



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Jolene Kiolbassa, Chair, and Members of the Zoning and Platting Commission

**FROM:** Christopher S. Herrington, P.E., Interim Environmental Officer  
Watershed Protection Department

**DATE:** September 26, 2018

**SUBJECT:** Camelback Planned Unit Development – C814-86-023.01

This memo provides a status update on environmental protection issues associated with the proposed amendment of the Camelback Planned Unit Development (PUD), including consideration of the conditions recommended by the Environmental Commission on September 19, 2018. Additionally, this memo contains as an attachment a presentation summarizing the project and the comparisons between the existing PUD and the proposed PUD along with staff recommendations.

The proposed PUD contains elements that are both environmentally superior as well as elements that are not environmentally superior relative to the existing PUD. Considering the full range of potential positive and negative impacts, staff finds that the proposed development would be environmentally superior to what could be built without the amendment to the PUD.

### Superior Project Elements

The following items are superior in the proposed PUD amendment relative to the entitlements of the existing 1987 PUD:

1. The proposed PUD will provide at least 60.46 acres of permanently protected open space and 26.16 acres of dedicated park land, more than would be required under either the existing PUD or current code.
2. Impervious cover for the proposed PUD is capped at 21.86 acres and, including the proposed 2 acre reduction of impervious cover for the Champions Tract 3, is less overall impervious cover than the existing PUD and the existing development planned for Champions Tract 3.
3. Development within the PUD will comply with current tree protection and mitigation, except for the removal of six identified trees which, pending confirmation by the City Arborist, have been found by an arborist to be dead, diseased or dying.
4. The proposed PUD will provide protection for most critical environmental features (CEF). CEFs were not required to be protected under the existing PUD. Although some

features have modified buffers and one karst feature is not protected, the overall buffer area is equivalent to the buffer area under current code.

5. The proposed PUD will treat 100% of the required stormwater runoff volume for water quality per current Land Development Code requirements, 75% of which will be treated through distributed green stormwater control measures. No water quality treatment is required under the existing PUD.
6. Public roadway and private drives shall clear span the 10-year storm elevation when crossing a waterway with a drainage area of more than 32 acres. This exceeds current code requirements.
7. Street crossings of the critical water quality zone shall span the 10-year storm elevation. This exceeds current code requirements.
8. An Integrated Pest Management Plan will be submitted for approval with each site plan application. All property owners within the PUD shall receive copies of the plan.
9. Outdoor lighting on the proposed PUD will be designed to incorporate dark sky lighting techniques.
10. An Austin Green Building rating of three stars or above will be achieved for all buildings in the proposed PUD.
11. All commercial buildings in the proposed PUD shall utilize non-potable water sources for irrigation of the building grounds, and air conditioner condensate for commercial buildings shall be directed to cisterns or landscaping on site for beneficial use.
12. Design of the dock facilities and dock access shall consider input from a design charrette made up of a group approved by the City and the developer to ensure the structure is protective of the environment and minimizes adverse visual aesthetic impacts.
13. Sewage lift stations within the Dock District shall include an emergency overflow tank and provide an oversized wet well to reduce the potential for sanitary sewer overflows to Lake Austin.

While not superior, the applicant will comply with current drainage, erosion hazard zone, and erosion control requirements.

#### **Non-Superior Project Elements:**

The proposed PUD includes multiple code modifications. Staff have worked collaboratively with the applicant to minimize the potential adverse environmental impacts of the proposed PUD amendment. The following project elements are not superior in the proposed PUD relative to the existing 1987 PUD:

1. The proposed PUD includes 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of impervious cover within the floodplain and within 50 ft of the shoreline setback in the Dock District for a clubhouse. Per a recommendation from the Environmental Commission, the gross floor area of the proposed clubhouse has been limited to 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. While the area of the clubhouse, dock, and dock access is 12,500 ft<sup>2</sup>, wetland mitigation of 18,700 ft<sup>2</sup> is proposed for an existing disturbed area.
2. To access the Dock District, the proposed PUD includes one mechanized access via one of two potential methods: an incline elevator from the Mixed Residential District or an elevator from the Commercial District. The mechanized access would encroach into the buffer of a critical environmental feature. Watershed Protection Department staff do not

support mechanized shoreline access. However, staff conclude that the elevator would result in less disturbance and negative environmental impact than the incline elevator. Either the incline elevator or the elevator shall span the critical environmental features such that no structural connections to the vertical face of bluff or rimrock are utilized. Any mechanized access shall utilize a non-hydraulic method or redundant fluid containment if a hydraulic method is used.

3. Overall critical environmental feature (CEF) protections for the proposed PUD are superior, as no CEF protections are required under the existing PUD. One karst feature is not protected. Some development will encroach into the buffer of the significant bluff (B-1). However, the bluff (B-1) is protected with at least a 100 ft setback in the Mixed Residential District. The significant bluff (B-1) is protected with a 50 ft setback for foundations and a 30 ft setback for any cantilevered construction or disturbance in the Commercial District.
4. The proposed PUD includes cut and fill up to 24 ft with up to 28 ft for fire lanes, although the total amount of cut and fill over 4 ft is limited as noted in the exhibits. The existing PUD allowed cut and fill up to 19 ft. All cut and fill over 4 ft in the proposed PUD shall be structurally contained using retaining walls.
5. The proposed PUD includes construction on slopes in excess of what would be allowed for the Lake Austin Zoning District and the existing PUD. The applicant has proposed to limit construction on slopes greater than 35% to not more than 1.09 acres in area. Staff recommend that construction on slopes be limited in total area, with area limits for each slope category and by proposed PUD district.
6. The proposed PUD is seeking to extend site plan and preliminary expiration dates to 7 years after the date of site plan or preliminary approval. Current code with extension options expires site plans after 4 years.
7. The proposed PUD includes a cluster dock for private use only that is 18,720 ft<sup>2</sup> in footprint. While the cluster dock would comply with the 30 ft length requirement of current code, the cluster dock is proposed to be located up to 75 ft from the shoreline to minimize dredging and shoreline disturbance. Dock construction would occur by barge from the lake to minimize impacts to the shoreline and critical environmental features. All motorboats will be moored or stored within the dock footprint. Other than in the Dock (D), no other docks will be allowed along the shoreline. No shower facilities, fuel storage, or commercial watercraft rentals are allowed on the dock. No intense recreational use shall be allowed within the Shoreline Recreation Area, and swimming areas within the Dock District shall be restricted in size and location to be protective of public safety, navigation safety, and shoreline integrity.
8. The proposed PUD includes development within the 100-year floodplain. Watershed Protection Department staff do not support a variance to allow development within the floodplain. Approval of the PUD by Austin City Council would constitute approval of a floodplain variance. Watershed Protection Department staff propose additional conditions to protect public safety should the floodplain variance be approved with the proposed PUD.

**Conditions from the Environmental Commission:**

On September 19, 2018, the Environmental Commission determined that the proposed PUD amendment is environmentally superior to the 1987 PUD with conditions. To date, all of the

conditions recommended by the Environmental Commission have been addressed in PUD notes and exhibits except:

- Adjacent property compatibility setbacks may need further evaluation by Zoning and Platting Department staff.
- The Environmental Commission recommended that engineering solutions that exceed the Environmental Criteria Manual requirements shall be provided for all construction on slopes greater than 25%. Staff are continuing to work with the applicant to identify feasible means to satisfy this recommendation.
- The proposed PUD includes a cluster dock 18,720 ft<sup>2</sup> in footprint. The Environmental Commission has recommended that the cluster dock be limited to 14,400 ft<sup>2</sup> in footprint.
- The proposed PUD includes a cluster dock that is 30 ft in length but may extend up to 75 ft from the shoreline. The Environmental Commission recommended an evaluation of reducing the distance of the dock from the shoreline to 60 ft to reduce the potential for navigation safety concerns. Bringing the proposed dock closer to the shoreline would substantially increase the amount of dredging necessary and may reduce the area proposed for wetland restoration. Watershed Protection Department staff prefer limiting the amount of dredging and impacts to the shoreline over bringing the dock closer to the shoreline.


**Attachments**






Attachment 1: Presentation Summarizing Environmental Superiority

# Camelback PUD

C814-86-023.01

Atha Phillips, Environmental Program Coordinator  
Watershed Protection Department



-  Site Location
-  Austin ETJ
-  Austin City Limits
-  Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone
-  Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone





## Background:

- 138.19 acres of land and 6.467 acres of water
- Lake Austin watershed
- Water Supply Rural
- Drinking Water Protection Zone
- Proposed revision to an existing PUD with 64 single family homes
- Addition of land from Coldwater PUD
- Bridgepoint Parkway extension is within the existing and proposed PUD
- Numerous CEFs exist on site
- Council District 10







Site Location

Watershed Boundary






# Existing PUD-Hidden Valley






## Existing PUD-Hidden Valley





## Existing PUD-Coldwater




## Existing PUDs





# Proposed PUD-Land Use



## DISTRICT SUMMARY

OVERALL SITE AREA: 144.817 AC.

O-MU	6.30 AC.	4%
C	7.46 AC.	5%
MR	36.75 AC.	26%
P-OS*	60.46 AC.	42%
PARK*	26.16 AC.	18%
DOCK	2.73 AC.	2%
Bridge Point Parkway ROW	4.96 AC.	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>144.82 AC.</b>	<b>100%</b>

- The total proposed Open Space is 86.62 Ac., equivalent to 60% of the total site area.

## Comparison:

### Land Use

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Commercial, Multi-Family, and Mixed Use	Hidden Valley: 64 Single Family Homes Coldwater: 5 Single Family Homes	Commercial, Multi-Family, and Mixed Use


### Parks and Open Space

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Park: 7.9 acres Open Space: 6.9 acres <b>Total: 14.8 acres</b>	Hidden Valley: 32.55 acres Coldwater: 6.88 acres <b>Total = 39.432 acres</b>	Park: 26.16 acres Open Space: 60.94 acres <b>Total = 86.62 acres</b>





# Proposed PUD: Parks and Open Space



## District Summary

Overall Site Area 144.817 acres  
138.19 land and 6.467 water

Park	26.16 acres
Open Space	60.46 acres
Total	86.62
<b>Total Land</b>	<b>80.15 acres</b>
<b>Total Water</b>	<b>6.467 acres</b>

Comparison:

Water Quality

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
1/2" plus for 100% of site	None required (<20% Impervious Cover)	1/2" plus for 100% of site 75% of captured water quality will be treated by green storm infrastructure

Drainage and Erosion Controls

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Current Code at time of Site Plan	Current Code at time of Site Plan	Current Code at time of Site Plan

## Comparison:

### Critical Water Quality Zone and Crossings

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Current code for CWQZ buffers and 1 variance required for crossing CWQZ buffer	No creek buffers	Proposes 2 crossings 1-Bridgepoint Pkwy 1-(C) Lot access Will span the 10 year high water mark


### Critical Environmental Features

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
CEFs protected with 150' buffer	Identification required but no buffers	Disturbance is located within some buffers but overall better protection





# Proposed PUD: Shoreline and Wetlands



## WETLAND RESTORATION

WETLAND CDEF W-6 MITIGATION SUMMARY		
AREA DESCRIPTION		SQUARE FEET
WETLAND EXISTING DISTURBED AREA		57,849.35
WETLAND PROPOSED DISTURBED AREA		13,133.23
WETLAND RESTORATION AREA		23,177.06

Wetland Restoration-Bull Rush



2009

2018







Comparison:

Floodplain

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Current code	Current code	Floodplain variance with PUD approval



Erosion Hazard Zone

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Current code	Not required	Current code



## Comparison:

### Impervious Cover

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
20% NSA = 10.54 acres + 2 acres Champion	16.92 acres + 1.23 acres + 2 acres Champion	21.86 acres - 2 acres Champion
Total = 12.54 acres	Total = 20.15 acres	Total = 19.86 acres



### Limits of Disturbance

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
18.81 acres	30.02 acres	35.16 acres



Comparison:

Cut

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Unlimited under buildings and road right-of-way, 4' elsewhere	Unlimited under buildings, 4' elsewhere Up to 19' granted for Bridgepoint Parkway and limited amounts for driveways to access lots	Up to 28' for fire lanes 20 to 24 ft: up to 0.27 acres 12 to 20 ft: up to 1.65 acres 4 to 12 ft: 5.31 acres

Fill

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Unlimited under buildings and road right-of-way, 4' elsewhere	Unlimited under buildings, 4' elsewhere Up to 19' granted for Bridgepoint Parkway and limited amounts for driveways to access lots	Up to 28' for fire lanes 20 to 24 ft: up to 0.27 acres 12 to 20 ft: up to 2.01 acres 4 to 12 ft: 6.80 acres

Cut and fill acreage can be transferred to lower amounts but not higher.

# Comparison:

## Construction on Slopes

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Road or driveway not allowed on slopes over 15% unless accessing 2 acres of 15% or less or 5 residential units.	Construction limited per LA watershed regulations	Construction on slopes:
<u>No Construction:</u> Buildings on slopes 25%+ Parking lot on slopes 15%+	<u>Single Family</u> Slope 0-15% 35% IC Slope 15-25% 10% IC Slope 25-35% 5% IC Slope 35% + 0	More than 35% IC on slopes 0-15% More than 10% IC on slopes between 15-25%
<u>If Construction 15-25%:</u> No more than 10% on 15%+ Must use terracing Must revegetate Stabilize slope	<u>Commercial</u> Slope 0-15% 65% IC Slope 15-25% 15% IC Slope 25-35% 5% IC Slope 35% + 0	More than 5% IC on slopes between 25-35% Construction on slopes greater than 35%

X



Comparison:

Boat Docks

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
Cluster boat dock is limited by residential units 600sf/unit	12-2 slip docks Total = 14,400 sf	625 lf dock Total = 18,750 sf




Shoreline Access

Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
No Mechanized Access	No Mechanized Access	Mechanized access 1. Elevator 2. Tram




# Proposed PUD: Boat Dock and Access






Proposed PUD: Shoreline





# Proposed PUD: Access-Recent Bluff Calving





# Proposed PUD: Access-Recent Rimrock Calving



70 Pascal Lane



# Proposed PUD: Access-Tram Channelization





## Comparison:

### Tree Preservation


Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
	Protect trees greater than 19"	Current code except administrative removal of heritage trees identified as dead or diseased. Specifically Trees #: 23179, 23231, 23381*, 23399, 23472*, 24317*

\*Tree health to be verified before PUD goes to Planning Commission

### Tree Mitigation


Existing Code	Existing PUD	Proposed PUD
	Mitigated per Tree Class	Current code mitigation except Ashe Juniper will be mitigated at 2" for each tree removed. Trees less than 8" preserved within LOC can count towards mitigation

# Proposed PUD: Heritage Trees





Tree #23179 40" Multi-stem Red Oak (Sick)







Tree #23231 27.5" Multi-stem Red Oak (Sick)







34" Multi-stem Red Oak (Sick)



Tree #23399

## Superiorities

- Parkland and Open Space
- Impervious Cover including removing 2 acres of impervious cover from the Champion Tract
- Current code water quality with 75% treated through distributed green stormwater infrastructure
- CWQZ buffer crossings will span the 10 year high water mark
- CWQZ will start at 32 acres as opposed to 64 acres
- 150' Critical Environmental Feature buffers for most features but approximately 10% of CEFs have reduced buffers
- Three Star Green Energy Building rating or above
- Comply with Erosion Hazard Zone requirements
- Outdoor lighting to incorporate dark sky lighting techniques



## Non-Superior Project Elements

- Construction of 5,000 sf building within the floodplain
- Construction on slopes
- Cut and Fill
- Floodplain variance
- Mechanized access
- Extent of development footprint
- Boat dock size
- Not all CEFs have the standard 150' buffer
- Shoreline setback reduction

# Conditions from the Environmental Commission

- Continue to work with staff for the floodplain variance prior to approval of the PUD and at a minimum safe access and safe refuge issues must be resolved with staff
- Require walls to contain cut and fill greater than 4'
- Provide an engineering solution for construction on slopes that exceeds the appropriate criteria manual requirements
- Verify the trees listed are dead or dying per the applicant's arborist report
- Work with staff to establish a minimum buffer for the bluff
- Tram/elevator/inclinators need to be finalized with safety and environmental constraints as applicable
- Sewage lift station provides an oversized wet well to accommodate extended downtime and back-up from force main
- Design of the dock facilities and access should include input from a design charrette made up of a group approved by the City staff and the developer to ensure the structure protects the visual environmental impacts

# Conditions from the Environmental Commission

- Work with staff to provide a gross floor area to limit clubhouse size
- Provide a geologic report regarding the impacts on the rimrock, springs and other features that are not included in a buffer area and along any access path to the lake front
- Boat dock construction and access are to be built from the lake via barge and not from the bluff down
- Swimming area restrictions should be included
- Limit or control commercial watercraft rentals
- Trail construction should be evaluated for sustainability and maintenance
- Adjacent property compatibility setback needs to be evaluated and discussed with the adjacent property owner
- No shower facilities at the boat dock or clubhouse
- Clarify restriction on noise limits
- Non-hydraulic design for any mechanical lift or redundant containment for any fluid lines



## Conditions from the Environmental Commission

- Open space and public access restrictions should be further evaluated
- Limit boat dock to 14,400 square footage
- Evaluate dock distance from shoreline down to 60' and impacts on the wetland
- No intense recreational use along the shoreline or clubhouse area
- Modify grandfathering language in accordance with staff recommendations and
- Any access structure shall not be attached to the bluff or rimrock.

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MOTION 20180919 008b**

**Date:** September 19, 2018

**Subject:** Camelback Planned Unit Development, C814-86-023.01

**Motion by:** Wendy Gordon

**Seconded by:** Hank Smith

**RATIONALE:**

**WHEREAS**, the Camelback Planned Unit Development (PUD) is a proposed amendment to an existing PUD from 1987; and

**WHEREAS**, City staff have concluded that elements of the project provide environmental superiority over the 1987 PUD; and

**WHEREAS**, the revised PUD will provide at least 60.46 acres of permanently protected open space and 26.16 acres of dedicated park land in an area that has high recreational use due to its scenic beauty and easy access; and

**WHEREAS**, other environmental superiority elements include: treating 100 percent of required stormwater runoff volume per current Land Development Code requirements, of which 75 percent will be treated through green stormwater control measures; designing outdoor lighting on the site with dark sky lighting techniques; and providing an Austin Energy Green Building rating of three stars or above; providing more critical environmental feature buffers than the current PUD; and

**WHEREAS**, in coordination with this PUD amendment, the applicant also proposes to acquire Champions Tract 3, located at the southeast corner of FM 2222 Road and City Park Road, reduce the planned use intensity of the property from apartments to a senior living development, and reduce two acres of impervious cover from the Champions Tract 3 development; and

**WHEREAS**, the Environmental Commission voted against the currently approved version of the Champions Tract 3 development concluding that it was "not necessarily environmentally superior" to the original development agreement and because of specific concerns relating to impervious cover and intensity of use; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed downscaling of the Champions Tract 3 development would help alleviate environmental impacts, address the Environmental Commission's previously stated concerns, and is supported by the surrounding neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS**, the majority of the neighbors and neighborhoods surrounding Camelback PUD have come out in favor of the project with written endorsements.

**THEREFORE**, the Environmental Commission finds that the proposed Camelback PUD amendment is environmentally superior to the 1987 PUD and is recommended with the conditions laid out by City staff in its September 13, 2018 memo and the following:

**Environmental Commission Conditions**

- continue to work with staff for the floodplain variance prior to approval of the PUD and at a minimum safe access and safe refuge issues must be resolved with staff
- require walls to contain cut and fill greater than 4'
- provide an engineering solution for construction on slopes that exceeds the appropriate criteria manual requirements
- verify the trees listed are dead or dying per the applicant's arborist report
- work with staff to establish a minimum buffer for the bluff
- tram/elevator/inclinor issues need to be finalized with safety and environmental constraints as applicable
- sewage lift station provides an oversized wet well to accommodate extended downtime and back-up from force main
- design of the dock facilities and access should include input from a design charrette made up of a group approved by the City staff and the developer to ensure the structure protects the visual environmental impacts
- work with staff to provide a gross floor area to limit clubhouse size
- provide a geologic report regarding the impacts on the rimrock, springs and other features that are not included in a buffer area and along any access path to the lake front
- boat dock construction and access are to be built from the lake via barge and not from the bluff down
- swimming area restrictions should be included
- limit or control commercial watercraft rentals
- trail construction should be evaluated for sustainability and maintenance
- adjacent property compatibility setback needs to be evaluated and discussed with the adjacent property owner
- no shower facilities at the boat dock or clubhouse
- clarify restriction on noise limits
- non-hydraulic design for any mechanical lift or redundant containment for any fluid lines
- open space and public access restrictions should be further evaluated
- limit boat dock to 14,400 square footage
- evaluate dock distance from shoreline down to 60' and impacts on the wetland
- no intense recreational use along the shoreline or clubhouse area
- modify grandfathering language in accordance with staff recommendations and
- any access structure shall not be attached to the bluff or rimrock.

**VOTE 7-2**

For: B. Smith, Creel, Neely, H. Smith, Guerrero, Gordon, and Coyne

Against: Thompson and Maceo


Abstain: None

Recuse: Perales

Absent: None



Approved By:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Linda Guerrero". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Linda Guerrero, Environmental Commission Chair



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Linda Guerrero, Chair, and Members of the Environmental Commission

**FROM:** Christopher S. Herrington, P.E., Interim Environmental Officer  
Watershed Protection Department

**DATE:** September 13, 2018

**SUBJECT:** Camelback Planned Unit Development – C814-86-023.01

This summary is being provided to the Environmental Commission for the Camelback Planned Unit Development (PUD), a proposed amendment to an existing PUD from 1987. This memo provides an overview of the property's environmental features, the requested modifications to environmental code requirements, and the elements of the project that provide environmental superiority. Staff finds that with staff's conditions, the proposed development would be environmentally superior to what could be built without the amendment to the PUD.

### Project History

The applicant proposes to revise the existing single-family Hidden Valley PUD (C814-86-023). The 1987 Hidden Valley PUD included 64 home sites, 27 acres of common open space, and the extension of the Bridge Point Parkway road (Exhibit A: Original PUDs). The density of single-family homes averaged one unit per two acres. An ordinance tied to the single-family project waived the requirements of the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance, giving the project the Lake Austin Watershed Ordinance in effect at the time of application. The proposed revision also includes the addition of 15.3214 acres from the Coldwater PUD (C814-84-020.03), which contained 5 single-family home sites and 6.88 acres of greenbelt. The original Hidden Valley PUD received environmental code modifications (Exhibit B: Original PUD variances).

### Project Description

The revision to the existing PUD proposes to modify uses to include mixed residential (single-family, condominiums, and townhouses) uses; commercial and office uses; 80.153 acres of park and open space; and a 625 ft<sup>2</sup> cluster dock. A collector road is proposed to be built through the site, connecting Bridge Point Parkway from the eastern portion of the site to the western portion. The proposed PUD amendment also includes a request to modify various environmental regulations including but not limited to: critical water quality zone buffers, tree preservation, impervious cover limitations, boat docks, boat dock access, and cut/fill.

In coordination with this PUD amendment, the applicant also proposes to acquire Champions Tract 3, located at the southeast corner of FM 2222 Road and City Park Road, reduce the

planned use intensity of the property from apartments to a senior living development, reduce 2 acres of impervious cover from the Champions Tract 3 development, and make certain traffic mobility improvements associated with Champions Tract 3.

**Description of Property**

The Camelback PUD consists of approximately 138.19 acres of land and 6.467 acres of water located on the north bank of Lake Austin, at the western terminus of Bridge Point Parkway, and approximately one quarter mile west of N. Capital of Texas Highway (Loop 360) (Exhibit C: Location Maps). The property is currently zoned PUD with a base zoning of Lake Austin residence (LA). The site is located in the Lake Austin and Coldwater Creek watersheds, which are classified as Water Supply Rural and are within the Drinking Water Protection Zone. The site is not within the Edwards Aquifer recharge or contributing zones. The property has approximately 3,126 feet of frontage along Lake Austin, which is protected by a 100-foot wide critical water quality zone (CWQZ) (Exhibit D: Critical Water Quality Zone and Floodplain).

**Existing Topography/Soil Characteristics/Trees**

The site contains steep slopes adjacent to Lake Austin, which transitions from flat areas along the lake shore to steep slopes greater than 400 percent along the bluff. Elevations range from approximately 492.8 feet above mean sea level at the lake shore to 732 feet above mean sea level at the top of the bluff. The rest of the property is comprised of several hill tops and a valley that bisects the two with the highest point at the northwest corner of the tract resting at an elevation of 932 feet above mean sea level. The property contains a large number of trees including heritage and protected trees. A full tree survey has not been conducted on the entire site, but the applicant has conducted transects and the applicant's arborist has prepared a tree report (Exhibit E: Arborist Report). Tree species on the site include but are not limited to escarpment oak, ash juniper, Texas red oak, eastern red cedar, and mountain laurel.

**Critical Environmental Features**

An Environmental Resource Inventory (ERI) was prepared by Terracon Consultants in July 2018 (Exhibit F: Applicant's Environmental Resource Inventory). The ERI identified 44 critical environmental features (CEFs) on or within 150 feet of the PUD site: ten canyon rimrocks, one bluff, 26 springs and seeps, one karst feature (solution cavity), and six wetlands. Forty-three (43) of the 44 CEFs are being protected with buffers. The solution cavity will not be preserved. Current code requires a 150-foot buffer zone for each CEF. The PUD proposes to modify the buffers for all of the CEFs as illustrated on the applicant's Exhibit G (Critical Environmental Feature Buffers). The PUD amendment designates CEF buffers and modified buffer areas and proposes wetland mitigation to minimize the impacts of the CEF buffer reductions.

**Requested Environmental Code Modifications**

The applicant proposes multiple environmental code modifications (Exhibit H).

**Proposed Environmental Superiority Elements**

Staff have prepared a comparison of the original PUD to the proposed PUD amendment (Exhibit I). The applicant is proposing to provide the following environmental superiority elements:

1. The revised PUD will provide at least 60.46 acres of permanently protected open space and 26.16 acres of dedicated park land.



2. The revised PUD will treat 100% of the required stormwater runoff volume for water quality per current Land Development Code requirements, 75% of which will be treated through distributed green stormwater control measures.
3. The revised PUD will comply with Erosion Hazard Zone requirements.
4. Outdoor lighting on the site will be designed to incorporate dark sky lighting techniques.
5. The revised PUD will provide an Austin Energy Green Building rating of three stars or above.
6. The revised PUD will provide more CEF buffers than the current PUD.
7. The applicant will reduce impervious cover on the Champions Tract 3 by 2 acres. Considering the reduced impervious cover on the Champions Tract 3, the overall impervious cover of the revised PUD is less than the current PUD.

**Determination**

Based on the superiority elements described above and in the comparison chart in combination with the staff recommended PUD notes, staff finds that the proposed development would be environmentally superior to what could be built with the existing PUD. Considering staff recommendations, the superiority elements preserve and enhance the site's natural features and protect the water quality of Lake Austin.

**Staff Recommendations**

Modify the following applicant PUD notes:

1. Revise note #1 to include dedicated open space and restrict uses in dedicated open space.
2. Clarify the overall allowable percent impervious cover in notes #2 and #3.
3. Revise notes #5 and #6 with respect to tree protection to comply with current code but allowing for certain specifically identified dead, diseased, or dying trees to be removed.
4. Clarify in note #8 the allowable exchange of commercial for residential unit.
5. Clarify number of allowable driveways in note #9
6. Revise note #11 restrict the area of improvements for buildings and related facilities in the Dock (D) District to a maximum of 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> and clarify applicable floodplain modification requirements.
7. Staff recommends an elevator as the only means of mechanized access to the Dock (D) District. Revise note #12, and clarify critical environmental feature buffer requirements.
8. Remove note #13 and replace with new notes for each item (see below).
9. Revise note #14 regarding applicable erosion and sedimentation controls.
10. Revise note #15 regarding applicable site plan expiration requirements.
11. Clarify note #16 in regards to exterior lighting and screening of equipment and utilities.
12. Revise note #23 to require that sidewalks shall meander so that trees greater than 19 in are preserved.
13. Revise note #25 to clarify that acreage for Preserve Open Space (P-OS) may not be combined with other districts to satisfy minimum area requirements.
14. Revise note #27 to clarify that no additional dock development other than the specified cluster dock is allowed.
15. Revise note #28 to clarify the revised impervious cover limitations on the Champions Tract 3.

16. Clarify note #29 regarding the watercraft which may be moored or stored on the cluster dock.
17. Clarify language in note #30, staff wants all environmental requirements to be shown on Land Use Plan or stated within PUD Notes.
18. Revise note #33 regarding modification of the alignment of Bridge Point Parkway.
19. Clarify critical environmental feature buffer requirements in note #34.
20. Potentially revise note #36 pending clarification from Austin Fire Department.
21. Revise note #38 to restrict staging for Bridge Point Parkway in locations other than the Park (P) and Preserve (P-OS) districts.
22. Clarify note #42 regarding floodplain requirements for the Dock (D) District.
23. Clarify note #45 regarding allowable incidental development in the Preserve (P-OS) District.

Additionally, staff recommend the inclusion of additional notes to the PUD including:


1. Clarify critical environmental feature buffer requirements in the Commercial (C) District.
2. Clarify that cut and fill max not exceed 24 ft, except for fire lanes which may not exceed 28 ft, and specify a maximum total amount of allowable cut and fill over 4 ft.
3. Specify the maximum footprint of the cluster dock.
4. Add structural containment requirements for cut and fill.
5. Add requirements for spanning of roadways and driveways for critical water quality zone crossings and other headwater creeks.
6. Specify shoreline wetland critical environmental feature delineation and mitigation.
7. Require structural stormwater control measures to capable of treating 100% of the required water quality volume, and utilize green stormwater control measures for at least 75% of the required water quality volume.
8. Specify integrated pest management plan requirements.
9. Specify outdoor lighting plans to minimize light pollution.
10. Specify green building requirements such that all buildings achieve a 3-star or greater rating.
11. Specify irrigation water sources and requirements for the use of air conditioning condensate for commercial buildings.
12. Specify tree species planting and placement criteria and non-turf plant requirements.
13. Specify drainage requirements.
14. Specify applicable Erosion Hazard Zone requirements.

**Exhibits:**

A	Original PUD
B	Original PUD Variances
C	Location Maps
D	Critical Water Quality Zone and Floodplain
E	Arborist Report
F	Environmental Resource Inventory/Site Photos
G	Critical Environmental Features
H	Environmental Code Modifications
I	PUD Amendment Comparison Chart


## Existing PUD-Hidden Valley

Exhibit A






## Exhibit A Existing PUD-Hidden Valley





# Existing PUD-Coldwater

## Exhibit A



## Exhibit B

**Austin City Council  
MINUTES****For** SEPTEMBER 24, 1987 - 1:00 P.M.

Council Chambers, 307 West Second Street, Austin, Texas

**Memorandum To:**

Mayor Cooksey called to order the meeting of the Council, noting the presence of all Councilmembers.

**MINUTES APPROVED**

The Council, on Councilmember Nofziger's motion, Councilmember Shipman's second, approved minutes for regular meetings of August 27, 1987 and September 3, 1987 and special meetings of September 3 & 15, 1987. (4-0 Vote, Mayor Pro Tem Trevino and Councilmember Urdy out of the room.)

**CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Janet Pogue discussed Wild Basin Interpretive Center and Mr. Mark R. Smith discussed City Landfill fees.

**ITEM POSTPONED**

Postponed to October 15, 1987 is consideration of second/third readings of the Development Processing Ordinance (13-1) and the Performance Overlay Ordinance.

**OLD BUSINESS - ZONING ORDINANCES**

The Council, on Councilmember Shipman's motion, Councilmember Humphrey's second, passed through second/third readings of ordinances amending Chapter 13-2A of the Austin City Code (Zoning Ordinance) to cover the following changes: (5-0 Vote, Councilmembers Urdy and Carl-Mitchell out of the room)

(1) **GEORGE NALLE**  
By Terry Bray  
C14r-86-207

1500 Capital  
Parkway

From "SF-2"  
to "MF-3"

First reading on December 4, 1986, (6-0). Mayor Pro Tem John Trevino, Jr. and Councilmember Charles E. Urdy absent. Conditions have been met as follows: Development restricted to that shown on site plan attached as an exhibit to the ordinance.



Council Memo

13

9/24/87

- |     |            |   |  |  |
|-----|------------|---|--|--|
| (5) | -87<br>127 | FIRST STATE<br>BANK<br>By John Lee                        | 3500 Block Dime<br>Circle                              | From "DR", "SF-2"<br>To "LI"<br><u>RECOMMENDED<br/>ORDINANCE</u> |
| (6) | -87<br>129 | LOU B. & PAE<br>FALLEY<br>By Shaffer<br>Financial Network | 9436 Parkfield<br>Drive                                | From "GR"<br>To "CS-1"<br><u>RECOMMENDED<br/>ORDINANCE</u>       |
| (7) | -87<br>122 | YAGER LANE/<br>DESSAU ROAD<br>PARTNERSHIP                 | 1600 Block Yager<br>Lane<br>12000 Block Dessau<br>Road | From "DR"<br>To "GR" & "RR"<br><u>FIRST READING</u>              |

RECOMMENDED "GR" zoning with "RR" zoning for the 100-year floodplain, subject to an impervious cover limit of 70 percent, no access to Dessau Road, no certificate of occupancy prior to construction of Doubleback Lane, and fulfilling recommendation of a revised traffic impact analysis prior to issuance of a building permit for any use other than a church, private elementary school, or commercial day care center.

- |     |             |  |                         |  |
|-----|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| (8) | 8286<br>023 | HIDDEN VALLEY<br>P.U.D.<br>CREDITBANC<br>INTERNATIONAL CORP. | Bridge Point<br>Parkway | From "LA" & "DR"<br>To PUD<br><u>FIRST READING</u> |
|-----|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|

RECOMMENDED PUD zoning, grant variances to exceed the maximum block length, to exceed the maximum cul-de-sac length for Grosse Pointe Ct., Eagle Ridge and Biltmore Court; approve variances from the Lake Austin Watershed Ordinance to construct a public or private roadway on slopes exceeding 25% and to exceed four feet of cut and fill, based on items 1, 2 and 3 of the finding of fact criteria being subject to Environmental Board recommendations and that erosion controls are to be provided at the headwall of the draw for the roadway that exceeds 25% slopes; applicant is to try to obtain access through Shepherd of the Hills Church site for lot 52.

(On Mayor Pro Tem Trevino's motion, Councilmember Urdy's second, 6-0 Vote, Councilmember Humphrey out of the room)

-----

- |     |            |  |  |  |
|-----|------------|--|--|--|
| (9) | -83<br>003 | CITY OF AUSTIN<br>By Stanley Depve,<br>Dan McRae | 2504-2508, 2505-2509<br>Westlake Drive and<br>West of 2506<br>Westlake Drive | From "I-LA" & "SF-3"<br>To "CR"<br>NO RECOMMENDATION |
|-----|------------|--|--|--|

CONTINUE UNTIL THE PARTIES  
CONCERNED BRING IT BACK

(On Councilmember Carl-Mitchell's motion, Councilmember Shipman's second, 5-0 Vote, Mayor Pro Tem Trevino and Councilmember Urdy out of the room)



## Austin City Council MINUTES

For DECEMBER 3, 1987 - 1:00 P.M.

Council Chambers, 307 West Second Street, Austin, Texas

Mayor Pro Tem Trevino called to order the meeting of the Council, noting the absence of Mayor Cooksey.

### MINUTES APPROVED

The Council, on Councilmember Carl-Mitchell's motion, Mayor Pro Tem Trevino's second, approved minutes for regular meeting of November 19, 1987 and special meetings of November 17 & 24 (10:00 & 4:00), 1987. (4-0 Vote, Mayor Cooksey absent, Councilmembers Humphrey and Urdy not yet in the Council Chamber.)

### CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

William Miller Jr. discussed STNP. Nancy Harris, Stephen B. Rodi, Otis Budd, Garry Wilkison, Chip Harris, Enrique Lopez Jr., and Al Dotson of the Library Commission, all discussed implementation of library budget cuts. Jackie Goodman did not appear but her statement was read by Chip Harris.

### ITEM POSTPONED

Postponed to December 10, 1987 is the Austin Convention and Visitor Bureau, Inc. report on annual marketing plan and budget for approval.

### CIVIC CENTER PROJECT

Council had under consideration ordinances and resolutions dealing with the Civic Center Project.

Motions made begin on the next page.

Council Memo

3

12/3/87

- (1) **HIDDEN VALLEY** Bridge Point From "LA" & "DR"  
**P.U.D.** Parkway to "P.U.D."  
 C814-86-023

First reading on September 24, 1987, (6-0).  
 Councilmember George Mumphrey out of room at roll  
 call. No conditions to be met.

- (2) **VESTRIDGE P.U.D.** FM 2222 @ Grace From "SF-2"  
 By Doug Dune Lane to P.U.D.  
 C814-85-007

First reading on July 11, 1985, (6-0). Mayor Pro  
 Tem John Trevino, Jr. abstained. No conditions to  
 be met.

(5-0 Vote, Mayor Pro Tem Trevino abstained, Mayor Cooksey absent.

- (3) **TEXAS COMMERCE** 505 & 507 Ferguson From "I-SF-2"  
**BANK-AUSTIN NATIONAL** to "CS"  
**ASSOCIATION, A NATIONAL**  
**BANKING ASSOCIATION**  
 By Sharon Peters Judge  
 C14-85-059

First reading on May 2, 1985, (5-0). Councilmember  
 Charles E. Urdy absent. Conditions have been met as  
 follows: Restrictive Covenant incorporating  
 conditions imposed by Council has been executed.

- (4) **THOMAS V. BRADFIELD** South Loop 1 at From "SF-2"  
**TRANSWESTERN PROPERTY** Loop 360 to "GO"  
**COMPANY**  
 C14r-86-283

Second reading on August 20, 1987, (6-0).  
 Councilmember Sally Shipman absent. Conditions  
 have been met as follows: Development restricted to  
 that shown on site plan attached as an exhibit to the  
 ordinance.

- (5) **CITY OF AUSTIN** 100-3000 Lamar From "UNZ", "SF-2"  
**PARKS AND RECREATION** Boulevard, 5100 - "SF-3", "HF-2",  
**DEPARTMENT** 6000 Shoal Creek "HF-3", "HF-4",  
 By Stuart Strong Boulevard "LO", "GO", "CS"  
 C14-87-082 to "P"

First reading on August 27, 1987, (7-0). No  
 conditions to be met.



Planning Commission Minutes

7

August 25, 1987

CB14-86-023    HIDDEN VALLEY P.U.D.  
CREDITBANC INTERNATIONAL CORP.  
By: Bury & Pittman  
Bridgepoint Parkway

Greg Strimska, agent, said the density of the proposed plan was originally limited to 134 units, but under the Northwest Area Plan the density was limited to 64 lots as a condition of the waiver from the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance. In addition, Bridgepoint Parkway was scaled down from 90' r.o.w. with 50' of pavement to 64' r.o.w. with 32' of pavement. Bridgepoint Parkway is dictated by the 40 m.p.h. mile speed that is required for geometrics. This has dictated the amount of cut and fill being requested by the applicant.

The applicant is requesting a cut and fill variance for 10 of the 64 lots. Those 10 lots contain cut and fill of less than 6' with the exception of Lot 42 which has a 9' cut and fill due to the fact that the streets bite into the tip of the hill at the end of the cul-de-sac.

The main issue is the variance to construct an easement across slopes of greater than 25% gradient. This easement will provide access to five lots that have frontage on Bridgepoint Parkway. They looked at various grades which would be encountered in taking access to Bridgepoint Parkway, and in all those instances they would traverse slopes in excess of 25% for much greater distances, and some of those grades were unacceptable to staff. The applicant therefore felt that the previous plan which would provide access through Shepard Mountain was most preferable; however, they have not been able to obtain an easement through Shepard Mountain. This alternative would require crossing an area of 100' across a slope, and is similar to the alignment which was previously agreed to. In addition, it will not create a significant environmental feature that would warrant special consideration if reviewed under the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance. They feel the disturbance in the area will be minimal.

Mary Arnold asked if erosion and sedimentation control measures would be required and if the Commission could obtain an evaluation of any erosion and sedimentation control proposals during construction.

Marie Silver said erosion and sedimentation control measures will not be required but they will be required to install a rock berm at the bottom end of each draw. She noted that if they cannot obtain access from the Shepard Mountain tract, they may need to redraw lot lines.

Scott Roberts recommended that the applicant continue working with Shepard Mountain in order to obtain an access easement to Lot 52. If the Commission denies the variance which prevents the applicant from obtaining access to Lot 52, he will be forced into a position of having to work with Shepard Mountain to obtain that access, and if he is unable to acquire that access easement, he will have to come back at a later date and reapply for that variance.

Ken Blaker, Office of Land Development Services, suggested that a condition be placed upon the preliminary plan stating that the final plat will not be approved pending access via the Shepard Mountain church site. He noted that nothing precludes the applicant from reapplying for a variance.

**DRAFT FORM ONLY  
SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION**

Planning Commission Minutes

8

August 25, 1987

Gail Gemberling said she would not vote against the variance given the Environmental Board recommendation.

Brad Greenblum, representing CreditBanc, said they have been negotiating with the Church of Christian Shepard for over one year to secure an easement. They have indicated a willingness to grant the easement, but their conditions are onerous and consist of view corridors which would reduce the number of lots. They are attempting to mitigate their considerations and are continuing to work with them.

Jim Cousar said he is not aware of any instance in which prohibiting a roadway on a 25% slope would deprive a property of privileges enjoyed by similarly situated and similarly timed development.

Scott Roberts said there have been instances in which the Commission has permitted developments to exceed the slope requirements for access and cut and fill.

Gail Gemberling said she views the easement as a driveway because it only provides access to one lot. She also noted that the applicant has worked very hard to comply with the requirements in other areas.

Jim Cousar said some portions of land within the Lake Austin Watershed are simply not suited for development and should therefore not have access to them.

Charles Miles suggested that the applicant make an effort to provide erosion and sedimentation controls.

**COMMISSION ACTION:** Roberts/Gemberling

**MOTION:** To grant PUD zoning, grant variances to exceed the maximum block length, to exceed the maximum cul-de-sac length for Grosse Pointe Ct., Eagle Ridge and Biltmore court, to delete the sidewalks along all roads; approve variances from the Lake Austin Watershed Ordinance to construct a public or private roadway on slopes exceeding 25%, and to exceed four feet of cut and fill, based on Items 1, 2 and 3 of finding of fact criteria; and subject to Environmental Board recommendations.

**Ayes:** Gemberling, Miles, Roberts, Arnold, Goodman, Parker

**Nays:** Cousar

**Abstained:** DeLaGarza

**MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 6-1-1**

**DRAFT FORM ONLY  
SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CB14-86-23(U1)

The staff is not opposed to the proposed land use of PUD zoning and its accompanying site plan. However, the staff recommends denial of this PUD based on the proposed preliminary subdivision. This tract is effected by severe topographic constraints and the applicant has requested variances to the subdivision requirements, which the staff cannot support at this time.

A. Synopsis

On August 28, 1986 this proposed plan was granted a waiver by the City Council from complying with the Comprehensive Watersheds Ordinance. The waiver was granted subject to the following conditions: The applicant was to limit their project to a maximum density of 64 units and that the roadway called Bridge Point Parkway was to be constructed at a width of 32 feet including curb and gutter.

The proposed Hidden Valley Planned Unit Development Phase C consists of 64 single family residential lots, 22 common area lots and is located in the Lake Austin Watershed. The tract encompasses a total of 130.7219 acres and has a unit per/acre density count of less than one (1) per every two (2) acres.

The design and size of this P.U.D. is similar to that of a regular subdivision that would be required if developed under normal subdivision regulations pursuant to the Lake Austin Watershed restrictions. The main difference being the proposed private streets being utilized to access most of the subdivisions proposed lots. Currently under normal subdivision regulations private streets are not allowed unless done in conjunction with a P.U.D.

This tract has a City of Austin water and wastewater service commitment with an approved transfer of service commitments from the Shepard Mountain Subdivision. Two hundred and sixty five (265) living unit equivalents were transferred from Shepard Mountain to Hidden Valley, sixty four (64) of which are to be utilized for this particular tract.

The zoning surrounding this site varies from the use category of PUD to O, LO, and GR. The PUD uses vary from single family, to multi-family in the proposed subdivision of Coldwater PUD which abuts this tract to south and west. Office retail uses are found in the existing subdivisions of Hidden Valley which abut this tract to the east and north. Due to the severe topographic constraints and this PUD's low unit per acre density it is the opinion of the staff that PUD (single family) zoning is appropriate for this area.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was not required as there is no significant traffic impact produced by the sixty four (64) single family lots.



**B. Variances/Waivers**

The applicant has requested three (3) variances from normal subdivision regulations they are as follows:

1. Section 13-3-101: To exceed the maximum block length. Recommend to grant, due to the severe topographic constraints that exist and adequate circulation is provided for the proposed density.
2. Section 13-3-87: To exceed the maximum cul-de-sac length for Grosse Pointe Ct., Eagle Ridge and Biltmore Court. Recommend to grant, due to projects low density and the severe topographic constraints that exist.
3. Section 13-3-151: To delete the sidewalks along all roads. This variance has been withdrawn since the applicant is providing sidewalks as required by the ordinance and staff.

The applicant for the above-mentioned subdivision has requested a variance from the following sections of the Lake Austin Watershed Ordinance:

- A. Section 13-3-621: Impervious cover is not permitted on slopes exceeding 35%;
- B. Section 13-3-638: Public or private roadway construction is prohibited on slopes exceeding 25%, unless accessing five lots; and,
- C. Section 13-3-651: Cut and fill shall not exceed four (4) feet.

The subdivision was granted a waiver from the Comprehensive Watershed Ordinance on August 28, 1987, subject to a density limit of 64 units and a 32-foot roadway design (with curb and gutter) for Bridge Point Parkway.

The following outlines the roadways and lots for driveways for which a variance is requested, and the proposed depth and extent of the excess cut or fill:

**ROADWAYS**

<u>Roadway</u>	<u>Max. Cut</u>	<u>Max. Fill</u>
Bridge Point Parkway	19'	17'
Hilton Head Court	6'	12'
Falls Church Court	5'	6'
Gunnston Court	4'	6'
Bellingrath Court	12'	7'
Belcourt Place	3'	9'
Eagle Ridge	4.5'	7.5'

Beauvoir Terrace	4'	3'
Grosse Point	16'	6'
Biltmore Court	10'	8'

DRIVEWAYS

<u>Lot #</u>	<u>Max. Cut/Fill</u>	<u>Length</u>
1	6' Fill	30'
13	6' Cut	30'
14	6' Cut	50'
15	6' Cut	30'
22	5.5' Cut	30'
23	6' Cut	50'
24	5' Cut	50'
42	9' Cut	40'
59	5' Cut	20'
60	5' Cut	15'

The Environmental Services Division of the Department of Environmental Protection recommends that the variance to exceed the cut and fill limits of Section 13-3-651 be granted for the following reasons:

1. All the roadway cut and fill will be contained within the right-of-way. The roadway design width of 32 feet will limit the impact of the excess cut and fill sections.
2. Alternatives to the proposed roadway alignments were considered. These alternative alignments resulted in increased cut and fill sections required for the construction of the roadway.
3. The excess cut and fill amounts are considered a minimum departure from the requirements of the ordinance when topographic constraints and required roadway design criteria are taken into account. The excess driveway depths are required to access lots from the adjacent roadways.

It is recommended that the variance from Sections 13-3-621 and 13-3-638 to cross slopes exceeding 25% with a driveway, and to locate impervious cover on slopes exceeding 35% be denied. The proposed access easement would have to cross an area of extremely steep slopes in order to access one lot (Lot 52). The joint use driveway proposed to access Lots 37 and 38 will cross areas of slopes exceeding 35% and would result in a driveway with a grade exceeding 30%. It is felt that the access easement can be relocated to a flatter area such that the disturbance associated with the construction of this driveway will be minimized as much as possible. The access of these three lots do not warrant the disturbance that will be created by the construction of the driveways across the steeply sloped areas. These standards would

not allow safe all weather access, and might not allow safe access even in periods of good weather. As such, it is the opinion of the Transportation Review staff that this driveway for lots 37, 38 and 49 would also require variances to Chapter 13-3-646 and 647; these sections mandate that all lots shall be reasonably accessible from the roadway (646), and that all joint access driveways be constructed with a 10 MPH design speed (647). The staff recommends to deny these variance requests as well.

Attached to this report are the required finding-of-fact checklists for the special watershed related requested variances.

C. Requirements

Before this case may be approved the variances requested must be granted. Denial of these variances will result in requiring revisions be made to this plan.

If the variances are granted and the plan is approved then additional final stage requirements must be met prior to final plat approval and site plan release.



Exhibit C






Exhibit C