

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Austin, Texas

Regular Meeting -- July 11, 1978

The Commission meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Present

Miguel Guerrero, Chairman
Leo Danze
Sid Jagger
Mary Ethel Schechter
Sally Shipman
Bernard Snyder
Bill Stoll
Jim Vier

Also Present

Richard Lillie, Director of Planning
Daron Butler, Director of Research and Budget
John Meinrath, Legal Department
Shelia Finneran, Legal Department
Joe Ternus, Urban Transportation Department
Jim Gotcher, Building Inspection
Charles Kanetzky, Water and Wastewater
Ouida W. Glass, Senior Secretary

Absent

Freddie Dixon

Planning Commission, Austin, Texas

July 11, 1978

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 1978-79.

Mrs. Shipman moved the following officers be elected for the coming year:

Miguel Guerrero, Chairman
Bill Stoll, Vice Chairman
Mary Ethel Schechter, Secretary
Jim Vier, Assistant Secretary, and
Bernard Snyder, Parliamentarian

and to maintain the present Executive Committee as for the previous year.
Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder, Stoll, and Vier.
ABSENT: Dixon and Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C20-78-012 Zoning Ordinance

Public hearing to consider amending the Zoning Ordinance regarding offstreet parking for furniture stores.

Mr. Richard Lillie, Director of the Planning Department, discussed the request from an individual regarding offstreet parking for furniture stores. Mr. Jim Gotcher of the Building Inspection Department explained that parking requirements for the entire City were received in 1954 and at that time there were requirements established for various uses within the city, many of which were lumped into one category, such as retail use which requires one parking space for every 200 square feet of gross floor area. Some uses in that general category do not require the amount of parking that other uses do; for instance, furniture stores and supermarkets. Since the Board of Adjustments is having more and more requests for variances to the parking requirements, it is now requested to reduce the parking requirements from one parking space for 200 square feet of gross floor area to one parking space for 400 square feet of gross floor area.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Kenneth Carr

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

None

COMMISSION ACTION

Kenneth Carr, who is in the retail leasing business, spoke in favor of the proposed ordinance, stating that in many cases furniture uses have not been permitted because of the parking requirements and sees no harm in the change.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Jagger moved to recommend the ordinance be passed. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Jagger, Schechter, Snyder, and Stoll

OUT OF ROOM: Shipman and Vier

ABSENT: Dixon

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C2o-78-011 Zoning Ordinance

Public hearing to consider amending Zoning Ordinance Chapters 45-1 and 45-23 for the purpose of placing adult-oriented bookstores and theaters in "C" Commercial.

The Planning Director explained this is a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, Chapters 45-1 and 45-23 for the purpose of placing adult-oriented bookstores and theaters in "C" Commercial. He gave a brief background, stating that over the past number of months representatives of neighborhood associations had expressed their concern on the location of adult-oriented bookstores and theaters. The Legal Department had been requested to draft an ordinance concerning this type of land use. Shelia Finneran of the Legal Department discussed the proposed ordinance, explaining that she was of the opinion that it should be applied to all bookstores and theaters to be legal. She cited the Detroit case and the Supreme Court ruling, explaining that it could be very hard to enforce because of violations with Amendment I of the Constitution. There are enforcement problems with an ordinance like this because the law is complicated; it deals with First Amendment rights, and because the law changes so quickly. There were problems with defining a bookstore or adult movie, pointing out that it is hard to tell why an adult bookstore has any different land use problems than any other book store. She recommended that if the intent is to regulate bookstores and movie theaters and make them have "C" Commercial zoning, that it should be applied to all bookstores and movie theaters in order to be safe legally, and not based on the content of what they are showing. They cannot be so regulated that they are forced out of business.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Merle L. Moden, 6506 Bridgewater Cove
Marilyn Simpson, 2307 Mimosa Drive

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

Cindy Soo, 2130 S. Congress

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Danze stated there was a distinction between beer and alcoholic beverages and wondered if the word "adult" might be a key factor here. Ms. Finneran pointed out that this was a distinction made and the U.S. Constitution states that alcoholic beverages can be regulated, whereas the First Amendment warns to be careful regulating books, movies, expression, etc. Mr. Stoll questioned whether or not an ordinance would hold up in court if drafted with a foot restriction, and Ms. Finneran responded that she did not think it would. Mrs. Shipman discussed the possibility of a new zoning possibility and this also was recommended against. There was then discussion of a special permit and this was not

C2o-78-011 Zoning Ordinance (cont'd.)

recommended as being feasible. Mr. Jagger felt that perhaps all movies could be placed under the special permit procedure and then they could be controlled; Mr. Vier suggested putting all theaters in "C" Commercial and then having the special permit. Mr. Danze again stated he felt they are already identified as adult. Merele Modeen, President of the University Hills Homeowners Association stated his association supports the First Amendment, does feel there are limitations on first Amendment rights; stated there is a nuisance effect here. They do not oppose the existence of these bookstores and theaters, but do oppose their location adjacent to residential areas. Marilyn Simpson of the Austin Neighborhood Council stated she is interested in keeping these types of businesses out of the neighborhoods, suggested a 500' restriction on an adult establishment. She warned that there is no follow-up when the zoning is changed, and did not wish to see "C" Commercial zoning allowed in neighborhoods because of the uses permitted with this type zoning. Cindy Soo, representative of Universal Amusements, expressed opposition to the zoning on the basis of First Amendment rights. She also stated that their clientele is conservative and does not tear up a neighborhood. She stated they had bought theaters that were having problems, they pay taxes, keep things cleaner and felt they were better than the persons in the building before. She felt their advertisements were better than those of the "R" Rated moveis and do not harrass anybody. She felt if there is going to be restrictions, that all theaters should be restricted. Mr. Snyder askef if a 500' requirement would create problems and if as well as how a variance could be obtained. Ms. Finneran stated she would like to have more time if a distance requirement is palced on all theaters, and again stated she felt that "C" Commercial would be the easiest to defend. There was discussion of "C" Commercial abutting neighborhoods.

COMMISSION VOTE.

Mrs. Shipman requested information on "C" Commercial zoning adjacent to residential areas. Mr. Stoll expressed favor with the distance limitation across the board for all theaters and bookstores, to place all in "C" Commercial with a 500' limitation from the property line. Mr. Jagger felt this could have a very negative impact on a number of small areas resulting in a tremendous impact. After discussion, it was decided to have the Legal Department draft another ordinance which would require all theaters and all bookstores to be placed in "C" Commercial with a 500' restriction from the property line and to bring back the original ordinance. Mr. Lillie explained that it would be on the agenda for the August meeting.

C14-67-212 Mrs. T.A. Mae Minnette Bryant and C.C. Cook
1811-1815 West 35th Street
3405-3411 Oakmont Boulevard
Consideration of removing restrictions

C14-67-212 Mrs. T.A. Mae Minnette Bryant (cont'd.)

The Planning Director explained this was to consider removing a restrictive covenant on property owned by Mr. C.C. Cook and that he had requested that the covenant not be considered. Mr. Cook had indicated he would contact all property owners of his request to withdraw this petition.

COMMISSION ACTION

Mrs. Shipman moved to postpone the request indefinitely. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder, Stoll and Vier.

ABSENT: Dixon and Jagger

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C14p-78-014 Vackar Interest, Inc.: A 5-unit townhouse project
3102-3106 Scenic Drive
3202-3206 Pecos Drive

The Planning Director stated that on April 20 and again on May 2 the Planning Commission had considered a townhouse project of six units by Mr. Walter Vackar at the corner of Scenic Drive and Pecos. After a public hearing on May 2 there were a number of motions made and the final motion resulted in a tie vote. The application was appealed to the City Council. The City Council, at the request of Mr. Vackar, referred it back to the Planning Commission for consideration of the originally-filed special permit which has now been reduced to five units from six units. He explained the tract includes just under three-fourths acre of land, it is zoned "A" Residential, the area is large enough to subdivide into three duplex lots which would permit six units and is permitted in the "A" district. Single-family detached homes on separate lots could also be built. This is before the Commission as a special permit since the ordinance requires that townhouse development be required to submit a special permit, and he explained the factors in the ordinance the Commission is to review. Since the application has been reduced from six to five units, the density has been reduced from 8.2 units to 6.82 units per acre. The duplexes on the east side of Pecos have a density of 6.5 units per acre and the P.U.D. has 8.05 units per acre. It has been found that the ordinance requirements listed under the six-unit project with several exceptions have been met. It is the intent to submit a revised site plan to five units in order to assure that the developer could meet all of the requirements of the ordinances without variances. That has been done. He discussed the storm run-off and drainage and the alternative methods under the Lake Austin standards that still have not been reviewed, commented on, and submitted to the Commission, but felt the recommendations had been

C14p-78-014 Vackar Interest, Inc. (cont'd.)

taken care of. Mr. Lillie told the Commissioners they had three alternatives: to deny because of certain information the ordinance requires; (2) postpone action pending receipt of the subdivision and drainage and Lake Austin material; or (3) approve the special permit subject to that information being presented through the subdivision process. He explained this is a "what comes first" question. When a special permit is submitted and a subdivision is required, the Lake Austin Growth Management standards fall under the subdivision procedures and are not applicable with a special permit. He stated that no site plan for a special permit is released until all ordinance requirements have been taken care of and it is totally compatible with subdivisions and all permitting activities prior to the release for a building permit. He expressed concern for making decisions on special permits where flooding possibilities are not addressed until the subdivision is received, and all applicants are being asked to submit applications for subdivisions and special permits concurrently from now on.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Walter Vackar, applicant

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

Frank and Evelyn Booth, 3000 Willowood Circle
Mr. & Mrs. Ronald C. Schultz, 3105 Scenic Drive
Laura Voiers, 34th and Jefferson
Mrs. Marjorie Childs Voiers, 3100 Scenic Drive
Mrs. S. W. Glazener, 3007 Scenic Drive

COMMISSION ACTION

Walter Vackar explained that the request had been reduced to five units, and he had asked the City Council to refer it back to the Planning Commission for consideration. He had invited the persons who had signed the petitions or who lived within 300 feet from the property lines to two different meetings and stated that 10 people showed up, eight for and two against. He referred to a report from Espy Houston on water runoff that would show the five units would decrease runoff and would improve the water quality with the development of the land. He stated if there was any question or concern regarding impervious cover he would be glad to postpone for one week.

Speaking in opposition, Frank R. Booth presented the following statement:

Law Offices
BOOTH, LLOYD AND SIMMONS
302 SAN JACINTO BUILDING
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701
TELEPHONE (512) 478-9506

FRANK R. BOOTH
ROBERT H. LLOYD
LUTCHER B. SIMMONS
PAUL G. GOSSELINK

July 11, 1978

Planning Commission
City of Austin
City Hall
Austin, Texas 78767

Re: July 11, 1978, Planning Commission, CLp-78-014, VACKAR Interest, Inc., Application for Special Permit, 3102-3106 Scenic Drive - 3202-3206 Pecos Drive.

Members of the Planning Commission:

My Name is FRANK R. BOOTH. I reside at 3000 Willowood Circle which is a street off of Scenic Drive about a block from the property involved in the referenced matter. I appear before you in opposition to Vackar Interest, Inc.'s, application for a special permit to build five townhouses in our residential neighborhood. I appear on behalf of myself, my wife, three sons and our neighbors who oppose the referenced application. My family and I have resided at the above-mentioned address which is our home for about nine years.

I will discuss legal and factual aspects of the application. But first, I want to state categorically and assure you with all of the persuasion that I possess, we oppose this application and consider it nothing more than a sophisticated procedure to spot zone a residential neighborhood. In candor, we advise you and the applicant that we will oppose a favorable decision for the applicant and will support an unfavorable decision in every forum available. Our reason is twofold. First, the application before you, if approved, will authorize a unit density in excess of 12 per acre in a neighborhood which has less than three units per acre. Second, your favorable consideration of the application before you will establish a precedent in our neighborhood that every remaining vacant lot can now be jammed with townhouses at a 12-plus density per acre.

We have obtained a copy of the Planning Department's staff report dated April 20, 1978, and the one small addendum affixed thereto dated July 6, 1978, which refers to the amended application which the City Council unanimously referred back to you on June 15, 1978.

Members of the Planning Commission
Page Two
July 11, 1978

Our neighborhood is zoned "A" RESIDENTS DISTRICTS as described in Section 45-17 of Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code. Subsection (h)(11) of this section of the Code authorizes townhouses by special permit. Sec. 45-2 of the Code states purpose of the chapter on zoning and says among other things that: the zoning ordinance was adopted

"with reasonable consideration...to the character of the district, and its peculiar suitability for the particular uses; and with a view of conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout the community."

Section 45-3 of the Code states that:

"In interpreting and applying the provisions of this chapter, they shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public safety, health, convenience, comfort, prosperity and general welfare of the community."

Section 45-29 of the Code designates the procedure for obtaining a special permit. Subsection (a) describes the requirements for an application for a special permit and provides for notice and hearing on the application. Subsection (b) describes your hearing procedure and states:

"The planning commission at its hearing on a special permit shall consider the formal application and the accompanying site plan, and shall impose only such conditions as are necessary to secure and protect the public health, safety, morals and general welfare."

Subsection (c) requires a site plan with the application and prescribes its requirements. Subsection (d) prescribes the factors to be considered by the Planning Commission on an application for special permit.

We have been unable to obtain a copy of the amended application which you are supposed to be considering. We therefore conclude that no such amended application exists. If we are correct, you lack jurisdiction to consider this matter and should dismiss the application for failure to comply with City Code Section 45-29(a) and (b).

We have reviewed the site plan available to us from the Planning Department. Section 45-29(c)(3) of the Code requires a Site Plan which shows "the center line of existing water courses, drainage features and location and size of existing and proposed streets and alleys." The addendum dated July 6, 1978, to the Planning Department's Staff Report on this application states "A creek permit will furthermore be necessary for this site."

We testify to the fact that the north side of the property involved in this application has a creek which either bisects the property or is the north boundary. We have not been furnished with a Site Plan which shows "the center line of existing water courses." If no such Site Plan exists, the application and Site Plan fail the requirements of the Code and the application should be rejected.

Section 45-29 (c)(2) of the Code requires that the Site Plan show "the location of existing boundary lines and dimensions of the tract." The Planning Department's April 20, 1978, Staff Report states in paragraph 5 that:

"A subdivision will be required Volume and Page of easement to property on West, allowing adjacent owner use of easement, will have to be noted on plat and site plan prior to release."

The original Site Plan submitted with the original application dated March 1, 1978, shows on the West property boundary an easement intruding ten feet into the West boundary with the following notation:

"Use of 10' easement granted to adjacent owner for driveway radius."

The revised Site Plan shows this easement on the Preliminary Subdivision Plat but inconsistently shows proposed development of the property (required by Sec. 45-29(c) of the Code) intruding into the easement. The Revised Site Plan shows on its face that a resubdivision cannot be approved on the basis of the Revised Site Plan application for Special Permit, and the application should be rejected.

Section 45-1 of the Code contains definitions. Pertinent to this application are the following definitions:

"Town House. A dwelling unit structure having a common wall with one or more adjoining dwelling unit structures (4-11-68).

"Town House Group. Two or more contiguous town houses connected by common walls (4-11-68)."

Section 45-17-"A" RESIDENCE DISTRICTS, Subsection (h)(11) authorizing townhouses by special permit provides in Subsection (h)(11)b as follows:

"b. The following unit and area requirements are complied with:

"1. That there be at least four connected units in each town house project."

The Revised Site Plan before you shows two groups of two townhouses connected by common walls. The fifth so-called townhouse (Unit A in the Revised Site Plan) is not connected by a common wall to another townhouse. The Revised Site Plan shows some small connection between Unit A and West Unit B, but by no stretch of the imagination or the Code definition can this connection be found to be a "common wall." The Revised Site Plan shows on its face that the amended application violates Section 45-1 of the Code, and the application should be rejected.

The time allotted to oppose an application before the Planning Commission (15 minutes) does not permit further elaboration of the deficiencies of the application for special permit in complying with the procedural requirements of Section 45 of the Code. Time does not permit a detailed discussion of the basic inconsistency between Section 45-3 of the Code entitled "INTERPRETATION AND APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER" which states that the Zoning Ordinance "shall be held to be the minimum requirements," and Section 45-29(b) of the Code, which states:

"The planning commission at its hearing on a special permit shall consider the formal application and the accompanying site plan, and shall impose only such conditions as are necessary to secure and protect the public health, safety, morals and general welfare."

Section 45-29(d) of the Code, entitled Factors to be Considered, provides:

"In granting or denying an application for a special permit, the city planning commission shall take into consideration the following factors:

"(1) Safety of the motoring public and of pedestrians using the facility and the area immediately surrounding the site.

.

"(3) Protection of adjacent property from flood or water damage.

.

"(9) Such other measures as will secure and protect the public health, safety, morals and general welfare."

Scenic Drive as it intersects Pecos going east is uphill. Pecos just before it intersects Scenic Drive going north tops a blind hill and provides a speedway going north which makes the Scenic Drive-Pecos intersection extremely dangerous because vision is obscured at the intersection by both hills. The application before you will aggravate this traffic danger and thus the application, if granted, will constitute a hazzard to the "Safety of the motoring public and of pedestrians using the facility and the area immediately surrounding the site.

A creek traverses the north side of the property involved in the application. The Planning Department Staff Report notes (1) that "A creek permit will furthermore be necessary for this site," (2) that "Rainfall runoff shall be held to the amount existing at undeveloped status by use of ponding or other approved methods," (3) that:

"Subdivision must comply with the Lake Austin Ordinance. The standard Lake Austin Ordinance limits impervious cover to under 30%, as a small part of the building site exceeds the 15% slope. The building coverage alone submitted for the project is 33.9%, which requires that alternative methods be used to meet the Lake Austin Growth Management Ordinance. Applicant needs to provide evidence that the proposed grass-concrete on driveways, etc. is not an impervious cover."

The Addendum dated July 6, 1978, to the Planning Division's Staff Report states "The subdivision on this tract however, will still have to comply with the Lake Austin Growth Ordinance and alternative methods will need final approval by City Engineering."

From the above quotations, it is obvious that the special permit sought by the application is marginal at best and will require subsequent variances in the Ordinance approval requirements of at least the following:

1. The creek permit ordinance.
2. The subdivision ordinance requirements.
3. The Lake Austin ordinance requirements.

Technicalities and legalisms aside, the fundamental question which faces the Planning Commission with regard to this application is that if approved it is a gross intrusion into a residential neighborhood and tantamount to prohibited spot zoning.

Premises and evidence considered, your motion and vote to deny the application upon the facts and City Code discretion allowed you should be along the lines as follows:

I move that the application of Vackar Interests, Inc., for a special permit at 3102-3106 Scenic Drive and 3202-3206 Pecos Drive be denied for the following reasons:

1. Applicant has failed to file an application in compliance with City Code Section 45-29(a) and (b).
2. Applicant has failed to file a Site Plan in compliance with City Code Section 45-29(c)(2).
3. Applicant has failed to file a Site Plan in compliance with City Code Section 45-29(c)(3).
4. Applicant's Revised Site Plan violates City Code Section 45-1 because Unit A fails to meet the requirement that a town house have a common wall with one or more adjoining dwellings.
5. Under the facts of this application, the safety of the motoring public and of pedestrians using the facility and the area immediately surrounding the site will be jeopardized contrary to City Code Section 45-29(d)(1).

Members of the Planning Commission
Page Seven
July 11, 1978

6. Under the facts of this application, the protection of adjacent property from flood or water damage was not established contrary to City Code Section 45-29 (d) (3).
7. Under the facts of this application, the ability to comply with the requirements of the Lake Austin Growth Ordinance was not established contrary to City Code Section 45-29(d) (9).
8. Under the facts of this application there will be an unwarranted intrusion into a residential neighborhood contrary to City Code Section 45-29 (d) (9) which requires this Commission to secure and protect the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the area involved.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank R. Booth

FRB:11

C14p-78-014 Vackar Interest, Inc. (con't.)

Ronald Schultz stated the neighborhood does not want the townhouses, they want the land left as originally zoned. He expressed the feeling that if this request is approved, there would be a lot more because of the vacant lots in the area and this would be creating multi-family units in the middle of a single family neighborhood. Mr. Stoll felt that this was not an official amended application, also expressed concern that it would set a precedent. He felt the situation to be greater than what is now being considered. Mr. Schultz was of the opinion it could be stopped now, but would be a real problem later. Marjorie Voiers discussed the western boundary of the tract and stated there was now litigation pending thereon. In rebuttal, Mr. Vackar stated he would be willing to push the units together if there was a question of a common wall, but felt it would be better the way it was submitted. He stated this is a vacated City easement. There was discussion of the deed restrictions in the area and the fact that there were no deed restrictions on this property. He indicated he would be willing to negotiate with the adjacent owner; the garage had been built too near the property line. Mrs. Schechter asked Mr. Ternus to discuss traffic and safety factors. He responded by stating that the entire area is difficult from a traffic standpoint, but failed to see how this would be a major factor in this decision. He stated any development in that area will have some problem. Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Graves if two weeks would be sufficient time for Engineering and ERM to respond. He felt there was substantial material that was not in at this time and asked for additional information on water quality. John Meinrath was asked to respond to the statement from Mr. Booth. Mrs. Shipman stated she felt very strongly that this will set a definite precedent and that this area is having to bear more than their share of multi-family housing. She felt it would be detrimental to the neighborhood that is trying to maintain a single-family nature. Mr. Snyder felt that first of all, the Commission must decide whether or not they have authority, or what authority they have on special permits. Mr. Stoll moved to deny the special permit application based on Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8, of the letter from Frank Booth dated July 11, 1978, deleting Item 4. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion.

AYE: Schechter, Shipman and Stoll

NAY: Danze, Guerrero, and Snyder

ABSTAINED: Jagger

ABSENT: Dixon and Vier.

THE MOTION ENDED IN A VOTE OF 3-3.

Mr. Guerrero moved to postpone the request to 5:30 PM, July 25, and that Mr. Meinrath respond to Mr. Booth's letter, that Engineering and ERM representatives be present to respond to alternatives proposed by Mr. Vackar. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

C14p-78-014 Vackar Interest, INC. (cont'd.)

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Snyder.

NAY: Schechter, Shipman and Stoll

ABSTAINED: Jagger

ABSENT: Dixon and Vier.

THIS MOTION ENDED IN A TIE VOTE OF 3-3.

Mr. Snyder then moved to table the request to July 25. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Snyder

NAY: Schechter, Shipman, Stoll

ABSTAINED: Jagger

ABSENT: Dixon and Vier

THIS MOTION ENDED IN A TIE VOTE OF 3-3

After considerable discussion it was decided to get a legal opinion on what authority the Planning Commission has regarding special permits and to schedule a worksession at 5:30 PM, July 18, with the Legal Department to discuss the zoning ordinance, special permits, and the subdivision process and to have court cases discussed. Mrs. Shipman stated they are "lay people making decisions regarding legal implications."

C12-78-004 Public Services

Consideration of a wastewater approach
main for Four Seasons Section 2.
(Postponed from May 9, 1978)

The Planning Director explained this was postponed from May 9, 1978 in order for applicant and the neighborhood to try to work out some arrangements on distribution or accessibility of that approach main to areas outside the subdivision.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

C12-78-004 Public Services (cont'd.)

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

John Coffee, applicant
Mr. Campbell

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

James F. Parker, 11618 River Oaks Trail
Dr. Milton L. Holloway, 11627 River Oaks Trail
Patrick M. Callan, 11600 Janaury

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Stoll stated the postponement was in order to have the City investigate about hooking up the substandard housing lots to the proposed approach main for the new subdivision, the feasibility, the cost, and also how many potential units could be hooked up with this proposed approach main. The Water and Wastewater Department has indicated that they could accept an additional 35 lots outside of Four seasons Section 2. One of the things to be worked out was how many persons wanted sewer service. Dr. Milton Holloway, representing the newly formed Northeast-Walnut Creek Homeowners Association, stated that 75 percent of persons wish to hook into the new line when and if it is available. There again was discussion of the problems in the area, discussion of raw sewage, pollution, etc. in the area. He felt that the applicant should not be allowed to proceed with a new subdivision until the problems already created had been corrected, pointing out they were not anywhere near an agreement. He stated they felt the developer should pay part of the costs involved and requested the City to do some investigation into the feasibility of City participation in the system in order to make it more feasible. There was discussion of the percolation tests that had been made and the results thereof, also that the Health Department was to investigate the seriousness of the pollution problems in the area, pointing out that 25 percent of the systems have failed. Applicant stated he wanted the approach main approved. No problems can be solved until a main is installed. Mr. Campbell felt the developer should be able to develop his land; was sympathetic with the problem but does not understand what that has to do with this approach main. He felt it to be unfair for the Planning Commission to require a developer to put in sewer service for something that was put in years ago and now has problems, pointing out that all these properties are outside the City limits. He stated he would be willing to work something out and bear a portion of the cost. Mr. Snyder felt the City should not bear the responsibility for the approach main and felt that the developer does have an obligation to the previous subdivision. Mr. Jagger felt that everybody must pay something at some time for service. There was discussion of this being outside the City limits and if and when the City might annex. Pat Parker felt that some efforts have been made to

C12-78-004 Public Services (cont'd.)

correct the situation, belt action to be premature at this time and requested an indefinite postponement until a firm, more definite solution could be reached. In rebuttal Mr. Coffee stated that some people want to live outside the city. He recognized that market and would build accordingly. He questioned what would happen to these people if the application for the approach main is withdrawn. Mrs. Shipman expressed concern of the area with respect to the existing city limits, felt that the City was committed to accelerate growth in this direction and to annex the area, and at the same time recognized that there were serious problems out there. Mr. Snyder agreed that the system as now designed is totally inadequate. Mr. Gerald Hart, engineer for the Big Walnut Creek Sewer Line from Cameron Road west, discussed the scheduling of that project and the area to be served, also the time frame involved. Mr. Jagger felt that the approach main should go in for a number of reasons, stated that the developer and the homeowners should agree on the extent of participation. He felt the Commission should not approve the approach main until there is a definite commitment from developer to correct a part of the situation. Mr. Coffee then stated they would furnish all engineering services, furnish all materials and labor at their cost, and would agree to bear 28 percent of the material and labor for the distribution system.

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Stoll moved to postpone the request and to encourage the developer to come back to the Planning Commission with a revised estimate of the percentage of the costs he will bear to put in sewer improvements to Four Seasons Phase I with problems that were outlined. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion. Mrs. Shipman offered a friendly amendment that this be considered in two weeks if they have reached an agreement.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.

NAY: Jagger

ABSENT: Dixon and Vier.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-1.

C12-78-008 Public Services
 Consideration of wastewater approach main
 for Convict Hill Subdivision
 (Postponed from June 13, 1978)

The Planning Director explained this is a request for an approach main to serve the Convict Hill Subdivision and is an extension of the Scenic Brook Line. The Environmental Board has recommended the project. The cost to the City is about 80 to 85 percent if the area is annexed; if it is not, it will at the total cost of the developer.

C12-78-008 Public Services (cont'd.)

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Jack Bellamy, engineer for applicant

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

None

COMMISSION ACTION

There was discussion of the area to be served and how the line would be placed.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mrs. Shipman moved to approve the wastewater approach main for the Convict Hill Subdivision. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Jagger, Schechter, Shipman.

ABSENT: Dixon and Vier.

OUT OF ROOM: Snyder and Stoll.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200 Brackenridge Urban Renewal Plan
To change use district from "P-1" to "P-2"
of the Brackenridge Urban Renewal Plan for
the area containing the Fehr and Granger
Building.

The Planning Director explained that within the Brackenridge Urban Renewal Area land uses are proposed and the area is designated like zoning. The Fehr and Granger Building as well as the building adjacent are designated "P-1" which is recreational for the most part. The City would like to have the use of that building broadened so it can be used for a number of activities, maybe some offices also. The proposal has been sent to the Urban Renewal Board and they passed a resolution recommending that that tract of land along the creek and on 15th Street be changed from "P-1" to "P-2". It is recommended to change the Urban Renewal Plan for that site from "P-1" to "P-2".

R200 Brackenridge Urban Renewal Plan (cont'd.)

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Guerrero moved to approve the request of the Urban Renewal Agency to change the use district from "P-1" to "P-2" of the Brackenridge Urban Renewal Plan for the area containing the Fehr and Granger Building. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C11-78-006 Transit and Transportation
Consideration of the Proposed
Austin Pedestrianway Plan

The Planning Director stated that Mr. Joe Ternus, Director of the Urban Transportation Department had requested that the Planning Commission review the Austin Pedestrianway Plan. Mr. Ternus explained copies had been distributed to neighborhood and civic organizations throughout the city.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Stoll stated he would like to see the slide presentation before the full commission and moved that it be done before the Planning Worksession at 5:30 PM, July 18, 1978.

C3-78-003 Waterway Development Permit
Enclosure of a waterway with a flow rate
exceeding 300 cubic feet per second on
Highland Mall, Austin Mall Resubdivision
of Lots 6A-2, 6B-2 and 3D for Waterway
Development Permit Application No. 78-06-3383.

The Planning Director introduced Mr. Charles Graves, Director of Engineering, who explained that this is a request to enclose an open drainage channel through the Highland Mall tract. The existing open ditch is man-made within a 50 foot drainage easement. After enclosure the area will be used as additional parking for the Mall expansion. He stated he felt the requirements of the "Creek Ordinance" could be met and recommended approval of the request.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Danze moved to approve the enclosure of the waterway. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

C3-78-003 Waterway Development Permit (cont'd.)

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, and Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger, Snyder and Vier.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

SUBDIVISIONSPRELIMINARY SUBDIVISIONSC8-78-62 Concept One
 183 and Hamilton Road

The staff reported that this preliminary plan consists of 221.99 acres with 475 lots, the average lot size being 75' x 140' and the density of 2.34 lots per acre.

The Plat Review Committee met on May 10, 1978 and recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. Variance required on scale of preliminary plan. Recommend to grant because of plat size at required scale of 1" = 100'.
2. Connection required to City of Austin water and wastewater systems.
3. Fiscal arrangements required for water approach main.
4. Council approval required for wastewater approach main prior to preliminary approval.
- *5. Suggest modifications as shown in blue to reduce the number of creek crossings.
6. Ownership of proposed neighborhood park and greenbelt must be determined prior to final plat approval and shown on final plat.
7. Show lot line between Lots 14 and 15, Block K.
8. Proposed Lake Austin alternative control strategies must be approved by Office of Environmental Resources Management and Engineering Department prior to final plat approval.
9. Scale Colina Lane as indicated at 64 feet r.o.w.
10. Show 25 foot building setback from Fourwinds Circle on Lot 12, Block C.
11. Reverse building setback lines for Lots 1 & 13, Block H; Lots 23 & 27, Block C; Lot 10, Block D and Lot 7, Block Q. Also show 25' setback line from Fourwinds Circle on Lot 12, Block C.

C8-78-62 Concept One (cont'd.)

12. All lots must comply with width and area requirements as outlined in Sec. 41-35, Subdivision Ordinance. (See lots 15, 16, 22 & 23, Block J)
13. Show 25' building setback from Badger Creek Trail on Lots 1 and 2, Block M.
14. Show addresses of all adjacent property owners including owners of platted lots.
15. Subdivision is classified as urban and all streets, drainage, sidewalks, water and wastewater lines required to be constructed to City standards with appropriate fiscal arrangements.
16. Show survey tie across Jollyville Road to verify r.o.w. shown.
17. Variance required on length of Sugarpine Court cul-de-sac. Recommend to grant because adequate circulation is provided.
18. Full 60 foot r.o.w. required to be dedicated for portion of Taylor Draper Lane at intersection of Crooked Fork Lane prior to platting of adjacent lots.
19. Topographic contours required not to be more than 100 horizontal feet apart.
20. Drainage and utility easements as required.
21. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all collector streets and one side (specify) of all residential streets.
22. Variance required for the length of Blocks A, D, E, G, I, K, N, O, P, and U. Recommend to grant because of topography and provision for adequate circulation.
23. Waterway development permit required prior to final approval.
24. Minimum building slab elevation note required on final plat.
25. Fiscal arrangements and sidewalk note required on final plat. (outside city)
- *26. Recommend 20 foot wide pedestrian access from street to greenbelt between lots 32 and 33, Block E.
27. Main line advance required for natural gas service.
28. Change names of Summit G, Balsam Ln., Otter Creek Ct., Buckboard Ct., Buckboard Tl., and Innisbrook Lane.

C8-78-62 Concept One (cont'd.)

29. Development permit required from Travis County prior to start of site development.
30. Monument a benchmark within the subdivision to U.S.G.S. 1929 datum.
31. All streets required to intersect at or near 90 degree angles.
32. Review required by Urban Transportation Department of street cross-section plans for Badger Creek Trail from Jollyville Road through transition to 70 feet r.o.w. prior to construction.
33. Street grades required not to exceed 20%. Recommend 15% or as approved by Urban Transportation, Engineering Department and County Engineer.
34. Submit letter to Chairman of Planning Commission requesting appropriate variances and stating reasons for such requests.
35. Bridge construction plans are required to be reviewed by City Engineer, County Engineer and Urban Transportation Department.
36. Submit impervious cover calculations by slope class.
37. Submit estimates of proposed cuts and fill.

* This is not an ordinance requirement and cannot be required unless agreed to by owner.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following preliminary subdivision pending City Council Approval of the wastewater approach main for southeast area and report from Engineering and Environmental offices regarding alternative methods of Lake Austin Ordinance.

C8-78-62 Concept One
183 and Hamilton Road

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, and Stoll
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger, Snyder and Vier.

C8-78-63 ~~Burleson Business Park-A~~
 Resub. of P.M. Bryant Industrial Park, Sec. One
 Burleson Road & Silver Dime Circle

The staff reported this preliminary plan consists of 15.44 acres with 14 lots, the average lot size being 75' x 105' and the density 0.91 lots per acre.

The Plat Review Committee met on June 14, 1978, and recommended approval of this preliminary plan with the following conditions based on ordinance requirements and departmental recommendations and subsequent departmental reports:

1. Connection required to City of Austin water and wastewater systems.
2. Subdivision is classified as urban and all streets, drainage, sidewalks, water and wastewater lines required to be constructed to City standards with appropriate fiscal arrangements.
3. Show book and page reference of P.M. Bryant Industrial Park, Sec. One in dedication statement.
4. Variance required on length of proposed cul-de-sac. Recommend to grant because of existing development and location of railroad spur.
5. Variance required on length of proposed block. Recommend to grant because of existing development and large lots.
6. Submit letter to Planning Commission requesting appropriate variances and stating reasons for such request.
7. Main line advance required for natural gas service.
8. Water supply to this area is limited by the small diameter water mains and only minimum fire flow can be provided.
9. Sidewalks required on both sides of proposed street and subdivision side of Burleson Road. Recommend variance to delete sidewalks on the proposed street because of proposed use.
10. Water way development permit required prior to final approval.
11. Drainage and utility easements as required.
12. Fiscal arrangements and sidewalk note required on final plat (outside city).
13. Delete "A Resubdivision of P.M. Bryant Industrial Park Sec. One" from subdivision title.
14. Contours required to be not more than 100 horizontal feet apart.
15. Change "grant" to "dedicate" in dedication statement referring to "grant to the public the use of this street, etc."

C8-78-63 Burleson Business Park (cont'd.)

16. Change name of Silver Dime Circle.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following preliminary subdivision subject to departmental requirements and to grant the request to DELETE sidewalks on both sides of Burleson Road and Silver Dime Circle and to GRANT the variances for city and county tax certificates.

C8-78-63 Burleson Business Park-A
Resub. of P.M. Bryant Industrial Park, Sec. One
Burleson Road and Silver Dime Circle

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, and Shipman

NAY: Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger, Snyder and Vier.

C8-78-23 Park Hills West
F.M. 1826

The staff reported this preliminary plan consists of 542 acres with 73 lots, the average lot size being 470' x 470' with a density of 0.134 lots per acre.

1. Waterway development permit required prior to final approval.
2. 100 year flood plain data required.
3. Drainage and utility easements as required.
4. Minimum building slab elevation note required on the final plat.
5. Subdivision is classified as suburban and all streets and drainage required to be constructed to county standards for acceptance for maintenance with appropriate bond posted with the County Engineer.
6. Health Department approval given for septic tank use.
7. Health Department approval required for individual water wells prior to final approval.
8. Variance required on the length of most blocks. Recommend to grant because of low density and topography.
9. Restriction required on the final plat prohibiting occupancy of any lot until connection is made to a water well approved by the local (city and county) Health Departments and a septic tank and system approved by the local (city and county) Health Departments.

C8-78-23 Park Hills West (cont'd.)

10. Show survey tie across F.M. 1826 and provide for 50' of R.O.W. from centerline.
11. Minimum centerline radius for collector streets is 300'.
12. Minimum centerline radius for residential streets is 200'.
13. No sidewalks required. (suburban)
14. Change name of Park Hills West Drive.
15. Variance required on the scale of this preliminary plan. Recommend to grant because of plat size at the required scale of 1" = 100'. Recommend final be submitted in sections at proper scale of 1" = 100'.
16. All street intersections required to be at or near 90 degrees.
17. Recommend 400' centerline radius on the 100' R.O.W. section of curve on Park Hills West Drive.
18. County Engineer approval required for construction of Ireland Drive across earthen dam between blocks J & K.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following preliminary subdivision subject to departmental requirements and to GRANT the variances for additional right-of-way and the restriction requirement on plat prohibiting occupancy until connection is made to a potable water supply and to a septic tank system approved by the Austin-Travis County Health Department or to a public sewer system.

C8-78-23 Park Hills West
F.M. 1826

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger, Snyder and Vier.

The staff reported that applicant had requested the following preliminary plan be reapproved. The staff recommended to grant. The Commission then

VOTED: To REAPPROVE the following preliminary subdivision subject to departmental requirements.

C8-77-26 Timberline IV
Spyglass Drive

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that applicant had requested name change on the following preliminary plan. The staff recommended to grant. The Commission then

VOTED To APPROVE the name change to Texas Oaks for the following preliminary subdivision.

C8-77-30 Westwood Heights, Section Two
Slaughter Lane

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

P.U.D. FINAL

The staff reported that the following Planned Unit Development has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have not been met. The staff recommends disapproval. The Commission then.

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following P.U.D. pending sidewalk note required on plat, plat corrections, street name changes, and all streets need to be marked as being either private or public.

C814-78-003 Cat Mountain Villas, Sec. III-A
Lookout Mt. Dr. & Mt. Bonnell

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following final plat 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 final plat.

C8-74-68 Village South, Ph. 3, Sec. 2.
Pleasant Valley Rd. & Stassney Ln.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger, and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final plat and to HOLD the plat for posting of Book and Page of the street vacation on the plat.

C8-77-49 Lakeway, Section 26C
Lohmans Crossing Rd. & World of Tennis Blvd.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.

ASBSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that the following plats are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval of these plats. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final plats.

C8-78-61 La Costa, Phase 3
Cameron Rd. & U.S. 290

C8-78-63 Burleson Business Park ~~A~~
Burleson Rd.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ASBSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that the following plats 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 plat pending fiscal arrangements compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalk note required on plat, plat corrections, and connection required to city water and wastewater systems.

C8-77-26 Timberline IV
Spyglass Drive

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalk note required on plat, plat corrections, and letter from Williamson County Municipal Utility District No. 1 for approval of water and wastewater services.

C8-78-07 Village 15 @ Anderson Mill
F.M. 620 & Lake Creek Pkwy.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final plat pending fiscal arrangements, current city and county tax certificates, sidewalk note required, plat corrections, and connection required to city water and wastewater systems.

C8-78-60 The Haystack, Phase 1
Providence Ave. & U.S. 183

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that 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

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form plats.

C8s-78-57 Southwest Oaks, Section 3
Manassas Dr. W. of Malvern Hill
C8s-78-94 Seton Medical Center Addition
Wabash Ave. & W. 38th St.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form plat and to GRANT the variance required on signature of adjoining owner and to GRANT the variance required on street width.

C8s-78-181 Daisley Acres
Old Bee Caves Road

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Staff reported that 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 DISAPPROVE the following plat pending fiscal arrangements and to GRANT the variance required on signature of adjoining owner.

C8s-78-91 Taranna Subdivision
Spring Hill Lane

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that the following short form subdivision has appeared before the Commission in the past and applicant has requested postponement. The Commission then

VOTED: To POSTPONE the following short form plat.

C8s-78-82 Watkins-Pettigrew
Alpine Rd. & S. Congress

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The staff reported that 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 of these plats. The Commission then

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

<u>C8s-78-196</u>	<u>Elton Lane Addition</u>
	Elton Lane S. of Enfield Rd.
<u>C8s-78-197</u>	<u>Verver's Addition</u>
	Mistletoe Trl. W. of Twin Creeks
<u>C8s-78-198</u>	<u>J.T. Ltd. Subdivision No. 3</u>
	Gessner Dr. & Wonsley Dr.
<u>C8s-78-199</u>	<u>Texwood Addition, No. 2</u>
	E. 1st St. & Redbluff Rd.
<u>C8s-78-200</u>	<u>Resub. of Woodcreek, Lt. 2</u>
	Greystone Dr. W. of Woodhollow
<u>C8s-78-203</u>	<u>Resub. of Lots. 5 & 6, Blk. 8, Travis Heights</u>
	E. Monroe St. & Alameda Dr.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivision pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, current city and county tax certificates, and variance required on signature of adjoining owner.

<u>C8s-78-191</u>	<u>The Gibson Addition</u>
	Bennett Ave. at E. 55th St.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivision plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, current city tax certificates, and plat corrections and to GRANT the variance on signature of the adjoining owner.

<u>C8s-78-192</u>	<u>Austin Bancshares Addition</u>
	Research Blvd. S. of McNeil Road

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form subdivision pending compliance with departmental requirements, and current city and county tax certificates.

C8s-78-201 Bank of the Hills, Sec. 1
U.S. 183 & Lake Creek Pkwy.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

SUBDIVISIONS LOCATED IN THE LAKE AUSTIN WATERSHED

NEW SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS

The staff reported that 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 of these plats. The Commission then

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

C8s-78-193 Spicewood at Balcones Village, Sec. 7A
Spicewood Club Dr. & Plumewood

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements. No increase in density. LAGMP Report not required.

C8s-78-202 The Resub. of Lots, 1,2,3,& 6, Blk. L,
Westhill Est., Sec. 1
Yaupon Dr. & D.K. Ranch Rd.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plats pending compliance with departmental requirements and Lake Austin Data required.

C8s-78-194 Matthew van Winkle Subdivision
Encinas Rojas E. of the High Road

C8s-78-195 Robin Estates
Toro Canyon Rd. N. of The High Rd.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.


The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements, current city and county tax certificates, and plat corrections, and to GRANT the variance required on signature of adjoining owner. Not in the Lake Austin Watershed; LAGMP not required.

C8s-78-190 Oak View
U.S. 183 North of Loop 360

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder and Stoll.
ABSENT: Dixon, Jagger and Vier.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM



Richard R. Lillie, Executive Secretary