



CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
January 30, 2012, 5:00pm
City Hall, Executive Session Room
301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX 78701

Current Committee Members in attendance:

Richard Hatfield
Dave Sullivan

Jean Stevens
Donna Tiemann

MINUTES

Other Commissioners in attendance

Jeff Jack (ex officio)

Citizens Advisory Task Force members in attendance:

Evan Taniguchi
Scooter Cheatham
Roger Cauvin
Mark Yznaga

Lori Renteria
Fritz Steiner
Jonathan Ogren
Ira Yates

Members of the public in attendance:

Steve Aleman
Tom Davis

Frank Harren
Lucy Galbraith

Members of staff in attendance:

Greg Claxton (PDR)
Paul Frank (PDR)
Gordon Derr (ATD)

Garner Stoll (PDR)
Matt Dugan (PDR)
Mike Personett (WPD)

Members of Imagine Austin consultant team in attendance:

Amelia Sondgerath

Commissioner Sullivan called the meeting to order at 5:05.

1. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: GENERAL

None.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from prior meetings were not available.

3. OLD BUSINESS

a. Discussion and possible action on Council Resolution relating to review of existing plans, sustainability indicators, and comprehensive plan metrics.

1. Review and discussion of map issues, with follow-up January 30

2. Continued review of existing plans, benchmarks, and indicators

Commissioners continued reviewing public comments related to the growth concept map:

- Multiple commenters requested removing the activity corridor designation from 51st Street west of Airport Boulevard. Commissioner Sullivan asked how transportation and other improvements were addressed through current planning efforts for Airport Boulevard. Commissioners their sense of the the concerns from the neighborhood. Commissioner Jack suggested adding a trigger for land use changes when transit becomes available. Commissioner Tiemann suggested creating a hierarchy of corridors. Commissioners postponed this item to give staff time to report back on current plans along Airport Boulevard.
- Multiple comments requested removing the activity corridor designation from Lake Austin Boulevard. Greg Claxton said that the designation was consistent with the Future Land Use Map and text of the Central West Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan. Jack asked whether it was necessary to include the designation, if it was already covered by the neighborhood plan. Sullivan suggested that the terminology could be the problem. Jack suggested including explicit language that it was consistent with the neighborhood plan. Commissioners did not take action on this.
- Commissioners discussed ways to connect affordability to the growth concept map. Lori Renteria suggested including affordability discussion in the description of corridors and centers, in line with existing actions in the plan. Mark Yznaga said that the key action in the plan was tracking affordability by broad areas of the city.
- Multiple comments requested removing SH-45 SW from growth concept map. Commissioners and Task Force members reviewed the history of discussion of SH-45 SW within the Imagine Austin process and the language in the draft plan reflecting the current status of SH-45 SW. Tiemann moved to remove SH-45 SW from the plan; Sullivan seconded. Tiemann, Sullivan, and Stevens voted to remove; Commissioner Hatfield voted against.
- Commissioners discussed comments from the Oak Hill Combined Neighborhood Plan Contact Team suggested that the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan and Imagine Austin were in conflict. Tiemann noted that the Oak Hill plan discussed preserving rural character, protecting watersheds, and developing a town center and transit. Fritz Steiner noted that opportunities to acquire large amounts of land within Austin were mostly gone and that a radically different form of development was the only way to continue protection of the aquifer. Ira Yates said that the focus should be on utility infrastructure, materials, and transfer of development rights. Sullivan requested that the growth concept map label the

Barton Springs Zone of the aquifer. Jonathan Ogren suggested that the Vast Open Spaces map from the Hill Country Conservancy could be a model.

- Jonathan Ogren requested that the growth concept map differentiate between current and proposed open space.
- Commissioners discussed what the plan should say about compatibility standards. Jack said that neighborhood were sympathetic to requests for increased density, if they could be shown how they would benefit. He said it would also help to clarify that the plan works with existing compatibility standards. Tiemann moved to include language that “The plan moves forward under existing compatibility standards, but acknowledge there may be future adjustments.” Commissioner Stevens seconded. Hatfield suggested tabling the motion until their review of comments had been completed.
- In response to a letter from the Southeast Combined Neighborhood Plan Contact Team, Greg Claxton presented staff recommendations to include a Neighborhood Center at Pleasant Valley and East St Elmo and discuss the existing Neighborhood Center at the Goodnight Ranch PUD.
- Staff presented preliminary work comparing growth concept map features with other geographical features, including city jurisdictions, proximity to SH-130, and environmental features.

4. NEW BUSINESS

None.

5. STAFF BRIEFINGS

a. Update on Comprehensive Plan process and Citizens Advisory Task Force
None.

b. Requests to staff
None.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Complete review of comments and return to centers over the aquifer, continued analysis of the growth concept map, compatibility, and South Lamar.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:00.