

***COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE***  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**January 10, 2011**

Subcommittee Members: Council Member Sheryl Cole  
Council Member Laura Morrison  
Council Member Chris Riley

1. Citizen Communication (3 minutes to speak).

Jeff Jack, spoke about the impact of the zoning capacity analysis for the Zilker neighborhood and the inability of the South Lamar corridor to accommodate the amount of density predicted by the analysis.

Frank Herrin noted that the zoning capacity analysis quoted by staff would create a density of 7,500 people per linear mile. He said it is unrealistic to implement such high density within the next 20-30 years.

Pam Thompson spoke about the proposed disc golf course at Roy Guerrero Park and the need to preserve the area as originally planned, and the need for public input before any additional changes are made to the original plan.

Susana Almanza, PODER, spoke about the relationship between park planning and neighborhood plans, and the development of the Roy Guerrero Park, which had originally been envisioned as public space for the Montopolis community. She said there is a great need to preserve land east of IH-35, and there needs to be a balance between a park plans and approved neighborhood plans. She also spoke about the relationship between neighborhood plans and the comprehensive plan and the importance of public input.

2. Approval of Minutes from the November 1, 2010, regular subcommittee meeting.

Minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0.

3. Presentation by Capital Area Planning Council of Governments (CAPCOG) on Growth Assessment Report.

David Fowler, CAPCOG, presented a growth analysis that was prepared for the 10 county region for the next 20 years. The analysis addressed water resources and capacity, transportation, economic development and land use controls. He said population projections in Williamson County are not supported by the current water supply. The analysis includes water policies which recommend that counties pay attention to the existing water supply when reviewing subdivisions and future growth. The analysis also included land use policies, such as preventing leap frog development, and preservation of rural character and the natural environment. The transportation analysis concluded that the current transportation system threatens

growth of the region and weakens the economic competitiveness. There is a need to create a regional approach to address economic development priorities and problems related to job growth. The analysis also concluded that Travis and Williamson County will grow very rapidly and most of the jobs would be located in Travis County, which would present transportation problems with the job force traveling from Williamson County to Travis County.

Council Member Riley noted that he serves as the Council's representative on CAPCOG and the goal of the analysis was to raise awareness of the issues facing the 10 county region. He said there is also a need to discuss priorities with the legislature, such as MUD approvals. He added that the legislature should consider TCEQ's authority to approve MUDs when the local government authority does not.

Council Member Cole stated that there is an inherent problem of accomplishing things at the Legislature and there is a need to enter into discussions between the City's legislative department, the Texas Municipal League (TML) and CAPCOG to resolve long term issues.

Council Member Morrison suggested that the analysis be presented to the Comprehensive Plan Task Force for discussion.

No action taken.

#### **4. Staff Update on Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.**

Matt Dugan, Planning and Development Review Department, provided a summary of the outreach activities conducted to date, and noted that the plan has had good media coverage in the Austin American Statesman and also coverage on Univision to reach out to the Hispanic community. He noted that there have been a total of 15,000 participants to date.

Greg Claxton, Planning and Development Review Department, discussed the recommended scenarios and the approach that led to the development of the preferred scenarios. Scenario D generated 46% of the votes and Scenario C had 26%. The general approach to arriving at the preferred scenario was to begin with Scenario D and incorporate the strongest aspects of Scenario C. Scenario C was supported because of transportation and bike/pedestrian trips. The Plan Framework begins by defining what sustainability means to Austin and will include the strategic direction of the region such as water, land use, and public safety.

Council Member Morrison questioned how the preferred draft scenario will be consistent with neighborhood plans. Mr. Claxton responded that the sense is that the preferred scenarios and neighborhood plans will be aligned, but there are areas which may be inconsistent, such as the Franklin Park/McKinney area, which needs a neighborhood center to provide services to its residents. Although the neighborhood center is not addressed in the major land use map, they will continue working with residents to resolve any inconsistencies.

Council Member Morrison spoke about the importance of knowing where inconsistencies exist, and stressed the need for an in-depth analysis that would

determine where those inconsistencies exist. She added that neighborhoods that don't have FLUMs should be made aware of how the scenarios will impact existing zoning in their neighborhoods. She said it is important for the public to know whether the scenarios will present major changes to their neighborhoods or whether they are consistent with current growth plans.

Council Member Cole said she didn't want to delay the plan any further, and noted that further analysis would require additional funding. She questioned whether it would be possible to update information after the plan is adopted. Mr. Stoll responded that the primary tool for implementing the plan is the land use code. After the plan is adopted, the land use code would be reviewed to determine if it can adequately implement the plan.

**5. Staff Update on current planning initiatives.**

Council Member Cole stated she requested this presentation on current staff initiatives because very often Council gives directives to staff to engage in initiatives that require a lot of staff time but they don't give direction on which initiatives are priority or whether the priorities need to be changed.

George Adams, Planning and Development Department (PDR), provided an overview of the various functions and services provided by PDR, and described the current initiatives and master plans being prepared by PDR.

Council Member Code expressed concerned about the number of tasks given to staff without knowledge of the amount of staff hours required by each initiative or the budget implications of each initiative.

No action taken.

**6. Discussion on relationship between park planning and neighborhood plans.**

Council Member Morrison questioned how amendments to neighborhood plans are coordinated with the Parks Department.

Ricardo Soliz, Parks and Recreation Department (PAR), responded that PAR, is invited to participate in the early sates of the neighborhood planning process to discuss the vision of the Parks Department and to determine whether any park deficiencies exist. In addition, PAR reviews recommendations made during the planning process. Both PDR and PAR have developed tracking system so that every recommendation can be tracked as they move towards implementation.

Council Member Morrison questioned the process followed by PAR when it foresees changes to an adopted neighborhood plan. Mr. Soliz responded that PAR follows the plan amendment process.

There was discussion about the process for approving the park master plan vs. individual park plans. Ricardo Soliz noted that although the park master plans are approved by council, individual park plans are approved by the Parks Board, not the Council.

Pam Thompson noted that the Colorado River Park plan was not approved by Council and there is strong concern among the Montopolis and EROC neighborhoods that changes can be made to the plan without Council's knowledge or approval. She said that changes to park plans should allow public input before those changes are implemented.

No action taken.

Meeting adjourned at 3:57