

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
September 12, 1978
Electric Building Auditorium
301 West Avenue

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:45 p.m.
in the Electric Building Auditorium at 301 West Avenue.

Present

Miguel Guerrero, Chairman
Leo Danze
Freddie Dixon
Sid Jagger
Sally Shipman
Bernard Snyder
Bill Stoll
Jim Vier

Absent

Mary Ethel Schechter

Also Present

Richard Lillie, Director of Planning
Tom Knickerbocker, Assistant Director of Planning
Evelyn Butler, Supervisor Current Planning
John Meinrath, Legal Department
Charles Graves, Director of Engineering
Maureen McReynolds, Director of OERM
Joe Ternus, Director of Urban Transportation
Sharon Barta, Assistant Director of Urban Trans.
Bob Liverman, Urban Transportation
Jim Gotcher, Building Inspection
Joe Lucas, Water and Wastewater
Ouida Glass, Senior Secretary



C14-78-105	Tom W. Bradfield	Interim "A" and Interim "AA" Residence
	2099-1101 Loop 1 (Mopac)	1st H & A to "O" Office, 1st H & A
	1398-1200 Loop 1	on Tracts 1, 7, 8, & 10, "GR" General
	1213-1209 Spyglass Dr.	Retail, 1st H & A on Tracts 3, 4, & 5,
	901-831 Loop 1	"BB" Residence, 1st H & A on Tract 9
	702-708 Columbus Dr.	and deletion of Tracts 2 and 6 (as amended)

Mr. Lillie explained that when this was last heard all departmental reports had not been completed and action had been postponed. The Water and Wastewater as well as the Urban Transportation report has now been received. Urban Transportation Director Joe Ternus discussed this particular development as it pertains to the traffic impacts on MoPac Boulevard and the street network. The existing and committed conditions within that particular area have been identified and he explained the traffic impact for that area. He felt any excessive development along MoPac should be minimized to maintain a certain caliber of facility; access should be limited to the facility; the number of public streets need to be limited coming onto the facility; and that access should be provided to these streets. He discussed the alternatives presented and stated that he felt Alternative C would best address the environmental needs, but all could be accomplished. Mr. Ternus expressed concern for generating more traffic than can be handled by the proposed facility.

Tom Knickerbocker explained there should be some corrections to the information given at the July 25 meeting, referring to Page 3 of the Minutes. He stated the information was correctly reported in the minutes, however, the information is wrong, and the Commission should be aware of the error before action is taken. The statement "The action of the City Council in 1976 on the Zilker Park lift station will require that all tracts developed more intensively than single-family residential lots are required to file a special permit." That is not true in this case; it only applied to properties which were to be connected to that lift station. None of this property was included in the contractual agreement. He explained this means that there would be no special permit review on any zoning granted under that Council policy and, in fact, there is no sewer capacity at the present time to serve any of this property without authorization of the Council to expand the sewer lift station. The Water and Wastewater Department has indicated it is possible to serve, but at this time we are not certain whether or not it would require Council authority to make that expansion of the plant. Mrs. Shipman stated that Item 3 on Page 3 should read "to recommend a reduction in the size of Tract 3".

Joe Lucas explained the procedure to obtain more capacity for this project and the route that must be taken. He stated that physically it can be done, it is just a maintenance problem and he was not aware of any other problems. Mr. Lucas stated that it can be handled physically; the problem seems to be administration. John Meinrath requested that any recommendation be postponed until the Legal Department had an opportunity to clarify the issue.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Tom Bradfield

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

None

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

SPECIAL PERMITS

C14p-76-035 Montopolis Community Center Health
Clinic C.I.P. Project No. 9125 0
Extension of special permit

The staff reported that the applicant has requested an extension for the special permit. The staff recommend that the request be granted.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve the extension of the special permit to allow the Montopolis Community Center Health Clinic, C.I.P. Project No. 9125 0, to be built in an A-Residential area. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

C2o-78-014 Zoning Ordinance
To consider amending Chapter 45 permitting
veterinarian clinics in "O" Office Districts
by Special Permit.

Tom Knickerbocker explained that the City Council had asked the staff to research the possibility of permitting veterinary clinics in "O" Office Districts under certain conditions. He introduced John Meinrath, who suggested the words "dogs, common cats, and other household pets" be substituted for "non-farm animals."

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Stoll moved to approve the proposed amendment to Chapter 45 of the Zoning ordinance permitting veterinarian clinics in "O" Office Districts and that the words "dogs, common cats, and other household pets" be substituted for "non-farm animals." Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Shipman, Stoll and Vier.
ABSENT: Danze and Schechter.
OUT OF THE ROOM: Jagger and Snyder.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

C2o-78-015 Zoning Ordinance
To consider setting a public hearing to
amend Chapter 45 related to dog kennels.

The staff reported this is to set a public hearing to consider amending the zoning ordinance relating to dog kennels.

C2o-78-015 Zoning Ordinance--Continued

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to set a public hearing on the fourth Tuesday in October to consider amending Chapter 45 related to dog kennels. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C12-78-013 Public Services

Consideration of an eight-inch wastewater approach main for the Pepsi Addition No. 1

The staff explained this is a request for an eight-inch wastewater approach main to serve the Pepsi Addition No. 1. All cost will be borne by the owner.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve the eight-inch wastewater approach main to the Pepsi Addition No. 1. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C12-78-014 Public Services

Consideration of an eight-inch wastewater approach main for Safeway Addition No. 13.

The staff reported this is a request for an eight-inch wastewater approach main, and there are three alternatives for consideration.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve an eight-inch wastewater approach main for the Safeway Addition No. 13, and that Alternate 1 be approved. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C17p-78-005 Sale of City Property

Consideration of the sale of city property at the Southwest corner of Tenth Street and West Avenue.

C17p-78-005 Sale of City Property -- Continued

Tom Knickerbocker stated this is to consider the sale of city property at the southwest corner of Tenth Street and West Avenue. The staff recommends approval of the sale to the adjoining owner.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve the sale of city property at the southwest corner of Tenth Street and West Avenue in accordance with staff recommendations. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman, Stoll and Vier.

ABSENT: Danze, Schechter and Snyder.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C7p-78-006 Sale of City Property
 Consideration of sale of city property
 at 7200-02 Bennett Avenue

Tom Knickerbocker explained this is to consider the sale of city property, and the staff recommends approval of the sale.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved approval of the sale of city property at 7200-02 Bennett Avenue in accordance with staff recommendations. Mr. Stoll seconded the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman, Stoll and Vier.

ABSENT: Danze, Schechter and Snyder.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C10v-78-024 Street Closure
 Portion of Matthews Lane

Mr. Guerrero explained that he had received several requests for this request to be postponed.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Guerrero moved to postpone the hearing on the street closure of a portion of Matthews Lane for two weeks and requested notices be sent. Mr. Dixon seconded the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman and Vier.

ABSENT: Danze, Schechter, Snyder and Stoll.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200 Annexation Plan

Tom Knickerbocker explained that the Commission had set a date of October 10 at 7 p.m. to hear the annexation report but that it should be moved

R200 Annexation Plan -- Continued

to September 26 in order for the Council to receive the Planning Commission recommendation prior to their hearing.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to hold the public hearing on the annexation report at 5:30 on September 26. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman, Stoll and Vier.

ABSENT: Danze, Schechter, and Snyder.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C8c-78-001 Consideration of the Lakeway Conceptual Plan

Tom Knickerbocker explained that the Commission at times reviews conceptual plans so that the applicants can get some guidance before becoming involved with expensive engineering. He explained that the staff has reviewed the proposed Lakeway Conceptual Plan and concurs with its purpose and intent, that it is in the ETJ and will have to meet City codes and ordinance requirements. There is concern, however, for transportation related items.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Donald Crawford, President of Lakeway Corporation

Jim Meadows

Mel Lacquement

Mike Willatt

Bill Roberts, Partner, WMRT

Michael Clarke, Associate Partner, WMRT

Joe Beal, Vice President, Espey-Huston Associates

Charles Wortan, Espey-Houston Associates

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

None

COMMISSION ACTION

Donald Crawford presented the history of Lakeway and discussed the progress that has been made. Mel Lacquement discussed their proposals for further development and the guidelines they wished to implement. He stated they were moving into new areas and needed approval, if at all possible, in order to change these areas against an overall plan. Mr. Guerrero asked for comments from City staff and Director of Engineering Charles Graves discussed the street system, stated that the density would be less than 2.5 lots per acre and will be classified as suburban and required only to meet county standards for drainage and paving. Mr. Jagger questioned whether or not the streets would be safe and the arterial streets wide enough to accommodate the traffic that would be generated. There was discussion of the county standards, the possible responsibility for the City now or at a later time; as well as discussion regarding safety, and what constitutes a safe street. There also was discussion of development of the adjacent property and that impact; the possibility that at some later time Austin would be responsible for maintaining these areas, and who would bear the cost of additional right-of-way.

C8c-78-001 Consideration of the Lakeway Conceptual Plan

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Jagger complimented the Lakeway people on the reports, and moved to approve the conceptual plan, pointing out the question of the street width as a question of concern and added that as the individual sections are brought in, they would be addressed specifically regarding safety as well as considerations brought up by staff. He felt this to be a very unique situation in a unique area with a unique kind of development unlike any others the Commission has considered. He emphasized this is not approving the street widths and the paving as the street widths might warrant being addressed differently from other areas of the county. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion. Mr. Vier amended the motion that the Planning Commission accept the plan as a guideline for future plats and developments and Mr. Jagger accepted the amendment.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman and Vier.

ABSENT: Danze, Schechter, Snyder and Stoll.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200 To consider amendment to 1978-79 HCD Application

Mr. Joe Yacuno of the Human Resources Department presented the proposed amendment to the Planning Commission. After discussion of the proposals the Planning Commission agreed to amend the application as requested.

Motion was made by Mrs. Shipman and seconded by Mr. Stoll to amend the 1978-79 HCD application to provide for:

1. Christian Services, Inc., Senior Housing Project - \$128,486
2. Austin Tenants Council Rental Assistance Project - \$ 16,431
3. Reallocation of \$900,000 of 4th Year CDBG Funds.

AYE: Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman and Stoll.

ABSENT: Dixon, Schechter, Snyder and Vier.

ABSTAINED: Danze.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1.

Motion was made by Mrs. Shipman and seconded by Mr. Stoll to amend the 1976-77 and 1977-78 HCD Program to reprogram funds in the amount of \$626,221 from specific projects not begun into contingency fund.

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

ABSENT: Dixon, Schechter and Vier.

ABSTAINED: Snyder.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0-1.

C11-78-006 Off-Street Exemption Parking Exemption Study
To consider amending Chapter 45 to
extend area of parking exemption in
Center City

Tom Knickerbocker, Assistant Director of Planning introduced Urban Transportation Director Joe Ternus.

Mr. Ternus stated that the current policy of the city pertaining to exemption of off-street parking provides that facilities constructed within an area bounded by First and Eleventh, Lavaca and San Jacinto Streets are not required to provide any off-street parking. Exemption to the requirement to provide off-street parking spaces is likely to cause many changes to occur. The benefits of not providing parking facilities acts as a considerable incentive for growth and increased development. The exemption policy also impacts land use, traffic flow, availability of parking spaces, transit use, pedestrianism, and the vitality of the commercial operations in the area. The central area was reviewed and three possible areas were identified where extending the exemption policy might be desirable. In addition to the currently exempt area which was studied, the second area between Guadalupe and Lavaca and First Street and MLK, Jr. Blvd. is characterized by a mixture of low and high intensity commercial and public land use. The land use between First and 12th Streets does not significantly differ from the land use between Lavaca and Colorado except for a few surface parking facilities. Going west of Guadalupe, a different change and character of the land use is noted, i.e. residential, and a concern for a buffer zone becomes more apparent in order to mitigate any spill-over affects that might occur because of development in this particular corridor. The third area is between San Jacinto and IH 35 and Fifth and Eleventh Streets, and this is similar to the Guadalupe-Lavaca area in its commercial and public land use.

Development would likely accelerate if exemptions were provided. The impacts in area III on adjacent residential area however, are not critical since there are no neighborhoods in the sense that are found on the west side of Guadalupe Street. The final area is the southeast area, or Area IV, which is considered underutilized. This type of exemption could offer opportunities for development and redevelopment. He discussed several suggestions contained in the report, pertaining to a special CBD parking fund, the exemption of off-street parking requirements for small businesses, exemption of parking requirements for historic structures and a variance or off-set policy which could be authorized for joint or mixed uses. He discussed the recommendations and pointed out that there is another option to #5 and that the Planning Commission might consider that the Urban Transportation Department suggested for consideration. Originally, thought was given to the Board of Adjustments authorizing variances but that this could possibly be

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption Study (cont'd.)

better handled through the Planning Commission, particularly as it relates to joint and mixed uses. He discussed Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 and stated he felt that these variations are critical. They are based on the current potential traffic generations, the capacity of the areas, and the current availability of parking spaces in the areas, and the possible impact upon surrounding land use and developmental priorities. He pointed out they are policy questions that the Planning Commission can recommend to the City Council. He emphasized that the exemptions recommended in this report will have several impacts. First, they should act as considerable incentives to growth which may, in turn, cause increased traffic congestion and parking problems to occur initially. In order to absorb the influx of more people accompanying increased development, a substantial commitment must be made (1) to improve the frequency and operation of transit in the downtown area; and (2) to construct municipal parking facilities. These two commitments must go hand in hand with the recommendations for exemption of parking requirements.

Mr. Ternus stated that this particular report has been reviewed by the Urban Transportation Commission and by the Landmark Commission. The Transportation Commission recommended this report be approved, noting the timing of the implementation of this policy change with the municipal parking facilities cannot be overstressed. It is essential that the alternative transportation measures noted in this study be coordinated with the reduction of off-street parking requirements in order to prevent traffic congestion. It is important that the transit network be expanded to fully integrate the street system, parking facilities and pedestrianway system. A central area circulation system should be instituted to serve as a vital link among these activity centers. The Urban Transportation Commission wanted to clarify the issue of financing and building municipal parking facilities. The City must play a strong leadership role in funding and development of these facilities in the interim between the implementation of the CBD parking fund, the construction of the first facility, and the collection of sufficient revenues to pay for the facilities. The costs may be recovered from user's fees when sufficient contributions to the fund are made.

Mr. Ternus reported that the Landmark Commission had considered the parking requirement exemption study and that Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 were accepted and an additional Recommendation No. 10 to "omit the requirement that off-street parking spaces be located with 200 feet of the premises which they are to serve from Section 45-30 of the City Code" was added. They agreed in principle with Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 and endorsed the concept of downtown revitalization, but felt that it was not in their jurisdiction or expertise to set specific percentages for exemptions. They did express concern for Area II and the area to the west of Area II which is an older neighborhood with historic structures. They would like to see consideration of the concept of the Eight Street Mall and a possible reduction in the exemption allotted to this area to decrease spill-over into that neighborhood. Mr. Ternus would recommend in regard to No. 10 that the provision that spaces be located within 200 feet of the premises which they are to serve be changed to 800 feet, not deleted. This applies only to Areas I, II, III, and IV.

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption Study (cont'd.)

Mr. Vier discussed the scarcity and also the cost of land in the CBD where it is needed the worst and asked how the pool will address those problems. Having the money to build the parking garage is one thing, but having it where it is needed and at a reasonable cost is another. Mr. Ternus stated that they suggested the City establish a parking fund so the City authority of condemnation, if necessary, to acquire the land in the proper location would be an added plus to help the developers and the property owners in that particular area. Location is very critical. Private enterprise and the public sector must be brought together to build facilities where they are needed. Mr. Vier felt that it could possibly be a detriment to the CBD revitalization, and questioned whether or not parking requirements for development in that area now are somewhat excessive under certain circumstances. Mr. Ternus discussed the percent reductions and how they would be implemented. Mr. Vier asked if this had been successfully done in other cities. Mr. Ternus explained there are a number of cities having a similar type fund and that municipal government involvement in parking facilities is quite common throughout the country. He felt the strength of this type of fund would be in getting the private sector as well as the public to work together to implement the parking. City funds could also be provided. There was discussion of the different types of mechanisms that could be used should the program be implemented. There was discussion of the areas and the percentages to be used, as well as the different ways in which this could be funded. The City could float a bond issue, contract with private developers who would use city-owned land. There is the option of the private developer providing all the parking he is required to, the option of municipal government providing off-street parking facilities, and the third option of joint off-street parking facilities that would be provided both by contributions of government and the private sector. The fund would work in such a manner that the city would contribute in different ways as well as the private sector contributing. This must be a "two-way street." Mr. Jagger felt that any major developer would build the required parking spaces. Development outside the central core area and how it could be handled was discussed. There was discussion of changing the boundaries and how this could be accomplished. Mr. Ternus explained he would have no problems recommending an extension of the northern boundary of Area III to include 12th Street, but does have serious concerns about boundary extensions proposed on the west side, i.e. Area II. There was discussion of the ordinance that would have to be developed. An attempt to arrive at a realistic space cost would be made and subject to review at the public hearing. Mr. Jagger felt that the overall plan should be sequenced in some way, felt that it could be counterproductive to what we are trying to accomplish. He expressed fear that the knowledge of these proposals might stop all downtown development until they were enacted. It could need to be a two-stage program. There can be a moral commitment to a parking garage, but it must have a bond election of some sort. Mr. Ternus did not feel there would have to be a bond election in order to have a parking garage; it is just one mechanism. Mr. Jagger felt it to be a real mistake to make a recommendation without taking into account what affect on downtown the recommendation will have if implemented

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption Study (cont'd.)

immediately as to the parking requirements and if the other, i.e. building of garages, does not happen for ten years. Mr. Stoll felt this could be a conceptual framework to develop a total parking plan for downtown. Mr. Ternus sees this, if recommended by the Planning Commission, as the staff's authorization to continue developing the studies and also the various ordinances to enact this type venture. Mr. Stoll suggested to go ahead and put in provision for a very sequential development system, if this is passed, to address these problems. Mr. Ternus agreed there will be some interim traffic congestion in these areas. Mr. Jagger feels the greatest problems will be with the medium-sized buildings. Mr. Guerrero wanted to know what would happen to smaller buildings or businesses. Mr. Ternus explained that businesses have 3 options: spaces could be provided, they could pay into the fund, or any combination thereof. Mr. Vier felt that no one knew right now whether it would encourage development or would be a detriment to good development and an asset to some things that are undesirable. Mr. Jagger had no problem with the percentages if this is made an "interim ordinance" for two years. Mr. Snyder said there must be emphasis before we do this because there must be pressure to develop this municipal parking facility. If not, it could be implemented and then in two or three years we are back where we were, a preamble or whatever.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR: Rueben Johnson
Terry J. Sasser
Ross Blumentritt
Ron Guerres

COMMISSION ACTION

Ruben Johnson, speaking for the University State Bank, hoped they could get a variance for their bank building, and stated Mr. Ternus should be congratulated; this is good; something to revitalize the downtown. He cautioned to be sure that what we do actually does revitalize downtown. There is more to it than just traffic and stated thought should be given so the small businessman will not be penalized. We must have all the services downtown Austin needs. Mr. Sasser agreed that Mr. Jagger has a very pertinent point and expressed concern for the change of use situation, and asked, "Where do we draw the line?" He discussed the grandfather clause and what affect it would have. He agreed it is needed and all the reasons behind it and the amount of money it will take to make the fund work, but expressed concern if the rate of inflation continues. If it is too long range, we will always come up short. Ross Blumentritt felt there should be an exemption for any building containing 4,000 square feet or less. He discussed the use changes and pointed out that could make it impractical to do anything and suggested Area I be enlarged. He felt Area I and IV to be identical and that this needs to be thought through quite a bit. He did state he favored the proposal. Ron Guerres asked if the boundaries of Area III could be extended to include 12th Street.

Planning Commission -- Austin, TX

September 12, 1978

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption (cont'd.)

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Jagger asked Mr. Ternus if any thought had been given to a more graduated type of exemption which would address some of the downtown areas that probably would not be served by public garages or transit. The parking and traffic problem is different from the revitalization problem, and he has a problem with hard, fast boundary lines. He moved that the Commission indicate agreement in principle but would like the staff to examine some of the peripheral impacts of the various percentages and the various boundary lines as this proposal comes up for final ordinance. He does not want to be locked in by approving this report to the particular boundaries and percentages shown, but would like the Commission to have an opportunity for further review and analysis. He felt there are some redevelopment aspects to this that have not been adequately addressed; the city really must make sure this change will not be counterproductive. Basically, the motion is that the Commission endorses the report; emphasizing the points made by the Urban Transportation Commission and this approach is part of a complex three-part plan which must be coordinated that the implementation of the exemption be made as an interim ordinance to be examined at the end of two years. Further, that the specific boundaries and specific percentages be further examined when the ordinance is brought forward after the Council has reviewed the study. Mr. Snyder suggested the implementation of parking garages be made a part of the motion because municipal-sponsored parking facilities are a vital element in the plan. Mr. Jagger agreed to this addition.

Mr. Stoll suggested a timetable on the sequential steps to implement the recommendations in the study should be developed and approved before any portion of the set of recommendations is set up by ordinances.

Other suggested changes as outlined earlier by Mr. Ternus would be to change No. 2 staff recommendation to exempt buildings rather than businesses of less than 4,000 square feet; No. 4 rewritten to coincide with the parking facilities and transit improvements; No. 5 changed for the Planning Commission to determine the number of off-street parking spaces; No. 8 extend the boundaries of Area III to 12th Street; No. 10 to extend the distance 200 feet to 800 feet; and that the percent requirement within the current exempt area only apply to expanded facilities. (A summary of the Commission's recommendations is presented below.)

Summary of the Planning Commission Actions of Sept. 12, 1978
on the Parking Requirement Exemption Study

The Planning Commission endorsed the report and agreed in principle with the concept of boundaries and percentages of exemption. However, they felt that the specific boundaries and percentages must be examined with the ordinance. In line with this, they felt that the northern boundary of Area III should be shifted north to 12th Street. They also suggested that the amended recommendations (below) be adopted as an interim ordinance, which should be

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption (cont'd.)

re-examined in 2 years. The Commission further wished to reemphasize the Urban Transportation Commission's remarks that stressed the importance of the timing of the implementation of this policy change with the construction of municipal parking facilities and expanded transit service in the downtown area. Therefore, it was felt that a timetable of sequential steps of implementation of the plan should be developed and approved before the ordinance is adopted.

The revised recommendations are as follows:

1. Establish a special Central Business District (CBD) Parking Fund. Some off-street parking requirements may be satisfied through contribution to this fund.
2. Exempt land uses in buildings of less than 4,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area from all off-street parking requirements.
3. Exempt all historic zoned sites ("H") from all off-street parking requirements.
4. Stage the implementation of the parking exemptions program to coincide with the construction of municipal parking facilities and the development of a central area circulation system which links major activity centers.
5. Authorize the Planning Commission to set the amount of off-street parking requirements for joint/mixed land use, carpooling/transit pass programs, and bicycle/motorcycle uses.
6. Adjust the requirement for the currently exempt area, Area I, to a 90% exemption, with the remaining 10% of the parking requirement being satisfied either by off-street spaces or by contributions to the CBD Parking Fund, applicable only to new construction or the expansion of existing facilities.
7. Allow the Guadalupe-Lavaca Area, Area II, a 60% exemption with the remaining 40% being satisfied by either off-street spaces or contribution to the Fund.
8. Allow the San Jacinto-IH 35 area, Area III, a 75% exemption, with the remaining 25% being satisfied by either off-street spaces or contribution to the Fund.
9. Allow the Southeastern CBD Area, Area IV, a 90% exemption with the remaining 10% being satisfied either off-street spaces or contribution to the Fund.
10. Adjust the requirement that off-street parking spaces be located within 200 feet of the premises which they are to serve to require that they be located within 800 feet of those premises.

Planning Commission -- Austin, TX

September 12, 1978

C11-78-006 Off-Street Parking Exemption (cont'd.)

The Commission voted on the motion by Mr. Jagger, as amended by Mr. Stoll, and seconded by Mr. Dixon.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

SUBDIVISIONSPRELIMINARY SUBDIVISIONSC8-78-73 Springwoods II

Anderson Mill Rd. & Villa Park Dr.

(continued from Aug. 8, 1978)

The staff reported that this preliminary plan consists of 100 acres which had 326 lots when reviewed at the August 8, 1978 meeting but has been reduced to 315 lots which results in a reduction in density from 3.4 to 3.29 lots per acre. Lot 1 fronting on Anderson Mill Road in the original plan is now proposed to be developed with residential lots located on two cul-de-sacs.

Modification of the plan to increase lot sizes adjacent to the developed subdivisions to the east, north and west and a change in the street plan was accomplished as a result of the meeting held with the neighborhood on August 17, 1978.

The staff recommended that the modified plan be approved.

1. Connection required to a sewage treatment plant and collection system. Plans and specifications for such facility required to be approved by the Director of the Water and Wastewater Department and the State Department of Health prior to final plat approval.
2. Show all lot dimensions.
3. Show centerline curve data.
4. Drainage and utility easements as required.
5. Waterway development permit required prior to final approval.
6. 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.
7. Show survey tie across all existing roads intersecting or abutting boundary of proposed subdivision.
8. Variance required on length of block on east side of Briar Hollow Drive between Hazelhurst Drive and Black Oak Street. Recommend to grant because of existing development.
9. Label all blocks to avoid lot number duplications.
10. Sidewalks required on one side (specify) of residential (50') streets, both sides of collector streets and subdivision side of Anderson Mill Road.
11. Fiscal arrangements and sidewalks note required on final plat.
12. Connection required to City of Austin water system.
13. Natural gas service is not available.
14. Change names of Lipan Trail, Cade Lane, and Santanta Trail.
15. 80 feet of R.O.W. required for Anderson Mill Road (40 feet from centerline).
16. Show proposed use for Lot 1 adjacent to Anderson Mill Road.
17. Show date.

C8-78-73 Springwoods II (cont'd)

18. Show existing easement and record references.
19. Show 90° angle turns with centerline curve radius of 50-75 feet or greater than 200 feet.
20. Restriction required, on final plat prohibiting occupancy until connection is made to the City water system and to a sewer treatment plant and collection system approved by the authorities identified in number 1 above or public sewer system.
21. Permit required, from Texas Department of Water Resources for sewer treatment plant prior to final approval.
22. Fiscal arrangements required for sewer treatment plant.

Several adjoining property owners presented their views on the subdivisions.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the modified preliminary subdivision and to grant the variances where recommended. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

NOTE:

Applicant has submitted a modification of the layout (attached hereto) following a meeting with the affected Neighborhood Group, but does not wish to revise preliminary plan until the Planning Commission makes a decision.

PRELIMINARY-FINAL SUBDIVISIONS

C8-78-50 Convict Hill "A"
Convict Hill Road & Hill Oak Dr.

Evelyn Butler explained that applicant had requested a postponement for two weeks.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To POSTPONE this preliminary-final subdivision for two weeks.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman, Stoll, and Vier.

ABSENT: Dixon, Snyder, and Schechter.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

C8-78-42 Great Hills Commercial Two (Amended)
U.S. 183 and Loop 360

Evelyn Butler requested disapproval and no hearing be held on Great Hills Commercial Two (Amended)

After further discussion the Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the preliminary-final subdivision.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Jagger, Shipman, Stoll, and Vier.

ABSENT: Dixon, Snyder, and Schechter.

R105-78 Subdivision Memorandum
Short Form and Final Subdivisions as listed
on the Subdivision Memorandum. Action taken
at meeting.

P.U.D. SHORT FORM

The staff reported that the P.U.D. Short Form has appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends approval. After further discussion the Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following P.U.D. Short Form.

C814s-78-002 A Resub. of Lots 33 & 34 of Cat Mountain
Villas, Section 1
Mountain Villa Circle & Mountain Villa Drive

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

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 of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final subdivision plat and to HOLD the plat for Book and Page of Street Vacation and Deed.

C8-77-08 Mesa Park, Phase Four
Mesa Park Blvd.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The staff reported that the following final plats are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The Commission then

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

C8-78-36 Gracywoods, Section Four
Carshalton Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and sidewalk note required on plat.

C8-78-48. Westlake Crossroads
Westlake High Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

ABSTAINED: Jagger.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, and street name changes and to GRANT variance required on signature of adjoining owner and to GRANT variance required to exclude balance of tract.

C8-78-58 The Ridge at Thomas Springs
Thomas Springs Rd.

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd)

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalk note required on plat, and street name changes.

C8-78-87 Scenic Brook West, Section VI
 Scenic Brook Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

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

C8-78-88 Scenic Brook West, Section VII
 Scenic Brook Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Staff reported that the preliminary plat has not yet been approved. Therefore the staff recommend that action be postponed for two weeks. After further discussion the Commission then

VOTED: To POSTPONE the following final plat for two weeks.

C8-78-50 Convict Hill, Section One
 Convict Hill Rd. & U.S. 290

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following old 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 subdivisions.

C8s-78-83 The Woods of Anderson Mill, Section Three
Woodland Village Dr. & Research

C8s-78-197 Verver Addition
Mistletoe Trail

C8s-78-214 1st Resub. of Lot 1, 183 Park
Anderson Ln. E. & Carver Ave.

C8s-78-217 C.N.B. Motor Bank Addition
W. 8th St. & Lavaca

C8s-78-247 Resub. of Lot 4, T.L. Subdivision No. 1
S. Congress & Barton Springs Rd.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form subdivision, to AUTHORIZE staff to hold plat until Zoning Ordinance is passed, and to GRANT variance required on signature of adjoining owner.

C8s-78-141 Donihee Addition
S. Congress & Stassney Lane

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form subdivision and to GRANT variance to delete fiscal for sewer and water service.

C8s-78-157 Vance Nauman Subdivision
Anderson Mill Road

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd)

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form subdivision and to GRANT variance required on signature of adjoining owner and to GRANT reduction of fiscal for wastewater as determined by formula - estimated cost per foot x lot frontage x 2.

C8s-78-190 Oak View
Jollyville Road

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form plat and to AUTHORIZE staff to hold plat for signature of owner.

C8s-78-206 Schubert Addition
Eck Lane

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-221 C.L. Briggs Subdivision
Cullen Ave. E. of Burnet Rd.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd)

The Commission then

VOTED To APPROVE the following short form plats and to grant VARIANCE required to exclude balance of tract.

C8s-78-235 First Resub. of Lot 1, Blk. C, LaCosta, Phase Three
U.S. 290 & Calidad Dr.

C8s-78-236 Resub. of Tract I-B, 1st Resub. La Costa, Phase One Section 2
U.S. 290 and Calma Dr.

C8s-78-239 Resub. of Lot 1, Blk. A, La Costa, Phase 2, Section 1
Camino La Costa & La Posada

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The staff reported that the following short form subdivision are appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been met. The staff recommends disapproval of these plats. The Commission then

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

C8s-78-248 Mercado Heights
F.M. Hwy. 2304 & Old Austin Manchaca Rd.

C8s-78-256 Resub. of a Part of Lots 4 & 5, Maas Addition
W. 11th St. & Charlotte St.

C8s-78-261 Springdale Center
Springdale Rd. & Ed Bluestein

C8s-78-262 First Church of the Nazarene Addition
E. 51st & Pecan Springs Rd.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plats pending compliance with departmental requirements and to GRANT variance required on signature of adjoining owner.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd)

C8s-78-252 A.C.I. Industrial Park
Ben White Blvd. & Chapman Ln.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and to GRANT the variance required to exclude the balance of the tract; to GRANT the variance to delete sidewalks; and to GRANT the variance required on scale of plat.

C8s- 78-255 Sunridge Park, Section Two
Ben White Blvd. W. of Montopolis

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and current city tax certificates required, and to GRANT the variance required to exclude the balance of the tract.

C8s-78-263 Motel 6 Addition
E. Rundberg & I.H. 35

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

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

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd)

C8s-78-264 Grove Subdivision No. 2
 Montopolis Dr. & U.S. Hwy. 183

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements, current city and county tax certificates, and additional right-of-way required.

C8s-78-249 Austin Business Park
 Research Blvd. & Putnam Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-250 Girard-McCoy-McClain Subd.
 Barton Hills Dr. E. of Trailside

C8s-78-253 Fred McNair Subdivision
 Wynona Ave. & White Horse Trl.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and additional right-of-way required.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd)

C8s-78-251 Resub. of Lots 1, 2, & 3, Blk. A
 Bee Caves Woods Section One
 Walsh Tarlton Ln. & Eanes Xing

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

ABSTAINED: Jagger.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plats pending compliance with departmental requirements and current county tax certificates required.

C8s-78-258 Lakeway, Section 15
 Lohman's Crossing Rd. S. of Hurst Creek Rd.

C8s-78-259 Lakeway, Section 25
 Lohman's Crossing at Sailmaster

C8s-78-260 First Resub. of Hills of Lost Creek, Section 2
 Quaker Ridge & Fox Chapel Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and current city tax certificates required.

C8s-78-257 Houston Square
 Cameron Rd. at Clearcreek Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

SUBDIVISIONS LOCATED IN THE LAKE AUSTIN WATERSHED

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following new final plat is appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of this plat. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following new final plat pending compliance with departmental requirements, preliminary approval required prior to final approval, and Lake Austin data required.

C8-78-42 Great Hills Commercial Two
Loop 360 and Great Hills Trail

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following short form subdivision 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 plat.

C8s-78-189 Perlitz Townhouse Addition
W. 35th & Exposition Blvd.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

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 to exclude balance of tract.

C8s-78-205 Pioneer Valley
Loop 360 N. of Creekbluff Dr.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

Planning Commission -- Austin, Tx.

September 12, 1978

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd)

The staff reported that the following short form plat is appearing before the Commission for the first time and all departmental requirements have not been complied with. The staff recommends disapproval of this plat. The Commission then

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

C8s-78-254 Deer Creek
 River Hills Rd.

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

ABSENT: Schechter.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.



Richard R. Lillie, Executive Secretary