

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Austin, Texas  
Regular Meeting -- October 10, 1978

The regular meeting of the City Planning Commission was called to order at 5:50 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Present

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

Also Present

Richard R. Lillie, Director of Planning  
Evelyn Butler, Supervisor Current Planning  
John Meinrath, Legal Department  
Joe Ternus, Director of Urban Transportation  
John German, Director of Public Works  
Councilman Richard Goodman  
Ouida Glass, Secretary

Absent

Mary Ethel Schechter  
Bernard Snyder

ZONING

C14-78-176	Ruben H. Johnson, Trustee: (by Tom Curtis) 400-412 West 15th St. 1507-1515 San Antonio 401-421 West 16th St. 1500-1518 Guadalupe	<u>"O" Office, 2nd H &amp; A (Tract 1)</u> <u>and "C", 3rd H &amp; A to "LR", 4th H &amp; A</u> <u>(Tract 1) and "C", 4th H &amp; A (Tr. 2)</u>
------------	---	---

Mr. Lillie explained that this application has been placed on the Commission's agenda because it had been advertised incorrectly and, therefore, was necessary that it be heard again. He discussed the land uses in the area and stated that the proposed use was bank building. Zoning in the area is "C" Commercial, and the staff recommends the application be recommended for approval.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR  
Tom Curtis

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION  
None

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to grant "LR" Local Retail on Tract 1 and "C" Commercial on Tract 2, both 4th H & A. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

SPECIAL PERMITS

C14p-78-027	Cotton Texas Ltd: A 390-Unit Apartment Dwelling Called South of Loop 360 at its intersec- tion with Spicewood Springs Road	<u>"Chimney Creek."</u>
-------------	--	-------------------------

Mr. Lillie explained this special permit came to the Commission in July and was postponed by the Commission in order for the applicant and the neighborhood to try to work out a compromise and to allow time for the applicant to comply with Lake Austin Growth Management Plan requirements. The subdivision has now been submitted with a site plan using the alternative methods provision of the Lake Austin Growth Management Plan and is recommended by city departments for approval. The plan has been amended to reduce density and to change locations of some of the buildings. The staff and other departments feel this proposal is much better oriented to the environment for which it is being placed. The staff would recommend approval of the application using alternative methods.

C14p-78-027 Cotton Texas Ltd--continued

## PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Robert Sneed, attorney for applicant  
George Gerry  
Wallace Pellerin, Homeowners Association  
Jim Frazier, 3104 Great Valley

## COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Sneed stated they had met with the neighborhood association on several occasions in an effort to work out items involved in the previous hearings. He offered a restrictive covenant setting forth the agreements reached with the additional protection by enforcement vested in the City of Austin. He explained they had agreed to underground utility lines and no TV antennas. He stated further, however, that Cotton Texas does not want to be bound by everything that has been agreed to by the Zavalas. There was discussion regarding the holding ponds, the excavation thereof, and Mr. Sneed explained that it would become the obligation of the Zavalas when this is conveyed to them. He discussed other provisions of the restrictive covenant that had been offered.

Wallace Pellerin, representing the homeowners association, expressed gratitude for the cooperation that had been received and stated the deed restrictions had answered questions that had been raised. There was discussion of the traffic impact and Mrs. Shipman expressed her concern. Mr. Pellerin requested the City accelerate improvement of Spicewood Springs Road to prevent neighborhood streets from being used as traffic arteries. George Gerry stated they had just recently discovered that someone else had filed the name "Chimmery Creek" and requested the name be changed on both the subdivision and the special permit request to "Spicewood Forest."

## COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve the special permit subject to ordinance requirements and departmental recommendations with the restrictive covenant as agreed to by applicant and with the name change to "Spicewood Forest". Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESSC2o-78-016 Zoning Ordinance

To set a public hearing to consider amending the zoning ordinance relating to Street and Parking Lot Landscaping.

Tom Knickerbocker suggested the proposed zoning ordinance relating to street and parking lot landscaping be set for public hearing on November 14.

C20-78-016      Zoning Ordinance--continued

## COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to set a public hearing November 14 to consider amending the zoning ordinance relating to street and parking lot landscaping. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

C10v-78-24      Street Closure

Matthews Lane  
(Postponed from September 26)

Mr. Lillie introduced John German, Director of the Public Works Department, who explained this request is to approve a closure of Matthews Lane at the MoPac Railroad tract. He stated that agreements had been made between the city and the railroad that this would be closed when William Cannon Drive was completed. It was agreed this request would have to go to both the Planning Commission and to the City Council for approval.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR  
None

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION  
Bill Malcolm, 1507 Matthews Lane

## COMMISSION ACTION

There was discussion of problems with persons getting in and out, of the neighborhood especially from the south side of Matthews Lane east of the railroad. Mr. German explained the subdivision was designed around this eventual closure. Mr. Vier asked Mr. Ternus responded that it might be feasible to justify signals in the area at a later time. He felt it may be possible that persons would have better access; it is further possible that traffic would shift and Matthews Lane might possibly be downgraded to the residential street for which it was originally designed. He pointed out that every at-grade railroad crossing poses a safety factor. Mr. Guerrero asked about the costs for signals. Mr. German proved the answers as requested.

## COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Jagger moved the street be closed. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-1.

C11-78-007      Parking Requirement  
for an auto repair garage at  
1606-1610 West Fifth Street

Mr. Lillie explained this request is to determine the number of required parking spaces for a proposed automobile general repair garage. Applicant has indicated 30 parking spaces can be provided and staff has determined that 19 on-site parking spaces will have to be provided.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to require 19 on-site parking spaces for the proposed auto er seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C11-78-008      Parking Requirement  
for an auto repair garage at  
9707 Gray Boulevard

Mr. Lillie explained this was a request for required parking for a proposed automobile repair garage which will employ four mechanics and can provide 30 parking spaces. The staff recommends that 24 parking spaces should be provided, ten of which will be inside the building itself and 14 on-site parking spaces will be provided outside the building.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve parking for ten cars inside the building with 14 on-site parking spaces outside the building. Mr. Vier seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C12-78-018      Public Services  
Consideration of a 12-inch and an eight-inch  
wastewater approach main for Meadow Mountain  
P.U.D.

Tom Knickerbocker stated the staff would recommend approval of the request for a 12-inch and an eight-inch wastewater approach main for the Meadow Mountain P.U.D.

C12-78-018 Public Services--continued

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to approve the 12-inch and eight-inch wastewater approach main for Meadow Mountain P.U.D. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

C10v-78-025 Street Vacation  
Portion of West 37th Street

Tom knickerbocker presented the proposed vacation of a portion of West 37th Street save and except enough property to result in 90-foot right-of-way for the future widening of the street.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved and Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion to vacate a portion of West 37th Street save and except enough to result in a 90-foot right-of-way.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200      Annexation Plan  
Consideration of the 1978 Annexation Plan

Mr. Lillie stated the City Council will hold a public hearing on the Annexation Plan on Thursday and that last week Mr. Schuller had presented the content and methodology of the plan to the Planning Commission. He stated that about 150 copies of the report had been distributed to Boards and Commissions, members of Commissioner's Courts in the three counties, to all of the incorporated jurisdictions, to the school districts, to L.C.R.A. and other state and federal agencies. A press release also was posted in the newspaper to inform the general public of the availability of the report. So far, the only response has been from the Austin Transportation Study Office.

Mr. Lillie explained that the county is expected to expand by another 200-250,000 in the next 15 to 20 years and the city must begin to plan for that kind of growth. Some of it will be within the corporate limits and some of it will be outside. He explained this planning is done through the Comprehensive Plan, Capital Improvements Projects, and annexation and other procedures. The Comprehensive Plan began in 1973 with the Austin Tomorrow Program and was adopted by the Planning Commission and Council in the spring of 1977. The Council has directed the Commission to redraft Chapter IV of that plan to identify a directed growth and inner-city expansion alternative which generally followed a north-south corridor of growth, development, and interest with respect to the future development of the city. In reviewing Chapter IV, the Commission identified six priority areas for development and for the allocation of City resources: Area 1 in the center city, Area 2 within the 1977 city limits, Area 3 generally in the north-south corridor along IH-35 and east of the Balcones Fault, Area 4 along U.S. 183 northwest and U.S. 290 southwest, and Area 5 and 6 to the east and west of the community. The City Council had requested their goals and objectives that would, in effect, implement the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the ability to implement growth management process outside the corporate limits in the State of Texas is very weak. If comprehensive planning is to be implemented, much of the authority will result from an annexation program which would bring land within the corporate limits whereby zoning, building and other City codes and ordinances can be extended. Rather than to approach annexation on a piece by piece procedure, or at the request of developers, or at random through interest of the city departments or the Council, this plan has been developed by reviewing large areas or patterns of annexation. He discussed Pattern A and Pattern B and explained that Pattern A is the most compatible with the Comprehensive Plan in that it recommends annexation north and south in conformance with the Plan. Pattern B recognizes existing public and private commitments in the U.S. 183 corridor northwest and also the U.S. 290 corridor southwest. He stated the Plan is ready for public hearing, pointing out that there may be some things the Commission has a problem with and citizens as well. The City Council is holding a public hearing on Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan and this document at 10 AM on October 12.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR:

Ken Manning, Sierra Club  
Brian Dudley, Austin Transportation Study Office  
Maury Hood, Citizens Environmental Review Board  
Joe Gieselmann  
Richard Timms  
Mary Lee

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: None

COMMISSION ACTION

Ken Manning questioned and Brian Schuller discussed the population distribution in both patterns. It was explained that the density at a given time would be less in Pattern B than in Pattern A, and the total population would be the same in both. The ultimate population would be greater in Pattern B. If an area is annexed and provided full city services, then it would have a larger population than if not annexed. Mr. Manning suggested this annexation procedure is a real step forward for the City of Austin to review annexation plans that are initiated by the city which guide development location rather than to respond to developer and property owner requests. This is something the Sierra Club is very pleased to see and would prefer Plan A, which is much more consistent with providing services to the preferred growth corridor. The Sierra Club would encourage the Commission to recommend to the Council that Plan A be followed, and suggested that the Planning Commission does have the responsibility to the City Council to formulate the recommendation and to provide them with some guidance.

Brian Dudley with the Austin Transportation Study encouraged the general approach but did feel some limitations significant. He discussed criteria that the felt should be taken into account and agreed to submit his comments in writing. Mr. Lillie explained the comments had been received and had been considered very seriously. There was discussion of this being considered at a worksession rather than a public hearing. Mrs. Shipman requested a copy of his comments and of the staff response.

Maury Hood, representing the Citizens Environmental Review Board, recommended that Plan A be adopted with modifications, stating this would not force growth in any one area. He pointed out you cannot make people live where they do not want to live. He felt this would be a viable tool requiring constant review and would support the growth modification plan the Environmental Board has recommended. He discussed the various areas and how they might be handled, and stated that the Environmental Board would recommend a modification between the two plans. Mrs. Shipman expressed concern that the Environmental Board is recommending a modification of the Comprehensive plan. Maury Hood explained that the Environmental Board has been for the



extension of the Big Walnut Creek main. He pointed out the annexation plan cannot "close your eyes" to what is actually happening. There is a lot happening there, and a lot that needs to happen in that area. Mrs. Shipman asked Mr. Hood to explain why he felt annexation should not be a contributing factor to development in Areas 38 and 39. Mr. Hood explained there is a plan to provide a lift station in Areas 1 and 40 and that Areas 1 and 40 should not be a factor in annexing Areas 38 and 39.

Joe Gieselman felt that the plan would, in effect, modify the Comprehensive Plan. Mrs. Shipman explained that Plan B does not conform with Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan. He asked if this annexation plan is a growth management tool; or is it primarily to control development that does occur; or is it to promote development in certain areas. He also wanted to know what affect would county ordinance making power have on the selection of a pattern. Mrs. Shipman explained that the plan would control the type of development through the City's power to enact ordinances and also would promote development in areas where it is the most environmentally suited. Mr. Stoll explained that this will be used in the C.I.P. program and in the approach main area when consideration is given to the extension of utilities. The staff will be using this document as a reference point to lay out options. Mrs. Shipman felt this document was in no way related to county ordinance making power, and felt that the possibility of this happening until after the 1980 census data is released is very remote.

Richard Timms and Mary Lee urged the Commission to support Plan A. At the request of the chairman, Brian Schuller stated the staff recommends that the Commission forward the Annexation Plan to the City Council with the recommendation they hold a public hearing and refer it back to the Planning Commission for further study and modifications, as needed. He suggested perhaps some worksessions and possibly further public hearings may be in order, with the final document ready for use along the with the next C.I.P. Mrs. Shipman again stated she had a real problem in that Plan B conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission has unanimously supported the Comprehensive Plan, supported Chapter IV and she felt it appropriate for the Commission to support any annexation that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. A specific annexation outline might require further study. She felt it might be appropriate to move forward and plan permanent infrastructure in those areas that are actually within both Plan A and Plan B. She felt this should be attached as an addendum to the City Council agenda on Thursday. Mr. Vier felt this would limit the scope, and would assume it to be a utility plan. He felt there might be reasons for annexing areas for control purposes. He felt there were other implications to the plan and would not want the scope of the annexation study limited.

He felt it to be a planning tool which provides guidelines, and not a firm plan. Mrs. Shipman stated this was not her intent. She discussed the Loop 360 area and stated she felt very strongly that the Commission should not consider these areas until a permanent Lake Austin Ordinance is adopted and until an in-depth transportation plan is available for that area and until a detailed fiscal analysis shows a positive economic return. Mr. Vier was concerned that this would become a substitute for the Master Plan. Mrs. Shipman suggested the Planning Commission forward the Plan to the Council on Thursday for their consideration and public hearing with the statement that the Planning Commission is in total support of the Comprehensive Plan and annexation should be a tool of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Vier again stated he did not feel the Annexation Plan to be a tool for the Comprehensive Plan. He felt it to be a tool to accomplish a whole lot of things. He felt the Annexation Plan is a planning tool and the Planning Commission should make it the best planning tool it can. Mr. Danze suggested the Planning Commission forward the plan to the Council for their review with the recommendation the City Council refer it back to the Planning Commission to be reviewed in light of the Comprehensive Plan.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Dixon moved to recommend the staff recommendation subject to review of the whole question of annexation in relation to the Comprehensive Plan that the City of Austin has already adopted. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

Mr. Stoll offered a friendly amendment suggesting the Planning Commission also recommend the Council proceed with this public hearing, get all of the testimony, and allow the Planning Commission to fine-tune this document within a specific time schedule, and also look at the fiscal implication to this document which needs to be very seriously studied. Mr. Dixon accepted the friendly amendment.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200      Permanent Zoning Request  
For the Northwest Oaks Neighborhood Association

Bill Stoll explained that the Commission had received a letter from Mrs. Judy Walker requesting permanent zoning for the Northwest Oaks Neighborhood area.

Judy Walker stated she again would like to bring to the attention of the Commission the lack of any zoning action for their neighborhood. She reviewed what had happened since annexation in 1976, stating that in November of 1977 they began working with the Planning Department to change zoning for the area from Interim "AA" to a permanent status. She explained there was a hearing in May of 1977, the hearing was closed at that time and action was deferred for not more than two months for additional study. She again stated that unless their homes are permanently zoned, they do not have any petitioning rights, and requested the Commission proceed with passage of their recommendation. She urged that all of the land within their boundaries be permanently zoned.

COMMISSION ACTION

Mr. Dixon wanted to know about the situation for the permanent zoning request and why it has taken so long. Tom Knickerbocker pointed out that nothing had been done since the hearing since the Planning Commission had not instructed the Department of their wishes in the matter. Mrs. Shipman asked if it would be appropriate to proceed like had been done with some other neighborhood roll back cases. Mr. Knickerbocker explained that this is a different type of area. Because no land use patterns have been established it was difficult to propose future land uses without extensive study. Mr. Danze mentioned that this area had already been broken into sections in the original hearing. Mr. Stoll asked about the Planning Commission recommending to the Council a zoning plan for this neighborhood, which, if adopted by the Council, would be really a policy or guideline for the staff to use in judging zoning requests as they come in. In this manner, a plan or policy could be established but would not be legally locked in. Mr. Knickerbocker stated this would not solve homeowners lack of petition rights and the choices are to proceed with an in-depth analysis to try to come up with a permanent zoning category which would take a lot more work and capability than the department presently possesses, or to consider the original staff report. Mr. Vier explained that the Commission felt they had begun a reasonable zoning plan and it would be used as a tool or guideline to work from that point forward and would alleviate the heavy workload of everyone coming in for zoning. Mr. Dixon felt the action that had already been taken should be considered as the best alternative at the present time and suggested this as a possible motion. Mrs. Walker again requested permanent zoning for their particular area, pointing out they wanted action and it not be left at the Commission level forever. Mrs. Shipman expressed concern that more and more the neighborhood associations are requesting zoning and more and more things of this nature are "lost in the shuffle", perhaps the Planning Commission again might look at their priorities in an attempt to alleviate this type situation. She also asked the status of the zoning ordinance and Mr. Knickerbocker explained that

R200 Permanent Zoning Request--continued

nothing had been done because of the heavy workload and Council projects on Downtown Planning.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to bring back the original staff recommendation at 5:30 PM, October 24, the first item on the agenda, and review it again with the hope that it might be possible to send it on to the Council. Mr. Danze seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200 Review Policy on MUD/Package Treatment Plant

Bill Stoll explained the Scheduling and Operations Committee had met on October 6 and wished to sechedule a worksession on Tuesday, October 17, and discussed the agenda to be considered.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Dixon moved to schedule a worksession on Tuesday, October 17, and to approve the agenda as submitted. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

R200 Citizen Communication  
Request by Mr. Paul Hernandez concerning a project  
in Festival Beach Area of Town Lake

Mr. Hernandez did not appear so the Commission moved on to other business.

NO ACTION WAS TAKEN.

SUBDIVISIONSPRELIMINARY SUBDIVISIONSC8-78-95 The Village of Angus Valley  
Angus Valley Rd. & Duval Rd.

The staff reported that applicant is planning to modify the plan and recommended disapproval of this preliminary plan pending City Council action on the wastewater approach main. No hearing was held. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the preliminary plan of The Village of Angus Valley pending City Council approval of the wastewater approach main.

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

ABSENT: Schechter and Snyder.

C8-78-102 Walnut Crossing, Section 3  
Duval Rd. and Scribe Drive

The staff reported that this preliminary plat consists of 35.0 acres with 136 lots, the average lot size being 60' x 120' and the density being 3.9 lots per acre.

The staff recommends approval of this preliminary plan with the following conditions based on ordinance requirements and departmental recommendations from the August 30, 1978, Plat Review meeting and subsequent departmental reports:

1. 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 therefor.
2. Connection required to the City of Austin water and wastewater systems.
3. Restriction required on final plat prohibiting vehicular access (driveways) onto Duval Road from adjacent lots.
4. Variance required on the length of block B. Recommend to grant because of topography and adequate circulation is provided.
5. Sidewalks required on both sides of Scribe Drive; one side (specify) of Grimsley Drive, Ambleside Drive, Tyrone Drive, Forsythe Drive, and Scotch Broom Drive; and the subdivision side of Duval Road.
6. Appropriate sidewalk location note required on final plat inside city limits.
7. Minimum street centerline radius is 300' for collector streets and 200' for residential streets.

C8-78-102 Walnut Crossing, Section 3 (cont'd.)

8. Waterway development permit required prior to final plat approval.
9. Show 100-year flood plain data on the preliminary plan.
10. Drainage and/or public utility easements as required.
11. Minimum building slab elevation note required on the final plat(s) for lots adjacent to waterway(s).
12. The 25-year flood plain required to be dedicated as a drainage easement.
13. Show building setback lines on the preliminary plan 25' from all front streets, 25' from all rear streets on through lots; and 15' from all side streets. The front of a corner lot is the narrower dimension on a street.
14. Show extension of Scotch Broom Drive with centerline curve radius not to exceed 200 feet.
15. Main line advance required for natural gas service.
16. Show survey tie with bearing and distance across Duval Road and provide for 90 feet R.O.W.
17. Show names of all adjacent (adjoining and across the street) property owners including owners of platted lots and accurate locations of property lines.
18. Show volume and page reference of owner of property at south boundary of proposed subdivision.
19. Fiscal arrangements required to construct Duval Road to urban standards.

After further discussion, the Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following preliminary plan of Walnut Crossing, Section 3, subject to staff recommendations.

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

ABSENT: Schechter and Snyder.

ABSTAINED: Danze and Jagger.

PRELIMINARY/FINAL SUBDIVISIONS

C8-78-100 The Meadows of Travis Oaks  
Convict Hill Rd. & Cannon Mt. Dr.

C8-78-100 The Meadows of Travis Oaks (cont'd.)

The staff recommended disapproval of this preliminary/final subdivision pending action of the wastewater approach main by the City Council. The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the preliminary/final subdivision of The Meadows of Travis Oaks pending City Council approval of the wastewater approach main.

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

C8-78-103 Sunridge South II  
Meadow Lea Dr. & Wishing Well Dr.

The staff reported applicant requested postponement for two weeks in order to provide schematic for the balance of the property. The Commission then

VOTED: To POSTPONE for two weeks the preliminary subdivision of Sunridge South II.

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

C8-78-32 Rob Roy Subdivision  
F.M. 2244 & St. Stephens Rd.

The staff reported that the county had agreed to the transfer of fiscal arrangements for streets and drainage to the County Engineer and the staff so recommended. The Commission then

VOTED: To GRANT the variance required to transfer the fiscal arrangements for streets and drainage to the County Engineer for the Rob Roy Subdivision.

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

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

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following final plats 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

FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final plats.

C8-77-114      Yarrabee Bend, Section four  
                    Onion Creek Dr.

C8-78-58      The Ridge at Thomas Springs  
                    Thomas Springs Road

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

ABSENT: Schechter and Snyder

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

VOTED: To APPROVE the following final plat and to AUTHORIZE the staff to hold the plat until the restrictive covenant is prepared and approved by the Legal Department subject to Volume and Page of the restrictive covenant being shown on the plat.

C8-78-96      The Hills of Lost Creek, Sec. 6  
                    Loop 360 and Lost Creek Blvd.

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

ABSENT: Guerrero, Jagger, Schechter, and Snyder.

The staff reported that the following final subdivision 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 subdivision plat pending compliance with departmental requirements and street name changes.

C8-78-97      The Hills of Lost Creek, Sec. 7  
                    Lost Creek Blvd. & Arronimink Cove

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

ABSENT: Schechter and Snyder.

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, sidewalk note required on plat, plat corrections, and removal of all lots east of Furness Drive.



FINAL SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

C8-78-101      Woodbridge, Section Three  
Rutherford Ln. & Furness St.

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

The Commission then

VOTED:      To DISAPPROVE the following final subdivision plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, and preliminary approval required prior to final approval.

C8-78-103      Sunridge South II  
Meadow Lea Dr. & Wishing Well Dr.

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

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the following short form plats 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-78-88      Bouldin Creek Center  
S. 1st St. at Herndon Lane

C8s-78-250      Girard-McCoy-McLain Subdivision  
Barton Hills and Trailside

C8s-78-251      Resub. of Lost 1, 2 and 3, Blk. A,  
Beecaves Woods, Sec. 1  
Walsh Tarlton Ln. & Eanes Xing

C8s-78-256      Resub. of Part of Lots 4 & 5,  
Blk. 14, Maas Addition  
Charlotte St. & W. 11th St.

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

The Commission then

VOTED:      To APPROVE the following short form plats and to GRANT the variance to exclude balance of tract.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

C8s-78-208      Chapa's Country Acres  
F.M. 812 North of Creedmoor Rd.

C8s-78-258      Lakeway Section 15  
Lohman's Xing S. of Hurst Creek

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

ABSENT:    Schechter and Snyder.

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-210      Pepsi Addition  
E. 7th St. & Airport Blvd.

C8s-78-269      Powell Acres, Section One  
Powell Ln. W. of Georgian Dr.

C8s-78-271      Resub. of Lots 6 & 7, Blk. J,  
Spring Hill Village  
Spring Hill Ln. at Patrick Place

C8s-78-272      Gray's Anderson Lane Addition  
E. Anderson Ln. E. of I.H. 35

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

ABSENT:    Schechter and Snyder.

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

VOTED:    To APPROVE the following short form plat.

C8s-78-283      Keighley Subdivision  
Geneva Dr.

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

ABSENT:    Schechter and Snyder.

The staff reported that the following short form 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 short form plats pending compliance with departmental requirements.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

C8s-78-281      Resub. Lots 9, 10, & 11, Blk. B.  
                  Country Club Gardens Sec 1  
                  Marigold Terrace & Montopolis

C8s-78-284      Resub. Lot 24 at Bannister Heights  
                  Morgan Ln. & Clawson Rd.

C8s-78-287      Western Oaks William Cannon Resub.  
                  McCarty Ln. & One Oak Rd.

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

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-288      Burton Homestead  
                  State Hwy. No 71 West

C8s-78-290      Resub. of Woodcreek, Lot 1  
                  Woodhollow Dr. & Greystone Dr.

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

(The record will show that Mr. Jagger abstained on C8s-78-290.)

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-282      Rosalie K. Rogers Subdivision  
                  Kinsey Cir. & Canyon Rim Dr.

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

The Commission then

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

C8s-78-285      183 Commercial  
                  Hwy. 183 and Hymeadow Dr.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISION PLATS (cont'd.)

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

The Commission then

VOTED: To DISAPPROVE the following short form plat pending fiscal arrangements, compliance with departmental requirements, and current county tax certificate.

C8s-78-286      Veannis M. Pressler Addition  
                    W. 10th St. & Rio Grande

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

SUBDIVISIONS LOCATED IN THE LAKE AUSTIN WATERSHED

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 plat and to change the name to SPICEWOOD FOREST.

C8-78-56      Chimney Creek  
                    Spicewood Springs Road

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

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

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

C8-78-98      1st Resub. Great Hills, Section VIII  
                    Continental Club Dr. & Bolden Hills Dr.

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

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS -- FILED AND CONSIDERED

The staff reported that the owners have requested a partial vacation for the following Short Form Subdivisions. The Commission then:

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd.)

VOTED: To GRANT the request for partial vacation of the following short form plat.

C8s-74-234      Barrington Oaks Commercial  
Spicewood Springs Road

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

The staff reported that the following short form plats have appeared before the Commission in the past and all departmental requirements have been complied with. The staff recommends to approve these plats. The Commission then

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

C8s-78-163      Barrington Oaks Comm., Sec. II  
Spicewood Springs Rd.

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

The Commission then

VOTED: To APPROVE the following short form plat and to GRANT the variance to exclude balance of tract.

C8s-78-165      Parliament Place, Section 1  
Spicewood Springs Rd.

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

The staff reported that the following short form 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 short form plats pending compliance with departmental requirements.

C8s-78-280      Trinity Trail  
Yucca Lane

C8s-78-289      620 Oaks, Section Two  
F.M. 620 & Boulder Lane

C8s-78-291      Walsh Hollow  
Scenic Dr. & Rockmoor Ave.

SHORT FORM SUBDIVISIONS (cont'd.)

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

Mr. Jagger abstained from C8s-78-289 and C8s-78-291.

The Commission requested that the staff provide additional information on C8s-78-289 and C8s-78-291 at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

  
Richard R. Lillie, Executive Secretary