

From: Joseph Crawford
To: [Sirwaitis, Sherri](#)
Subject: Re: Permit/Case 2022-078539 ZC
Date: Friday, September 2, 2022 8:45:09 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Hello Ms. Sirwaitis - Below are my comments for the proposed zoning designation. Please confirm receipt and that these will be provided to the Commission in their backup materials. Thanks again for your assistance.

My name is Joe Crawford, my wife and I live in one of the three residential properties immediately adjacent to this tract. If the proposed use can be accomplished under Limited Office ("LO") zoning then I have no objection to allowing this art school on the property. College and University Facilities are conditionally allowed under LO zoning, but the proposed user is not a degree-offering institution so it would need a variance to be allowed here and I have no issue with that solution. I do object to the property being zoned General Office ("GO").

As geographical background, several LO-zoned properties separate this property from 183 on the East. It is otherwise surrounded by schools to the North and West and single-family residential properties to the South. The existing buildings of the property at issue appear also to comply with the height, use, and setback requirements of LO zoning.

GO zoning would open the door to more intrusive uses that would not follow the City's comprehensive zoning plan. First - this property exactly meets the description of LO zoning districts from the City's Zoning Guide:

"Limited Office district is the designation for an office use that serves neighborhood or community needs and **that is located in or adjacent to residential neighborhoods**. An office in an LO district may contain one or more different uses. Site development regulations and performance standards applicable to an LO district use are designed to ensure that **the use is compatible and complementary in scale and appearance with the residential environment**.

This tract abuts three residential lots and so it is important that its development match the residential environment in scale and appearance. That is exactly why the LO zoning designation was created and this property should follow the City's comprehensive plan.

Next, the City has adopted 12 principles to organize discussion on zoning issues and when this application is reviewed with these principles in mind, the property must be zoned LO. It is a long list but the City has adopted these principles for this exact purpose so please do review each individually and ask yourself whether GO zoning or LO zoning is more appropriate.

1. Zoning should be consistent with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) or adopted neighborhood plan.
 1. JRC Comment: Neither of these appears to apply to the property
2. Zoning should satisfy a public need and not constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner; the request should not result in spot zoning.

1. JRC Comment: Zoning this property as General Office would create an outlier on the street and result in spot zoning. The South side of this street abuts single family properties including my own. Between the property at issue and 183 there are several offices zoned limited office. No other property is zoned GO on that side of the block. There is no reason to designate this single property as GO instead of matching the rest of the similarly-situated properties which are all designated LO. There are many GO tracts within a quarter mile that serve any public need for denser office space.
3. Granting a request for zoning should result in an equal treatment of similarly situated properties.
 1. JRC Comment: This would be the only tract on the street that abuts single family residential property and is zoned GO.
4. Granting the zoning should not in any way set an undesirable precedent for other properties in the neighborhood or within other areas of the city.
 1. JRC Comment: The proposed use is not itself an undesirable precedent, but other uses allowed by GO zoning would be undesirable adjacent to schools and neighborhoods. GO zoning allows general purpose hospital uses, rehab clinics, halfway houses and fast food restaurants. LO zoning allows some of these uses on a conditional basis which I would welcome, but the important difference is that they could be properly conditioned to ensure compatibility with all of the current uses in the area.
5. Zoning should allow for a reasonable use of the property.
 1. JRC Comment: The current use of the property appears to comply with the requirements of a limited office zoning designation so the zoning designation allows reasonable use of the property.
6. Zoning changes should promote compatibility with adjacent and nearby uses and should not result in detrimental impacts to the neighborhood character.
 1. JRC Comment: The property is adjacent to limited office, high school, early education, and residential uses. General Office zoning would detrimentally impact the neighborhood character by allowing more intensive use and uses like general hospital, group home, and restaurant uses that are more properly located at least one tract away from residential lots.
7. Zoning should promote a transition between adjacent and nearby zoning districts, land uses, and development intensities.
 1. JRC Comment: Zoning this property as General Office would serve the exact opposite purpose as this principle requires. Moving east to west from 183 this property should be zoned Neighborhood Office in order to properly transition between the districts and uses. Zoning the property Limited Office, while not serving this principle exactly, would at least continue the buffer of limited-office properties on that block.
8. Zoning should promote the policy of locating retail and more intensive zoning near the intersections of arterial roadways or at the intersections of arterials and major collectors.
 1. JRC Comment: The property is located on a road that is used almost exclusively for school and neighborhood traffic. Retail and more intensive zoning are located towards the intersection of the two collectors, Lake Creek and 183 to the Northeast of the property.
9. The request should serve to protect and preserve places and areas of historical and cultural significance.

1. JRC Comment: Not applicable
10. Zoning should promote clearly identified community goals such as creating employment opportunities or providing for affordable housing.
 1. JRC Comment: A minimal increase in office space in a neighborhood would only increase employment opportunities if the lack of office space were creating unemployment. The addition of two stories of office space would not increase employment opportunities when demand for office space is at a low point.
11. A change in conditions has occurred within the area indicating that there is a basis for changing the originally established zoning and/or development restrictions for the property.
 1. JRC Comment: Not applicable.
12. The rezoning should be consistent with the policies adopted by the City Council or Planning Commission/Zoning and Platting Commission
 1. JRC Comment: The policies of the commission state that limited office districts are appropriate for an office **that is located in or adjacent to residential neighborhoods**, and the designation is **designed to ensure that the use is compatible and complementary in scale and appearance with the residential environment**. This tract is adjacent to residential neighborhoods so it must get a zoning designation that will ensure that the use is compatible and complementary in scale and appearance with the residential environment.

Again I have no objection to allowing the proposed use on the property neighboring my house provided that it could be accomplished under Limited Office zoning. I would support any necessary variance with the Board of Adjustment to allow that use. My concern is that this will drive a stake in the ground and when more intensive uses are proposed in the future, my neighbors and I will not be given the chance to ensure that the uses are compatible with the adjacent school and residential tracts.

Please contact me at your convenience to discuss any questions or concerns you may have. Thank you for your service to the City and for reviewing these comments.

-Joe Crawford
10100 Hidden Meadow Dr.

On Thu, Aug 18, 2022 at 4:27 PM Sirwaitis, Sherri <Sherri.Sirwaitis@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Hi Mr. Crawford,

The applicant is requesting GO, General Office District, zoning to permit a Business or Trade School use (Gemini School of Visual Arts and Communications). Currently this property does not have a zoning designation. It was given an interim (I-SF-2) category upon annexation. However, it was never actually zoned. Therefore, to request permits the applicant needs a base district zoning to utilize a suite within the existing office building.

<https://www.austintexas.gov/page/zoning-resources-site-regulations>

The staff supports GO zoning for the existing office development at this location.

If you would like to submit comments for the Zoning and Platting Commission and the City Council's review, just send me an e-mail and I will include it with the backup material for the public hearings for this zoning case.

Sincerely,

Sherri Sirwaitis

City of Austin

Housing & Planning Department

sherri.sirwaitis@austintexas.gov

512-974-3057(office)



**HOUSING &
PLANNING**

Please note: E-mail correspondence to and from the City of Austin is subject to required disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act.

From: Joseph Crawford <> **Sent:** Thursday, August 18, 2022 9:11 AM
To: Sirwaitis, Sherri <Sherri.Sirwaitis@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Permit/Case 2022-078539 ZC

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Hello Ms. Sirwaitis,

My name is Joe Crawford, my wife and I bought the house at 10100 Hidden Meadow drive in May of this year. Our house shares a fence with the property at 12325 HYMEADOW DR, and I am trying to find information about the rezoning application listed in the subject line. Please let me know if there is a better way to ask questions or submit comments about the application.

Although we bought our house before the application was submitted, we are not listed as property owners in the application file so if any notifications have been sent to our address, the post office probably forwarded those to the previous owner.

I wanted to know first, will the proposed change be just for the school of visual arts or would it be permanent and apply to other uses? Our preference would be to have the school use approved conditionally to avoid more intrusive uses being allowed without further consideration. Also, is there a way for me to submit comments on the application before your office makes a recommendation?

I appreciate any help that you can provide.

Thanks,

Joseph Crawford

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.