| 6.Rezoning: <br> Location: | C14-2018-0141-1907 Inverness Zoning Change; District 5 <br>  <br> Owner/Applicant: |
| :---: | :--- |
| Austin Combined (South Manchaca) NP Area | Marquee Investments, LLC (Alex Bahrami) |
| Agent: | Austex Building Consultants (Jonathan Perlstein) |
| Request: | SF-3-NP to LO-MU-NP |
| Staff Rec.: | Recommended |
| Staff: | Wendy Rhoades, 512-974-7719, wendy.rhoades@ austintexas.gov |
|  | Planning and Zoning Department |

## Question: Commissioner McGraw

The staff states that the property was used for a commercial use for many years. Is that suggesting that after a certain amount of time that an illegal use becomes legal? I have always thought that a use established without proper zoning and permits is illegal. I don't know of any situation where a single family use was legal for commercial unless it was previously zoned commercial or constructed prior to 1931.

Also, there is a comment that the pavement existed by 1986 and is likely non-conforming. this would mean it was placed there legally at some point. Same comments as above.

Both of these situations are illegal. I know the neighbors have brought this up, but why would staff use this as a basis for recommending a zoning change?

## Answer: Staff

1) As explanation, I am conveying information about a previous use of the property.
2) I am conveying information that the parking lot existed in 1986, based on aerial photography taken that year. Council adopted the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance in 1986 and established site plan requirements at that time. Impervious cover in place before adoption of the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance is considered grandfathered, hence my response that the parking area is likely a nonconforming structure.
3) The basis for Staff's recommendation of the Applicant's request is its location in the Neighborhood Transition character district which encourages small scale offices of the adopted Neighborhood Plan.
8. Rezoning: C14-2018-0100.SH-2107 Alamo; District 1

Location: 2107 Alamo Street, Boggy Creek Watershed; Upper Boggy Creek
NP Area
Owner/Applicant: Anmol Mehra
Agent:
Request:
Staff Rec.:
South Llano Strategies (Glen Coleman)
SF-3-NP to MF-4-CO-NP
Not Recommended
Staff:
Heather Chaffin, 512-974-2122
Planning and Zoning Department

## Question: Commissioner McGraw

I noticed that Exhibit C of the Smart Housing certification notes a long list of fees that will be waived for this project.

1) Can we get a total of these? I am assuming they pertain to the entire project? all 5 units? It actually notes these may not be all of the waivers! so what else will apply? I guess demolition of existing residence?
2) What is the cost of ensuring that all of the inspections are made by NHCD, the occupant of the affordable unit meets the requirements and the rental rate continues to be as required. This includes both initial and on-going costs.
3) When fees normally paid to DSD are waived who pays for these? DSD is an enterprise department now so that presumes that the fees are spread to other applicants including homeowners seeking permits. Can you clarify this?
4) Is there a survey for the lot ?
5) Can you tell me what Restrictive Covenant is being considered?
6) Do you have the neighbors in opposition and support mapped?
7) Will sidewalks be required? The elevation sent by the developer shows no sidewalk on Alamo.
8) What will the setback be on 22 nd St.?
9) I believe this is next to a single family home. Do we know the front setback of that home?
10) Will compatibility require a matching setback?
11) Since this did not trigger a plan amendment, can you find a staff member who participated in the neighborhood plan and can speak to why the transition zone was placed on existing viable homes?

Answer: Staff

1) Attached (Item C-08, Exhibit A) is the list of fees eligible to be waived under City's Land Development Code, Chapter 25-1-704. There are other fees that are eligible to be waived by separate ordinance, parkland dedication, etc. The amount of expected fees to be waived would need to be provided by the developer. The fees would apply to the entire project.
2) With NHCD's current vendor the monitoring fee per unit is an estimated \$100, per monitoring. NHCD monitor's a unit once every 3 years for the duration of the affordability period.
3) For information regarding DSD's budgeting for SMART Housing fee waivers, I recommend reaching out to Andy Linseisen.
4) See exhibit Item C-08, Exhibit B.
5) The applicant is proposing a private RC related to affordable housing and some design elements. The proposed private RC is attached to the staff report as Exhibit D (Pg. 11 of 38).
6) No
7) Sidewalks will be required at time of site plan.
8) It appears that this is a subdivided lot, but I haven't been able to track down the plat (I believe it's from 1968). At that time the front lot line/yard would've been determined, and would've been designated as facing $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street. (The property owner would have to resubdivide to designate a different front lot line). Based on this, the setback from $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street would be $15^{\prime}$ if rezoned. Compatibility would also apply along this side.
9) No. Looking at the aerial, it appears to be similar to the setback of the duplex on the rezoning tract.
10) Compatibility setbacks/height limits/etc. are triggered by SF-3-NP zoned properties that surround the site-the park to the west and southwest is the only property that won't trigger compatibility. Compatibility does not take into account the setbacks of surrounding existing structures.
11) Staff: Mark Walters, Planning and Zoning Department:

I wasn't heavily involved with the plan's development since I live in the area and due to conflict of interest concerns I could not directly participate and nobody who worked on the plan still works for the City. That said, from reading the plan and talking to my wife (who represented our household in the planning process) I can discuss as to why the Neighborhood Transition (NT) was applied to houses abutting Manchaca Road. The main reasons were that some houses along Manchaca are already being used for some small-scale retail/office uses and that the participants recognized that these emerging uses represented the changing character of the roadway, and combined with heavy
traffic volumes, made the location less than ideal for the past SF uses. Also, there was a recognition that many of the uses (small-scale commercial, live-work housing and middle-density, smaller scaled housing) allowed in the zoning districts allowed in NT could be a benefit and contribute to a more complete community. The introductory paragraphs in the plan regarding NT discuss this in greater detail.

Neighborhood Transition character districts, along with Neighborhood Nodes, border the Residential Core along arterial roadways. Primarily residential, these areas consist of clusters of duplexes, fourplexes, and apartment buildings, along with small-scaled offices and neighborhood-serving businesses. Neighborhood Transition districts create a buffer between Residential Core districts and more intense character districts or busy roads. Many of these districts are located along Imagine Austin Activity Corridors.

Neighborhood Transition districts in particular present an opportunity to incorporate more missing middle housing types that are compatible with the neighborhood. The missing middle refers to duplexes and other housing types, such as row houses, bungalow courts and other housing types compatible with the existing neighborhood, that provide options between the scale of singlefamily houses and mid-rise apartments or condos. As Austin's population grows and its demographics change, these housing types provide the opportunity to accommodate growth in walkable neighborhoods while respecting neighbor-hood character. The variety of housing types in the missing middle promote multigenerational communities, providing options for young people and for older generations to age in place. (South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan, p. 53)

Here is a link to the plan: $\mathrm{ftp}: / / \mathrm{ttp} . \mathrm{ci}$. austin.tx.us/npzd/Austingo/SACNP FINAL.pdf. The NT discussion starts on p. 53.

## Item C-08, Exhibit A

## 4. S.M.A.R.T. Housing ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Fees Eligible for Waiver

On April 20, 2000 the Austin City Council adopted Ordinance No. $000420-77^{3}$ creating the S.M.A.R.T. Housing ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Policy and authorizing the administrative authority to waive fees for S.M.A.R.T. Housing ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ developments. Fees listed in the ordinance are:

| City Department | Fee Types |
| :---: | :---: |
| Water and Wastewater | Capital Recovery (Impact) Fee |
| Parks and Recreation | Parkland Dedication $\mathrm{Fec}^{4}$ |
| Public Works | Construction Inspection Fee |
| Watershed Protection and Development Review | Development Assessment Fee |
|  | Traffic Impact Analysis Fee |
|  | Traffic Impact Analysis Revision Fee |
| Zoning Fees | Regular Zoning Fee |
|  | Interim to Permanent Zoning Fee |
|  | Miscellaneous Zoning Fee |
|  | Zoning Verification Letter Fee |
|  | Board of Adjustment Fee |
|  | Managed Growth Agreement Fee |
|  | Planned Development Area Fee |
| Subdivision Fees | Preliminary Subdivision Fee |
|  | Final Subdivision Fee |
|  | Final Without Preliminary Subdivision Fee |
|  | Miscellaneous Subdivision Fee |
| Site Plan Fees | Consolidated Site Plan Fee |
|  | Miscellaneous Site Plan Fee |
|  | Site Plan Revision Fee |
|  | Site Plan - Construction Element Fee |
| Building Plan Review, Permit, and Inspection Fees | Building Review Plan Fee |
|  | Building Permit Fee |
|  | Electric Permit Fee |
|  | Mechanical Permit Fee |
|  | Plumbing Permit Fee |
|  | Concrete Permit Fee |
|  | Demolition Permit Fee |
|  | Electric Service Inspection Fee |
|  | Move House Onto Lot/ |
|  | Move House Onto Right-of-Way Fee |

[^0]

## C-08, Exhibit B

## PREMIER SURVEYING LLC

5700 W. Plano Parkway, Suite 2700
Plano, Texas 75093
972-612-3601
Fax: 972-964-7021

## Exhibit "A"

(2101 E. 22ND STREET)

BEING A PORTION OF LOT 8, BLOCK 11, OF C.R. JOHNS SUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 11, 12, 13 AND 14, IN OUTLOT NO. 46, DIVISION "B", AN ADDITION IN THE TOWN OF AUSTIN (NOW IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN), TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN VOLUME 3, PAGE 14, PLAT RECORDS, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED BY METES AND BOUNDS AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A 1/2-INCH IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTH LINE OF A 20 FOOT ALLEY, SAID IRON PIPE BEING SOUTH $80^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 6.00 FEET FROM THE COMMON SOUTH CORNER OF SAID LOT 8 AND LOT 7, SAID BLOCK;

THENCE SOUTH $80^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 64.33 FEET ALONG SAID NORTH LINE TO THE INTERSECTION OF SAID NORTH LINE AND THE EAST LINE OF ALAMO STREET;

THENCE NORTH $10^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 149.00 FEET ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO THE INTERSECTION OF SAID EAST LINE AND THE SOUTH LINE OF E. 22ND STREET (50 FOOT RIGHT-OFWAY);

THENCE NORTH $80^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 64.33 FEET ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE TO A POINT FROM WHICH A 1/2-INCH IRON PIPE FOUND BEARS SOUTH $62^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime}$ EAST - 0.50 OF ONE FOOT;

THENCE SOUTH $10^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, DEPARTING SAID SOUTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 149.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND CONTAINING 9,585 SQUARE FEET OR 0.22 OF ONE ACRE OF LAND.


Survey Plat of even date attached hereto and made a part hereof.
Date: 01/26/16


[^0]:    ${ }^{3}$ Amended November 29, 2007, Ordinance 20071129-100.
    ${ }^{4}$ Parkland Dedication Fees are waived for reasonably priced units only. Waiver established by separate ordinance. 16

