

- TIA (p. 10-13)
- ADDN COND. AGREED TO BY APPLICANT: (p. 14-15)
- ZAP REC. ON (P. 5)

UPDATED

ZONING CHANGE REVIEW SHEET

CASE: C814-04-0061

Z.A.P. DATE: June 1, 2004
June 7, 2004

ADDRESS: R.M. 2222 Road

OWNER/APPLICANT: Ribelin Ranch Partners, Ltd. (Frank Ribelin), Charles & Martha Ribelin, Tom & Lucia Francis

AGENT: Thrower Design (Ron Thrower)

ZONING FROM: I-RR (upon annexation) **TO:** PUD **AREA:** 428.069 acres

The applicant will prohibit the following uses in the PUD:

- Automotive Sales
- Automotive Repair Services
- Service Station (with retail sales of liquefied fuels)
- Exterminating Services
- Pawn Shops

SUMMARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff's alternate recommendation is to approve the proposed Ribelin Ranch Planned Unit Development (PUD) with the following conditions:

1. The development of the site will be subject to the attached Land Use Plan, Exhibit "A".
2. The applicant shall place a note or table on the Land Use Plan showing the maximum intensity/density of the proposed uses for the PUD in accordance with the determinations made through the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for this site.
3. The PUD will be subject to GO-MU (General Office-Mixed Use District) development standards for Tract 1A and GR-MU (Community Commercial-Mixed Use District) development standards for Tract 1B. The development of Single-Family Residential uses on Tracts 1A or 1B, shall comply with SF-3 (Family Residence District) development standards.
4. The applicant will adopt Grown Green and IPM standards as part of the PUD zoning case.
5. The staff recommends the requested alterations (modifications, variances, and waivers) to the Land Development Code requirements for the items 3, 4, 5, 6, 15 (portion concerning Sec. 25-2-423), 17, 25, 26, 28, and 31.
6. The staff recommends the following alterations (modifications, variances, and waivers) to the Land Development Code requirements listed in Exhibit "B", with conditions:

- a) Item # 7 - "Administrative approval of cut and fill up to eight feet is granted."

Staff conditions: Eight feet cut and fill is permitted for construction of detention and

water quality facilities. Except as otherwise provided, the Director of Watershed Protection and Development Review (WPDR) may approve an administrative variance for cut and fill between 4 feet and (up to) eight feet.

- b) Item # 9 – “Preliminary plans and final plats may occur in one or more phases or sections. A variance from Sec. 25-4-33 to permit preliminary and final plats which do not include entirety of the original tract to be submitted and approved.”

Staff conditions: At the time of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a 30-foot permanent access easement to Tracts 2A, 2B, and 2C, unless alternate access is provided.

- c) Item # 18 – “Pursuant to Sect. 25-2-1105, a waiver to Sec. 25-2-1023(A) to allow a vegetative buffer of seventy five feet along R.M. 2222.”

Staff conditions: The staff recommends this waiver request to allow a vegetative buffer of 75 feet rather than 100 feet along R.M. 2222, with the condition that the applicant restore the 75 foot vegetative buffer to High Intensity standards.

- d) Item # 19 – “Pursuant to Sec. 25-2-1105, a waiver to Sec. 25-2-1025(a) to allow a natural area of twenty percent, excluding dedicated right-of-way, of the area of the PUD within 1,000 feet of the existing right-of-way of R.M. 2222”

Staff conditions: The staff recommends the provision to allow a 20% natural area rather than 40% for the area within the 1,000 foot Hill Country Roadway Corridor. This is recommended because the overall PUD site provides a natural area (including Preserve Areas) in excess of 40%.

The Hill Country Roadway Corridor landscaping to be required in all commercial areas within the PUD, and single family home buyers must be furnished with a homeowners education packet that includes an Integrated Pest Management plan and a Grow Green booklet.

- e) Item # 27 – “Modify Sec. 25-8-123(2)(a) so that tree surveys will be for protected trees and larger.”

Staff conditions: The applicant is required to conduct standard tree surveys for Ash Juniper (Cedar) trees with a single stem of 8 inches or greater.

- f) Item # 30 – “A variance from Sec. 25-7-32(C) requiring delineation of the flood plan and floodway is granted.”

Staff conditions: The staff requires the applicant to comply with this section of the LDC. However, the staff will allow the floodplain delineation requirement to be deferred to the subdivision process.

- g) Item # 33 – “The posting of any fiscal relating to roadway improvements shall be deferred so as to be a requirement for site plan release.”

Staff conditions: The applicant has modified this request to apply to only off-site roadway improvements. The staff agrees with the applicant's request for this item

with the condition that this will only apply to off-site roadway improvements. **However, the Law Department has stated that they would like to review the applicant's revision to this request before they agree to the conditions.**

- h) Item # 34 – "Service Extension Requests 2337 and 2338 shall be effective for ten years."

Note: The staff recommends this request, however this request is not part of the PUD application and cannot be addressed through the PUD ordinance for this case. The Water and Wastewater department is processing a Service Extension Request (SER) for this property that will be considered by the Water and Wastewater Commission on June 2, 2004 and the City Council on June 24, 2004. SER issues will be addressed in a separate ordinance.

7. The staff recommends denial of the following alteration (modification, variance, and waiver) to the Land Development Code requirements listed in Exhibit "B":

- a) Item # 35 – "The filing fees for the PUD zoning application shall be refunded."

Basis for Denial: The applicant has stated that the filing fees for this application should be refunded in the manner consistent with the Robinson Ranch PUD case. The staff notes that the Robinson Ranch PUD was a city initiated case and did not require filing fees. Therefore the applicant's argument for this request is not justified. The Law Department has said that this request cannot be accommodated through a PUD ordinance.

8. The applicant shall comply with the conditions listed in the Environmental Memorandum from Sylvia Pope, dated May 26, 2004 (Exhibit "C").
9. The applicant shall comply with Environmental Board recommendations as stated in the Environmental Board Motion, dated May 19, 2004, Exhibit "D".
10. The development of the PUD site will be subject to the attached TIA memorandum from Watershed Protection and Development Review (WPDR) Department dated May 19, 2004, (Exhibit "E"). The TIA memo limit the site development to uses and intensities that will not exceed or vary from the projected traffic conditions assumed in the final TIA [John Hickman-April 23, 2004].
11. The applicant shall meet Parkland Dedication Ordinance requirements by paying parkland fees.
12. The landowner must obtain City approval of a Service Extension Request (SER) for this site before 3rd reading of the zoning case at City Council.
13. The applicant will comply with Water Quality issues at preliminary/final plat stage.
14. The applicant will comply with all drainage issues at preliminary/final plat stage.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS:

The applicants originally proposed 35 alterations (modifications, variances, or waivers) to the Land Development Code requirements. These modifications are listed in the, "Requested Alterations to the

Land Development Code Ribelin Ranch," which is provided as Exhibit "B" to this report. After numerous discussions with the staff, the applicant requested to remove items 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 32, and 34 from this list. Therefore, at this time the applicant is now requesting 18 alterations (modifications, variances, or waivers) to the Land Development Code requirements.

The staff recommends the requested modifications for the items 3, 4, 5, 6, 15 (portion concerning Sec. 25-2-423), 17, 25, 26, 28, and 31. The staff recommends the following modification items with conditions:

- a) Item # 7 - "Administrative approval of cut and fill up to eight feet is granted."

Staff conditions: Eight feet cut and fill is permitted for construction of detention and water quality facilities. Except as otherwise provided, the Director of Watershed Protection and Development Review (WPDR) may approve an administrative variance for cut and fill between 4 feet and (up to) eight feet.

- b) Item # 9 - "Preliminary plans and final plats may occur in one or more phases or sections. A variance from Sec. 25-4-33 to permit preliminary and final plats which do not include entirety of the original tract to be submitted and approved."

Staff conditions: At the time of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a 30-foot permanent access easement to Tracts 2A, 2B, and 2C, unless alternate access is provided.

- c) Item # 18 - "Pursuant to Sect. 25-2-1105, a waiver to Sec. 25-2-1023(A) to allow a vegetative buffer of seventy five feet along R.M. 2222."

Staff conditions: The staff recommends this waiver request to allow a vegetative buffer of 75 feet rather than 100 feet along R.M. 2222, with the condition that the applicant restore the 75 foot vegetative buffer to High Intensity standards.

- d) Item # 19 - "Pursuant to Sec. 25-2-1105, a waiver to Sec. 25-2-1025(a) to allow a natural area of twenty percent, excluding dedicated right-of-way, of the area of the PUD within 1,000 feet of the existing right-of-way of R.M. 2222"

Staff conditions: The staff recommends the provision to allow a 20% natural area rather than 40% for the area within the 1,000 foot Hill Country Roadway Corridor. This is recommended because the overall PUD site provides a natural area (including Preserve Areas) in excess of 40%.

The Hill Country Roadway Corridor landscaping to be required in all commercial areas within the PUD, and single family home buyers must be furnished with a homeowners education packet that includes an Integrated Pest Management plan and a Grow Green booklet.

- e) Item # 27 - "Modify Sec. 25-8-123(2)(a) so that tree surveys will be for protected trees and larger."

Staff conditions: The applicant is required to conduct standard tree surveys for Ash Juniper (Cedar) trees with a single stem of 8 inches or greater.

- f) Item # 30 – “A variance from Sec. 25-7-32(C) requiring delineation of the flood plan and floodway is granted.”

Staff conditions: The staff requires the applicant to comply with this section of the LDC. However, the staff will allow the floodplain delineation requirement to be deferred to the subdivision process.

- g) Item # 33 – “The posting of any fiscal relating to roadway improvements shall be deferred so as to be a requirement for site plan release.”

Staff conditions: The applicant has modified this request to apply to only off-site roadway improvements. The staff agrees with the applicant's request for this item with the condition that this will only apply to off-site roadway improvements. **However, the Law Department has stated that they would like to review the applicant's revision to this request before they agree to the conditions.**

- h) Item # 34 – “Service Extension Requests 2337 and 2338 shall be effective for ten years.”

Note: The staff recommends this request, however this request is not part of the PUD application and cannot be addressed through the PUD ordinance for this case. The Water and Wastewater department is processing a Service Extension Request (SER) for this property that will be considered by the Water and Wastewater Commission on June 2, 2004 and the City Council on June 24, 2004. SER issues will be addressed in a separate ordinance.

ZONING AND PLATTING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

6/1/04: Motion made to continue to 6/07/04 (ZAP); Special called meeting; at 5:30 p.m. (8-0); M. Whaley-1st, J. Martinez-2nd.

6/7/04: Approve staff's recommendation of PUD zoning, including the Environmental Board's recommendation (7-0, J. Pinnelli-absent, M. Whaley-not yet arrived); K. Jackson-1st, J. Martinez-2nd.

ISSUES:

After the Zoning & Platting Commission meeting on June 7, 2004, the applicant handed the staff an e-mail and a letter regarding their meetings with the surrounding neighborhood associations. This information has been included as “Exhibit H” to this report.

The applicant provided the staff with an updated version of the “Requested Alterations to the Land Development Code Ribelin Ranch,” list on Friday, June 4, 2004 (“Exhibit G” to this report). The staff did not have an opportunity to revise the zoning case report based on this reduced list of variances from the applicant. Therefore, the staff's report is based on the requested alteration list from the applicant dated June 3, 2004, current “Exhibit B”.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The property in question consists of approximately 428 acres of undeveloped land. The applicant's are currently in negotiations for Travis County to purchase the 319.71 acres of land to the north of this site for the Balcones Canyonland Preserve. The applicant has stated that the sale of the B.C.C.P. land to the County is contingent on the City establishing land use/zoning on the property directly to

the south (428.069 acres within this PUD application). Therefore, the applicant's are pursuing PUD zoning for this site because they would like address development parameters, environmental issues, and traffic concerns for the property at this time. They want to create an over all list of uses for the PUD and then allow them to be located in specific sections of the PUD within the developable area. The applicant's want to be flexible with the location of uses within the PUD site because they do not have developers involved with the project at this time.

A proposed timeline for issues concerning Ribelin Ranch property has been included at Exhibit "F".

HISTORY:

The Ribelin Ranch tract is 740 acres of total land area. The property has been in the Ribelin family since 1951. The applicant's representatives met with the Fish and Wildlife Department in December of 1997 and the Federal Government considered buying this site in 1998. However, the purchase of the land failed when the request reached Washington, D.C. In the fall of 1998, the applicant worked with the Fish and Wildlife Department to obtain a 10-A permit (for the Preserve Area- Tracts 1A and 1B). This process went on for three years and the permit was granted in 2001.

The site has approximately 240 acres of developable area. The power lines (Electric and Utility Easements) running through the center of the property would be the development barrier line. The property to the north of these lines would be uses for a preserve. Travis County presented the applicant an offer to buy the northern part of the property (B.C.C.P area-319.71 acres) in December 2003.

The agents have been in discussions with Ben Luckens, with the Transportation Planning & Sustainability Department, for the past three years about the annexation process. The agents have met with neighborhood groups concerning the idea of SMART (compact/concentrated) development of the site. From these meeting, the agents sensed that the staff would like to encourage a mixed-use development on the property.

Travis County hired the Holford Group to conduct a land use appraisal of the property. The applicant is requesting to use a scaled back version of that proposed land use plan for the PUD site. The applicant wants to have a mix of about 50,000 sq. ft. of commercial, 1,000,000 sq. ft. of office, the same amount (as the land use appraisal) of multi-family development (units) and single-family development (units). The applicant would also like to encourage the development of a Park & Ride use on the property. Therefore, they will need an additional street constructed on the site for circulation. There are small slopes on the site and a few identified CEFs. The property has the headwaters of Bull Creek and West Bull Creek running through and adjacent to it.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

	ZONING	LAND USES
<i>Site</i>	County (Not zoned)	Undeveloped
<i>North</i>	I-RR, County	Undeveloped
<i>South</i>	R&D, R&D-PDA, LO	Industrial Park (3M), Undeveloped Tract, Vacant Property (Old Tumbleweed Restaurant Site)
<i>East</i>	County, DR	Future Balcones Canyon land Preserve Area, Undeveloped
<i>West</i>	P-CO, PUD, R&D	Undeveloped (Future site of City of Austin Water Treatment Plant #4), Undeveloped (Four Points Centre PUD), Industrial Park (3M)

AREA STUDY: N/A**TIA:** Yes**WATERSHED:** Bull Creek, West Bull Creek**DESIRED DEVELOPMENT ZONE:** Yes**CAPITOL VIEW CORRIDOR:** No**HILL COUNTRY ROADWAY:** Yes**NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:**

- 190 - Middle Bull Creek Neighborhood Association
- 426 - River Place Residential Community Association, Inc.
- 434 - Lake Austin Business Owners
- 448 - Canyon Creek Homeowners Association
- 475 - Bull Creek Foundation
- 965 - Old Spicewood Springs Road Neighborhood Association
- 978 - Upper Bull Creek Neighborhood Association

CASE HISTORIES:

NUMBER	REQUEST	COMMISSION	CITY COUNCIL
C14-04-0010.	I-RR to LO-MU-CO	2/17/04: Approved staff's recommendation of LO-MU-CO zoning (8-1, J. Martinez-Nay)	3/25/04: Granted LO-MU-CO – Limited to right-in and right-out to FM-2222, and limit vehicle trips per day to 1000 (7-0); 1 st reading 5/6/04: Approved (7-0)
C814-95-0002.04	PUD to PUD	2/4/03: Approved staff's recommendation of PUD zoning by consent (7-0, K. Jackson, J. Martinez-absent)	3/6/03: Granted PUD zoning on 1 st reading (6-0, Dunkerley-absent)
C14-01-0058	SF-2 to GR	5/8/01: Approved GR-CO w/ trip limitation conditions maintained as per staff rec. & prohibit auto related uses (6-2, JM/RC-No)	7/19/01: Approved GR-MU-CO w/ conditions & RR (6-0) 7/19/02: Expired-No 3 rd reading (Administrative)
C14-01-0057	SF-2 to GR	5/8/01: Approved GR-CO w/ trip limitation conditions maintained as per staff rec. & prohibit auto related uses (6-2, JM/RC-No)	7/19/01: Approved GR-CO w/ conditions (6-0); all 3 readings
C14-01-0056	SF-2 to GR	5/8/01: Approved GR-CO w/ trip limitation conditions maintained as per staff rec. & prohibit auto related uses (6-2, JM/RC-No)	7/19/01: Approved GR-CO w/ conditions (6-0); all 3 readings

C14-99-2075	RR to GO	11/16/99: Approved GO, limited to 'LO' development regs. and 1,500 trips per day (8-0)	1/27/00: Approved PC rec. of GO-CO (5-0); 1 st reading 3/23/00: Approved GO-CO w/ restrictions: 1) Office size limited to 150,000, 2) Limited traffic to 1,850 TPD, 3) Limited any single tenant lease space to 75,000 sq ft (6-0, DS-out of room); 2 nd reading 6/1/00: Approved 3 rd reading (7-0)
C14-98-0236	I-RR to LI	4/6/99: Approved LI w/ conditions (8-0)	5/6/99: Approved PC rec. of LI-CO w/ conditions and provision to rollback to GR if current use ceases for more than 90 days (6-0); 1 st reading 7/1/99: Approved LI-CO w/ conditions: 1) Allow all restaurant uses, 2) Rollback to 'GR' if use ceases for more than 180 days (subj. to discussion taken at 3 rd reading) (6-0); 2 nd reading 7/15/99: Approved LI-CO w/ conditions (4-2, Griffith/ Slusher-Nay); 3 rd reading
C14-98-0225	I-RR to GR	2/2/99: Send case to CC without recommendation	3/4/99: Approved GR-MU-CO w/ conditions (6-1, DS-Nay) 7/1/99: Approved GR-MU-CO w/ conditions (5-1, DS-No); 2 nd reading 7/22/99: Approved GR-MU-Co w/ conditions (6-1, Slusher-No)

C14-98-0214	SF-2, DR to CS	3/2/99: Approved GR (comply with HCS), CS only for storage (6-2, BB/SA-Nay)	4/15/99: Approved GR-CO for entire site w/ LR uses and Automotive Sales and Automotive Repair as only GR uses & other conditions (6-0); 3 rd reading
C14-98-0027	I-SF-2 to GR	4/14/98: Approved GR-CO w/ conditions (6-2)	6/11/98: Approved PC rec. of GR-CO w/ conditions: deleted ROW dedication sue to waiver by TXDOT (6-0); 1 st reading 7/9/98: Approved GR-CO w/ conditions (7-0); 2 nd / 3 rd readings
C814-95-0002	PUD to PUD	12/12/95: Approved PUD revision w/ conditions (5-3)	12/14/95: Approved PUD subject to list of conditions (4-0); 1 st reading; (Public hearing closed but speakers will be allowed to speak at 2 nd /3 rd readings) 6/13/96: Approved PUD subject to conditions

RELATED CASES: C7L-04-002 (Annexation Case)

ABUTTING STREETS:

STREET	RIGHT-OF-WAY	PAVEMENT WIDTH	CLASSIFICATION	DAILY TRAFFIC
RM 2222	100'	48'	Major Arterial	28,000
McNeil Drive	120'	2@24'	Collector	n.a.

CITY COUNCIL DATE: June 10, 2004

ACTION:

ORDINANCE READINGS: 1st

2nd

3rd

ORDINANCE NUMBER:

CASE MANAGER: Sherri Gager

PHONE: 974-3057

sherri.gager@ci.austin.tx.us



MEMORANDUM

To: Sherry Gager, Case Manager
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

From: George Zapalac
Watershed Protection and Development Review Department

Date: June 8, 2004 (Updated)

Subject: Ribelin Ranch
C814-04-0061
Traffic Impact Analysis

The following are staff comments on the traffic impact analysis for Ribelin Ranch prepared by John F. Hickman and Associates and dated April 23, 2004.

TRIP GENERATION

Ribelin Ranch is located near the intersection of RM 2222 and McNeil Rd. and consists of 747 acres, of which 188 are proposed for development. The assumed build-out of the project is the year 2020.

The TIA assumed that the development would consist of the mixed land uses listed in Table 1. Based on the standard trip generation rates established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the development will generate approximately 24,168 unadjusted daily trips. The adjusted site trips, excluding the internal capture and pass-by trips, are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Proposed Trip Generation (Adjusted)				
Land Use	Size	Daily Trips	AM Peak	PM Peak
General Office	1,000,000 s.f.	5,905	1,022	882
Convenience with Gas Pumps	3,500 s.f.	954	49	62
Retail	50,000 s.f.	2,488	57	217
Multi-family Residential	950 units	5,073	399	424
Residential Condominium	300 units	1,413	106	139
Park and Ride	350 spaces	1,156	229	158
TOTAL		16,989	1,862	1,882

ASSUMPTIONS

A growth rate was developed using roadway traffic volume trends and CAMPO forecasts, which resulted in a 1.68% compounded average annual growth rate. To this was added traffic from 16 other approved but unbuilt projects which will contribute traffic to RM 2222 between RM 620 and Loop 360. Adjustments were made to account for internal capture (vehicles which would visit more than one of the land uses in the development) and pass-by trips (vehicles which already use RM 2222 during the peak periods and would stop at the Ribelin development before continuing their trips).

EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROADWAYS

RM 2222 currently exists as a 4-lane undivided major arterial adjacent to the site. The Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (AMATP) calls for widening to a 4-lane divided roadway by 2025, which could include either a raised median or a center two-way left-turn lane. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2004 on a continuous left-turn lane along RM 2222 from RM 620 to River Place Blvd., and a similar left-turn lane already exists between River Place Blvd. and McNeil Dr. west of the site.

McNeil Dr. exists as a 4-lane divided collector street at the site's southern boundary and will provide major access to the project.

Ribelin Ranch Rd. is a proposed collector street which will intersect RM 2222 east of McNeil and extend through the site to an intersection with McNeil. It will also provide access to the adjacent property to the east.

Loop 360 is a 4-lane divided major arterial. It is currently being considered as a candidate for upgrading to a toll facility through the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority.

RM 620 currently exists as a 4-lane major arterial with a continuous left-turn lane. In the AMATP it is recommended to be upgraded by 2025 to a 6-lane expressway between Quinlan Park Rd. and Anderson Mill Rd.

Bullick Hollw Rd. exists as a two-lane undivided minor arterial. No expansion of the road is called for in the AMATP, but the CAMPO plan classifies it as a 4-lane minor arterial.

River Place Blvd. is a 4-lane divided minor arterial which intersects RM 2222 west of Ribelin Ranch. No upgrading of this facility is presently proposed.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The impact of site traffic on the area roadways was analyzed for build-out conditions in 2020. Because of the long-term build-out, significant increases in background traffic from other approved projects, and limited roadway capacity, all affected intersections were projected to operate at Level of Service F in 2020, with or without traffic from the site, even after additional

turning lanes were added at the access points to the project. Lengthy delays averaging from 1 to over 7 minutes per vehicle were projected at every intersection.

The applicant then analyzed another scenario with a 6-lane divided roadway on RM 2222. Some improvement in service levels was achieved in this scenario, although several intersections still operated at Level of Service F with delays of up to nearly 5 minutes per vehicle in some cases. The 6-lane divided roadway would require an amendment to the Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan. Existing and projected levels of service under both scenarios are indicated in Table 2.

Table 2. Existing and Projected Levels of Service						
Intersection	Existing 2004		2020 w. turn lanes		2020 w. 6 lanes	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
RM 2222 & RM 620	F	D	F	F	F	F
RM 2222 & River Place Blvd.	F	D	F	F	F	F
RM 2222 & McNeil	B	B	F	F	D	F
RM 2222 & Ribelin Ranch Rd.	N.A.	N.A.	F	F	C	E
RM 2222 & Loop 360 west side	E	C	F	F	D	F
RM 2222 & Loop 360 east side	C	F	F	F	F	F

The TIA confirms the conclusions of a 1998 City of Austin study of the RM 2222 corridor: in the long term there is insufficient capacity in the corridor to accommodate all the traffic from projects which have already been approved, assuming that they develop to their maximum intensity.

In the TIA the entire project was assumed to be developed in one phase. Since that time, the applicant has proposed to reduce the intensity of the project slightly (to 15,000 adjusted trips per day) and to phase the development. Due to the time constraints under which this case is being processed, the applicant has not prepared an evaluation of the reduced intensity and the interim phases.

The applicant is proposing to set aside 10 acres of the site for a park-and-ride facility, which could help intercept inbound traffic on RM 2222 in the AM peak and reduce its impact on other intersections. However, at this time Capital Metro has not committed to developing a facility at this location.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If the zoning is approved, the following conditions should apply:

1. Prior to the approval of any final subdivision plat or site plan on the property, the applicant should dedicate up to 57 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of RM 2222 in accordance with the Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan. Additional right-of-way may be required in the future with the subdivision or site plan if the AMATP is amended to provide for a 6-lane divided facility on RM 2222.

2. Prior to the approval of any subdivision plat or site plan on the property, the developer should post fiscal surety for the Phase 1 improvements identified in Table 3 below.
3. Development should be limited to no more than 5,000 adjusted trips per day until the developer constructs Ribelin Ranch Blvd. as a 4-lane divided road between RM 2222 and McNeil Rd. and posts fiscal surety for the Phase 2 improvements identified in Table 3 below.
4. Development should be limited to no more than 10,000 adjusted trips per day unless the Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan is amended to include RM 2222 as a 6-lane divided major arterial or funds are approved for construction of such a facility.
5. Development should be limited to no more than 15,000 adjusted trips per day at full build-out of the project.
6. Improvements on State highways are subject to approval and verification of costs by the Texas Department of Transportation.

Table 3. Traffic Improvements					
Phase	Location	Improvement	Total Cost	Applicant's Share	Applicant's Cost
1	RM 2222 & RM 620	NB & SB Right Turn Lanes; EB Left Turn Lane	\$107,150	7.01%	\$7,511
1	RM 2222 & McNeil	Restripe for Shared SB Left Turn-Right Turn Lane	3,470	65.40%	2,269
2	RM 2222 & Ribelin Ranch	Traffic Signal	82,500	84.70%	69,878
		Center Turn Lane	425,041	84.62%	360,010
		WB Right Turn Lane	227,406	90.69%	206,235
	TOTAL				\$645,903

Please contact me at 974-2725 if you have any questions.

George Zapalac
Watershed Protection and Development Review

cc: John Hickman
Carol Kaml

Gager, Sherri

From: Robert J. Kleeman [rjkleeman@hallkleeman.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2004 2:24 PM
To: Thomas, Deborah; Charles Farmer; pate_brendle@yahoo.com
Cc: Murphy, Pat [WP]; Sylvia Pope; Gager, Sherri; Ron thrower; Murphy, Pat [WP]



763 ADDITIONAL
CONDITIONS OF R.

Attached is a list of conditions agreed to by the Ribelins that do not currently appear in staff recommendations and memos. It is my understanding that these conditions will have to be added to the ordinance. If I have missed anything, please let me know as soon as possible. I need help on the big box retail prohibition.

I will be adding some design guidelines for buildings in the southern portion of the ranch but I am awaiting language from a council office.

Robert Kleeman
Hall & Kleeman, P.L.L.C.
1515 South Capital of Texas Hwy. Ste. 415
Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 329-5227
(512) 329-8803 fax

Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from the nature of the foregoing communication, the information contained herein is attorney-client privileged and confidential information/work product. The communication is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error or are not sure whether it is privileged, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and destroy any copies, electronic, paper or otherwise, that you possess of this communication.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.700 / Virus Database: 457 - Release Date: 6/6/2004

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF RIBELIN PUD

No development is allowed within the approximately thirty foot wide base channel of the two draws within Tract 1A as shown on the PUD conceptual site plan except for vegetation management limited to hand clearing to allow more sun light for ground cover to grow.

Within Tract 1B residential use structures are prohibited; provided, however, neighborhood mixed use buildings are allowed.

Big box retail buildings, as defined in Ord. No. _____ are prohibited in Tract 1B.