

Hilton L. Puckett

4500 Bunny Run
Austin, Texas 78746
October 25, 2018

Camelback PUD C814-86-023.01

The highland lakes are not static bodies of water but have directional flow down the lower Colorado River. Building a large structures on the outside of a bend in the river certainly defies the laws of nature and forms a perfect trap for sediment, trash, amplifies noise and erosion. Many times I have stressed we don't have enough information to make a decision on the Dock and structures in the proposed Dock District. A whole lot of piers and cables will be needed to bored/drilled into Lake Austin, the shoreline and cliff side for the applicant's conceptual dock district components to be anchored!

Mechanized access was forbidden by code to protect rim rock and the scenic beauty along the lake. The Lake Austin Task force spent years studying and having meetings with people living and enjoying the lake to come up with unilateral codes in 2014. *"to protect the scenic, recreational, and environmental benefits of Lake Austin by restricting the scale and intensity of development near the lake."* That was only a few years ago

Allowing mechanized access, development in sensitive environmental areas, under a known falling rock area is unprecedented. In the rush of this PUD application, the Dock District details that would be revealed in planned and detailed drawings, with complete engineering work up will be overlooked. **A Dock Application has yet to be applied for.**

A perfect example is the proposed footprint of applicants dock structure. The **upstream** part of the dock is laid out to be 60-75 feet from shore with a proposed 650 piling structure angled back to shore for boat traffic navigational safety. Keep in mind this is on the outside turn of a moving body of water. **This forms a perfect funnel** on the outside bend of a river to catch anything floating and accelerate sediment accumulation. This will eventually form an environmental disaster and **wipe out the wetland** not protect it!

44 code modifications are sought and 20 out of 57 PUD notes are concerning the Dock District. Taking exception to these codes will set up new precedence's essentially opening the flood gates to applicants that demand equality and those that have been denied permits per the codes and regulations. Please don't pass these in the PUD agreement!

With the self-imposed deadline of the Champion tract deadline and missing dock/access information - I ask everyone to please think this through. For our brother and sister Neighborhoods across the lake, at least **pass the dock district as a zoning use conditional on a formal Dock Application being approved.**

Hilton L Puckett
President of the Aqua Verde Association Inc.

Hilton L. Puckett

4500 Bunny Run
Austin, Texas 78746
October25, 2018

Camelback PUD C814-86-023.01

Parks: This is by far the superior part of this PUD amendment plan and the big trade-off for the inferior Dock District. One Park of dedicated land includes the developments watersheds run off reserve and the other being a scenic cliff side park. **An accurate number of acres and the parkland /use rights remain elusive.**

At the Park commission: Code says the applicant is required to donate as parkland, at least 10.4 acres per 1,000 residents. He agreed per Aug. 28, 2018 Memorandum **to donate 26.11 Acres** of parkland to the city, which would be 16.58 acres in excess per current code.

At the Environmental Commission and Zap sessions: Applicant showed intent to use the entire shoreline in his 20% calculations for dock linear feet of 624 Ft. Which has been **corrected Oct. 22;** Special warranty deed vol. 12255 p 208-221 shows applicant does not have development rights to part of what claimed. Thus: the applicant has changed the dock length amount to 576 linear ft. (20% of **2,880 Linear Feet** of shoreline)

<http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=309117> page 10

Conflicting data (in chronological order):

No survey or legal description of the sloped and expensive to develop cliff park was provided at the Parks commission. However, a map submitted indicate and notes from staff indicate: Applicant dedicated all of Hidden Valley Lots 2 through 5 and portions of Lots 1, 6 through 9 to the City as parkland. The remaining residential lots, part of 9 and all of 10-12 are proposed to be re-zoned Commercial Use (CU) and Preserve Open Space (P OS).

[PUD note #1 states "A 9.53 acre dedicated park and a 16.56 acres (**10.713 Acres Land and 5.847 acres of water**) dedicated Cliff side park shall be provided, subject to a Parkland Dedication Improvement Agreement. (26.09 acres)]

*Oct 2, 2018-<http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=307241> States **6.467 acres are on the water and the property has approximately 3,126 feet of Lake Austin frontage.***

*Page 3 states **26.16 acres of park including 16.56 acre park with 2,070 liner feet of shoreline frontage.** (Page 6 Applicant requesting 44 modifications to code.)* Special warranty deed vol. 12255 p 208-221 shows applicant does not have development rights to part of what is claimed. Thus: the applicant has changed the dock length amount to 576 linear ft. (20% of **2,880 Linear Feet of Total Taxable shoreline**) on the current Council info sheet -Oct 22,2018.

<http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=309117> page 10

At the Environmental Commission -The applicant said he should not be penalized for his gift and wanted to use development rights on the Cliff parkland along the shoreline and in the water – (**approx. 2,070 linear feet of park dedicated shoreline**). Lacking a survey, is the Applicant **reclaiming approximately 11.74 acres** in the water and along the shoreline to use in dock computations? Are we to understand that the Applicant wants to deprive the shoreline portion from the citizens so he may apply it to the mega dock calculations? **If so, this would deny public shoreline access and rights.** Should the applicant be required to post signage along lots 1-9 prohibiting use of any beach area or lounging because private property - stripped Public Park shoreline rights? Would this not be double dipping and reducing the Park Land dedication amount?

Perhaps **the total park land acreage should be recalculated** for donation, use and property tax purposes? Approximately 26.16 acres less 11.74 = 14.4 acres dedicated for tax purposes. Making the cliff park dedication amount corrected to just 4.82 acres of land only with no water?

Using the entire shoreline the applicant seeks entitlement to a 576 linear ft. of dock. Using the shoreline remaining after giving the Park the unconditional rights, applicant would have 2,880-2,070 = 810 linear ft. x 20% = 162 linear ft of dock.

Please clarify!

Hilton L Puckett
President of the Aqua Verde Association Inc.