



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, May 16, 2012**

**The Planning Commission Neighborhood Plan Subcommittee convened in a regular meeting on Wednesday, May 16, 2012, at 301 W. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, City Hall, Room #2016, in Austin, Texas.**

Commissioner Chimenti called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

**Subcommittee Members in Attendance:**

Danette Chimenti - Chair  
Saundra Kirk  
Dave Sullivan  
Jeff Jack – Ex-Officio

**City Staff in Attendance:**

Greg Dutton, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Review  
Margaret Valenti, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Review  
Melissa Laursen, Principal Planner, Planning and Development Review  
Kathleen Fox, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Review  
Sandra Harkins, Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

**Others in Attendance:**

Michael Clark-Madison, Vice-Chair, Urban Renewal Board  
Andrew Bucknall, Chair, Urban Renewal Board  
Tracy Witte, Swede Hill/Organization of Central East Austin Neighborhoods  
Penelope Doherty, Ridgetop/Harmon Triangle, North Loop  
David Hartman, Smith Robertson

**1. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: GENERAL**

- a. **Ridgetop Development** - Penelope Doherty, resident of Ridgetop neighborhood (in the North Loop neighborhood planning area), explained that the area has recently had many noticed regarding different types of pending developments. She indicated that many of these developments fall outside of what the North Loop neighborhood plan addresses, and so she would like to know if there was some other avenue to address the development pressures in the area.

Mrs. Doherty will contact PDR staff about next steps and getting on June's subcommittee agenda.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. The minutes for the regular meeting of March 21, 2012, were approved on Commissioner Kirk's motion; Commissioner Sullivan's second on a 3 to 0 vote.

### 3. OLD BUSINESS

a. **Neighborhood Plan Amendment Ordinance** – Melissa Laursen, Principal Planner, (512) 974-7226, will present an update about an ordinance amending Chapter 25-1, Article 16 of the City Code to amend the requirements for neighborhood plan amendment and neighborhood plan contact team procedures. This is a continuation from the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. (Discussion and/or Possible Action)

Melissa Laursen explained that Planning and Development Review (PDR) staff wanted to come back to the subcommittee for clarification on possible code changes to the Neighborhood Plan Amendment (NPA) process. At the March subcommittee meeting the Commissioners indicated that they would like Planning Commission to have the ability to initiate NPAs (both for individual properties and subdistrict/area-wide) at any time for minor changes, such as oversights, errors, or residual issues. In addition, the Commissioners stated that they would like Planning Commission to have the ability to give permission for an NPA for an individual property owner, outside of the regular application cycle, in areas where a Contact Team does not exist, as long as the property owner has shown an attempt to reach out to the surrounding neighborhood(s). Ms. Laursen explained that she had met with the Law Department and that the Commissioners could chose to have the code changes made to either the bylaws for the Planning Commission, or to the land development code itself. The Commissioners noted that while the bylaws are more flexible and easier to amend, that it would be easier for the public to see any changes if they were made to the land development code.

The Commissioners recommended making any NPA changes as both an amendment to the land development code and as a change to the Planning Commission bylaws, on Commissioner Kirk's motion, Commissioner Sullivan's second, on a 3 to 0 vote.

b. **Land Development Code Article 16 Section 25-1-805, Neighborhood Plan Contact Team – requirements** – Margaret Valenti, Senior Planner, (512) 974-2648, will give an update on the process to address non-compliant contact teams. This is a continuation from the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. (Discussion and/or Possible Action)

Margaret Valenti explained that all contact teams west of IH35 had been contacted by City staff with a request for bylaw updates, and that all contact teams had responded. Some of the contact teams currently have bylaws that are not in compliance with the City code, but all are working to rectify any discrepancies. Contact teams on the east side of IH35 will get bylaw update requests from staff in July. Commissioners Chimenti and Sullivan indicated that they would be happy to work with and contact teams that need help coming into compliance.

Ms. Valenti indicated that she would return to the August subcommittee meeting with an update on contact team compliance. No action was taken.

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

a. **None**

## 5. STAFF BRIEFINGS

**a. Urban Renewal Board, East 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Street Corridors** – Andrew Bucknall, Urban Renewal Board Chair, and/or Michael Clark-Madison, Urban Renewal Board Vice-Chair, will generally discuss their board’s mission and possible potential for amending the East 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor NCCDs and Urban Renewal Plan. (Discussion and/or Possible Action)

Andrew Bucknall explained that the mission of the Urban Renewal Board (URB) is to do away with blight and renew activity in the E. 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> St. corridors. The question currently is how to develop properties that currently are unused, in a way that satisfies the URB’s and Urban Renewal Plan’s (URP) mission and vision, as well as respects the wishes of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Michael Clark-Madison explained that there are many different documents that regulate the corridors: URPs, NCCDs, adjacent neighborhood plans, and HUD requirements. A recent market study, conducted by a consultant, suggested that all regulations be consolidated into a single document, making it easier for the public and developers to read and understand what is feasible on each parcel.

Some of the neighborhoods around E. 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> St. currently have concerns about the discrepancies between the NCCDs and URP, as the URP is set to expire in 2018, and some NCCD regulations are less restrictive than the URP. Sandra Harkins explained that the URP and NCCD for E. 12<sup>th</sup> St. are very similar and there are few conflicts, compared to the URP and NCCD for E. 11<sup>th</sup> St., where there are more conflicts. The market study (mentioned above) recommended letting the base zoning districts for E. 11<sup>th</sup> St. guide development in that corridor.

The URB understands that development in the corridors is a balance between the board’s mission of removing blight and the neighborhood’s concerns about the types of development, added density, long term impacts, etc. The URB wants to try to attract development that will benefit the area and appeal to surrounding neighborhoods, but understands that there are side effects of revitalizing an area, such as increased property taxes and traffic.

The present goal of the URB is to have a single unifying document that is clear and easy to read, that spells out regulations for the E. 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> St. corridors. The URB doesn’t want regulations to be an impediment to development in the corridors. The URB believes that the NCCDs for the corridors will have to be amended, but not until after the URP “one stop” document can be created. To that end, Mr. Bucknall and Mr. Clark-Madison indicated that it would be helpful for full PC to direct City staff to amend the NCCDs.

The Commissioners suggested that a presentation on the differences between the NCCDs and URP would be helpful for them to better understand the conflicts in play; Ms. Harkins indicated that she would be able to have a presentation ready for the July subcommittee meeting.

The Commissioners recommended putting an item on the full PC agenda to direct City staff to work on E. 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> St. NCCD amendments, on Commissioner Sullivan’s motion, Commissioner Kirk’s second, on a 3 to 0 vote.

## **6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**a. None.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Chimenti adjourned the meeting without objection at approximately 5:45 pm.

DRAFT