

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW SHEET

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN: East Riverside/Oltorf Combined

CASE#: NPA-2016-0021.01 **DATE FILED:** July 1, 2016 (In-cycle)

PROJECT NAME: Ben White FLUM Change

PC DATE: September 27, 2016

ADDRESS: 5016 ½ E. Ben White Blvd.

DISTRICT AREA: 3

SITE AREA: 12.821 acres

OWNER/APPLICANT: Ashley Gibson

AGENT: Brown & Gay Engineers (Steven Buffum, P.E.)

TYPE OF AMENDMENT:

Change in Future Land Use Designation

From: Commercial

To: Mixed Use

Base District Zoning Change

Related Zoning Case: C14-2016-0069

From: GR-CO-NP and CS-CO-NP **To:** GR-MU-CO-NP and CS-MU-CO-NP

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ADOPTION DATE: November 16, 2006

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

October 11, 2016- To close the public hearing and to approve staff recommendation of Mixed Use and Commercial land use. [J. Schissler – 1st; P. Seeger – 2nd] Vote: 10-2-1 [F. Kazi and T. White voted nay; N. Zaragoza abstained].

September 27, 2016- Postponed on the consent agenda to the October 11, 2016 hearing date. [J. Schissler- 1st; P. Seeger-2nd] Vote: 12-0 [F. Kazi absent].


STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Commercial and Mixed Use land use (see map below).

BASIS FOR STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION: Staff does not support the applicant's request for Mixed Use land use on the entire tract. Staff recommends Commercial land use on the road frontage of E. Ben White Boulevard and Mixed Use on the north part. See map below.

It must be noted that Obj. 1.2, R15 of the East Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Plan, which is highlighted below in red, does not support the extension of Sundridge Drive to Hwy 71; however, since this plan was adopted, the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan was approved by City Council which supports a compact and connected city.

***GROW AS A COMPACT, CONNECTED CITY
(Page 10 of Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan)***

Austin's long-term sustainability requires a fresh focus on redevelopment and infill within the city's developed areas. Favoring compact growth presents an alternative direction to earlier decades of sprawling, low-density development. More compact growth contains costs by capitalizing on the land and infrastructure already in place. It also enhances human connections, innovation, and urban vibrancy. Creating a more compact and efficient city is critical to our ability to connect people of all ages, backgrounds, and abilities to homes, jobs, schools, arts and cultural amenities, and other destinations with a more complete transportation system that is affordable to build, operate, and maintain.



Goals and Recommendations from the plan document related to the applicant's request:

Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods.

R1 Retain single family uses in established single family neighborhoods (NPZD; Neighborhood).

R2 Consider existing residential densities and current housing stock in future land use and zoning decisions to promote compatibility (NPZD; Neighborhood).

Obj. 1.1 Minimize the negative effects between differing intensities of uses by:

R5 Requiring strict adherence to Compatibility Standards (NPZD).

R6 Encouraging City Council to modify the Land Development Code to require compatibility standards between residential uses (including multifamily) and all office and commercial uses, (Neighborhood).

Obj. 1.2 Discourage additional through-streets within established residential neighborhoods. If through-streets are not constructed, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity should be encouraged.

R15 Ensure that Sunridge Drive does not connect to Highway 71 (PW).

Goal 2

Increase home ownership opportunities that are compatible with surrounding properties.

Obj 2.1 Apply zoning tools or options in specified areas that promote housing types which are traditionally owner-occupied.

Goal 3

Improve the appearance, vitality and safety of existing commercial corridors and community amenities and encourage quality urban design and form that ensures adequate transition between commercial properties and adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Obj. 3.1 Promote the redevelopment of underutilized properties.

R26 Support the development of buildings with both a commercial and residential component along the south side of Riverside Drive west of Pleasant Valley Road and along the west side of Pleasant Valley Road north of Riverside Drive (NPZD; Neighborhood).

Goal 4

Encourage a balanced mix of residential, civic, commercial, office and other land uses without adversely affecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Obj. 4.1 Apply land use and zoning tools or options in specified areas to promote a mixture of uses.

Obj. 4.2 Offer diverse commercial and office types to serve the retail and professional service needs in the community.

R32 Maintain opportunities for office uses on major corridors (NPZD; Neighborhood).

Goal 5

Enhance the transportation network to allow residents and visitors to travel around safely and efficiently by foot, bicycle, automobile and public transit.

LAND USE DESCRIPTION

EXISTING LAND USE ON THE PROPERTY

Commercial

Lots or parcels containing retail sales, services, hotel/motels and all recreational services that are predominantly privately owned and operated for profit (for example, theaters and bowling alleys). Included are private institutional uses (convalescent homes and rest homes in which medical or surgical services are not a main function of the institution), but not hospitals.

Purpose

1. Encourage employment centers, commercial activities, and other non- residential development to locate along major thoroughfares; and
2. Reserve limited areas for intense, auto-oriented commercial uses that are generally not compatible with residential or mixed use environments.

Application

1. Focus the highest intensity commercial and industrial activities along freeways and major highways; and
2. Should be used in areas with good transportation access such as frontage roads and arterial roadways, which are generally not suitable for residential development.

PROPOSED LAND USE ON THE PROPERTY

Mixed Use – An area that is appropriate for a mix of residential and non-residential uses.

Purpose

1. Encourage more retail and commercial services within walking distance of residents;
2. Allow live-work/flex space on existing commercially zoned land in the neighborhood;

3. Allow a mixture of complementary land use types, which may include housing, retail, offices, commercial services, and civic uses (with the exception of government offices) to encourage linking of trips;
4. Create viable development opportunities for underused center city sites;
5. Encourage the transition from non-residential to residential uses;
6. Provide flexibility in land use standards to anticipate changes in the marketplace;
7. Create additional opportunities for the development of residential uses and affordable housing; and
8. Provide on-street activity in commercial areas after 5 p.m. and built-in customers for local businesses.

Application


1. Allow mixed use development along major corridors and intersections;
2. Establish compatible mixed-use corridors along the neighborhood's edge
3. The neighborhood plan may further specify either the desired intensity of commercial uses (i.e. LR, GR, CS) or specific types of mixed use (i.e. Neighborhood Mixed Use Building, Neighborhood Urban Center, Mixed Use Combining District);
4. Mixed Use is generally not compatible with industrial development, however it may be combined with these uses to encourage an area to transition to a more complementary mix of development types;
5. The Mixed Use (MU) Combining District should be applied to existing residential uses to avoid creating or maintaining a non-conforming use; and
6. Apply to areas where vertical mixed use development is encouraged such as Core Transit Corridors (CTC) and Future Core Transit Corridors.

IMAGINE AUSTIN PLANNING PRINCIPLES


- Create complete neighborhoods across Austin that provide a mix of housing types to suit a variety of household needs and incomes, offer a variety of transportation options, and have easy access to daily needs such as schools, retail, employment, community services, and parks and other recreation options.
 - *The proposed development will have a mix of commercial, multifamily, and detached condos. The property is near commercial uses located along E. Oltorf Street and E. Ben White Blvd. The property is near Country Club Creek Greenbelt Park.*
- Support the development of compact and connected activity centers and corridors that are well-served by public transit and designed to promote walking and bicycling as a way of reducing household expenditures for housing and transportation.

- ***The property is located on the edge of an Imagine Austin Job Center and is located to the east of South Pleasant Valley Road and the southern portion Burleson Road which are identified as an Imagine Austin Activity Corridor.***
- Protect neighborhood character by ensuring context-sensitive development and directing more intensive development to activity centers and corridors, redevelopment, and infill sites.
 - ***The proposed development is located along a highway where the proposed commercial uses would be located. The proposed residential part of the development would be located to the north near the existing single family zoning and land uses.***
- Expand the number and variety of housing choices throughout Austin to meet the financial and lifestyle needs of our diverse population.
 - ***The proposed development would include apartments and detached single family homes, which would provide additional housing options for the community and for Austin.***
- Ensure harmonious transitions between adjacent land uses and development intensities.
 - ***Staff's recommendation of Commercial land use along the E. Ben White Boulevard and Mixed Use to the north, is compatible with the single family land use to the north, Industry land use to the east and Civic land use to the west.***
- Protect Austin's natural resources and environmental systems by limiting land use and transportation development over environmentally sensitive areas and preserve open space and protect the function of the resource.
 - ***The property is not located in an environmentally sensitive area.***
- Integrate and expand green infrastructure—preserves and parks, community gardens, trails, stream corridors, green streets, greenways, and the trails system—into the urban environment and transportation network.
 - ***The applicant said he would work with the neighborhood to create a pedestrian and bicycle access to the property from Sundridge Drive, which could add to the trail system in the city.***
- Protect, preserve and promote historically and culturally significant areas.
 - ***Not applicable.***
- Encourage active and healthy lifestyles by promoting walking and biking, healthy food choices, access to affordable healthcare, and to recreational opportunities.
 - ***The applicant said he would work with the neighborhood to create a pedestrian and bicycle access to the property from Sundridge Drive, which could create recreational opportunities for the community.***
- Expand the economic base, create job opportunities, and promote education to support a strong and adaptable workforce.

- *Not directly applicable.*
- Sustain and grow Austin's live music, festivals, theater, film, digital media, and new creative art forms.
 - *Not applicable.*
- Provide public facilities and services that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, decrease water and energy usage, increase waste diversion, ensure the health and safety of the public, and support compact, connected, and complete communities.
 - *Not applicable.*




Location of Parks in the Vicinity of the Property




THIS PRODUCT IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES AND MAY NOT HAVE BEEN PREPARED FOR OR BE SUITABLE FOR LEGAL, ENGINEERING, OR SURVEYING PURPOSES. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AN ON-THE-GROUND SURVEY AND REPRESENTS ONLY THE APPROXIMATE RELATIVE LOCATION OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES. THIS PRODUCT HAS BEEN PRODUCED BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF GEOGRAPHIC REFERENCE. NO WARRANTY IS MADE BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN REGARDING SPECIFIC ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS.

Capital Metro Bus Routes in the Vicinity of the Property



THIS PRODUCT IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES AND MAY NOT HAVE BEEN PREPARED FOR OR BE SUITABLE FOR LEGAL, ENGINEERING, OR SURVEYING PURPOSES. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AN ON-THE-GROUND SURVEY AND REPRESENTS ONLY THE APPROXIMATE RELATIVE LOCATION OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES. THIS PRODUCT HAS BEEN PRODUCED BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF GEOGRAPHIC REFERENCE. NO WARRANTY IS MADE BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN REGARDING SPECIFIC ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS.



IMAGINE AUSTIN GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Definitions

Neighborhood Centers - The smallest and least intense of the three mixed-use centers are neighborhood centers. As with the regional and town centers, neighborhood centers are walkable, bikable, and supported by transit. The greatest density of people and activities in neighborhood centers will likely be concentrated on several blocks or around one or two intersections. However, depending on localized conditions, different neighborhood centers can be very different places. If a neighborhood center is designated on an existing commercial area, such as a shopping center or mall, it could represent redevelopment or the addition of housing. A new neighborhood center may be focused on a dense, mixed-use core surrounded by a mix of housing. In other instances, new or redevelopment may occur incrementally and concentrate people and activities along several blocks or around one or two intersections. Neighborhood centers will be more locally focused than either a regional or a town center. Businesses and services—grocery and department stores, doctors and dentists, shops, branch libraries, dry cleaners, hair salons, schools, restaurants, and other small and local businesses—will generally serve the center and surrounding neighborhoods.

Town Centers - Although less intense than regional centers, town centers are also where many people will live and work. Town centers will have large and small employers, although fewer than in regional centers. These employers will have regional customer and employee bases, and provide goods and services for the center as well as the surrounding areas. The buildings found in a town center will range in size from one-to three-story houses, duplexes, townhouses, and rowhouses, to low-to midrise apartments, mixed use buildings, and office buildings. These centers will also be important hubs in the transit system.

Job Centers - Job centers accommodate those businesses not well-suited for residential or environmentally- sensitive areas. These centers take advantage of existing transportation infrastructure such as arterial roadways, freeways, or the Austin-Bergstrom International airport. Job centers will mostly contain office parks, manufacturing, warehouses, logistics, and other businesses with similar demands and operating characteristics. They should nevertheless become more pedestrian and bicycle friendly, in part by better accommodating services for the people who work in those centers. While many of these centers are currently best served by car, the growth Concept map offers transportation choices such as light rail and bus rapid transit to increase commuter options.

Corridors - Activity corridors have a dual nature. They are the connections that link activity centers and other key destinations to one another and allow people to travel throughout the city and region by bicycle, transit, or automobile. Corridors are also characterized by a variety of activities and types of buildings located along the roadway — shopping, restaurants and cafés, parks, schools, single-family houses, apartments, public buildings, houses of worship, mixed-use buildings, and offices. Along many corridors, there will be both large and small redevelopment sites. These redevelopment opportunities may be continuous along stretches of the corridor. There may also be a series of small neighborhood centers, connected by the roadway. Other corridors may have fewer redevelopment opportunities, but already have a mixture of uses, and could provide critical transportation connections. As a corridor evolves, sites that do not redevelop may transition from one use to another, such as a service station becoming a restaurant or a large retail space being divided into several storefronts. To improve mobility along an activity corridor, new and redevelopment should reduce per capita car use and increase walking, bicycling, and transit use. Intensity of land use should correspond to the availability of quality transit, public space, and walkable destinations. Site design should use building arrangement and open space to reduce walking distance to transit and destinations, achieve safety and comfort, and draw people outdoors.

BACKGROUND: The application was filed on July 1, 2016, which is in-cycle for applications filed in neighborhood planning areas located on the east side of I.H.-35.

The applicant proposes to change the land use on the future land use map from Commercial to Mixed Use.

The applicant submitted an associated zoning case on the property, case number C14-2016-0069, which proposes a zoning change from CS-CO-NP and GR-CO-NP to CS-MU-CO-NP

and GR-MU-CO-NP to allow for residential uses. Please see the zoning case report for more information on this request.

PUBLIC MEETINGS: The ordinance-required community meeting was held on August 11, 2016. Approximately 70 community meeting notices were mailed people who lived or owned property within 500 feet of the property in addition to neighborhood organizations and environmental groups who requested notification for the area.

After city staff gave a presentation outlining the applicant's request and the planning process in general, the applicant's agent gave the following presentation.

Seth Mearig, Director of Land Development from Brown and Gay Engineers, said the developer, Light Harvest Communities, does not have a site plan, but proposes to build multifamily uses, detached condos, and commercial uses. The applicant would be willing to have a conditional overlay outlining setbacks, buffering and restricting the location of the buildings. A TIA would be required if the development generates more than 2000 vehicle trips a day. On the frontage of Ben White would be some commercial uses. The apartments would be subject to compatibility standards and buffered from the industrial uses to the east of the site. On the northern part of the property would be the water quality and detention ponds.

Q. Are there restrictions regarding building near pipelines?

A. City code requires certain protections be provided for buildings constructed in close proximity to pipelines such as the one on the north end of the property. Within 200 feet of the pipeline, protective elements become increasingly more robust to protect occupants in the event of any pipeline-related disaster.

Q. Are there two tracts?

A. There are to zoning districts, not really two tracts of land. The land will need to be platted.

Q. Is your client under contract to purchase the property?

A. Yes. If the property is rezoned, he will purchase the property.

Q. What will happen if he doesn't get the zoning?

A. I can't answer that question.

Q. What about the Sunridge Drive extension?

A. The City is requiring us to extend the road, but neighborhoods usually don't want these road extensions.

Q. Why extend the road? Is it necessary?

A. Aaron from Light Harvest Communities, the prospective buyer, doesn't want or need the extension for his development. He would prefer a pedestrian and bike connection or only access for the Fire Department. Andrew Moore, the zoning planner, spoke about Sunridge Drive and traffic congestion in the area saying the more connections, the better. A variance

would be required to NOT have the extension. The City's Transportation Department would more than likely NOT support eliminating this extension.

Q. Are there drainage issues on the north part of the property?

A. All additional impervious cover would be handled with a detention pond.

Q. Would you have a recreational easement?

A. The developer understands the neighborhood wishes to have a recreational easement along the northern property edge to connect neighborhoods to adjacent parklands. The developer is amicable to this request, but desires the recreational easement to coincide with the existing pipeline easement and/or northern zoning buffer. Further verification may be required to confirm that the easements can coincide.

Q. Would the developer support the neighborhood's request to not extend Sunridge Drive?

A. If you write something up, we will get back to the neighborhood.

Q. What are you proposing to build on the site?

A. Retail in the frontage of Ben White and multifamily on the rest of the property.

Q. Would you have an entrance on Ben White? Are two required?

A. The LDC does not require two access points.

Comments:

- Sunridge Drive is used by families to walk with their children.
- This is a bad location for access to E. Ben White Blvd. It's dangerous.
- There are too many cars speeding on Sunridge Drive as it is now.

The recommendation letter from the East Riverside/Oltorf Neighborhood Plan Contact Team is on page 17.

CITY COUNCIL DATE:

October 13, 2016

ACTION: Postponed to November 10, 2016 at the request of staff.

November 10, 2016

ACTION: Postponed to the December 8, 2016 hearing date at the request of the applicant. [D. Zimmerman-1st; O. Houston – 2nd] Vote: 11-0.

December 8, 2016

ACTION: Postponed to the January 26, 2017 hearing date at the request of the applicant. [E. Troxclair – 1st; D. Zimmerman – 2nd] Vote: 10-0 [Mayor Pro Tem Tovo absent]

January 26, 2017

ACTION:

CASE MANAGER: Maureen Meredith

PHONE: (512) 974-2695

EMAIL: maureen.meredith@austintexas.gov

Summary Letter Submitted by the Applicant

Page 13 of 16

NPA- 2016- 0021.01
5016 1/2 E. Ben White Blvd

Neighborhood Plan Amendment

SUMMARY LETTER

Brown & Gay Engineers have been contracted by Ashley Gibson of Light Harvest Communities, LLC for the purposes of coordinating a neighborhood plan amendment application. The application intends to amend the Future Land Use Map for the East Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Plan, changing the site's designated future land use from "Commercial" to "Mixed Use-Office". The site is within the full purpose jurisdiction of the city and is called by conveyance deed (document #0893600289 O.P.R.T.C.T.) as 12.821 acres out of Santiago Del Valle Grant. The current owner, Azur Property Investment USA, Inc., intends to convey the property to Light Harvest Communities.

The proposed mixed use development will provide multi-family housing and retail/office opportunities, while maintaining a buffer with existing single-family communities in the area. BGE will work with city staff and the Neighborhood Planning Area contact team to ensure certain conditional overlays are provided that will adequately protect the character of the adjacent uses and the existing East Riverside/Oltorf Neighborhood Plan.

Summary Letter Submitted by the Applicant



June 8, 2016

Director
City of Austin Planning and Development Review Department
One Texas Center, 505 Barton Springs Rd.
Austin, Texas 78704


Re: Ben White Zoning
5016 ½ E Ben White
Austin, Texas

Brown & Gay Engineers have been contracted by Light Harvest Communities, LLC for the purposes of coordinating Zoning and Neighborhood Plan Amendment (NPA) applications to allow for the property located at 5016 ½ E Ben White. The purpose of the applications is to provide a mix of multi-family housing and retail/office opportunities to the E. Riverside/Oltorf area. The applications are internally referenced as the "Ben White Zoning" application. The property is within the full purpose jurisdiction of the City of Austin and is called by conveyance deed (document #0893600289 O.P.R.T.C.T.) as 12.821 acres out of Santiago Del Valle Grant. The property is currently divided into two zoning districts described Tracts 1 and 2, being 12.043 and 0.776 acres, respectively. Tract 1 is currently zoned CS-CO-NP and Tract 2 is currently zoned GR-CO-NP. The property is currently undeveloped and the current owner, Azur Property Investment USA, Inc., intends to convey the property to Light Harvest Communities.

The Ben White Zoning application intends to attach a Mixed Use Combining District (-MU) to Tracts 1 and 2 to the current base zoning designation to change the zoning from CS-CO-NP and GR-O-NP to CS-MU-CO-NP and GR-MU-CO-NP. The properties adjacent to the site are zoned GR-CO-NP, GO-CO-NP, LI-NP, and SF-2-NP, as evidenced in the zoning map provided with the application. The East Riverside / Oltorf Combined planning area Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the property for commercial use. Therefore, a NPA application is required to change the FLUM to allow mixed use on the property. The NPA application is being processed simultaneously with the zoning application.

The Ben White Zoning application team intends to coordinate with city staff and the Neighborhood Planning Area contact team to ensure certain conditional overlays are provided that will adequately protect the character of the adjacent uses and the existing E. Riverside/Oltorf Neighborhood Plan. You may contact me at (512) 879-8413 or at sbuffum@brownngay.com if you have any questions regarding this submittal.

Sincerely,



Steven Buffum, P.E.
Project Engineer
Brown & Gay Engineers,
TBPE Firm #F-1046




Letter from the East Riverside/Oltorf Neighborhood
Planning Contact Team

From: Malcolm Yeatts
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 12:48 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Cc: 'Aaron Hill'
Subject: NPA-2016-0021.01

The EROC Contact Team has voted that they will support the Plan Amendment for 5016 ½ Ben White if the Planning Commission will approve the Conditional Overlay proposed by the owner and the developer that vehicular access from 5016 ½ East Ben White to Sunridge Drive will be restricted to a gated access for use by emergency services (if this access is required by AFD).
















East Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Planning Area
Case #: NPA-2016-0021.01


This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning and Development Review for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

 City of Austin
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Created on 7/11/2016, by: meredithm


Future Land Use

	500 ft. Notification Boundary		Industry
	Subject Property		Civic
	Single-Family		Transportation
	Multi-Family		Utilities
	Commercial		Excluded from FLUM
	Office		



ZONING

Case#: C14-2016-0069





This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning and Zoning Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



Created: 7/7/2016





Citizen Correspondence

From: Susie
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 6:59 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Sun ridge Park community

Hello Meredith,

I wasn't able to attend the meeting this evening but wanted to express my concerns in regards to the possible extension of Sunridge to Ben White. I live 4 houses from Sunridge Dr. Our community is called Subrudge Park because it's tucked away from all the bustle giving it a quaint quiet park like feeling. Residents from the surrounding apts as well as my neighbors walk these streets with their kids and their dogs. It would be a tragedy waiting to happen if this road should be extended to Ben White. As it is, cars speed by Oltorf and even some down Sunridge thinking it intersects with Ben White. In my opinion, Pleasant Valley is a better candidate with it having the wider lanes and some sidewalks giving it a Blvd feel. Alvin Devane and Montopolis also serve that purpose well.

Sunridge Park is home to some native denizens such as deer, raccoons, opossums and many other animals. Where will they go? Please consider my thoughts. I appreciate your time.
Thank you!!

Susie Martinez, GRI
JBGGoodwin Realtors
512-636-9135

From: Susan Alexander
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 8:09 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Zoning Change Case C14-2016-0021.01 Sunridge Park Neighborhood

To whom it may concern:

I am a 15+ year resident of Sunridge Park and am writing to express my opinion of the proposed zoning changes and extension of Sunridge Drive.

While I welcome the zoning change to allow for a mixed use development, I am strongly opposed to the hazards that would be inflicted on our neighborhood if Sunridge Drive were to be extended through to Ben White Blvd. The streets in our neighborhood are wide, yet curvy and hilly, which is a dangerous combination. Wide streets are conducive to driving at a higher rate of speed than normally safe in a neighborhood, which I see on almost a daily basis, while curves and hills limit visibility. Increasing the cut through traffic from Ben White to Oltorf through our neighborhood, which an extension of Sunridge Drive would surely achieve, is the

last thing our residents, their pets, and their property need. It would decrease our residents safety and quality of life.

In addition, an extension of Sunridge Drive is unnecessary and a waste of money. There is an existing, non-residential, and relatively strait and flat road not 1,900 feet from the intersection of Sunridge Drive and Oltorf. This road, Alvin DeVane, is wide enough to handle increased traffic and is already a regularly used path between the main arterial roadways of Oltorf and Ben White. Did I mention that this already used road is non-residential?

My understanding is that the majority of my neighbors, and the developer himself, do not want the Sunridge Drive road extension and it is only an issue because of a requirement of the Traffic Engineering Division. While I believe that planning and rules are important, what is equally if not more important is to assess the needs of all parties involved in the development of a neighborhood and its surrounding land at the time of change. At this time of change to our neighborhood, not only is the extension Sunridge Drive not wanted, it is certainly not needed.

I appreciate you taking my input under consideration

Best,

Susan Alexander
4502 Ari Ct.
Austin, TX 78741
(512)589-9693

From: SBus46@
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 4:33 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Fwd: Street plans sunridge dr

From: [marcusmoziek](#)
To: SBus46@
Sent: 8/10/2016 2:47:35 P.M. Central Daylight Time
Subj: Street plans sunridge dr

Marcus moziek at 2903 Allison dr
I am apposed to any neighborhood cut throughs and opposed to the variance.
I am not able to make the meeting but stand in opposition with my neighbors.
Thanks marcus

From: SBus46@
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 12:29 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Street plans sunridge dr

Dear Ms. Meredith,

I understand that other neighbors have contacted you about this issue. I'm also a resident of Sunridge and I will be attending the meeting tonight at the library, but I wanted to share my deep concerns with you about the city's plan to extend Sunridge Drive through to Ben White.

My primary concern is safety. Cars and trucks already speed down Sunridge southbound, until they come to a screeching halt at the dead-end; they turn around and speed back down Sunridge.

Sunridge Drive is not a straight or level street. It has a blind curve, a steep hill, and 3 intersections, one at Wickersham Lane (whose stop signs generally mean nothing, not even a mere suggestion...). Sunridge Drive has heavy pedestrian traffic, joggers and walkers in the mornings when people would likely be cutting through the neighborhood rushing to work, and the same in the evenings, when people would likely be rushing home from work. Pedestrian traffic is not able stay on sidewalks exclusively because there are properties that have not been developed, and some homeowners have elected to opt out of installing sidewalks.

Keep in mind that if Sunridge Drive is cut through to Ben White, the only destination for that northbound traffic off Ben White is East Oltorf. Alvin Devane already provides access to Oltorf from the Ben White frontage road, and it runs, appropriately, through a commercial development.

A more thoughtful solution to building a well-connected city in this south/southeast corridor would be to cut Pleasant Valley through to Ben White, because Pleasant Valley is already a MAJOR existing north/south corridor that carries a lot of traffic across the river, along with Montopolis Drive and IH-35. Cutting Pleasant Valley through to Ben White is clearly a better choice than extending Sunridge Drive, which runs through a residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to the meeting tonight.

Sincerely,

Julia Diggs
2905 Allison Drive, 78741
512/385-3756

From: ggunn@
To: SBus46@
Sent: 8/11/2016 2:26:00 P.M. Central Daylight Time
Subj: Re: Street plans sunridge dr

There is another safety concern that I plan to bring up. I use Alvin DeVane to get to Ben White in the mornings; the vast majority of cars using that intersection are going onto Ben White proper, not the frontage road. Where the Sunridge extension would hit the Ben White frontage road is right across from the ramp onto Ben White. The only way to get from Sunridge onto Ben White at that ramp would be to cut directly across the three lanes of the frontage road, and you know that there will be people trying to do just that. It would be only a matter of time before someone gets T-boned.

Also, according to my Google Earth measurements, Sunridge Drive is only 39 feet wide, where Alvin Devane is 61 feet wide. This is another way the two roads are not equivalent.

Gordon

From: mvtaichi
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2016 11:02 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: EROC NPCT Meeting

Maureen, I am looking forward to meeting you and talking about the developments in the EROC area at the Ruiz Library on Thursday, August 11 at 6:00 pm. As an aside, I am generally in favor of these two projects, with a few qualms.

See you soon.

Mike Valescu
Sunridge NA

From: Moonbeamweaver
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 11:40 AM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Pls do NOT put thru street on Sunridge ref Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01

Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01

I have lived in this neighborhood for 24 years and watched the crime escalate in our Henry sector, seen monies given to other areas for parks while ours is ignored and now feel we will be punished further if Sunridge becomes a cut thru street to Ben White. This is a small neighborhood where the elderly walk and children play in the street as there are no nice parks like Violet Crown, veloway, shoal creek, etc.

Making this a thru street would endanger the children and elderly, be dangerous to all drivers as it is not wide enough for the cars that park on both sides of the street plus increased traffic and this would increase the number of robberies and break ins

and currently the majority of the streets feed into dead ends. I am not

totally opposed to the change in zoning, We are only opposed to the requirement that Sunridge Drive be extended to Ben White.

Sunridge Drive has steep grades, curves, and runs through a small residential neighborhood. We recently had to appeal to Ott, City Manager, to get multiple street lights repaired after several months of request and lack of action. It is a short street that only serves the Sunridge residential neighborhood and apartments, and does not connect to any other arterial street other than Oltorf. It is not suited as short cut between major arterial roads.

Alvin DeVane is a wide, straight flat street that runs through an industrial area from Oltorf to Ben White. The intersection of Alvin Devane and Oltorf is only about 1,900 feet from the intersection with Sunridge. Traffic to Ben White currently takes this route, and should continue to take this route. Alvane Devane does nit cut through a residential area, it is a current known cut through as well as Montopolis which is a bit furthur east on Oltorf.

The entrance from Oltorf to the large City View apartment complex is 100 feet from the intersection of Sunridge and Oltorf. This arrangement has already created a traffic hazard, because east bound cars turning left into the apartment complex and west bound cars turning left into Sunridge Drive quite often are in head on conflict. This situation will become worse with more cars trying to use Sunridge Drive as a cut through.

Please do penalize our neighborhood and make our residential streets more dangerous . Do not make Sunridge a cut thru street

Linda Yeatts
Resident

From: Malcolm Yeatts
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 9:20 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: C14-2016-0021.01

As a resident of the Sunridge neighborhood, I will not support the zoning change C14-2016-0021.01 if Public Works requires that Sunridge Drive be extended through to Ben White. This extension will destroy the residential character of this neighborhood, while not improving area connectivity to a significant degree. I will support the zoning change if there is a Conditional Overlay added to the property that prohibits the extension of Sunridge Drive. I am in favor of pedestrian access through to Sunridge Drive from the Ben White property.

Malcolm Yeatts
4811 Allison Cove
Austin TX 78741
512-385-1958

From: garypreuss
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 3:05 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen; Moore, Andrew
Subject: Case # NPA-2016-0021.01 and a request to open Sunridge Drive to Ben White Boulevard

RE: Case # NPA-2016-0021.01

Dear Maureen and Andrew,

I live at the southern part of the Sunridge Park subdivision and know about the request for a zoning change to include MU for the wilderness lot between Ben White and our subdivision. I am OK with the MU change. It is preferable to the previous land-use proposal for that lot.

I am in favor of opening Sunridge Drive to Ben White Boulevard, if development occurs in this area. With increased population in the area, continuing to restrict access contributes to unnecessarily long driving routes from one place to another.

For example, I live 1/4th mile from my church on Ben White Boulevard. I generally I walk there through the woods, but if I need to haul something there in the car, I must drive all the way to Oltorf and loop around. Google shows this to be a 2-mile drive there and more than 3 miles to return home. It is necessary to drive too far in every direction, because of the limited roads available today.

From the meeting at Ruiz last week, I am aware that vocal Sunridge residents (particularly in the northern part of our subdivision) would like to restrict access to Ben White Boulevard from Sunridge Drive. For those of us at the southern end of Sunridge Drive, it seems that the benefits would outweigh the cost of increased traffic. Besides, I believe that most nonresidents would continue to prefer the shorter Alvin Devane route than meandering between Ben White and Oltorf on Sunridge Drive.

So, my vote is to expand the zoning for the lot in question to multi-use and open Sunridge Drive to access Ben White Boulevard.

Thank you.

Gary Preuss
4701 Sunridge Court
Austin, TX 78741
512-444-4853
512-914-7848 (cellular)

From: EK K
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen; Moore, Andrew; Renteria, Sabino
Subject: Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01

Hi, Maureen, Andrew, and Sabino,

Please, see below regarding Plan Amendment case number NPA-2016-0021.01 for Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01:

I am against the extension of Sunridge Drive to the access road of Highway 71/ Ben White for the following reasons:

1. Sunridge Drive will be more dangerous for neighborhood pedestrians, pets, drivers, and bikers. Also, those entering Ben White or turning onto a new extension will increase car crashes.
2. Sunridge Drive road is not physically wide enough for increased traffic. It has hills, curves, and cars parked on both sides of the roads. Also, Sunridge Drive already plays chicken with City View apartment residents turning into the property across the street and gambles with speeding cars and busses both school and city flying and stopping down/on Oltorf's hills, respectively.
3. This road is NOT Alvin Devane which is a wide, flat industrial main street with a dangerously busy turning lane. Sunridge Drive is purely residential with an already dangerous intersection for vehicles, pedestrians, City View apartment residents/visitors, 2 bus stops, and bus passengers illegally crossing the 5 lanes of Oltorf to get to the opposite bus stop.
4. Adding a traffic light and pedestrian blinking stop light cross walk would make Alvin de Vain safer. Have you ever witnessed the morning rush hour, lunchtime, and end of the business day at Alvin Devane. It is DANGEROUS! Please, add these 2 items to Alvin Devane before adding a dangerous extension to Sunridge Drive.
5. An extension will bring more crime. As a single woman, I will move if this change happens because this extension will bring more awareness to this hidden neighborhood.
6. At least 40 Sunridge Drive neighbors protested the extension at the Ruiz library. They unanimously opposed the requirement that Sunridge Drive be extended to Highway 71/ Ben White.
7. Seth Mearig, the representative of the developer, mentioned that the developer did NOT want Sunridge Drive extended through their property.
8. Andrew Moore, the City of Austin Planning and Zoning staff member explained that this is a requirement of the Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department. If this is true, then why is Pleasant Valley not extended? Pleasant Valley is a busy mixed used area of residents and businesses.

Please, consider the above and my neighbor's pleas before extending Sunridge Drive. I will be happy to elaborate on or clarify my concerns. Also, I'm willing to give you a guided tour of our neighborhood on Sunridge Drive and Alvin Devane if you are available for a field trip. Please, don't hesitate to reach out to me directly.

Thank you,
Erin King
512.409.1525
2900 Sunridge Drive #1121
Austin, Texas 78741

From: Diaz, Gricelda
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 8:18 AM
To: Moore, Andrew; Meredith, Maureen
Cc: SBus46@
Subject: FW: SUNRIDGE DR WILL BE CUT THROUGH TO BEN WHITE... UNLESS...

Dear Mr. Moore & Ms. Meredith;

I'm a resident of Sunridge Subdivision and I am unable to attend the meeting on Thursday, due to prior commitments, but I want to voice my opinion on the issue addressed here. I am **totally & strongly objecting** to the idea of Sunridge Drive being cut to allow through traffic to Ben White.

Please make a note of my strong objection as this will affect my home directly and the safety of our neighborhood. My neighborhood is strictly residential homes and we like the traffic flow the way it is.

As it is, we have cars zooming through Sunridge Drive and this will definitely attract more of these irresponsible drivers. There is never police present when this happens and if we call 311 they take forever to send someone over since it is not considered an emergency. And I understand this, but please protect us from attracting more of these drivers by not allowing Sunridge Drive to be a through traffic street to Ben White.

The fact that it is a neighborhood with no through traffic is what makes it attractive, safe for our kids, our elderly and our pets. It also helps with break-ins.

Again, please voice my concern since I won't be able to attend the meeting on Thursday.

If you must cut a street to Ben White why don't you cut Pleasant Valley? It's already running very close to Ben White and is highly populated with the apartment complex.

Thanking you in advance.

Gricelda Diaz
2910 Allison Drive
Austin, TX 78741
Phone: 512- 389-5355



From: Diaz, Gricelda

Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 4:28 PM

To: Renteria, Sabino; Meredith, Maureen; Moore, Andrew

Subject: Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01 - Sunridge extension Ben White zoning

Council Member Renteria,

I am a resident of Sunridge Subdivision and I am contacting you in regards to the zoning change for the property at the end of Sunridge Drive. I understand that Planning & Zoning Department is planning on extending Sunridge Drive through to Ben White.

As a resident of this subdivision I want to make you aware that I am strongly opposed to this change. I am not alone, all of my neighbors are also opposed to this idea, as you can read in the Meeting attendance & Minutes from last Thursday's meeting at the Ruiz Library. The representative of the developer, Seth Mearig, also mentioned that the developer did not want Sunridge Drive extended through their property either.

Sunridge Drive is not a straight or level street. It has a curve with steep hills, and 3 intersections, runs from east to west and then curves south. Sunridge Drive has

heavy pedestrian traffic, joggers and walkers which will be affected by the morning traffic cutting through the neighborhood rushing to work & home from work.

Sunridge Drive does not connect to any other arterial street other than Oltoft. It is not suited as short cut between major arterial roads. If they take Sunridge from Ben White, travelling north, they would only get to Oltoft and have to turn either right, towards Alvin DeVane or left toward Pleasant Valley. They can't continue travelling north. Alvin DeVane is only about 1,900 feet from Sunridge. If you are travelling West on Ben White you would get to Alvin DeVane before Sunridge.

Mr. Andrew Moore of the Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department said that this is a requirement, however, we know for a fact that this requirement could be waived.

I, nor the Sunridge neighborhood residents along with the EROC Contact Team will not oppose the rezoning if a Conditional Overlay is added to the zoning that prohibits extending Sunridge Drive through to Ben White. I am also asking that the EROC Contact Team vote to deny this Plan Amendment change.

It makes more sense to extend Pleasant Valley to Ben White as Pleasant Valley runs directly north through the River and all the way North to Manor St.

Thanking you in advance for your serious consideration in this matter.

Gricelda Valerio Diaz

2910 Allison Drive

Austin, TX 78741

(512) 695-4690

From: Dean

Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 4:40 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Concern over Sunridge Dr Expansion

Hi Maureen,

I am a resident on Allison Cove near Sunridge Dr. I understand there is a plan to expand Sunridge Dr to Ben White, Blvd. I would like to express my concern and opposition over this proposal.

I have seen people barreling through the street. We walk our two dogs down Sunridge and we have to run across the street because cars come barreling down the road. There are hills with blind spots and drivers care less about speed and safety if they do not live in the area. I also fear it will bring more crime and unwanted activity with it being overly accessible.

Also please consider that semi-trucks illegally park along Sunridge all the time, the drivers take naps and keep the trucks on the street overnight since it is close to Ben White. I feel this will only worsen with the additional access.

Please keep this area RESIDENTIAL and not a cut through to Ben White. There are already 2 nearby options that are commercial areas to get to Ben White. There is no more efficiency or connectivity by adding more traffic just a few blocks to a family neighborhood. Being a well connected city should also consider keeping neighborhoods safe and not just add as many road as we can in order to cater to traffic.

Please do NOT expand Sunridge Dr.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dean Nixon

From: DarleneRipper

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 12:15 PM

To: Meredith, Maureen

Subject: Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01

Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01 I am an elderly, 87 year old widow.

I have lived in this neighborhood for 11 years and I walk around the neighborhood for exercise. I already have to be very careful on Sunridge as once the apartments were built the traffic increased, speeding increased and the number of cars parked on Sunridge really increased. Visibility is poor around the cars as it is a small street and often one car has to wait for another to get thru if cars are parked on both sides.

Also large semi trucks have started parking at nite on the street sides making transit more difficult. I strongly oppose placing more traffic on this tiny, already overburdened neighborhood, residential street. Cars can already cross at Burleson, Alvan Devane and Montopolis. Why do they need to burden this tiny street?

I dont feel safe in neighborhood due to crime , so why are you considering increasing our danger to robbery and aggressive road rage ? This would make it extremely dangerous for our seniors, children and bikers who currently use the street

Please do not ruin our safety. Do not make Sunridge go thru to Ben White. This would endanger automobiles on Ben White as people driving out of Sunridge would try to cross 2 or 3 lanes of traffic to enter the Ben White entrance to the expressway. How many horrific accidents would that cause?

Please dont do this.

Darlene Ripper
Very concerned resident

From: Dan Arnold
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 3:29 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: sunridge drive

Good afternoon Ms. Meredith,

I was copied on an email sent to you from my neighbor, Ms. Julie Diggs, regarding the proposed extension of Sunridge Drive.

I just wanted to take a moment to let you know that I fully agree with everything Ms. Diggs said. I won't be able to attend the meeting regarding this proposal, but I hope a more appropriate solution can be reached. Our neighborhood is simply not conducive to being a thoroughfare handling large traffic volume.

Thank you,

Dan Arnold

From: adrienne herring
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 11:28 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Zoning Change Case number: Case C14-2016-0021.01

Hello Ms. Meredith,

I was in attendance at the meeting at Ruiz Library regarding the zoning changes for the property at the end of Sunridge.

I just wanted to make sure the importance of our message is heard and know by all parties involved. We are not opposed to the changes in zoning. We are opposed to the possibility of Sunridge Drive being extended to Ben White.

It would be detrimental to our neighborhood if they wanted to extended Sunridge drive to Ben White opening up our community to such traffic. Sunridge runs through a small residential neighborhood. which only has access to Oltorf.

The roads are narrow and cannot support high traffic and It is not suited as a short cut between major arterial roads.

Alvin DeVane is a wide, straight flat street that runs through an industrial area from Oltorf to Ben White. There is also already access to Ben White down Alvin Devane.

My concern is safety of our neighborhood kids , families and dog walkers. As Sunridge Drive has heavy pedestrian traffic and sidewalks are not always available.

We frequently see cars unfamiliar with the area who are speeding through in search for an outlet only to reach a dead end.

I /we are greatly opposed to the idea of Sunridge Drive being extended to Ben White and think that Pleasant Valley seems like a more appropriate option as it extends closer to Ben White, does not travel through a neighborhood and already continues South on the south side of Ben White.

Thank you for your time.

Adrienne Herring
2909 Allison Drive Austin, Tx 78741

From: yvette carroll
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 7:06 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Sunridge Subdivision

Ms. Meredith,

As a member of the Sunridge subdivision, I am concerned that the city still wants to put in an extension of Sunridge to Ben White. At the last meeting, the residents of the Sunridge subdivision made it perfectly clear that we do not want this nor is it necessary. In fact, we clearly demonstrated that there is another more logical point of extension at Pleasant Valley. It's ridiculous to think that the City of Austin is not taking into account the needs of the residents of the Sunridge subdivision nor their safety.

Sunridge is a narrow street that has a lot of pedestrian traffic especially during peak traffic hours because most people in the subdivision walk their dogs, walk their babies or just walk for exercise during that time.

Making Sunridge a through street would create a dangerous environment for the residents of the Sunridge subdivision.

Please take into account the safety and needs of the Sunridge subdivision.

Sincerely,

Yvette Carroll
4703 Sunridge CT
Austin, TX 78741

If you use this form to comment, it may be submitted to:

City of Austin
Planning and Zoning Department
Maureen Meredith
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

RECEIVED

If you do not use this form to submit your comments, you must include the name of the body conducting the public hearing, its scheduled date, the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice in your submission.

Case Number: NPA-2016-0021.02
Contact: Maureen Meredith, phone 512-974-2695
Public Hearings: Sep 13, 2016, Planning Commission
Oct 13, 2016, City Council

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

CHRIS CANN

Your Name (please print)

2701 METCALFE 512-924-8742

Your address(es) affected by this application

[Signature] 9/12/16

Signature

Date

Comments: We are highly opposed to this proposal.

Edgewick has already overbuilt across the street and this unwelcome addition will increase traffic (this is a school zone with children) create more pollution and congestion. Edgewick has already tried to make Carlson Rd a private street even though it is a PUBLIC street that our exorbitant tax dollars pay for. Stop the MADNESS! Does every square inch of Austin have to be soulless

greedy condos?? NO!

From: yvette carroll
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 7:06 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Sunridge Subdivision

Ms. Meredith,

As a member of the Sunridge subdivision, I am concerned that the city still wants to put in an extension of Sunridge to Ben White. At the last meeting, the residents of the Sunridge subdivision made it perfectly clear that we do not want this nor is it necessary. In fact, we clearly demonstrated that there is another more logical point of extension at Pleasant Valley. It's ridiculous to think that the City of Austin is not taking into account the needs of the residents of the Sunridge subdivision nor their safety.

Sunridge is a narrow street that has a lot of pedestrian traffic especially during peak traffic hours because most people in the subdivision walk their dogs, walk their babies or just walk for exercise during that time.

Making Sunridge a through street would create a dangerous environment for the residents of the Sunridge subdivision.

Please take into account the safety and needs of the Sunridge subdivision.

Sincerely,

Yvette Carroll
4703 Sunridge CT

-----Original Message-----

From: Casino
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 12:55 PM
To: Meredith, Maureen
Subject: sunridge extention: C14-2016-0069-5016 1/2 E. Ben White Staff Report PC 9-27

Dear Ms. Meredith,

I am writing to express my opposition to the planned extension of Sunridge Drive. Such a plan is unnecessary since Alvin Devane already provides a connection with Ben White Blvd. I also believe that a Sunridge Dr that runs through to Ben White will lead to increase in crime as criminals will have an easy escape route through our neighborhood. Traffic accidents will increase and pedestrians will be endangered. I have been to the meetings on the proposed development at the end of Sunridge Dr and know that the developer is also in favor of no extension as well. If the city feels we absolutely must have more "connectivity", an extension of Pleasant Valley would make much more sense since it is already a major thoroughfare. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Paul Eighmey
4700 Sunridge Court
Austin, TX 78741
512-626-6371

From: Sam Lee
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 1:12 PM
To: Moore, Andrew; Meredith, Maureen
Subject: Potential Sunridge Drive Development

To whom it may concern,

I am an Allison Drive resident and have gotten wind of the plan to develop Sunridge Dr. to Ben White.

I am disappointed in these plans for a multitude of reasons and I'm sure many tax payers have already listed many.

Another reason why this decision does not make sense is the calculation of distance. **The distance from Oltorf/Sunridge Dr. to Ben White would be approximately .7 miles. The same distance from Oltorf/Sunridge to Ben White/Alvin Devane.** There is no advantage to take Sunridge vs Alvin Devane. In fact it would be way more dangerous because of all the sharp turns, a blind intersection, foot traffic, cars parked on the street, dogs, young children, and many more. Alvin Devane has NONE of that.

I drive down Alvan Devane during the heart of rush hour and never have to wait more than 1 minute to pull out onto Ben White.

I would hate to see a serious injury on the Wickersham/Sunridge stop sign and I would think we would all agree that we would not want that to happen on your and our tax paying watches. That intersection is very tough to see either way and someone speeding through Sunridge would sure to cause an accident in due time. It's just a matter of when.

I hope you take this into consideration. I respect the cities planning committee and know there can be another alternative or if one is needed at all.

Thanks for your time.

Samuel Lee
Allison Drive Resident

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

Provide this information with your plan amendment application.

Taken From: Article 16: Neighborhood Plan Amendment Ordinance

§ 25-1-810 - RECOMMENDATION CRITERIA.

(A) The director may not recommend approval of a neighborhood plan amendment unless the requirements of Subsections (B) and (C) are satisfied.

(B) The applicant must demonstrate that:

- (1) the proposed amendment is appropriate because of a mapping or textual error or omission made when the original plan was adopted or during subsequent amendments;

Does this criterion apply to your proposed plan amendment application? ___ Yes x No

If there was a mapping error, explain here and provide documentation: _____

- (2) the denial of the proposed amendment would jeopardize public health, safety, or welfare;

Does this criterion apply to your application? ___ Yes x No

If this condition applies, explain here _____

- (3) the proposed amendment is appropriate:

(a) because of a material change in circumstances since the adoption of the plan; and

(b) denial would result in a hardship to the applicant;

Does this criteria apply to your application? x Yes ___ No

If yes, explain here This portion of the neighborhood is in need of multifamily housing opportunities. The NPA at the time of latest revision, did not consider the excellent opportunity to provide said housing along the Ben White corridor. Denial of the change would prevent the applicant from providing said multifamily housing opportunities in this area.

- (4) the proposed project:

(a) provides environmental protection that is superior to the protection that would otherwise be achieved under existing zoning and development regulations;

Does this criterion apply to your application? ___ Yes x No

If yes, explain here _____

or

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

(b) promotes the recruitment or retention of an employment center with 100 or more employees;

Does either one of these criterion apply to your application? ____ Yes x No

If yes, explain here _____

(5) the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and objectives of the neighborhood plan;

List the goals and objectives from the plan that you feel support your plan amendment request, along with your rationale for why it meets these goals/objectives. Use separate document if necessary:

Applicant team has contacted the NPA Contact Team which supports the FLUM change.
Rezoning meets the "Vision and Goals" of the Neighborhood Plan. Goals met: Items 1,3, 4, 8,
and specifically item 12 of the vision and goals (attached).

(Reference the plan document here: <http://austintexas.gov/page/adopted-neighborhood-planning-areas-0>)

or

(6) the proposed amendment promotes additional S.M.A.R.T. Housing opportunities.

Is this a S.M.A.R.T. Housing project? ____ Yes x No

If yes, explain here and provide the letter from Neighborhood Housing and Community Development _____

(C) The applicant must demonstrate that:

(1) the proposed amendment complies with applicable regulations and standards established by Title 25 (Land Development), the objectives of Chapter 25-2 (Zoning), and the purposes of the zoning district proposed for the subject property;

https://www.municode.com/library/tx/austin/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT25LADE

All future development of subject tract will fall under regulations current at the time of application. Proposed FLUM change allows zoning which provides a transition between the commercial and single family intensive uses. Also the change would permit a more complatible residential use (multifamily) adjacent to the single family district to the north of the property.

and

(2) the proposed amendment is consistent with sound planning principles. (See attached)

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

LAND USE PLANNING PRINCIPLES

You can find the Guide to Land Use Standards here:

<http://www.austintexas.gov/department/neighborhood-planning-resources>

Please **DESCRIBE** how your proposed plan amendment request will meet these principles. If you believe a principle does not apply to your proposed plan amendment application, write "Not applicable".

1. Ensure that the decision will not create an arbitrary development pattern;

Provide your analysis here: The plan amendment allows for transitional zoning and flexibility of use for the property in between the adjacent commercial / industrial properties and the single family neighborhoods.

2. Ensure an adequate and diverse supply of housing for all income levels;

Provide your analysis here: Not Applicable

3. Minimize negative effects between incompatible land uses;

Provide your analysis here: The FLUM update enhances transitional zoning and compatibility of uses in between adjacent lands

4. Recognize suitable areas for public uses, such as hospitals and schools that will minimize the impacts to residential areas;

Provide your analysis here: Not Applicable

5. Discourage intense uses within or adjacent to residential areas;

Provide your analysis here: FLUM change allows for residential / residential compatibility. Existing zoning offsets / transitions on property further protect adjacent single family residences from any development.

6. Ensure neighborhood businesses are planned to minimize adverse effects to the neighborhood;

Provide your analysis here: Neighborhood business to be regulated by zoning and conditional overlays which limit business types to those approved by council.

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

7. Minimize development in floodplains and environmentally sensitive areas;

Provide your analysis here: Not Applicable – there is no floodplain onsite and stormwater mitigation is applicable under current code.

8. Promote goals that provide additional environmental protection;

Provide your analysis here: Not applicable – current regulations apply.

9. Consider regulations that address public safety as they pertain to future developments (e.g. overlay zones, pipeline ordinances that limit residential development);

Provide your analysis here: Not applicable – current regulations apply.

10. Ensure adequate transition between adjacent land uses and development intensities;

Provide your analysis here: The mixed use land use provides transition between the industrial and commercial uses to the south and the single family residential uses to the north.

11. Protect and promote historically and culturally significant areas;

Provide your analysis here: Not Applicable

12. Recognize current City Council priorities; (Look at the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan Document found here: <http://austintexas.gov/department/imagine-austin-download-center>. Appendix E. Framework for Decision Making, pages A-57 through A-58.)

Provide your analysis here: Zoning and Land Use change would be livable by providing retail or services and connectivity within half a mile.

13. Avoid creating undesirable precedents;

Provide your analysis here: Current precedent is established in Subchapter E via the “Opt-In” process. Multifamily is an allowed use in CS based zoning districts when on XXXX Roadways. Nevertheless, the proposed use still requires a FLUM change.

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

14. Promote expansion of the economic base and create job opportunities;

Provide your analysis here: Retail and management jobs related to commercial / residential mixed use would be permitted with zoning and FLUM change. Additional housing provides needed housing availability.

15. Ensure similar treatment of land use decisions on similar properties;

Provide your analysis here: Mixed use is allowed as a standard for CS based districts on XX Roadways. In this NPA, a FLUM change is required to permit the use.

16. Balance individual property rights with community interests and goals;

Provide your analysis here: Housing and jobs to be provided via mixed use land use designation.

17. Consider infrastructure when making land use decisions;

Provide your analysis here: Infrastructure currently available surrounding the project area.

18. Promote development that serves the needs of a diverse population.

Provide your analysis here: Housing and jobs to be provided via mixed use land use designation.

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

East Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Plan

Vision and Goals

Vision

We who live, work and own property in the East Riverside/Oltorf Area wish to preserve and improve the quality of life in our residential neighborhoods, honor the cultural diversity of our residents, be good stewards of the natural environment, support the success of our locally owned businesses and major employers, and build and maintain a strong sense of community.

Goals

1. Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods.
2. Increase home ownership opportunities that are compatible with surrounding properties.
3. Improve the appearance, vitality and safety of existing commercial corridors and community amenities and encourage quality urban design and form that ensures adequate transition between commercial properties and adjacent residential neighborhoods.
4. Encourage a balanced mix of residential, civic, commercial, office and other land uses without adversely affecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.
5. Enhance the transportation network to allow residents and visitors to get around safely and efficiently by foot, bicycle, automobile and public transit.
6. Protect and enhance the Town Lake Waterfront as well as creek areas and other natural amenities.
7. Preserve and enhance existing parks, the 18-hole Riverside Golf Course and other open spaces and create opportunities for additional public open space.
8. Provide affordable housing opportunities through redevelopment of existing multifamily developments.

Applicant Criteria Worksheet Submitted by the Applicant

9. Create interesting, lively, inviting, attractive, safe and comfortable non-residential environments that will encourage walking, biking and transit use and be appealing to passing motorists.
10. Create convenient and accessible parking areas that do not dominate the environment and provide safe interaction between vehicles and pedestrians.
11. Encourage urban design strategies for single-family neighborhoods that preserve, complement and enhance existing character.
12. Promote multifamily structures that relate well to the surrounding environment, utilize a variety of building forms, have a thoughtful parking scheme, provide public open space and include a variety of appropriate landscape options.
13. Minimize the visual impact of industrial properties from other districts and public spaces in the neighborhood planning area.