

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Austin, Texas
Regular Meeting -- October 23, 1979

The regular meeting of the City Planning Commission was called to order at 5:40 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 301 West Second Street.

Present

Miguel Guerrero, Chairman
Leo Danze
Freddie Dixon
Mary Ethel Schechter
Sally Shipman
Bill Stoll
Jim Vier

Absent

Sid Jagger

Also Present

Richard Lillie, Director of Planning
Evelyn Butler, Supervising Planner
Walt Darbyshire, Planner III
Rick Vaughan, Planner
Aliece Minassian, Planner
Helen Fermin, Administrative Aide
Sheila Finneran, Legal Department
Charles Graves, Director of Engineering
Joe Ternus, Director of Urban Transportation
Ouida Glass, Senior Secretary

ZONING

C14-79-199 H.E. Butt Grocery Co.: I-AA, 1st H&A to GR, 1st H&A
(C. Morris Davis)
13804 Research Boulevard

Mr. Lillie explained this item had been requested to be postponed by the applicant when it originally was scheduled on October 3.

PERSONS APPEARING

Julian Lockwood, representing the applicant

COMMISSION ACTION

Julian Lockwood, representing the applicant, discussed the background of the tract and explained that the H.E. Butt Grocery Company now wishes to expand. He discussed the zoning in the entire shopping center and stated that all parking requirements have been met. He stated this H.E.B. tract is the only tract in the entire shopping center that is not zoned "GR". He stated they had been working on this expansion since 1978 and felt that the center should be developed as a single unit and submitted a letter from Anderson Mill Joint Venture in support of their request. He stated they would landscape along the front of the store and discussed the provisions of the 183 study they could comply with. He was of the opinion they were entitled to the GR zoning and requested it be granted.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Danze moved to grant "GR", 1st H&A subject to the recommendations on Sheet 2 of the 183 study, Items 1 (a), (b), and (c), and Item 2. Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion. Mr. Lillie stated he would meet with Mr. Lockwood on the recommendations of the 183 study.

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

ABSENT: Jagger.

ASBSTAINED: Vier.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0-1.

ZONING

C14-79-207 Mrs. Della M. Albrecht: I-A, 1st H&A to C-2, 1st H&A
9613 Old McNeil Road

SPECIAL PERMIT

C14p-79-046 Mrs. Della M. Albrecht: On-site Consumption of liquor for
 (by Larry Edgeman) "The Fountain Club" (Country Club)
 9613 Old McNeil Road

Mr. Lillie explained these two items were postponed from October 3. The Urban Transportation Department had requested the Planning Commission consider the Roadway Plan before taking action on the two items. The tract is located in an area designated industrial in the Comprehensive Plan. This application, if approved, would permit a bar, lounge, or tavern with a special permit. The staff felt that "O" zoning might be compatible with the uses in the area and that there are some problems with access to the site.

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Larry Edgement, representing applicant

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

Ralph W. Vertrees, 2525 Harris Boulevard

WRITTEN COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. and Mrs. Kelly E. McAdams
Dr. and Mrs. Herb Muecke

COMMISSION ACTION

Larry Edgement, representing applicant, discussed the proposed use and stated the property would be sold if the zoning granted. He stated that access is a problem but would do whatever is necessary to dedicate necessary right-of-way to provide better access. Speaking in opposition Ralph Vertrees discussed property he owned in another part of the city behind a bar and stated he did not want any more. He point out that debris is a problem, as well as traffic, and did not see how this could benefit a neighborhood. Mrs. Shipman asked about the special permit criteria and Evelyn Butler explained that Urban Transportation and Planning staffs are very concerned for the traffic. Mr. Lillie stated that "D" zoning for the entire area and for this particular tract was approved by the City Council in 1970 and that applicant is not asking for C-2 for this specific use.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mrs. Shipman moved to deny the zoning and the special permit. It does not meet Nos. 1, 6, 7, and 9, four of the nine criteria on the special permit finding of fact check list. Reverend Dixon seconded the motion.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C14p-79-034 American National Bank of Austin: A Car Wash
(by Roy Beard)
7300-7326 Cameron Road

Mr. Lillie explained this item had been heard on September 4 and the neighborhood had requested postponement in order to work with the applicant prior to Commission action. He stated the tract is zoned "LR" Local Retail and discussed the provisions of the zoning ordinance whereby if a property is adjacent to or across the street from "GR" General Retail or more permissive, that General Retail use can be placed on the property by special permit. A site plan has been submitted and all departmental reports have been submitted. Petitions have been submitted to the Department in objection to this use, however, petitions are valid for zoning cases only.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

PERSONS APPEARING IN FAVOR

Roy Beard, representing the American National Bank of Austin

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

Ted Vitek, 2012 Sunny Brook Dive
Jay F. Lehnertz, 1204-B Radcliff
Jim A. Hall, 7301-A Irving Lane
John Curttright, 1201 Fairbanks
Bill Windrum, 11109 Orsini Place
William Stewart, 1300 Fairbanks
Margie Beth Cheney, 7020 Grand Canyon Drive
Frank R. Franklin, 1304 Fairbanks
Gaylan DuBose, 1304 Fairbanks
Lucy Lee Bisette, 1202 Radcliff Drive
Jay Lennox
Jim Bowman, 7304 Grand Canyon
Mrs. Sammy McKelvy, 1202-B Fairbanks
Frances T. Bisette, 1202 Radcliff Drive
Shirley Guttenfelder Hearne, 1306-B Radcliff

WRITTEN COMMENTS IN FAVOR - None

WRITTEN COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION

Petition
Wm. Stewart, 1300-A Fairbanks

COMMISSION ACTION

Roy Beard, representing the American Bank of Austin, summarized the events since the meeting on September 4 and the alternative that had been discussed. He explained that the neighborhood was totally opposed to any and all alternatives. He maintained the car wash would not be a nuisance and would

Cl4p-79-034 American National Bank of Austin--continued

not be trashy, or would not be a disturbance to the neighborhood. Speaking in opposition Ted Vitek stated the car wash would be a public nuisance, pointed out a problem with lights, noise, and felt it would be a health hazard. He discussed security being a problem and the difficulty he might have to rent his property and would be forced to reduce the rental rate. Jim Hall submitted a petition containing 92 signatures in opposition to the car wash. He stated these are homes where people live as opposed to an investment by the bank. Jay Lennox pointed out this area is a diverse group of Anglos, Chicanos, and Black, both young and old. He stated this is a fragile neighborhood group bounded on the north by 183, on the west by IH-35, on the south by 290, to the east by Cameron Road. He requested that the Commission respect the present zoning and not permit a special permit to allow construction of a business which cannot comply with Local Retail and to permit the area to survive with some sort of neighborhood identity. The car wash is unacceptable. It is not the kind of business that is neighborhood oriented. He expressed concern for what will happen along Cameron Road in that area. Mr. Vier stated this is an opportunity for the neighborhood to negotiate with the applicant and that under the LR zoning they might not have that opportunity. Mr. Lennox stated this had been considered, but was of the opinion that a car wash was simply not a satisfactory alternative. He requested the present zoning be respected and that a special permit not be granted. Mr. Beard emphasized that a compromise could not be reached and stated the neighborhood does not want the car wash there. He did not see how it would be a detriment to the neighborhood and requested the special permit be granted. Mrs. Shipman asked and Mr. Lennox confirmed that the property across Cameron Road is zoned GR and is undeveloped. This would be the first type of development along that section of Cameron Road from St. Johns northward and they were very concerned for what would happen along that stretch of Cameron Road. Mr. Beard stated the southern portion of the tract is the only portion that is bounded by residential and that it would be buffered. Trees will be planted, a fence will be installed and it will be maintained as a green area. He pointed out again that he had offered many compromises, none of which were accepted. They do not want anything there. He did not see how it would be a detriment to the neighborhood and respectfully requested the special permit be granted.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mrs. Shipman moved the special permit be denied. The car wash is not an automatic use granted under "LR"; it is only by special permit. She discussed the factors the Planning Commission is charged with, one of which is securing and protecting the public health, safety, morals and general welfare. She felt that a car wash at this particular location does not meet Criteria No. 9. Mr. Danze seconded the motion. Following the advice of the attorney, Mrs. Shipman submitted also it does not meet Criteria No. 4 because of the noise producing elements. A car wash is not compatible with a residential neighborhood and has the potential of creating a negative impact on the property values.

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

ABSENT: Jagger and Stoll.

OUT OF THE ROOM: Dixon.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 5-0.

C14p-79-036 Jerry Stone: A 257-Unit Apartment Project
(by G.W. Thompson)
Bounded by Great Hills Trail and
Mountain Ridge Drive

Mr. Lillie explained a public hearing on this item had been held on October 3 and the Commission had asked that the applicant and neighborhood meet. This is a project for 257 units on about 10.2 acres of land. The staff would recommend that the special permit be approved and that since the project exceeds the impervious coverage under the Lake Austin Growth Management Plan that the total acreage of 20+ acres be committed to this particular project until some alternative methods can be submitted for the handling of the impervious cover problem.

PERSONS APPEARING

Jerry Stone, applicant
Ron Allen

COMMISSION ACTION

Jerry Stone explained they had met with the neighborhood associations and that all neighborhood concerns have been satisfied regarding the proposed development. Ron Allen stated they had no problem with the plan but expressed concern for the area in general. He discussed the type of growth occurring here and the density, also the traffic. He expressed fear that this would turn into another mass of high density apartments.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Vier moved and Reverend Dixon seconded the motion to approve the special permit in accordance with departmental recommendations and ordinance requirements.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan
Consider the Proposed Roadway Plan

Mr. Lillie explained the subcommittee had met with Joe Ternus, Director of the Urban Transportation Department, regarding the Roadway Plan. He discussed some of the concerns of the subcommittee and the recommendations that the Urban Transportation Department is now making regarding those concerns. The subcommittee had requested the minor modifications be approved. Mr. Ternus discussed the Koenig Lane, Allandale, Northland, and 2222 area and some of the alternatives that might be considered, and pointed out that this is the only east-west thoroughfare through the City

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

from one end to the other. Mr. Danze asked about the last traffic count and whether or not the traffic had increased. Mrs. Shipman felt this was not in support of the comprehensive plan and violates the plan by routing a major arterial through a residential neighborhood. There also was discussion of Hancock Drive and the amount of traffic carried there.

PERSONS APPEARING IN OPPOSITION

David Bodenman, 5704 Bull Creek Road
Max A. Fariss, 5703 Marilyn Drive
Dan Gardner, 5707 Marilyn Drive
Colonel Dwight Garrison, 5802 Bullard
Terry Leifeste, 2611 Pembroke
Jerry Lobdill, 6708 Beckett Road
Allan McMurtry, 5901 Cary
Otto Paganini, 6104 Shoalwood
John J. Panak, 6008 Shoal Creek
Harry Pruett, 5901 Highland Hills Terrace
Sam Montgomery, 5903 Shoalwood
Betty Hay
Dorothy Jacobs
Elmer Hickson
Susan Lillie
Andy James

COMMISSION ACTION

Residents of the area of Allandale Road and Shoal Creek spoke in opposition to the Roadway Plan as it related to their area. There was discussion of building wider streets that would attract more traffic and the need for doing so was questioned. It was pointed out that this is an old, established, residential neighborhood and the area residents would urge that it remain that way. Otto Paganini suggested that if there was need to carry more traffic, that another road be built above what is existing. Terry Leifeste discussed the City property and the recreation center that is being constructed and pointed out the traffic danger involved with citizens using that facility. There also was discussion of what is best for the community and for the City of Austin, as well as the need for allowing parking on Allandale Road. Harry Pruett, representing the Covenant Presbyterian Church, discussed how their church had grown, how they would be unable to expand since they were surrounded by City property, and suggested that if the roadway is to be widened, they would prefer to trade land with the City rather than give up land. There was discussion of property values, of being displaced, the danger with increased traffic at increased speeds. Other east-west thoroughfares were discussed, IH-35, Anderson Lane, Justin Lane, 45th and 38th Streets. There also was discussion of a loop around the City rather than going through residential areas. These homes are at a price that retired people can afford and it was pointed out that there is less of that type housing in the City and it is not the thing to do to tear them down. Elmer Hickson, a resident of the area, and member of the St. John's Methodist Church, stated increased traffic would bring in a lot of extra noise and would affect the three major churches along the street, as well as the neighborhood. He explained their

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

arrangement with the Allandale Shopping Center to use the parking facilities on Sundays and the problems that would arise should Allandale Road be widened into a major thoroughfare.

Mr. Danze discussed the possibility of several four-lane streets going east-west rather than one six-lane in one location. Mr. Ternus stated this is a real possibility, but discussed the problem of citizen opposition to any facility in their area. He used as an example the C.I.P. process and citizen interest in "their project, their street". He stated everybody wants good access, but want it "in someone elses neighborhood, not in my neighborhood." This problem is what makes the situation so difficult to deal with.

Mr. Ternus stated his recommendation is what is in the Plan as amended by the Subcommittee. If the Commission would like to support the neighborhood group at this time, he suggested to change the proposed right-of-way on Allandale Road from 120 feet from Loop 360 to Burnet Road to "OK" and leave the remaining east of Burnet Road; that in the section between Loop 1 and the bridge west of Shoal Creek, that be reduced from 66 feet to 60 feet and that the section between Shoal Creek and Burnet Road be reduced from 66 feet to 48 feet and the remaining east of Burnet Road toward 290 and Airport Boulevard remain as it is. This change would modify the section between MoPac and Burnet Road which would give, basically, 48-foot roadway, four 12 foot lanes where there is four 10 foot lanes and maintain a divided roadway where it is now divided. He discussed a left turn lane at Marilyn Drive for the recreation center, as well as a left turn lane at Shoal Creek and the need to widen the existing section to 60 feet. The existing right-of-way is between 80 and 100 feet.

Mr. Danze asked if several four-lane streets should be instituted in an east-west manner, just where would they be. Mr. Ternus replied Anderson Lane, the extension of Justin Lane to Far West, 45th Street and was not sure about 38th Street at this time. Mr. Danze stated he would like to see a plan be implemented whereby four-lane roadways are very definitely established east-west rather than coming through any neighborhood with six lanes. He felt that the Roadway Plan should be modified with a resolution reflecting this concept. Mr. Ternus discussed his concern for citizen opposition to this philosophy. He was of the opinion that at some point and time there must be a major arterial and emphasized that Allandale Road would remain a major arterial whether people like it or not and the need to keep it safe for the people crossing the facility as well as those traveling along the facility. Mr. Ternus discussed the need to take traffic out of residential neighborhoods and put it on designated arterial streets. He felt this proposal would improve the safety of the neighborhoods, but again stated that the problem is that no one wants it anywhere that it would affect them, which makes it a very difficult situation. Mrs. Shipman did not feel that the traffic would increase and, therefore, did not need to be widened in this particular section.

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

COMMISSION VOTE

Bill Stoll moved to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the Austin Metropolitan Roadway Plan with the following addendums:

1. Enfield Road-Exposition to Hartford - reduce recommended "70' ROW" to "60' ROW with 5' pedestrian/access easements on both sides".
2. Exposition Blvd. - 35th to Enfield - reduce recommended "70' ROW" to "60'". Correct existing ROW to read "50' - 85'".
3. Hancock Drive - Balcones to Bull Creek Rd. - reduce recommended "70'" to "60' ROW with 5' pedestrian/access easements on both sides".
4. Mesa Drive - break out to read:

"U.S. 183 - Far West	90'	44'	OK	OK
Far West - Ledge Mountain	60'	44'	OK	OK
Ledge Mountain - RM 2222	0'	0'	80'	60'"
5. Shoal Creek Blvd. - U.S. 183 to Foster - reduce recommended "90' ROW" to "80' ROW with 5' pedestrian/access easements on both sides".
6. Windsor Road/W. 24th St. - Exposition Blvd. to Lamar Blvd. - reduce recommended "80' ROW" to "60' ROW with 5' pedestrian/access easements on both sides and variable ROW at the intersections".
7. Arterial #7 - add in the remarks column the following: "subject to further transportation/environmental design studies and evaluation of need, possible alignments, preliminary design, and R.O.W. requirements".

The following is a list of technical corrections the staff recommends be considered:

1. Anderson Lane - Woodrow to N. Lamar - correct existing ROW to read "75' - 90'", existing pavement to read "55' - 60'" and the recommendations to read "90' ROW and 60' pavement".
2. Decker Lane - U.S. 290 - Springdale/Sprinkle Cut-off - correct recommended ROW to read "90'".
3. Duval Road - correct the spelling of Yett Lane - change from "Yeatt" to "Yett".
4. Howard Lane - Bridge to IH-35 correct existing ROW to "0-100'".

IH-35 to Cameron Rd. correct existing ROW to read 50' to 60'.

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

5. Pleasant Valley Rd./Todd Ln. - Nuckles Crossing to St. Elmo - change existing ROW to "0 - 90'", existing pavement to "0-2 @ 24'" and recommended ROW to "90'".
6. Stassney Lane - IH-35 to Lockhart Hwy. - change existing ROW to "100".

Sally Shipman stated the first addendum group is the memorandum received from Joe Ternus as acted on by the Urban Transportation Commission that modifies some of the recommendations in the plan. Secondly, communicating to the City Council that we feel any widening of Allandale Road from east of MoPac would not be in conformance with the Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan because any widening would have a severe impact on an established neighborhood and the Plan is directed to maintaining neighborhoods and preserving them.

Mr. Stoll further recommended that Koenig Lane and Allandale Road be re-designated as a minor arterial and that not more than two feet of roadway be added to either side of the road that no more than ten feet of right-of-way be added in the residential neighborhood and no more than ten feet in the commercial areas; and that Hancock Drive be retained at 40 feet.

Mr. Stoll did not include no parking prohibitions and maintaining 35 mile per hour speed limit as part of the motion, did feel they should be something for consideration. He understood that Shoal Creek Boulevard will be maintained as a 40-foot wide street. Mr. Stoll also moved that the Planning Commission postpone the Parmer Lane issue until November 13, 1979, Planning Commission meeting at the request of Mr. Mac Allen representing NPC. Reverend Dixon seconded the motion.

In the discussion Mr. Danze stated the need for a left turn lane on 48-foot streets. Mr. Stoll emphasized that to go beyond four-foot of widening on Allandale would damage what we are trying to preserve in that neighborhood, and to go four more feet would wreck the overall situation there. He felt that four feet was really too much. Mr. Danze stated if there is to be a compromise, there should be a compromise all the way across town. He also discussed the need for left turn lanes on 35th Street and felt that left turn lanes are an important part of any kind of east-west traffic movement. Mrs. Schechter emphasized they are needed badly going east-west on Shoal Creek. Mr. Danze stated he went along with the recommendation except for the left turn lane.

Mr. Vier stated that he felt this recommendation would make Mr. Ternus' job impossible in a lot of respects because it does not matter which street you talk about improving. When you talk about east-west access, you are going to have neighborhood residents in opposition. At some point we have to take the responsibility for saying this is a good plan or this is not a good plan. If we say it is not good, then we must what is good as opposed to just shuffling it in the background for another meeting. He stated he felt that was what the Commission was getting into. To justify taking this out of the Plan on the basis that it is going to encourage growth, or is out of the growth corridor, does not have any bearing on the issue whatsoever. Mr. Vier

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

Mr. Vier pointed out that this is a very popular motion at this time because there are so many people present in support of it, but regardless of whether it is popular or not, he felt the Commission has a responsibility as a Planning Commission to assess the reality of what will work and not just what will get a round of applause after a motion is made. He felt if the Plan is to be changed, some consideration must be given to what Mr. Ternus had said -- if the Commission wants to back off the six-lane issue -- he is the professional, the expert, and he is charged with what will work from a traffic standpoint. We at least need to give some consideration to the changes he talked about, like the turn lanes, etc. If we are not going to go with the six lane proposal, make the road accommodate four lanes properly. Mr. Stoll was of the opinion that 44 feet would give four lanes of 11 feet each. Mr. Vier pointed out that would not accommodate the turn lanes. Mr. Stoll explained that could be taken up on an ad hoc situation.

Mr. Stoll agreed that Joe Ternus is the traffic engineer but stated he felt it to be the role of the Planning Commission to make final policy decisions on this and he felt that in the best interest of the neighborhood that it would be best not to proceed with the amended recommendation of the Urban Transportation Department. He felt that 44 feet is too wide, would be more comfortable with 40 feet, but stated that is what is proposed by the neighborhood and he thought they should go that route. He explained the other alterations could be taken on an ad hoc basis as we go into the future years.

Mr. Vier stated he felt that now is the time to line things up. If we are going to back off six lanes and say it is not going to be a major arterial, at least let us make the necessary judgment to make it a good four lane roadway.

Mr. Danze explained that if we have four lanes here, then amend Justin Lane or wherever else it will come up. Mr. Stoll felt that Mr. Danze's suggestion could be covered by a more positive statement on the entire Roadway Plan recommendation. He felt that 44 feet was ample. It would be improper to recommend any broader policies recommendation to the Council. Mrs. Schechter pointed out this would recommend leaving out the 48 feet and doing away with the left turn lanes. She felt that the area residents felt the left turn lane is needed, and needed badly. She discussed the traffic there and asked why not put it in now. Mr. Stoll discussed the plan does not specifically call for a left turn lane at this certain intersection, this plan is a broad document and we can take up a left turn lane any time during the year it is needed. Mrs. Sehechter felt that now is a good time to do it.

Mr. Guerrero stated the Planning Commission does not make the final policy decision, it is merely a recommendation going to the City Council. He felt everyone should be aware of that. Mr. Stoll expressed agreement. Mr. Guerrero discussed this roadway coming up for C.I.P. project and could be more specific at that time. He felt that to widen it two more feet on each side would be cutting it pretty tight. He felt the left turn lane should be taken care of as the Commission goes along and gets more specific about the streets. Mr. Stoll suggested the Commission go ahead with a vote on the motion.

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

Mr. Vier then made a substitute motion to drop back to the four lane situation, that the Commission utilize the dimensions that Mr. Ternus submitted earlier. Mr. Vier pointed out that Mr. Ternus had thought this out regarding what was needed and where it is needed. He went on to state that if this is to be dropped back to a four-lane roadway, that Mr. Ternus' recommendation be accepted on how the right-of-way would be structured, etc. Mrs. Schechter seconded the substitute motion. Mr. Ternus at this point, answering Mr. Stoll's question, explained this would be 48 feet, four twelve-foot lanes. Mr. Danze also seconded this motion. Mr. Guerrero asked if Mr. Vier was substituting in entirety and asked about the other portion that was included in the original motion, the other roads involved except for Allandale. Mr. Vier stated he would accept what was in the original motion in regard to the other roadways. Mr. Ternus asked for a clarification of what was being said. He stated it was his understanding that the recommendation includes all the items in his memorandum of October 18 with the addition on Hancock Drive that the pavement width go from 44 feet back to 40 feet. Mr. Stoll stated this is correct. Mr. Ternus then discussed the substitute motion, as he understood it, speaks in terms of the section between Loop 1 and the bridge as the right-of-way being OK and the roadway width being at 60 feet and from Shoal Creek east to Burnet Road that the right-of-way be OK and the pavement width be 48 feet.

Mr. Ternus discussed the part that would generate growth is that part west of MoPac. The part that is being discussed as going from 48 feet to 60 feet on 2222 all the way to Loop 360 is the part, if any part of this network encourages growth, that is the part that would encourage it. He explained the extra 12 feet there is for left turn lanes, with the terrain, that from a safety standpoint, that was necessary. He explained they are not trying to increase any more through lanes of traffic along that corridor. Mrs. Schechter asked about Page 21 regarding the pavement width from existing Loop 1 to the bridge being 40 feet. Mr. Ternus explained that would need to be changed, but would suspect it would be from 62 - 64 feet and that it would be changed depending on the actual width there. He explained only a small portion east of Marilyn to Shoal Creek to put in left turn lanes for the recreation center would need to be changed. Mrs. Schechter stated she felt this would make the neighborhood feel better to know that the width was already there.

Mr. Guerrero explained the Commission needed to take a step backward and take a vote on whether to take up discussion on the substitute motion versus the original motion. The Commission then voted 3-4 on the substitute motion.

Mr. Ternus then asked for clarification of the motion the Commission was to vote on.

C2-79-008 Roadway Plan--continued

Mr. Guerrero stated the original motion was to widen Allandale Road from 40 to 44 feet from Loop 1 to Burnet Road. Mr. Stoll emphasized that he intended Allandale Road be limited to 44 feet. He discussed the Master Plan designation of major and minor arterial streets and felt it to be significant for the future growth and development of the City. Mr. Guerrero also explained that Parmer Lane was to be pulled and postponed to November 13. Mr. Ternus stated he wished the Commission would not take this action regarding Parmer Lane and pointed out that the Commission was not giving any direction at all to one of the most major changes in the Roadway Plan and to take the Plan to the City Council without this facility in it would be weak. Mr. Guerrero stated that since the County and the State is involved, as well as property owners and developers, there was a need to postpone the issue.

Mrs. Schechter asked how it was possible to vote for part of the Plan and not vote for all of it. Mr. Guerrero replied to abstain. The Commission then voted on the original motion as made by Bill Stoll. Mr. Vier, Mrs. Schechter and Mr. Danze explained the only thing they were against was cutting down those lanes and left turns on Allandale from Loop 1 to Burnet Road; they did not have any problems with the rest of the plan as expressed in the motion.

AYE: Dixon, Guerrero, Shipman, and Stoll.

ABSTAINED: Danze, Schechter, and Vier.

ABSENT: Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-3.

C2a-76-001 Expressway and Major Arterial Plan
William Cannon Drive alignment
alternatives - Beckett Road to U.S. 290 West

Mr. Lillie discussed William Cannon Drive alignment alternatives, specifically Beckett Road to 290 West. Evelyn Butler stated there was an amendment to the Expressway and Major Arterial Plan in 1976 extending William Cannon Drive westerly to U.S. 290. She discussed the alignment agreed to in 1977. Since then two developments have been submitted with alignments which do not meet. She discussed three alternatives that have been proposed. The staff has met with property owners and would recommend the alignment indicated in green on the exhibit to be used. The neighborhood association is also in agreement.

PERSONS APPEARING

Phil Savoy
Ira Yates

⁷⁶
C2a-79-001 Expressway and Major Arterial Plan--continued

COMMISSION ACTION

There was discussion of the flaring of the right-of-way at U.S. 290, the intersections at U.S. 71 and also at FM 1826. Mr. Savoy representing himself stated the alignment issue is a Master Plan Change and should be decided at the Council level or in the new Roadway Plan.

COMMISSION VOTE

Reverend Dixon moved and Mrs. Shipman seconded the motion to accept Alternative No. 2.

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

ABSENT: Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C2a-79-007 Master Plan Change

Consider setting a public hearing for request by Nash Phillips-Copus Company to reduce the street right-of-way requirements for Parmer Lane.

Reverend Dixon moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion to postpone the request to reduce the street right-of-way requirements for Parmer Lane to November 13 as requested by applicant.

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

ABSENT: Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C2o-79-011 Zoning Ordinance

To amend Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code authorizing limited (non-fixed wing aircraft) landing fields pursuant to special permit.

Mr. Lillie discussed the recently adopted zoning district for the airport and the fact that the use of helicopters within the community and also the opportunity to locate heliports other than at the airport was not considered. He discussed landing fields for this type of aircraft being permitted by special permit subject to special conditions. He also discussed a provision be included which would address a one-time event and recommended consideration of this amendment to the zoning ordinance.

C2o-79-11 Zoning Ordinance--continued

COMMISSION VOTE

Reverend Dixon moved and Mr. Stoll seconded the motion to approve staff recommendations to amend Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code authorizing limited (non-fixed wing aircraft) landing fields pursuant to special permit.

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

OUT OF THE ROOM: Vier.

ABSENT: Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C2o-78-012 Zoning Ordinance

To amend Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code
to provide for common driveways in townhouse
projects.

Mr. Lillie discussed townhouse projects and the number of driveways necessary to serve a project and explained that the zoning ordinance as written does not permit common driveways parallel to the street. The proposed amendment would permit common driveways in the front building setback area so that access could be provided across the lot lines resulting in fewer driveways and entrances to the streets.

COMMISSION ACTION

Messrs. Danze and Vier discussed the need for the ordinance and expressed the feeling that it would solve a lot of problems.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mrs. Shipman moved and Mr. Vier seconded the motion to amend Chapter 45 of the Austin City Code to provide for common driveways in townhouse projects.

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

ABSENT: Jagger.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C2o-79-013 Zoning Ordinance

Consider setting a public hearing for amendment to Section 41-51(d) of the Austin City Code, Zoning Ordinance, regarding appeal of Landmark Commission action on demolition or removal.

Mr. Vier moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the consent motion to set the public hearing at 7 p.m. on November 27.

AYE: Danze, Dixon, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, and Vier.

ABSENT: Jagger and Stoll.

THE CONSENT MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C10v-79-018 Street Vacation

Joan D'Arc Court, Sayers Street
to West Sixth Street

Mr. Vier moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the consent motion to vacate Joan D'Arc Court, Sayers Street to West Sixth Street in accordance with staff recommendations.

AYE: Danze, Dixon, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, and Vier.

ABSENT: Jagger and Stoll.

THE CONSENT MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

R1700 Consideration of the Joint Subcommittee Recommendation
on 1979-80 HCD Reprogramming.

On a consent motion by Mr. Vier, seconded by Mrs. Schechter, the Planning Commission approved the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee regarding 1979-80 HCD Reprogramming.

AYE: Danze, Dixon, Guerrero, Schechter, Shipman, and Vier.

ABSENT: Jagger and Stoll.

THE CONSENT MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

C1-79 Minutes

To approve Planning Commission Minutes of
September 25, 1979
October 2, 1979
October 3, 1979
October 9, 1979.

Mr. Vier moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mrs. Schechter seconded the consent motion.

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

THE CONSENT MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

SUBDIVISIONSPRELIMINARY SUBDIVISIONS

C8-79-78 Summit Oaks, Section 3
Sierra Nevada

Walt Darbyshire explained that applicant had requested variance on sidewalks on one side. The Urban Transportation Department has reviewed and has recommended approval. The staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat and of the variance.

A. Synopsis: Approve

The staff recommends approval of Lots 2, 3 and Sierra Nevada Drive of this preliminary plan. Lots 2 and 3 are in Austin's ETJ. An eight-inch, 275 foot long wastewater approach main has been administratively approved for this tract. Although the proposed subdivision is within the Lake Austin Growth Management area, drainage is away from Lake Austin.

B. Variances: None

C. Requirements:

This portion of the preliminary plan meets all city ordinances. Approval of the remainder of this plan will require compatible zoning for the proposed land uses. Additional requirements must be satisfied for final plat approval.

COMMISSION ACTION

Mrs. Schechter moved and Mr. Stoll seconded the motion to approve the preliminary plat and to grant the variance on sidewalk as approved by the Urban Transportation Department.

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0.

C8-79-81 North Crossing Subdivision
Balcones and Tallwood

A. Synopsis: Approval

The staff recommends approval of this preliminary plan. Commercial use is proposed for this subdivision; the tract is zoned for commercial use.

B. Variances:

- 1) Variance is requested to permit a non-radial lot line to the street between Lots 1 & 2, Block "B" (Sec. 41-34)
Recommend: Grant, to conform with topography.
- 2) Variance is requested to permit a street intersection greater than 80 degrees. (Sec. 41-28)
Recommend: Grant, to conform with proposed intersection at Jollyville Road and 183.

C. Requirements:

This preliminary plan meets all city-adopted requirements. Additional requirements must be satisfied for final approval.

Richard Wackerbarth expressed concern for the curb cut on Tallwood and requested it be moved nearer the intersection or eliminated entirely. He also expressed concern that the zoning be downgraded.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Vier moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion to approve the preliminary plat in accordance with staff recommendations and that the curb cut be moved or eliminated altogether on Tallwood.

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

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

C8-79-84 Vintage Hills Section Seven
Ed Bluestein and Langston Drive

A. Synopsis: Approve

The staff recommends approval of this preliminary plan.

B. Variances: None

C. Requirements:

The preliminary plan meets all city-adopted requirements. Additional requirements must be satisfied for final plat approval.

C8-79-84 Vintage Hills Section Seven--continued

COMMISSION ACTION

John Meinrath, representing Bill Milburn, stated the P.U.D. will need to be vacated if the preliminary plat is approved. He discussed meetings with the neighborhood and also the drainage problem. He requested approval of the plat, pointed out it has met all requirements of the subdivision ordinance, and is consistent with the "A" zoning on the property. Joan Bartz, University Hills Homeowners Association, read a prepared statement into the record expressing concerns for the subdivision, and it is on file in the offices of the Planning Department. There was discussion of the utilities and also of the drainage, as well as for the one two-story unit. Applicant agreed to spend no more than \$3,000 toward underground utilities, provided it is comparable to what it would cost elsewhere. Applicant also agreed to a drainage feature which would eliminate two-thirds of the drainage now flowing on to the backs of the property on Lynridge by a berm enforced by a plat restriction requiring site approval for drainage for each individual lot prior to commencement of construction on any lot in the subdivision.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Stoll moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion to approve the preliminary subdivision as recommended by the staff with the drainage note to be entered on the plat. The Commission acknowledged applicant's agreement to extend underground utilities and to limit the cost thereof to \$3,000.

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

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

C814-77-033^{ccy} Meadow Mountain A Subdivision

The Commissioners voted to consider the emergency item. Mr. Vier moved and Mrs. Schechter seconded the consent motion to approve the correction of plat notes governing zero lot line guidelines for the Meadow Mountain A Subdivision in accordance with staff recommendations.

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

THE CONSENT MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.

R105-79 Subdivision Memorandum


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

The Planning Commission considered items listed on the Subdivision
Memorandum and took the action as indicated.

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

(The record will show that Mr. Danze abstained and Reverend Dixon voted
Nay on C814-73-007 Vintage Hills Planned Unit Development and also on
C8f-79-92, Vintage Hills Section 7.)

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:45 PM.


Richard R. Lillie, Executive Secretary

TYPE: P.U.D.'s		PLANNING COMMISSION MEMORANDUM					DATE: October 23, 1979		PAGE: 1	
C8 14	SUBDIVISION	CITY	ZON- ING	ETJ	PROPOSED	ACPEAGE	VARIANCES		ACTION	
	LOCATION				LAND USE	LOTS	STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS		
79 004	Williamsburg, Phase I	X	1-A, 1st H & A		Residential PUD	6.84	INCOMPLETE	DISAPPROVAL		
	Spicewood Springs Rd. @ Prop. Greenslope				46					
79 005	Williamsburg, Phase II	X	1-A, 1st H & A		Residential PUD	11.152	INCOMPLETE	DISAPPROVAL		
	Spicewood Springs Rd. @ Chimney Corners				76					
C8	FINAL SUBDIVISIONS									
f79 80	Quatro Addition	X	A & C		Residential & Commercial	2.95	COMPLETE	APPROVAL		
	Burns Street				3					
C8 14 73 007	Vintage Hills Planned Unit Devel.						VACATION	APPROVAL	Approved staff recommendations. 5-1-1.	
C8 f 79 92	Vintage Hills Sec. 7	X	B			5.23	COMPLETE	APPROVAL	Approved staff recommendations. 5-1-1.	
	Ed. Bluestein & Langston Drive				17					
70 22	Southcrest Park No. 3						6 Month Extension	GRANT		
	F.M. 812 & Clinger Road									
78 142	Kramer Square						VACATION	APPROVAL		
	Kramer Lane									
78 142	Quail Ridge						NAME CHANGE			
	Kramer Lane						COMPLETE	APPROVAL		
f79 86	Summit Oaks Annex Sec. 3, Phase 1			X	Residential	3.285	COMPLETE	APPROVAL		
	Sierra Nevada					2				

7.a 62-77 Summit Oaks Annex, Sec. 2

Partial Vacation APPROVED

TYPE: SHORT FORMS		PLANNING COMMISSION MEMORANDUM						DATE: October 23, 1979	PAGE: 2
C8s	SUBDIVISION	CITY	ZON- ING	ETJ	PROPOSED LAND USE	ACREAGE	VARIANCES		ACTION
	LOCATION					LOTS	STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS	
1.	79 Kings Village Section 4					10.925	Adjoining Owner - Balance of Tract;		
	96 Howard Ln., E. of Ida Ridge Drive			X	Industrial	1	Fiscal W.W. - GRANT INCOMPLETE	DISAPPROVAL	
2.	79 The Erickson Addition					0.70	Balance of Tract - GRANT		
	183 Arthur Lane & Rabb Road	X	IA			2	COMPLETE	BARTON CREEK APPROVAL	
3.	79 Faulkner South					1.423	Adjoining Owner - GRANT		
	133 Ben White & Burleson Road	X	IA			1	COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
4.	79 Austin Cha Yon Ryu		C			0.2383	Balance of Tract - GRANT		
	184 White Horse Tr., W. of Burnet Road	X	6th			1	COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
5.	79 Buckingham Estates Section 3					4.37			
	06 So. 1st Street & Thelma Drive	X	IAA			16	COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
6.	79 The James Casey St. Addition					0.792	Adjoining Owner - GRANT		
	177 W. St. Elmo & James Casey Street	X	A			4	R.O.W. Width - GRANT COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
7a.	78 Springdale Center								
	261 Ed. Bluestein & Manor Road						VACATION	APPROVAL	
7b.	79 Springdale Center II					15.626			
	180 E. Bluestein & Manor Road	X	GR			1	COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
3.	79 Santerre Industrial Park						Balance of Tract - GRANT		
	166 N. Lamar Blvd. & W. Powell Lane	X	D				COMPLETE	APPROVAL	
9a.	68 Bee Caves Section 3 Addition						PARTIAL VACATION		
	79 Mo-Pac Blvd. & Tammarron Blvd.							APPROVAL	
9b.	79 Bee Caves Section 4					35.02	Delete SWK on Mo-Pac - GRANT		
	185 Mo-Pac Blvd. & Tammarron Blvd.	X				1	Scale of Plat - GRANT COMPLETE	BARTON CREEK DISAPPROVAL	

TYPE: PRELIMINARIES		PLANNING COMMISSION MEMORANDUM						DATE: October 23, 1979		PAGE: 3
	SUBDIVISION				PROPOSED	ACREAGE	VARIANCES			
C8	LOCATION	CITY	ZON- ING	ETJ	LAND USE	LOTS	STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	
79	Woodhue Heights						30 day Extension	APPROVAL		
57										
	30 DAY STATUTORY REVIEW									
78	Davenport Ranch							DISAPPROVAL		
108										
79	Lamplight West Section 2							DISAPPROVAL		
95										
79	Lloyd Subdivision							DISAPPROVAL		
96										
79	Far Northwest Hills							DISAPPROVAL		
97										
79	Shady Hollow Sec. 4							DISAPPROVAL		
98										
79	Shady Hollow Sec. 3-A, Phase 3							DISAPPROVAL		
99										
79	Interstate 35 Industrial Park							DISAPPROVAL		
100										

[illegible]

