Montopolis
Neighborhood Plan

PLAN ADOPTED: September 27, 2001
This Neighborhood Plan has been amended by City Council. These amendments may include text changes or Future Land Use Map (FLUM) changes. Please refer to the Ordinance Chart on the planning area webpage for more information on amendments. Planning and Development Review staff updates the Ordinance Chart on a regular basis; however, newly adopted amendments may not be reflected on the chart.
Montopolis Neighborhood Plan

An amendment to the City of Austin’s Comprehensive Plan

The Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan
Chapter 5
Section 5-7
Exhibit A
Adoption of a Neighborhood Plan by City Ordinance shows the City Council’s general commitment and support for the projects and programs included in the plan, but does not obligate the City to implement individual plan recommendations.
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The Montopolis Neighborhood

The Montopolis community was originally settled as a separate community on the outskirts of Austin, surrounded by open fields which helped preserve the identity of the area. The feeling of isolation in Montopolis is enhanced by the general street pattern. Vargas Rd. and Montopolis Dr. run the entire length of the neighborhood and offer the only obvious access to the area. An observer has the feeling of being in a distinct community with clear points of entry.

Prior to annexation by the City, the subdivision of land was conducted informally. This resulted in lots of unwieldy shape and size in several areas, most notably between Montopolis Dr. and Vargas Rd. The pattern of areas subdivided after annexation tends to be much more like the remainder of the city.

Early planning studies of the Montopolis neighborhood envisioned the area as being eventually built out as single-family with commercial uses limited to highway commercial on U.S. 183 and a few neighborhood convenience nodes.

In contrast, the 1985 Montopolis Area Study recommended a future land use pattern that would accommodate industrial expansion occurring in the area and which recognized the impacts of noise from nearby Bergstrom Air Force Base. The eastern edge of the study area, contains a mix of single-family, industrial and commercial zoning.

Today, as Austin makes its metamorphosis into a metropolitan region covering five counties, Montopolis is becoming less isolated. Although few major projects have been completed in the study area over the last ten years, there is a steady and increasing level of activity to the west and southwest. Development projects stimulated by the construction of Austin-Bergstrom Airport will undoubtedly create additional impacts over the next few years.

Major parkland acquisition along the Colorado River and the ACC Riverside campus forms a partial buffer against intensive multi-family and commercial development along Pleasant Valley Rd. In contrast, no natural buffer exists between the Montopolis neighborhood and the growing industrial area along Ben White Blvd. Certain sites within the Montopolis study area and adjacent to it along the freeways have the potential for non-residential development. The proximity of the airport and freeways makes these areas appropriate for some non-residential development. As sites with direct access to the emerging freeway system become rare, however, other large undeveloped tracts may be considered as potential sites for non-residential development.
Neighborhood Planning Process

Stakeholder Involvement

The Montopolis Neighborhood Plan is the result of multiple planning and organizing efforts by neighborhood stakeholders with the City of Austin and the University of Texas. The Montopolis Planning process began with authorization from the Austin City Council to the University of Texas to create a conceptual land use plan to serve as a framework for more specific land use recommendations.

Upon completion of the University of Texas Land Use Study, the City of Austin began working with neighborhood stakeholders (May 2000) to build upon the University of Texas land use study as well as to identify transportation and urban design issues.

Regular bi-monthly meetings were held on the first and third Wednesdays in the community from May 2000 to March 2001. The Montopolis Recreation Center and Dolores Catholic Church served as meeting grounds for the process. The culmination of the planning efforts took place with two major community workshops. The first was held in September of 2000 and the second one was held in March of 2001. The purpose of the workshop were to refine recommendations on the proposed action items in the plan as well as to educate and involve new and existing stakeholders to the process.

Neighborhood Planning Team

The Montopolis Neighborhood Planning Team was representative of all stakeholders in the neighborhood. These stakeholders included: residents, non-resident property owners, business owners, renters, schools, non-profit organizations and other business institutions. Although over 130 participants contributed to the development of the plan, the following individuals attended at least 50% of all Neighborhood Planning Team meetings and as a result constituted the primary planning team.

- Myrtle Bashara
- Jim Crockett
- Mary Eichner
- Brad Joiner
- Linda Watkins
- Florence Ponziano
- John Stratton
- Kimberle Hatcher
- Susana Almanza
- Richard Castillo
- Estella Fabian
- Margie Garza
- Clementine Mims
Community Outreach

- **Community Workshops**: Three community workshops were held for the Montopolis Neighborhood Planning Area (5/23-25/00, 10/30/00 & 3/24/01). The last of these meetings in March allowed the community to identify opportunities for housing as well as familiarize all stakeholders with the final plan.

- **Institutional Involvement**: The Neighborhood Planning Team worked with existing institutions including various neighborhood associations, Austin Community College, Dolores Catholic Church, Allison Elementary and Advanced Micro Devices.

- **Additional Neighborhood Input Opportunities**: In December, 2000 a draft neighborhood plan was mailed to all residents and property owners in the neighborhood along with a form to provide feedback and to indicate their level of support for the plan. **Feedback Results**: The overall response rate to the feedback form was 6%. Of those responding to the ballot, 89% of the residents and 88% of business and non-resident property owners supported the neighborhood plan. This feedback form also identified those areas where further discussion was needed.
Montopolis Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montopolis NPT Meeting or Community-Wide Notifications</th>
<th>Attendance/Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 7, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Finalized rezoning recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Rezonings Continued to 8/7/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Continued to 7/31/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Notice of Planning Commission Hearing &amp; City Council Hearing</td>
<td>(June 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Postponed to 7/17/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Postponed to 6/19/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2001 @ PC</td>
<td>Presentation to Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Notice of Planning Commission Hearing &amp; City Council Hearing</th>
<th>(April 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2001</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2001</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2001</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice for March 25 Workshop</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8, 2001</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated Notice Action</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 2001</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2001</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Form/Ballot</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 25, 2000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 27, 2000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice for September 30 Workshop</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2000</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 2000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16, 2000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13, 2000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 2000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 2000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 2000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23-25, 2000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Notice of First meetings in May                                  | *            |
Neighborhood Plan Goals

The following Goals are the broadest statements about what the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan seeks to accomplish. These Goals are then expanded with more defined Objectives. The Objectives are then supported by specific, measurable Actions. It is the Action Items which will describe the specific steps for the implementation of the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan.

LAND USE

Goal 1: Improve the Quality of Life in Montopolis through Land Use and Zoning Decisions.

Goal 2: Create Homes for all Stages of Life within Montopolis.

TRANSPORTATION

Goal 3: Improve Transportation Safety in Montopolis.

Goal 4: Improve Transportation Connections within Montopolis and to the rest of Austin.

URBAN DESIGN

Goal 5: Respect the Diverse Character of the Montopolis Neighborhood.

Goal 6: Enhance and Enliven the Streetscape.

Goal 7: Ensure Compatibility and Encourage a Complimentary Relationship Between Adjacent Land Uses.
Montopolis Future Land Use Map

Montopolis Neighborhood Planning Area
Future Land Use Map: Adopted 9/27/01

Residential Uses may include the following zoning options: Small Lot Amnesty, Cottage Lot Infill, Urban Home Lot Infill, Secondary Apartment Infill, SF-4A, SF-6 and MF-6.

A comprehensive plan shall not constitute zoning regulations or establish zoning district boundaries.
LAND USE

Goal 1: Improve the Quality of Life in Montopolis through Land Use and Zoning Decisions.

Objective 1: Support the role Montopolis Drive has historically played as the heart of the neighborhood, especially from Riverside Drive to the River.

Action 1: Preserve the existing mix of zoning along Montopolis Drive, which allows a for a variety of business and residential uses. (Please refer to the Proposed Future Land Use Map for the specific land uses and zoning.)

Action 2: Establish a mercado, open air market, plaza or other outdoor public space along Montopolis Drive

Action 3: Maintain support and funding for facilities and programs operating out of the Montopolis Recreation Center, the Montopolis Neighborhood Center and the Montopolis Health Clinic all located on Montopolis Drive.

Objective 2: Continue to promote the existing neighborhood pattern of development with new and Smart Growth Infill development.

Action 4: The properties north of Riverside and east of Lawrence should be built out with commercial uses along the corridors of Riverside and 183. Residential uses are recommended on the remaining undeveloped land where permissible. Residential uses may include Smart Growth infill options and zoning designations that would allow the development of affordable housing. Appropriate residential zoning designations may include the following zoning options: Small Lot Amnesty, Cottage Lot Infill, Urban Home Lot Infill, Secondary Apartment Infill, SF-4A, SF-6, and MF-4. (Please refer to the Proposed Future Land Use Map for specific land uses and locations.)

Action 5: Create new streets, where possible, to enhance community access and connectivity.

Where possible, reconnect discontinuous streets and dead-ends, to improve neighborhood accessibility. Specifically:

Action 6: Carson Ridge should be continued to Thrasher and Maxwell, and

Action 7: Lawrence should be completed from Riverside to Montana

Action 8: Extend the established curvilinear street grid pattern into the remaining developable residential areas north of Riverside Dr. and east of Montopolis Dr. with short block lengths that average 400 feet or less.

Action 9: Create easy access from the Montopolis neighborhood to the Colorado River Park for cars, bicycles and pedestrians.
Action 10: Work the City of Austin, the Chamber of Commerce and other agencies to encourage the infill of vacant commercial land and buildings in the neighborhood.

Objective 3: Focus the highest intense commercial and industrial activities along Ben White Drive and U.S. Hwy 183. Airport-related businesses and services should be located at Austin-Bergstrom International Airport or along Ben White or U.S. 183.

Action 11: Zone the properties along 183 and Ben White to allow commercial or limited industrial uses along these major corridors. (Please refer to the Figure 4: Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.)

Goal 2: Create Homes for all Stages of Life within Montopolis.

Objective 4: Enhance and protect existing single family housing.

Action 12: Preserve the existing Single Family uses and zoning in the older, established areas of Montopolis. (Please refer to the Proposed Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.)

Action 13: Preserve residential zoning in the interior of East Montopolis to allow for new homes to be built. (Please refer to the Figure 4: Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.)

Action 14: Preserve Single Family zoning in the interior of South Montopolis. (Please refer to the Proposed Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.)

Action 15: Provide information in both English and Spanish to homeowners regarding existing methods of preventing increases in their property taxes.

Objective 5: Create multiple housing types of varied intensities.

Action 16: Allow "Small Lot Amnesty" throughout the entire Montopolis neighborhood as described in the Smart Growth Infill proposals, permitting new single-family development on existing lots of 2,500 square feet or greater.

Action 17: Allow garage apartments and secondary residential units throughout the Montopolis neighborhood on lots of 5,750 square feet or greater with MF-6 or less restrictive zoning. Other site development standards would apply, as specified in the Smart Growth Infill "Secondary Apartment" option.

Action 18: Allow "Cottage Lot" development - single-family units on lots of 2,500 square feet or greater with MF-6 or less restrictive zoning. Other site development standards would apply, as specified in the Smart Growth Infill "Cottage Lot" option.

Action 19: Allow "Urban Home" development - single-family units on lots of 3,500 square feet or greater with MF-6 or less restrictive zoning. Other site
development standards would apply, as specified in the Smart Growth Infill "Urban Home" option.

Action 20: Allow "Neighborhood Mixed Use Building" development – use of a single building for both commercial and residential uses – on specific commercially zoned areas on the smaller commercial tracts of land along Riverside Drive. (Please refer to the Figure 4: Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.) Other site development standards would apply, as specified in the Smart Growth Infill "Neighborhood Mixed Use Building" option.

Action 21: Allow Mixed Use Structures and other Mixed Uses through a Mixed Use Combining District on specific properties along Riverside Drive. (Please refer to the Future Land Use Map for the specific land uses and zoning). This zoning recommendations take the form of options along the south side of Riverside Drive, property owners will retain the choice of selecting a Mixed-Use Structure or Mixed-Use Combining District zoning designation to overlay the proposed base zoning recommendations. Properties along north Riverside will be limited to a site specific Mixed Use structure designation.

Action 22: Preserve the existing multi-family zoning throughout the neighborhood. (Please refer to the Proposed Future Land Use Map, for specific land uses and locations.)

Action 23: The neighborhood planning team strongly suggests that emerging developments east of Frontier Valley use the recommendations of the 1999 University of Texas Land Use Study as a guide for future development. The UT Land Use Study suggests a mixture of residential uses for this area. The UT Land Use Study also provides guidance for street layout, block size, a range of housing densities mixed with open space and appropriately scaled neighborhood serving businesses. In the case of larger scale development of the area, any proposed development should provide a conceptual plan with TND or New Urbanist principles.

Objective 6: Encourage property owners to maintain, and landscape their properties.

The following vacant areas should receive increase attention to weed clearing and general maintenance:

Action 24: West side of Kemp near 183

Action 25: Overgrowth near Riverside and Vargas

Action 26: Near the neighborhood center and Old Drive Inn

Action 27: Increase enforcement of No-Dumping regulations.
As per action taken by the Austin City Council on September 27, 2001, the Montopolis Community would like to see additional "reasonably priced" housing in the neighborhood. The Montopolis Neighborhood Plan supports the recommendation to rezone the Fiesta "Drive-In" tract to GR-MU so long as the proposed development for SMART Housing is constructed within a two year period and the projected financing comes through to make the proposed project affordable for the community. If the project does not develop the intended affordable housing, the Plan supports a full rollback of the Fiesta "Drive-In" tract to reflect single-family residential use for the site.
TRANSPORTATION

Accessibility, safety and mobility are key values that serve as the framework for this section of the plan. Montopolis will experience change, growth and development due to its location adjacent to the airport and to downtown. The neighborhood planning team supports the inevitable changes, in that, such changes will facilitate the movement of goods, the creation of new jobs and services, and other activities. The neighborhood embraces the opportunity to direct such changes and take ownership of their community.

**Goal 3: Improve Transportation Safety in Montopolis.**

**Objective 7: Improve pedestrian accessibility and safety throughout Montopolis.**

**Action 28:** Install a pedestrian activated crosswalk on Grove and Riverside.

**Action 29:** Insure that any new changes to Riverside Drive and Montopolis Drive, that are in accordance with the CAMPO 2025 plan, address pedestrian and bicyclists needs such as bike lanes and walkways.

**Action 30:** Install a crosswalk at the intersection of Montopolis and Riverside.

**Action 31:** Install more signs to better mark the school zone on Vargas Street.

Construct and repair sidewalks in Montopolis at the following locations.

**Action 32:** Maintain sidewalks between Santos and Riverside along Montopolis Drive.

**Action 33:** Install sidewalk along one side of Maxwell St.

**Action 34:** Install sidewalk along one side of Yellow Jacket St.

**Action 35:** Provide additional pedestrian oriented lighting along Frontier Valley.

**Action 36:** Install pedestrian oriented street lighting on the 500 and 600 block of Kemp Street.

**Objective 8: Improve traffic flow throughout the neighborhood.**

**Action 39:** Paint crosswalk at the intersection of Vargas and Ponca to reflect pedestrian crossing zones.

**Action 40:** Demarcate actual lane usage by designating a Capital Metro bus lane at the Ponca and Vargas bus stop thereby preventing traffic from spilling over into haphazard patterns along the throughway.

**Action 41:** Extend Frontier Valley to 183.

**Action 42:** Improve signage to slow motorist down Montopolis Drive and Riverside Drive.
Action 43: Add a four-way stop sign on Hogan and Grove.

Action 44: Add a left turn signal at Grove and Riverside (Northbound on Grove).

Action 45: Synchronize lights along Montopolis Drive.

Action 46: Insure that the future street network in South and East Montopolis allows for the development of interconnected street networks that provide access to neighborhood collectors while preserving the existing residential character of the neighborhood.

Action 47: The developing street network’s design should consider issues of connectivity for pedestrians and for other modes of transportation (bicycle, transit, vehicular).

Action 48: Upon completion of Thrasher and Maxwell Drive to Carson Ridge, the City should install appropriate signage or investigate alternative deterrents to prevent commercial cut through traffic or truck traffic along Thrasher and Maxwell Drive.

Objective 9: Reduce traffic speeds along Montopolis Drive and on neighborhood collector and local streets.

Action 49: Improve the enforcement of transportation safety laws and regulations intended to reduce injury and property damage. Emphasize enforcement of laws and regulations involving excessive speed, use of safety belts, alcohol and other drug use.

Action 50: Work with the Austin Police Department and Public Works to reduce speeding on Montopolis Drive and Riverside.

Objective 10: Minimize the amount of through traffic from residential areas.

Action 51: Install signage indicating no through traffic to prevent excessive traffic throughout residential areas of the neighborhood such as on Thrasher and Maxwell once they are developed to Carson Ridge.

Action 52: Replace missing stop sign on Thrasher and Riverside.

Goal 4: Improve Transportation Connections Montopolis and to the rest of Austin.

Objective 11: Work with Capital Metro to improve transit services in the neighborhood.

Action 53: If the Light Rail referendum passes, encourage Capital Metro to build a Light Rail station in the neighborhood so that residents can utilize its services and so that the route does not serve as a cut through route to the airport.

Action 54: Developing all transit centers near residential areas to be safely and expeditiously accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists.
Work with Capital Metro to construct covered bus stops/shaded structures at the corner of:

**Action 55**: Vargas and Ponca (highly utilized stop by children and residents dropping off their kids at school), and

**Action 56**: Vargas and Felix.

**Action 57**: Encourage Capital Metro to improve bus time frequency on the #4 Route and #350 Route.
URBAN DESIGN

Introduction
Urban Design Guidelines are different than other parts of a neighborhood plan. For Land Use and Transportation, specific, measurable actions will be adopted for later implementation. Design Guidelines are statements about the look and feel of a neighborhood. They will provide suggestions about how to improve the neighborhood through urban design. These guidelines will be developed as the plan is being finalized and might not be completed with the other parts of the plan.

Neighborhood Design Guidelines provide a common basis for making consistent decisions about building and streetscape design that may affect the character of a neighborhood. Adherence to the guidelines is voluntary. They are not intended to limit development with the neighborhood. Instead, they focus mainly on the streetscape – the publicly viewed area between the fronts of buildings along the street. This includes the public streets and sidewalks, front yards, building fronts, porches and driveways, etc. The Guidelines aim to guide building scale size and shape, orientation and site development with the streetscape.

GOAL 5: Respect the Diverse Character of the Montopolis Neighborhood.
The Guidelines document aims to reinforce the neighborhood’s diverse character by identifying the positive elements, patterns, and characteristics which define the neighborhood’s unique sense of place within the city. The Guidelines serve as a framework for new development providing suggestions as to how it may fit into the existing neighborhood character in terms of scale, mass, building patterns, and details.

GOAL 6: Enhance and Enliven the Streetscape.
The Guidelines promote the design of safe, comfortable and interesting streetscapes that help encourage walking, biking and transit use. Key to achieving this goal is creating a sense of human scale in the buildings that line the street, enhancing visibility from buildings to the sidewalk, and providing accessible, adequately sized and protected walkways.

GOAL 7: Ensure Compatibility and Encourage a Complimentary Relationship Between Adjacent Land Uses.
In the Future Land Use Map, the neighborhood has expressed a preference for increasing or decreasing the occurrence of certain types of land uses in the neighborhood. The Guidelines show how these uses can be grouped together to create a complimentary mixture of uses while being designed so as to be compatible with each other.
Implementation

By adopting the plan, the City Council will demonstrate the City’s commitment to the plan’s implementation. However, every action item listed in this plan will require separate and specific implementation. Adoption of the plan does not, on its own, begin the implementation of any item. Approval of the plan does not legally obligate the City to implement any particular action item. The implementation will require specific actions by the neighborhood, the City and by other agencies. The Neighborhood Plan will be supported and implemented by:

• City Boards, Commissions and Staff
• City Departmental Budgets
• Capital Improvement Projects
• Other Agencies and Organizations
• Direct Neighborhood Action

City Boards, Commissions and Staff
The numerous boards and commissions of the City will look to the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan when they need guidance about the neighborhood. The Parks and Recreation Board will have a guide available stating the neighborhood’s priorities for parks and open space. The Planning Commission will already know if a proposed zoning change in Montopolis would be appropriate and supported by the residents and businesses of the neighborhood. Additionally City staff will use the plan as a guidance document for review of projects and programs.

Department Budgets
Each year every City department puts together a budget that states the department’s priorities for the coming year. By bringing the strengths and desires of the neighborhood to the attention of City departments, the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan will help them prioritize those projects that help safeguard the neighborhood’s assets while addressing its needs.

Capital Improvement Projects
There may be issues in the neighborhood that require a major capital expenditure. In these instances the guidance provided by the plan will be critical to guarantee the project will proceed in a fashion that keeps in mind the overall long term interests of the neighborhood.

Other Agencies and Organizations
Other agencies and organizations outside City government will play a key role in the implementation of the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan. As these agencies look for public
input, the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan will be available as a clearly articulated vision of
the direction the neighborhood desires to go.

**Direct Neighborhood Action**
Some of the elements of the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan will be implemented by direct
neighborhood action, possibly with some City support. Neighborhood clean-ups, graffiti
abatement, and a citizens’ crime watch are a few examples of projects that might best be
accomplished by the neighborhood.

**Schedule of Implementation**
The implementation of the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan will be monitored. Some items
are expected to be completed quickly. For others, especially those items that need additional
funding, it may be harder to schedule a firm completion date. Nevertheless, the status of
every item proposed in the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan, the status will be tracked. A
check date, if not a completion date, will be set for each item. This tracking chart will be
updated regularly as more information becomes available and as the status of projects
change.

**Updating the Montopolis Neighborhood Plan**
Neighborhoods are dynamic. To be effective, a neighborhood plan must be periodically
updated to reflect changes in the neighborhood. The Montopolis Neighborhood Plan will
undergo regular review every 6 months. A subcommittee of the neighborhood planning
team will conduct this review, updating the status of the action items and considering
additions or amendments. Just as the full neighborhood planning team represented the
diverse interests of the neighborhood, the updating subcommittee should include
representatives of homeowner, renters, businesses and non-resident property owners.

Over time, a neighborhood plan may need more changes to stay current then would be
appropriate for a small subcommittee to make. How often this will be necessary depends on
how much conditions have changed in the neighborhood. Overall, it seems that a
neighborhood plan, with any needed changes, should be re-approved and re-adopted every
3-5 years.

**Tracking Implementation**
The Montopolis Neighborhood Plan Action Item Tracking Chart provides means to easily
check the status of the implementation of the plan. For each action proposed in the plan,
the chart lists the contact, the estimated cost, the priority, the schedule, the current status
and the next needed action. This chart will be updated as the status of projects change and
as new information is available.
Rezoning Issues

Montopolis Neighborhood Planning Area
Rezoning Issues: # C14-01-0060

NPZ
Neighborhood Planning
August 22, 2001

Existing Zoning: GR
Staff Rec: GR-CO
NP: SF-3
Issue(s): Former Landfill Site
Owner: GR

Existing Zoning: LR
Staff Rec: LR
NP: LR
Issue(s): New request by property owner.
Owner: GR

Existing Zoning: SF-3
Staff Rec: SF-3
NP: SF-3
Issue(s): NPT has heard this request. Prop. Owner wants to expand MH Park.
Owner: MH

Existing Zoning: SF-3
Staff Rec: W-LO
NP: SF-3
Issue(s): Previously in AO-3 zone & adjacent to school.
Owner: MF-3 zoning south of Ponca & CS North of Ponca.

Existing Zoning: SF-2, SF-3
Staff Rec: Due to pending negotiations between the City and property owners, staff recommends withdrawal of Tract 47 (a.k.a. Austin Jockey Club Tract) at this time.

Existing Zoning: SF-3 & SF-6-CO
Staff Rec: SF-3
NP: GR
Issue(s): Traffic circulation along Uphill. Only access is to Ben White.
Owner: CS

Existing Zoning: CS
Staff Rec: CS
NP: LI
Issue(s): Property owner requests not to be upzoned.

Existing Zoning: GR, CS
Staff Rec: GR-MU-NP & SF-3
MU would extend to first 200'
NP: Concurrent with Staff Issue(s): Neighborhood has heard this request.
Owner: GR-MU, CS-MU

Existing Zoning: SF-3
Staff Rec: SF-6
NP: SF-3
Issue(s): Neighborhood has heard this request.
Owner: CS-MU

Existing Zoning: SF-3
Staff Rec: SF-6
NP: GR
Issue(s): Easement has been vacated, thereby cutting off access to Carson Ridge.