

## September 17, 2019 Zoning and Platting Commission Q & A Report

### C. Public Hearings

2. **Rezoning:** [C814-96-0003.14 - Pioneer Crossing PUD Amendment #14; District 1](#)
- Location: 3124 East Parmer Lane, Harris Branch Watershed
- Owner/Applicant: RH Pioneer North, LLC
- Agent: LJA Engineering (T. Walter Hoysa, P.E.)
- Request: PUD to PUD, to amend conditions of zoning
- Staff Rec.: **Not Recommended**
- Staff: [Sherri Sirwaitis](#), 512-974-3057  
Planning and Zoning Department

#### Question: Commissioner King

1. Does staff now support the PUD amendment?
2. What conditions will be read into the record tonight for this case?
3. Does staff have any concerns about the PUD amendment? If so, what are those concerns?

#### Answer: Staff

The zoning staff is supportive of the applicant's request to relocate uses on the site and to request additional height to develop a mixed use project along E. Parmer Lane, a major arterial roadway/state highway. Recently Samsung Manufacturing was granted up to 150 feet in height across E. Parmer Lane to the south through case C14-96-0007.01 by the City Council on May 9, 2019. East Parmer Lane is a designated Activity Corridor where higher intensity mixed use is encouraged in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.

#### Question: Commissioner King

Regarding the request for a 50% increase in height for tract RA-7, a 90% increase in height for tract RA-8, and a roughly 30% increase in commercial area to develop a mixed use project along E. Parmer Lane, what additional community benefits (additional parkland, subsidized affordable housing, etc.) is the applicant offering?

Is staff supporting these increased entitlements with no commensurate increase in community benefits?

#### Answer: Staff

The applicant is not required to offer superiority in a PUD amendment. This is an old PUD, prior to the 2010 PUD revision ordinance. The applicant is not changing any of the approved benefits of the PUD.

However, In this case the applicant has agreed to the following additional conditions regarding the dedication of parkland:

The following language related to parkland dedication be added to Part 13 of Ordinance No. 970410-I:

(b) Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a), the dedication of Parcel Nos. RA-10, RA-11 and RA-1 as a Trail and Recreation Easement, accessible to the public and maintained by the owner, to the City shall satisfy the City Parkland decision and parkland development fee requirements for Parcels Nos. RA-2 through RA-17 at the time of final plat; in addition RA-1 may have designated areas, not to exceed a total of 20 acres that will not be included in the easement, for (i) water quality and detention facilities and (ii) a private amenity center for residents of RA-2 through PAR-17 and not publicly available and (iii) RA-1 may provide shared parking for RA-10 (shared parking shall not exceed 3 of the 20 acres and shall be adjacent to RA-10 on the west side), and (iv) Austin Energy may utilize areas of RA-1 (not to exceed 7 of the 20 acres).

In addition, we have received the following new conditions from Environmental review, which the applicant has agreed to, that will be read into the record this evening:

1. Remove request to revise building setback allowances along Tributary #6 to Harris Branch.
2. Remove all references to golf course and golf cart trails from 2005 PUD ordinance 20050512-058.
3. Establish conservation easement for Tributary #6 outside the looped road - up and downstream of RA-8 and RA-9 to the extent of the 500-year floodplain
4. Revegetation of any disturbance within building setback on Tributary #6 shall be to 609S standard specification – Native Seeding and Planting for Restoration.
5. Retain impervious cover allowance of 25% for RA-1, reduce impervious cover on development parcels to retain total impervious cover area approved through Revision 13. Allow no change to overall impervious cover.
6. Increase width of conservation easements from the 100-year floodplain to the 500-year floodplain.
7. In Part 7(C)(6), limit roadway crossings to only two new crossings, in addition to the existing crossing at Yager Lane, as shown on Exhibit B. Trails are allowed in the current code requirements for trails in the critical water quality zone at the time of site development permit application.

The staff recommends the applicant's request for the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Pioneer Crossing PUD, with these conditions.

**Question: Commissioner King**

What is the expiration date for this PUD amendment application?

**Answer: Staff**

The PUD was noticed and received an indefinite postponement by the Zoning and Platting Commission on January 15, 2019. The staff's comments were cleared by the applicant through Update # 2 submitted on May 24, 2019. However, in June additional Environmental review was required and the case was

delayed. This amendment must proceed through Commission and City Council before Amendment #15 concerning parkland dedication for parcel W23 can be scheduled and considered.

**Question: Commissioner King**

As I understand from your reply, there is no expiration date for PUD amendment #14 since ZAP approved and indefinite postponement. Is that correct?

Has an expiration date for PUD amendment #15 been established? If so, what is that expiration date for PUD amendment #15?

**Answer: Staff**

Pioneer Crossing PUD Amendment #14 would have expired on June 15, 2019. However, it received an indefinite postponement at ZAP Commission in January.

Pioneer Crossing PUD Amendment #15 is currently scheduled to be noticed/heard on October 1, 2019 at ZAP Commission and on October 31, 2019 at City Council. It will expire on February 17, 2020.

**Question: Commissioner Denkler**

Why isn't an amendment proposed that removes the golf course as a use?

What superiority element is being offered?

I am having a hard time understanding why 2989 dwelling units equaled 13,819 trips and 3052 dwelling units equaled 18,508 trips? How can 69 apartment units amount to 4,689 trips? Are the applicant's estimates correct?

When was the last TIA or TIA amendment done?

**Answer: Staff / Applicant**

Staff: The golf course area was reassigned as green belt/open space/community recreation on the land use plan in administrative Amendment #13.

Applicant:

The golf course area was reassigned as green belt/open space/community recreation on the land use plan in administrative Amendment #13.

The applicant is not required to offer superiority in a PUD amendment. This is an old PUD, prior to the 2010 PUD revision ordinance. However, the applicant is proposing a mixed use development and they are requesting additional height along Parmer Lane, an major arterial roadway/state highway. The

current planning staff finds this request to be reasonable as Samsung Manufacturing was granted up to 150 feet in height across Parmer Lane to the south through case C14-96-0007.01 on May 9, 2019 and East Parmer Lane is a designated Activity Corridor in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.

The applicant is working off the TIA approved with the addition of Areas A, B and C to the PUD in 2005. DSD Transportation staff and ATD Transportation staff have reviewed this amendment and their comments have been cleared.

I will forward your questions to the applicant to see if they have any additional information to add.

See attached C-02, Exhibit A

**7. Code  
Amendment**

**[Atlas 14](#)**

Request: Discuss and consider an ordinance amending Title 25 and Title 30 of the City Code related to floodplain regulations.

Staff: [Kevin Shunk](#), Watershed Engineering Division Manager, Watershed Protection Department, (512) 974-9176

**Question: Commissioner Aguirre**

1. On the PPT presentation, Slide #7, will you please provide the locations of the buildings by Council Districts. I know we have a lot in District 2, and I would like to know which areas have higher risks of having buildings in the floodplain or if the risks are equal through out all districts. I like the breakdown of the types of buildings. Please continue to provide the same breakdown by district.

2. On the PPT presentation, Slide #20, it outlines a list of who you met with. Please provide the numbers. For example the number of neighborhood groups (I believe these happened first and I attended at least one), the number of Environmental Community groups, etc. Please provide a list of the groups for each category. For example, which Professional Organizations participated? Also, was there a sequence on which groups you met with first? Was there a strategy on who you met with?

3. I noted that the ERI (Part 12 and Part 31) proposes not including the floodplain. Please help me understand why that is being proposed. From experience, I know our Contact Team and neighborhood groups also look at that very closely.

**Answer:** Pending



## CITY OF AUSTIN

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (TIA) DETERMINATION WORKSHEET

APPLICANT MUST FILL IN WORKSHEET PRIOR TO SUBMITTING FOR TIA DETERMINATION

PROJECT NAME: Pioneer Crossing PUD (Land Plan Amendment No 14)

LOCATION: 3124 East Parmer Lane

APPLICANT'S AGENT: T. Walter Hoysa, P.E. TELEPHONE NO: (512) 306 - 0228

APPLICATION STATUS: DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT: ZONING: X SITE PLAN:

## PRIOR PUD LAND USES:

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

TRACT NUMBER	TRACT ACRES	INTENSITY	ZONING	LAND USE	I.T.E CODE	TRIP RATE	TRIPS PER DAY
RA 4-5, 8-9, 13-16	204.26	3058 DU	PUD	MDR	220	EQN	18,508
RA-2, 7	14.68	269.99 KSF	PUD	Shopping Center	820	EQN	15,104
RA-1	151.2	18 holes	PUD	Golf Course	430	AVG	643
RA-10	6.35	n/a	PUD	Public Park	411	AVG	5
						Total	34,260

## PROPOSED REVISED LAND USES:

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

TRACT NUMBER	TRACT ACRES	INTENSITY.	ZONING	LAND USE	I.T.E CODE	TRIP RATE/EQ	TRIPS PER DAY
RA - 1	150.56		PUD	Community Recreation	-		
RA - 2, 3, & 7	19.14	393 ksf	PUD	Shopping Center	820	EQN	16,531
RA-4-6, 8-9, 12-16	199.59	2989	PUD	MDR	220	EQN	13,819
RA-10, 11	7.09		PUD	Public Park	411	AVG	6
						Total	30,356

## ABUTTING ROADWAYS

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

STREET NAME	PROPOSED ACCESS?	PAVEMENT WIDTH	CLASSIFICATION
E. Parmer Lane	Yes		
E. Yager Lane	Yes		
E. Howard Lane	Yes		

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

- A traffic impact analysis is required. The traffic consultant must meet with to discuss the TIA scope and requirements.
- A traffic impact analysis is NOT required. The traffic generated by the proposal does not exceed the thresholds established in the Land Development Code. Mitigation of the site traffic may be required based on Land Use Review/Transportation Review staff review.
- X The traffic impact analysis has been waived for the following reason: Revised land use estimated trips are fewer than previously approved PUD. A revised TIA may be required at the time of site plan, depending upon final land use mix.
- A neighborhood traffic analysis will be performed by the City for this project. The applicant may have to collect existing traffic counts. See a transportation planner for information.

REVIEWED BY: Scott A. James, P.E., PTOE

DATE: June 19, 2018

DISTRIBUTION:

FILE CAP. METRO SDHPT TRANS. REV. TRAVIS CO. TPSD TOTAL COPIES:

NOTE: A TIA determination must be made prior to submittal of any zoning or site plan application, therefore, this completed and reviewed form MUST ACCOMPANY any subsequent application for the IDENTICAL project. CHANGES to the proposed project will REQUIRE a new TIA determination to be made.