ways. "This body does not have the legal right to force this man to reduce the density, the City Attorney is sitting there and agrees to that; all of us agree that we do not have the authority -- the only authority we have is either to grant him the approach main or to recommend to the City Council to grant it or not to grant the approach main." Mrs. Schechter stated she thought the City may be under a legal obligation for the 16 acres that are within the City limits. Is this true? Mr. Gutierrez explained that had never

C12-77-001 Public Services (continued)

been resolved. Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Reed if the City had an obligation to the 16 acres; whereupon he stated he would have to refer that to the City Attorney's office.

The substitute motion is to approve and that the density be held down to 1.75. All those in favor of the substitute motion.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder and Vier. Mrs. Schechter.

NAY: Messrs. Dixon and Stoll. Mrs. Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 5-3 VOTE.

Mr. Guerrero explained that the first motion dies because of the passage of the substitute motion. After much discussion, he stated he would call the question again.

Mr. Dixon again stated that the developer was intimidated by the motion that was made and the hearing was closed. He had every right to make that kind of statement; Commissioner Stoll had asked him more than one time and also Attorney Gutierrez asked him the same thing. He had ample time, and three times said he could not answer. Once the motion was put before the house, he comes up here behind the stand and says to one of the Commissioners that he will agree to lower the density, which I (Mr. Dixon) do not feel was right. Mr. Gutierrez agreed with Mr. Dixon, but stated that before the vote was taken, he did offer the 1.75

RECOUNT OF SUBSTITUTE MOTION:

Mrs. Shipman stated the substitute motion read to approve the approach main to this particular site and the recommendation which is nonlegally binding that the density be held to 1.75 units per acre. They then voted again to assure everyone that they understood and were fully aware of what they were voting on. Mr. Guerrero called for a vote on the substitute motion.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, and Vier. Mrs. Schechter.

NAY: Messrs. Dixon and Stoll. Mrs. Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION AGAIN PASSED BY A 5-3 VOTE.

Planning Commission--Austin, Texas

Reg. Mtg. 8-9-77

C7p-77-009 Sale of City Property

Consideration of the sale of City Property  
located at Windsor Road at Hartford Road  
(MoPac Interchange).

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff presented the staff report and explained that the City Ordinance requires that the Planning Commission review all sales of surplus City property prior to the Council's executing sale documents.

CITIZEN ACTION

The Commission heard testimony to show that this property was no longer needed for the City and staff recommended approval for sale to the adjoining owner.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Snyder moved approval of the sale of the property. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C7p-77-010 Sale of City Property

Consideration of the sale of City Property  
located at 5307 Balcones

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff stated that this property is no longer needed by the City and is recommended for sale to the adjoining property owner.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony presented.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Gutierrez moved for approval of the sale of the property in accordance with staff recommendations. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes.  
Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

R200                      Staff Report 77/75-01Presentation of 8th Street Mall Proposal between Guadalupe  
Street and San Antonio Street

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained that some time ago, as part of the library development, there was a request for a project to be generated for a pedestrian mall. After several months work, Mr. Bill Perkins, staff architect of the Planning Department, is to present that report at this time.

Mr. Perkins explained that no request for action was required at this time. This report and slide presentation is strictly for information. A finalized design would be presented at some later date. The actual project for the closing of the 8th Street Mall began in August of 1975 with a report by the Urban Transportation Department to close that section of 8th Street between Guadalupe and San Antonio. C.I.P. funding for 1976-77 also allocated some funds for preliminary designs for that pedestrian mall. As a result, a team was formed consisting of the Planning Department, the Engineering Department, Public Transportation, Parks and Recreation Department to begin an actual analysis of the site to determine what should or should not be included. This has resulted in three alternative schemes for what the Pedestrian Mall should look like and it is strictly for information at this time.

The Transportation analysis came directly from the report that was done in 1975 and would only change would be the closing of 8th Street and the rerouting of traffic around San Antonio and 7th Street.

There were three schemes presented. Scheme A is a very low density scheme, basically low, medium and high density. It consists mainly of extensions of sidewalks around the new library site, remainder of the area to be a grassy, play area with very little construction taking place.

Scheme B is a more formalized scheme and is the first attempt to get a variation in the land so far as earth or vegetation work. There would be some seating areas, areas where classes or group meetings could take place, children could play; still keeping in mind separation of activities by screening elements so that various numbers of activities could take place at the same time and not be in conflict with each other.

The final scheme, Scheme C, is the most intense of the development. This is more in line with the program that was developed initially by the team that was made up of the City Departments. This goes into areas for pedestrians, sitting, standing, activities.

Planning Commission--Austin, Texas

Reg. Mtg. 8-9-77

R200      Staff Report 77/75-01 (continued)

## COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Dixon commended Mr. Perkins for an excellent job. Mrs. Shipman expressed excitement about positive statement regarding revitalization of the downtown area and offered her congratulations. The staff recommendation as a result of the team design for was for Scheme C due to the amount of funds in the library as well as the Bremond Block would bring this in line with the development that has already occurred in the area.

Mr. Perkins explained there is no decision to be made at this time basically what they would like to have at this time from the Planning Commission would be (1) the adoption of the report for the closing of 8th Street; (2) for the funding of a particular scheme; and (3) for the Commission to pick a scheme for approval.

Mr. Stoll expressed the Commission's thanks for an excellent presentation. Mr. Perkins explained this has been presented to several other boards and Commissions and it seems that the general consensus is that there is too much information to decide in one night. We will now go back to a joint committee to get a specific recommendation by the particular boards and commissions and then that one recommendation will be presented again to all boards and commissions concerned for their adoption.

Mr. Knickerbocker explained that at the request of the Landmark Commission models are being built of the three options and they will be presented.

R200      Staff Report

Presentation of the effect of Zoning on Preserving  
the View of the Capitol Building

Mr. Bill Perkins, staff architect of the Planning Department, presented the report. He explained this was the result of the Texas Employment Commission making a height change they wanted in the Brackenridge Urban Renewal Tract which was originally set for 90' and they requested a variance of 105'. The Planning Commission was instructed to study the effects of what would happen in the height changes of the area to see how it related to the vistas by the capitol from I.35 under the present conditions. The study shows sections as they drove through the sites, some effects of what would happen if the zoning varied over and above the limits as established by the Brackenridge Urban Renewal area, and finally a recommendation on the heights that could be established in the area to preserve the views of the capitol. He presented a report and slides on the area from I.35 south where the capitol first comes into sight and on north through the overhead intersector. Mr. Perkins stated that if there is a desire to preserve the view of the capitol and preserve the height in that area there are three major categories that need to be looked at. There has been a case and the height was granted at 120' maximum, but in order to preserve the view at 12th and Trinity it must be maintained at 85'.

R200      Staff Report (continued)

## COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Dixon questioned whether or not the City had control over the State in building requirements. Mr. Perkins explained that there was now a 120' height limitation. According to the Brackenridge Renewal tract and also the agency, there is a 90' height maximum in existence and that 90' height still has precedence over the 120' that was granted for that area.

## COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved that further exploration be given into the whole aspect of vistas involving the capitol which would extend it beyond the present perimeter of the Brackenridge Urban Renewal area to other areas which would be within the vistas. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion. Mr. Guerrero requested that Mr. Dixon withdraw the motion so it could be studied in more detail; come back later; and decide if the Commission wishes to expand it or set up a subcommittee so it can be studied more. Mr. Guerrero requested that it be placed on the agenda for the September 13 meeting.

R900      Parks and Recreation Department  
Consider setting public hearing for expansion of  
Town Lake Park through public streets.

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained that this is a long range plan for Fiesta Gardens-Festival Beach area that has been considered in C.I.P.'s past and part of that has been in the acquisition of properties for expansion and redevelopment. The Public Works Department is now ready to make the changes between the old streets that existed and dedicating those into parkland and remove some property from the parkland for the required access. It is required that a public hearing be held for that purpose.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented and the request that a public hearing be held prior to September 15.

#### COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved that a public hearing be scheduled for 7:30 p.m., September 13. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
             Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT:    Mr. Jagger

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

R81400      Planned Unit Development  
Request by Mr. Robert H. Nutter to be allowed to submit a  
Planned Unit Development on less than five acres at 4206 Steck  
Avenue as required by Planning Commission Guidelines for  
PUD Development.

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained that a developer must have five acres of land before he can submit a planned unit development under the ordinance. This is a request to submit a site plan for a PUD on less than five acres.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard testimony as presented. It was explained that the applicant cannot submit a site plan until he is given authority to do so.

#### COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved the Commission waive the requirement for five acres for this applicant. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
             Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT:    Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

- R141      Planning Commission Rules and Regulations  
Consider amending Section V, Meetings, to the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations to change the time of meetings for the first and third Tuesdays from 5:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained that before rules and regulations of the Planning Commission can be changed, a hearing must be held. If you wish to move your meetings from 5:30 to 6 p.m., it must be placed on the agenda, change the time, and then that action can be taken.

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Stoll said he did not remember discussing this; does not think it is a good idea. Mr. Dixon explained that it was not openly discussed; it was just informal.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Snyder moved the request be tabled. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

- R143      Planning Commission  
Consider setting date for an Orientation Session for Members of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dixon moved the Orientation Session be scheduled at 9 a.m., Saturday, August 27, 1977, in the Third Floor Conference Room. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

C1-77      Minutes

Mrs. Schechter moved acceptance of the minutes as submitted for the July 5 and July 12, 1977, Planning Commission meetings. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.



Planning Commission--Austin, Texas

Reg. Mtg. 8-9-77

C2o-77-001      Zoning Ordinance

Consider setting a public hearing on September 13 at 7:30 p.m. to amend Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code, Zoning Ordinance, to establish procedures for the zoning of historic districts.

Mr. Tom Knickerbocker of the Planning staff explained this was a request to set a public hearing at 7:30 p.m., September 13, 1977, to consider the criteria for establishment of historic districts. This item was considered at a prior hearing and a joint subcommittee was created between the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission. After several meetings of the concerned parties, the item is now ready for public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION

The Commission heard the testimony as presented. Mr. Vier explained that he wanted the ordinance clearly written so that people understood what appeal procedures they have.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Gutierrez moved that the public hearing be set at 7:30 p.m., September 13. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE:        Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes. Shipman and Schechter.

ABSENT:    Mr. Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 8-0 VOTE.

## SUBDIVISIONS

R105-76 SUBDIVISION MEMORANDUM

Short Form and Final Subdivisions as listed on the Subdivision Memorandum. Action taken at meeting.

FINAL SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED

The following final subdivisions have appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval of these plats. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final subdivision plats.

<u>C8-76-37</u>	<u>Shiloh Subdivision, Ph. 2, Sec. 1</u>
	Shiloh Road and Seminary Drive
<u>C8-77-19</u>	<u>Cherry Mountain</u>
	Cherry Mountain Drive
<u>C8-77-20</u>	<u>Lakeway, Section 26-B</u>
	Lakeway Boulevard

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The following final subdivision plat which has been recorded is appearing before the Commission for vacation. The staff recommends to grant the plat vacation. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the vacation of the following final subdivision plat.

<u>C8-74-04</u>	<u>Wagon Crossing, Section 3</u>
	E. Stassney Lane & Ponciana Dr.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The following final subdivision has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To POSTPONE for 30 days the following final subdivision plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and proper notification to the applicant.

<u>C8-77-44</u>	<u>Forest North Estates, Ph. Five</u>
	Effingham St. & Braes Valley St.

FINAL SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The following final subdivision is appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final subdivision plat and to GRANT revision of the preliminary plan to eliminate further extension of Dillard Circle.

C8-77-54 St. John's Commercial Area, Sec. 4  
Denson Dr. & Dillard Cir.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The following final subdivisions are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of these plats. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending compliance with departmental requirements.

C8-77-56 Mausoleum Complex at Forest Oaks  
U.S. 290 and Oak Hill/Memorial Park

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision pending compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalk requirements and street construction to urban standards.

C8-77-51 Lost Creek Blvd. Dedication Plat  
Lost Creek Blvd.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

FINAL SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending compliance with departmental requirements; sidewalks; and street name changes.

C8-77-53 Northwood III  
Tamarack Tr. & Tumbleweed Tr.

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending departmental requirements of waterway development permit, street name changes, and current tax certificates.

C8-77-52 Balcones Woods, Section 5  
Balcones Woods Drive

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalks, and street name changes.

C8-77-55 Mesa Park, Ph. 3, Section 1  
Red Cloud Drive

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED

The following short form subdivisions have appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval of these plats. The Commission then

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form subdivision plats.

- C8s-77-164 Whittington Addition  
Old Gregg Lane
- C8s-77-165 Resub. of Rutland Dr. Business Park, Sec. 4  
Metropolitan Dr.
- C8s-77-167 Rhodes & Puett Addition  
E. 47th Street & Duval Road
- C8s-77-169 Presbyterian Addition No. 2  
Bull Creek Rd. & Jackson Ave.
- C8s-77-171 Resub. of Lot 30, Camelot, Sec. 2  
Castle Ridge Rd.
- C8s-77-148 Resub. of Lot 4E, Rosa J. Spillmann Estates  
I.H. 35
- C8s-77-149 Indian Oaks 2  
McNeil Road and Blackfoot Tr.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivisions have appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of these plats. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivision plat pending a clear report from the Building Inspection Department and provisions for additional right-of-way.

- C8s-77-159 H.S. Wallace, Jr., Subdivision  
Barton Springs Road and Toomey Road

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending removal of the existing accessory building on proposed Lot A:

- C8s-77-140 The Stratton Subdivision  
Georgian Drive

AYE: Messrs. Dixon, Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

The Commission then

VOTED: To VACATE the recorded final plat and to DISAPPROVE the amended plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and receipt of current tax certificates.

C8s-77-05 Parker Heights, Section 1-B  
Burleson Road and Metcalfe Road

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements, fiscal arrangements as required, and a letter of variance to reduce the wastewater fees from \$109,300 to \$15,584.40:

C8s-77-104 Lot 3, Summit Oaks  
U.S. 183 East of Bell Ave.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivision has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends the plat be held until Water District No. 10 gives written approval for water service. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the short form subdivision and to AUTHORIZE the staff to HOLD the plat until the water source has been approved and to GRANT the variance to exclude the balance of the tract.

C8s-77-155 The Hills of Lost Creek, Sec. 1  
Lost Creek Blvd.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

The following short form subdivision has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the subdivision and to GRANT the variances regarding the tax certificates and exclusion of the balance of the tract.

C8s-76-85 Resub. of Lot 2, Metro Park  
I.H. 35 and Reinli St.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivision is appearing before the Commission for the first time and all filing requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends rejection of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To REJECT the following short form plat pending compliance with Departmental filing requirements.

C8s-77-172 Barry D. Cunningham Addn.  
Bratton Lane

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivisions are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval pending compliance with departmental requirements. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivisions pending compliance with departmental requirements.

C8s-77-174 Lanier Village  
Lamar Blvd. & Fairfield Dr.  
C8s-77-176 Resub. Tr. 1 of Cross Country Inn Subd.  
Sheridan Avenue & U.S. 290  
C8s-77-179 D & M 77  
Aurora Dr. & Koenig Lane

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued)

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following subdivisions pending compliance with departmental requirements and to GRANT the variance to exclude the balance of the tract.

C8s-77-173 Boggy Acres

Dittmar Road and Bridgewater Dr.

C8s-77-175 Ellison-Knight Addition

U.S. 290

C8s-77-178 2nd Resub. of Tr. 2, Mesa Park, Section 5, Amended  
Thunder Creek Road & Angus Rd.

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivisions are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivisions pending compliance with departmental requirements and receipt of a letter requesting the needed variance.

*Original Townsite of City of Austin*  
C8s-77-180 1st Resub. of Lots 1, 2, 3 & a, Por. of 4, Blk. 100  
Guadalupe Street & W. 8th St.

C8s-77-181 Resub. of Lot 2, 183 Park  
U.S. 183 and Carver Street

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier. Mmes.  
Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon

SUBDIVISIONS LOCATED IN THE LAKE AUSTIN WATERSHED

The following subdivision located in the Lake Austin Watershed has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval. The Commission then



SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS--FILED AND CONSIDERED (continued).

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final and to GRANT the variance on the requirement for a cul-de-sac at the end of Hyridge Drive.

C8-76-18 Twin Mesa  
Hyridge Drive

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The following short form subdivision has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form subdivision.

C8s-77-177 Resub. of Lots 1 & <sup>24</sup>~~24~~, Blk. 6, Austin Lake Estate <sup>Sec 1</sup>~~Sec 6~~  
Sky View Drive

AYE: Messrs. Guerrero, Gutierrez, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.  
Mmes. Schechter and Shipman.

ABSENT: Mr. Jagger.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Mr. Dixon.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

  
Richard R. Lillie, Executive Secretary